

# GENESIS AND DEVELOPMENT OF TANTRISM

[Extract]

Edited by

Shingo EINO

## **The Saiva Age**

**The Rise and Dominance of Saivism during the Early Medieval Period**

**By**

**Alexis Sanderson**

INSTITUTE OF ORIENTAL CULTURE UNIVERSITY OF TOKYO

# GENESIS AND DEVELOPMENT OF TANTRISM

Edited by

Shingo EINO

INSTITUTE OF ORIENTAL CULTURE

UNIVERSITY OF TOKYO



## CONTENTS

|  |     |
|--|-----|
| <i>Preface</i> .....   | 9   |
| <i>Introduction</i> .....  | 11  |
| Shingo EINO : <i>From kāmās to siddhis — Tendencies in the Development<br/>of Ritual towards Tantrism</i> — .....        | 17  |
| Alexis SANDERSON : <i>The Śaiva Age — The Rise and Dominance of Śaivism<br/>during the Early Medieval Period</i> — ..... | 41  |
| <i>The Dominance of Śaivism</i> .....  | 44  |
| <i>The Incorporation of Śāktism</i> .....  | 45  |
| <i>The Etiolation and Subsumption of the Cult of the Sun-God</i> .   | 53  |
| <i>The Decline of Vaiṣṇavism and the Rise of the Tantric</i>   |     |
| <i>Pañcarātra Following Śaiva Models</i> .....   | 58  |
| <i>Royal Patronage of Buddhism</i> .....   | 70  |
| <i>The Viṣṇukundīs of Āndhra</i> .....   | 70  |
| <i>The Maitrakas of Valabhī</i> .....  | 72  |
| <i>The Kārkoṭas of Kashmir</i> .....   | 73  |
| <i>The Licchavis of Nepal</i> .....  | 74  |
| <i>The Thākuri Kings of Nepal</i> .....  | 77  |
| <i>The Bhauma-Karas of Orissa</i> .....  | 80  |
| <i>The Candras of South-East Bengal</i> .....  | 83  |
| <i>The Khadgas of Samatāṭa</i> .....   | 83  |
| <i>The Candras of Arakan and Miscellaneous Other</i>   |     |
| <i>Buddhist Kings of Eastern India</i> .....   | 84  |
| <i>The Pāla Emperors and the Great Monasteries<br/>of Eastern India</i> .....  | 87  |
| <i>The Pālas' Engagement with Śaivism</i> .....  | 108 |
| <i>Buddhist Kings of Eastern India and their Commitment<br/>to Brahmanism</i> .....                                      | 115 |
| <i>Joint Patronage of Buddhism and Śaivism in the Kingdoms<br/>of the Khmers, Chams, and Javanese</i> .....              | 117 |
| <i>The Development of Tantric Buddhism Through the Adoption<br/>and Adaptation of Śaiva and Śākta Śaiva Models</i> ..... | 124 |
| <i>The Parallel Repertoire of Rituals</i> .....  | 124 |
| <i>The Mahāvairocanābhisaṃbodhi, the Mañjuśriya-<br/>mūlakalpa, and Buddhaguhya</i> .....                                | 128 |

|  |     |
|--|-----|
| <i>The Sarvatathāgatattvasaṃgraha and the First Inroads of Śākta Śaivism: Possession, Goddesses, and the Sacralization of Sex</i> .....                                  | 132 |
| <i>The Guhyasamāja: Copulating Deities, Sexual Initiation Rites, and the Sacralization of Impurity</i> .....   | 141 |
| <i>The Sarvabuddhasamāyogaḍākinījālaśaṃvara: Heruka and his Yoginīs, Kāpālika iconography, the Gaṇamaṇḍalam, and the Beginning of Śaiva-Buddhist Intertextuality</i> ... | 145 |
| <i>The Yoginītantras and the Full Appropriation of Vidyāpīṭha Śaivism</i> .....  | 156 |
| <i>Chronology and Provenance</i> .....   | 158 |
| <i>Śaṃvara / Vajrarudra and Vajravārāhī:</i>   |     |
| <i>The Transformation of Bhairava and his consort</i> ..   | 169 |
| <i>The Rise of the Goddess to Independence</i> .....   | 173 |
| <i>The Adoption of the Vidyāpīṭha's Caryā and Yoga</i> ..  | 179 |
| <i>The Incorporation of Text-passages from the Vidyāpīṭha</i> .....  | 186 |
| <i>Converting the Outsiders</i> .....  | 220 |
| <i>The Reflux of Buddhist Śāktism into the Śāktism of Bengal</i> .....   | 240 |
| <i>The Jains' Adaptation of the Śaiva Mantrasāstra</i> .....   | 243 |
| <i>Śaivism in the Brahmanical Substrate</i> .....  | 249 |
| <i>The Causes of the Dominance of Śaivism</i> .....  | 252 |
| <i>The Early Medieval Process</i> .....  | 252 |
| <i>Śaivism and Monarchy</i> .....  | 254 |
| <i>Śaivism and the Royal Temple</i> .....  | 274 |
| <i>Śaivism and New Settlements</i> .....   | 280 |
| <i>Śaivism and Irrigation</i> .....  | 282 |
| <i>Śaivism and Social Integration</i> .....  | 284 |
| <i>The Śaiva-brahmanical Order</i> .....   | 301 |
| <i>Abbreviations</i> .....   | 304 |
| <i>References</i> .....  | 305 |
| <i>Conventions in the Footnotes</i> .....  | 348 |
| Dominic GOODALL : <i>Who is Caṇḍeśa ?</i> .....  | 351 |
| Kimiaki TANAKA : <i>Nāgabodhi's Śrī-guhyasamājamaṇḍalopāyikā-viṃśati-vidhi — The Sanskrit Text Restored from the Vajrācāryanayottama —</i> .....                         | 425 |
| Francesco SFERRA : <i>The Laud of the Chosen Deity, the First Chapter of the Hevajratantrapīṇḍārthatīkā by Vajragarbha</i> .....   | 435 |
| Taiken KYUMA : <i>Superiority of Vajrayāna — Part I: Some Remarks on the</i>   |     |

|                    |   |     |
|--------------------|---|-----|
|                    | <i>Vajrayānāntadvayanirākaraṇa (rDo rje theg pa'i mtha' gñis sel ba)</i>  |     |
|                    | <i>Ascribed to Jñānaśrī —</i>   | 469 |
| Ryugen TANEMURA :  | <i>Superiority of Vajrayāna — Part II: Superiority of the Tantric Practice Taught in the *Vajrayānāntadvayanirākaraṇa (rDo rje theg pa'i mtha' gñis sel ba) —</i>   | 487 |
| Tsunehiko SUGIKI : | <i>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 —</i> | 515 |

## The Śaiva Age

— The Rise and Dominance of Śaivism During the Early Medieval Period —

Alexis SANDERSON

The early medieval period, from about the fifth century to the thirteenth, saw a decline in the role of Śrauta 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 (*varṇāśramadharmah*) 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 Vaṅga and the Parivrājaka Mahārāja Saṃkṣobha of Ḍabhālarājya in the sixth, the Puṣyabhūti Prabhākaravardhana of Kanyakubja, Bhāskaravarman of Prāgyotiṣa, the Maitraka Kharagraha II Dharmāditya of Valabhī, the Gūrjara Dadda III of Bharukaccha in the seventh, and the Licchavi Śivadeva of Nepal at the turn of the seventh and eighth.<sup>1</sup> The same claim is seen in the account of the

---

<sup>1</sup> *CII* 3, p.220, ll.1–2: *varṇāśramavyavasthāpanapravṛttacakraḥ* ‘[Harivarman], who set in motion the establishing of the distinctions between the caste-classes and disciplines’; RAJAGURU 1962, ll.6–9: *varṇāśramavyavasthāhetuḥ \*sākṣād* (corr. RAJAGURU : *sākṣad* Ep.) *dharma \*ivopāttajanmā* (corr. : *ivopāntajanmā* RAJAGURU) . . . *paramamāheśvaro mahārājādhirājaśrīgopacandra-* ‘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: *varṇāśramadharmasthāpanābhīratena* (Saṃkṣobha); *EI* 4:29, l. 3: *varṇāśramavyavasthāpanapravṛttacakraḥ* (Prabhākaravardhana); *EI* 12:13, ll. 34–35: *bhagavatā kamalasambhavenāvakīrṇavarṇāśramadharmapravibhāgāya nirmīto bhuvanapatir* ‘King [Bhāskaravarman], created by Brahmā himself to separate the caste-classes and disciplines that had abandoned their duties’; *CII* 3, pp.173ff., ll.43–44: *sākṣād dharma iva samyagvyavasthāpitavarṇāśramācāraḥ* ‘[Kharagraha II Dharmāditya], who established the observances of the caste-classes and disciplines, as though he were Dharma in visible form’; *CII* 4i:21, ll.7–9: *mahāmuniṃmanupraṇītapravacanādhigamavivekasvadharmānuṣṭhāna\*pravīṇo* (em. MIRASHI : *pravāṇi* Ep.) *varṇāśramavyavasthōnmūlitasakalikalikālāvalepa<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 discriminating understanding of the teachings authored by the great sage Manu’; *LKA* 140, ll.1–2: *suvihitavarṇāśramasthitir licchavikulaketur . . . mahārājādhirājaśrīśivadevaḥ* ‘Mahārājādhirāja Śivadeva, war-banner of the Licchavi dynasty, who correctly established the system of the caste-classes and disciplines’; *LKA* 143, l.1: *samyagviracitasakalavarṇāśramavyavasthaḥ* ‘[Śivadeva], who correctly fashioned the system of the distinct castes and disciplines’.

history of Kashmir before the advent of the Kārkoṭa dynasty in the seventh century given in the twelfth by the Kashmirian historian Kalhaṇa. 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.<sup>2</sup> 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.<sup>3</sup>

Seeing these claims of the royal imposition of the *varṇāśramadharmah* one thinks of the non-geographical definition of territory fit for brahmanical rites (*yajñīyo deśah*) formulated by Manu's commentator Medhātithi 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 (*caṇḍālah*). 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.<sup>4</sup>

<sup>2</sup> *Rājataranṅinī* 1.339: *jugopa gopādityo 'tha kṣmām sadvīpām tadātmaḥ | varṇāśramapratyavekṣādarsītādīyugodayaḥ* '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'.

<sup>3</sup> *Rājataranṅinī* 1.312–313b: *ākrānte dāradair bhautṭair mlecchair aśucikarmabhiḥ | vīnaṣṭadharme deśe 'smin \*puṇyācārapravartane* (conj.: *pravartanam* Ed.) | *āryadeśyān sa saṁsthāpya vyatanod dāruṇam tapaḥ* "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 *puṇyācārapravartanam* rather than *puṇyācārapravartane* and this leaves him no alternative other than to take not only *dāruṇam tapaḥ* 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 *puṇyācārapravartanam vyatanot* is not too inelegant an expression for an author of Kalhaṇa'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 *puṇyācārapravartane*, which, taken as an instance of the use of the locative of purpose (*nimittasaptamī*), 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 *āryadeśyān saṁsthāpya* 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 *saṁsthāpya* in its contextually more appropriate meaning, namely 'having settled'.

<sup>4</sup> See SANDERSON 2005a, pp. 400–401, citing Medhātithi, *Manusmṛtibhāṣya* p. 80,



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,<sup>5</sup> thereby extending the penetration of brahmanical culture while facilitating the administration of their territories and promoting agricultural development.<sup>6</sup>

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 (Bhagavatī), 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

---

ll.24-26 on 2.23: *yadi kathamcid brahmāvartādideśam api mlecchā ākrameyuḥ tatraiva <ca> <svadharmā?>vyavasthānaṃ kuryuḥ bhaved evāsau mlecchadeśaḥ. tathā yadi kaś cit kṣatriyādijātīyo rājā sādhuvacaraṇo mlecchān parājayec cāturvarṇyaṃ vāsayaṃ mlecchāṃś cāryāvarta iva cāṇḍālān vyavasthāpayet so 'pi syād yajñīyaḥ* ‘If somehow foreigners were to invade such [pure] regions as that between the Sarasvatī and Drṣadvatī rivers (Brahmāvarta) <and> impose <their religion?>, then even they would definitely become foreign lands [unfit for sacrifice]. By the same standard, if some king belonging to the Kṣatriya or other [suitable caste-class] and of orthodox [brahmanical] observance were to conquer foreigners [in their lands], settle communities of the four caste-classes [there], and impose on those foreigners the status of untouchables, just as in the brahmanical heartland of India north of the Vindhya (Āryāvarta), then those territories too would be fit for the performance of [Vaidika] sacrifices’.

<sup>5</sup> On the duty of the king to donate [tax-free] land and other valuables to learned Vaidika brahmins (*viprāḥ, śrotriyāḥ*) see, e.g., *Yājñavalkyaśmṛti* 1.315–320; 1.323: *nātaḥ parataro dharmo nṛpānāṃ yad raṇārjitam | viprebhyo dīyate dravyam ...* ‘There is no higher religious obligation for kings than that of bestowing the wealth they acquire through war on learned Vaidika brahmins ...’; *Viṣṇuśmṛti* 3.81–82: *brāhmaṇebhyaś ca bhuvam pratipādayet ...* ‘He should bestow land on brahmins’. On the king’s duty not to tax learned Vaidikas see *Manuśmṛti* 7.133ab: *mriyamāṇo 'py ādadīta na rājā śrotriyāt 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: *abhiśicyaiva nṛpatim śrāvayed imam āgamam*).

<sup>6</sup> For a study of land-grants to brahmins (*brahmadeyam, agrahārah, 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 *paramamāheśvaraḥ* 'entirely devoted to Śiva' is the most frequently encountered in declarations of the religious adherence of rulers;<sup>7</sup> 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.<sup>8</sup>

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

<sup>7</sup> The royal epithet *paramamāheśvaraḥ* first appears in the epigraphical record in the fourth century in Andhra, in an inscription of the Śālaṅkāyana Mahārāja Devavarman of Veṅgīpura (*EI* 9:7, ll. 1–7), probably the earliest of the Śālaṅkāyanas in our records since this inscription alone is in Prakrit: *sirivijayaveṅgīpurā bhagavato cittarathasāmipādānujjhātassa bappabhaṭṭārakapādabhattasya paramamāhessarassa śālaṅkāyanassa asamedhayājino mahārājasirivijayadevavammassa vayanena* ... 'From victorious Veṅgīpura: by the command of the Śālaṅkāyana, who has performed the Aśvamedha sacrifice, the venerable Mahārāja Vijayadevarman, 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): *paramamāheśvara mātāpitṛpādānudhyāta śrīkṛṣṇarāja* (MIRASHI, *CII* 4i p. clxxx). This is the standard term, as is confirmed by its use in literary sources. But we also find the synonym *atyantamāheśvaraḥ* (e.g. *CII* 5:3, l. 8: Vākāṭaka Pṛthivīseṇa I, late fourth century), and, though very rarely and not to my knowledge in any inscription, *paramaśaivaḥ* (PETECH 1984, pp. 57 and 61: the twelfth-century Nepalese kings Indradeva and Ānandadeva in the colophons of manuscripts). That the Taddhita *māheśvaraḥ* is to be understood as formed from the name Maheśvara in the meaning 'devoted to Maheśvara' (*maheśvarabhaktaḥ*), 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 *paramabhāgavataḥ* but also *paraṃ bhagavadbhaktaḥ* and in the case of the Sun-god (Sūrya/Āditya) we see both *paramasauraḥ* and *paramādityabhaktaḥ*. 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 *paraṃ bhagavatībhaktaḥ* and *atyantasvāmimahābhairavabhaktaḥ*. For all these epithets see MIRASHI *CII* 3, pp. 253–254, n. 3.

<sup>8</sup> 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.

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 Śaivism to attain this dominant position.

### THE INCORPORATION OF ŚĀKTISM

The worship of the Goddess was progressively subsumed within Śaivism, being promoted by its adherents as a higher form of that religion.<sup>9</sup> The Śaiva mainstream was, as one might expect, focused on Śiva. This is so in the earliest forms of the religion, which later Śaivas would call the Atimārga, practised by such Śaiva ascetics as the Pāñcārthikas, Lākulas, and Somasiddhāntins, 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* scriptures<sup>10</sup> and then in a number of others, notable among which are the *Pārameśvara* (*Pauṣkarapārameśvara*), the *Svāyambhuvasūtrasaṃgraha*, the *Rauravasūtrasaṃgraha*, the *Mataṅga-pārameśvara*, the *Sarvajñānottara*, the *Kālottara* in a number of redactions, the *Kiraṇa*, the *Parākhya*, the *Mṛgendra*, the *Bṛhatkālottara*, the *Mayasaṃgraha*, the *Devyāmata*, and the *Mohacūḍottara*, the last three representing a sub-corpus of texts of more restricted application concerned with the rituals of the installation 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 (*śaktiḥ*). The Śaiva 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 Svachhandabhairava and his consort Aghoreśvarī, and the earlier among those devoted to cults of Goddesses as the Vidyāpīṭha or Vidyā Corpus,<sup>11</sup>

<sup>9</sup> On the Śākta elements in Śaivism see SANDERSON 1988, 1995a, and 2007a.

<sup>10</sup> 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.

<sup>11</sup> For the use of the term *pīṭham* in this context in the meaning 'corpus' or 'collection' see *Tantrāloka* 37.18c–19c1, quoting or paraphrasing the lost *Ānandaśāstra*: *śrīmadānandaśāstrāḍau proktaṃ bhagavatā kila || samūhaḥ pīṭham etac ca dvidhā dakṣiṇāvāmataḥ | mantrō vidyēti* 'The Lord has taught in such scriptures as the *Ānanda* that *pīṭham* [here means] the corpus [of the non-Saiddhāntika Śaiva scriptures]. It is divided into two, to the right and left [respectively], namely the

headed by (1) the *Jayadrathayāmala*, also known as the *Śiraścheda*, consisting of four parts called hexads (*ṣaṭkam*) because each is approximately six thousand verses in length, which teaches the cult of Kālasaṃkarṣaṇī or Kālī 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*, *Kālikulapañcaśataka* and others, that were the scriptural basis of the Kālikula Kālī cult known as the Krama, Mahānaya, or Mahārtha—, (2) the *Siddhayogeśvarīmata*, 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 Caṇḍā Kāpālīnī and numerous related Kalpas, and (4) the texts of the *vāmasrotaḥ*, of which only the *Vīṇāśikha* has come down to us intact, which teach the cult of the four goddesses Jayā, Vijayā, Jayantī/Ajitā, and Aparājītā, the sisters of the god Tumburu, venerated as an aspect of Śiva.<sup>12</sup>

---

Mantra[piṭha] and the Vidyāpiṭha'. The terms 'right' and 'left' assigned to the two Piṭhas follow the common notion that these are the relative positions of the male/masculine and female/feminine, Mantras being masculine and the deities they embody male and Vidyās being feminine and their deities female.

<sup>12</sup> 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 (*dakṣiṇasrotaḥ*) and the left current (*vāmasrotaḥ*) 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 Sadāśiva, 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 *Siddhayogeśvarīmata* and the *Picumata* are both assigned to the former, while according to itself the first *Ṣaṭka* 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 Gāruḍatantras 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-Siddhāntika 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 (*ūrdhvordhvasrotaḥ*) 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: *prakṛtaṃ brūmahe devīvisṛṣṭās citrasamvidah | yāvat tāvat tad ūrdhvordhvaṃ sroto yad bhedavarjitaṃ || 161 saurabhargasīkhādīni tataḥ śāstrāṇi tenire | uktaṃ bhargasīkhāyāṃ ca devena parameṣṭhīnā || 162 ūrdhvasrotodbhavaṃ jñānam idaṃ tat paramaṃ priye | paramadhvaninordhvothasamvidrūpābhīdhāyīnā ||*

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 *Kubjikāmata* and related texts such as the *Ṣaṭsāhasra*, 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 *Siddhayogeśvarīmata* and is associated with the Śākta system that would be developed under the name of the Trika: the *Siddhayogeśvarīmata* itself, the [*Trika*]kularatnamālā, the *Tantrasadbhāva*, the *Devyāyāmala*, and the *Triśirobhairava*. Also allied in character is the *Nityāṣoḍaśikārṇava* or *Vāmakeśvarīmata*, 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.<sup>13</sup> This early cult was eclipsed by its

---

*īśānavaktraniryātāt siddhāntād bhedam ādiśat* 'I shall return now to the matter in hand. The nondualistic upper-upper stream is present when the various modes of consciousness are [still] in the state of [primal] emission within the Goddess [Parā]. From this [state of fusion] are created the *Saurabhargasīkhā* and other such [nondualistic (Kaula) scriptures]. And the Supreme Lord has spoken [to this effect] in the *Bhargasīkhā* [itself], saying, "This knowledge, O beloved, is the supreme product of the upper face". By using the word supreme [here] in reference to the nature of the consciousness that has arisen from this upper [face] he shows that he means something different from [and superior to] the Siddhānta, which has come forth from the face of Īśāna'.

<sup>13</sup> The distinctness of this tradition is expressed in the *Kumārīkhaṇḍa* of the *Manthānabhairava* in an account of the hierarchy of the various soteriologies. It places those who follow the scripture(s) of the Nityās above those of the Atimārgic traditions (Mausula, Vaimala, Lākula) and below those of the Bhairava corpus comprising the scriptures of the left and right currents. Above this it places six Śākta Tantras (*parāṣaṭkam*): three of the Trika (*Ṣaḍardha* [= *Mālinīvijayottara*], *Bhairava[kula]*, and *Vīrāvali*, then the *Kālikula* [texts] of the Krama, and finally itself, in two scriptural levels. It is significant that it does not put the Nityā cult on the level of its Śākta Tantras or even on that of the Bhairavatantras below them; see f. 213r3–7 (*Muktisaṃgrahasūtra*, vv. 108–114c): \**musulāyudhahastānām* (em. : *mausulāyudhahastānām* Cod.) *māyātattvaṃ paraṃ padam* | *śuddhajñānamayā vidyā vaimalānām paraṃ padam* || 109 *aṣṭapramāṇavedajñā lākulārthaviśāradāḥ* | *vrate pāsupate caiva aiśvaraṃ paraṃ padam* || 110 ***navanītyāgamajñānām*** *śivatattvaṃ paraṃ padam* | *tasyordhve \*kāraṇān* (em. : *kāraṇāḥ* Cod.) *pañca tyaktvā ūrdhvaṃ tu bhairava<h>* || 111 *\*sāṣṭatantratāntrikānām* (?) *nityānandaṃ paraṃ padam* | *samanāntakalātītaṃ vāmadakṣiṇasamsthitaṃ* || 112 *pañktikrameṇa mokṣo 'stī satyaṃ nāsty atra saṃśayaḥ* | *tasya ūrdhve parāṣaṭkam upary upari samsthitaṃ* || 113 *ṣaḍardhaṃ prathamam bhedam bhairavākhyam dvitīyakam* | *vīrāvalī trtīyam tu caturtham kālikākulam* || 114 *tatas tv ādyāvātaram tu tasya ūrdhvaṃ anāhatam* | *śrīmatkulālikākhyam* 'The final destination of the [Mausula Pāsupatas,] those who carry a club in their hands, is Māyātattva. That of the Vaimala[pāsupata]s is Śuddhavidyā[tattva]. For those who are versed in the Lākula[pāsupata] doctrine,

much more successful successor. But nonetheless evidence of it has survived, attesting two forms. One is taught in the *Nityākaula*, of which a single, incomplete manuscript has come down to us in Nepal. Here the goddess Tripurā is surrounded by a circle of twelve deities comprising eleven Nityā goddesses and Kāmadeva, the Indian Cupid.<sup>14</sup> The other has been preserved in the eclectic *Manthānabhairava*, whose *Siddhakhaṇḍa* contains detailed manual-like instructions for a Śākta cult of Tripurā and nine Nityās with Kāmadeva as her consort.<sup>15</sup> The earlier prominence of the Nityā cult is indicated by the fact that a syncretistic text of the cult of Kubjikā, the \**Ciñciṇīmatasārasamuccaya*, contains a section drawn from the *Nityākaula*, 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 Pāñcārthikapāśūpatas, who engage] in the Pāśūpata observance, it is [the Tattva] of Īśvara. 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, Īśvara, and Sadāśiva]. This, eternal bliss, is the final destination of the Tāntrikas of the Tantras of the eight [Bhairavas] [v. 132: the *Niṣkala-Svacchandabhairava*, the *Sakala-Svacchandabhairava*, the *Bahurūpabhairava*, the *Aghoriśabhairava*, the *Vyādhibhakṣabhairava*, the *Candraagarbhabhairava*, the *Vijñānabhairava*, the *Tumburubhairava* (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 [*dakṣiṇasrotaḥ*]. 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 *Ṣaḍardha* (=Mālinīvijaya, vv. 125a and 133cd), the second the *Bhairava[kula]* (=Klīnānvayayoga, v. 134a), the third the *Vīrāvalī* (=Vīrāvalīkulāmnāya, v. 134c), and the fourth the *Kālikula* [scriptures] (=Kālikākrama, v. 134d). Above this is the *Ādyāvātāra* [of the Paścimāmnāya], and above that the Anāhata [revelation] called *Kulālikā[mnāya]*. 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 *śaivam*, i.e. the Siddhānta’s scriptures, between the *pāśūpatam* and the eight Bhairavatantras (v. 128bcd: *tathā pāśūpatam mahat | śaivam tasya viśeṣam tu bhairavāṣṭakanirṇayam*). Since the passage also omits Sadāśivatattva 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 Sadāśivatattva would, of course, be to disdain their claim that their *param padam* is in fact Śivatattva.

<sup>14</sup> The eleven Nityās of this text are Hṛllekhā, Kledinī, Nandā, Kṣobhanī, Madanātūrā, Nirañjanā, Rāgavatī, Madanāvātī, Khekalā, Drāvaṇī and Vegavatī; see *Nityākaula*, f. 2r7–2v1.

<sup>15</sup> *Manthānabhairava*, *Siddhakhaṇḍa*, ff. 186v–231r1. The nine Nityās are Kulavidyā, Vajreśvarī, Tvaritā, Kurukullā, Lalitā, Bheruṇḍā, Nilapatākā, Maṅgalā and Vyomavyāpini. The section on Tripurā continues to f. 252v and includes the text of the *Nityāśoḍaśikārṇava*. 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.

der' (*dakṣiṇagharāmnāyaḥ*), grouping it with the cult of Kubjikā, the cult of Kālī (Kālīkula) 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 (Pāścimagharāmnāya, Uttaragharāmnāya, 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 Kāpālīka 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-Kāpālīka 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 *Siddhayogēśvarīmata* also came to do so,<sup>16</sup> the cult of Kālī that came to constitute the Kaulas' Northern Teaching (*uttarāmnāyaḥ*) remained both Kaula in its self-definition and firmly Kāpālīka in its practise.<sup>17</sup>

<sup>16</sup> On the anti-Kāpālīka stance of the mature Trika see SANDERSON 2005c, pp. 118–119, fn. 74.

<sup>17</sup> For the Kāpālīka/Mahāvratin asceticism of practitioners of the Uttarāmnāya, that is to say of the Kālīkula and Krama/Mahānaya, see SANDERSON 2007a, pp. 293–294 (Cakrabhānu, Īsānī, and Jaiyaka), 323 (Cakrapāṇinātha, author of the *Bhāvopahārastotra*). 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 *Bhāvopahārastotra* under the title *Bhāvopahārapūjā*, 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 Kāpālīka observance in 2007a I now propose to add one more. According to a manuscript of the *Chummāsaṃketaparakāśa* 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 Nīskriyānanda was one Anantaśakti. He is described there as *mudrādharah* (A, f. 11r7–9): *saṃsārasaṃbhramacayaprabhāgabandhasaṃbandhasaṃkṣaya\*gatir* (em. : *gater* Cod.) *avikalpamūrtiḥ | sāksād anābiladhiyā laghuvākkrameṇa mudrādharas tu vidadhe tad anantaśaktiḥ*. This expression I take to have the same meaning as *pañcamudrādharah* 'wearer of the five sect marks [of the Kāpālīka/Mahāvratin]'; see, e.g., *Svāyambhuvasūtrasaṃgraha*, Paṭala 14 (*saṭsamayabhedah*), one of the chapters that is not part of the original work of this name, vv. 19–20: *caturdaśapramāṇena yuktaṃ kāpālam ucyate | kāpāle ca vrataṃ mukhyam sarvapāpanikṛntanam | tasmīn vrataṃ cared yas tu ṣaṇmāsān mutim āpnuyāt | pañcamudrādharah śāntah samayācārapālakah*; and *Kubjikāmata*

In general we may say that these non-Saiddhāntika texts with their strongly Śākta 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*,<sup>18</sup> the first hexad of the *Jayadrathayāmala* after the *Kubjikāmata*,<sup>19</sup> and the remaining three hexads after the first.<sup>20</sup> 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 Dharmakīrti (*fl.* c. 550–650),<sup>21</sup> and the first two folios of a post-scriptural text on this cult, the \**Devītantrasadbhāvasāra*, written in learned style in the Āryā 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.<sup>22</sup> A second area

---

25.31cd: *pañcamudrādharo vāpi bhasmaniṣṭho digambaraḥ*. He is probably one with the Anantaśakti who wrote the published commentary on the Krama's *Vātulanāthasūtra* but probably not with the Anantaśakti who has left us a commentary (*Viṣamapadasaṃketa*), as yet unpublished, on the *Bahurūpagarbhasotra*; see SANDERSON 2007a, p. 344.

<sup>18</sup> See the evidence for this sequence in SANDERSON 2001, pp. 20–35.

<sup>19</sup> See SANDERSON 2002, p. 1 and note 4 on p. 21.

<sup>20</sup> See SANDERSON 2002, p. 2 and note 13 on p. 22.

<sup>21</sup> See SANDERSON 2001, pp. 11–13, fn. 10.

<sup>22</sup> 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 (*sārah*) of the Essence of the Tantras (*tantrasadbhāvaḥ*) of the [four] Goddesses (*devīnām*) that had been received from Śiva by a sage identified only as the ornament of the lineage of Atri: 3 *ātreyaśātilakenoktaṃ śarvād avāpya yat pūrvaṃ | suramuni-narāsurāṇāṃ devīnāṃ tantrasadbhāvaṃ || 4 tasmād aham apy adhunā vakṣye saṃhṛtya sāraṃ āryābhiḥ | spaṣṭatarākṣarapaṅktibhir aviśāladhiyāṃ \*prabodhāya* (em. : *pravodhāta* 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 Āryā 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-Śāradā 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 Somdev VASUDEVA, 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 Yāmalatantras assigned to the Vidyāpīṭha, represented in our surviving manuscripts by the 12000-verse *Picumata*, also called the *Brahmayāmala*. For the *Skandapurāṇa-Ambikākhaṇḍa*, whose earliest surviving manuscript was completed in 810, lists seven Yāmala texts, beginning with the *Brahmayāmala*, as Tantras of the Mother Goddesses (*mātrtantrāṇi*).<sup>23</sup> 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.<sup>24</sup> It is certainly

---

ural accomplishments and liberation (v. 11cd: *prādurbhūtā devyaḥ siddhyartham muktaye caiva*), their ancillaries (*aṅgamantrāḥ*), their retinue of [four] Dūtīs and [four] Kīṅkaras (v. 16bc: *dūtyas sakiṅkarā<ḥ>*), Tumburu (v. 17ab: *praṇavaṃ tumburusahitaṃ sārthavāhā +*), and the Aṅkuśa (v. 18bc: *sapraṇavaṃ HŪM-PHAṬ-viniyuktam aṅkuśam etat*). The *Vīṇāsīkha*, our only complete surviving Tantra of the *vāmasrotah*, teaches the four Devīs (vv. 30c–32b), Tumburu (vv. 29c–30b), and the Aṅkuśa (v. 41d etc.), but not the Dūtīs or Kīṅkaras. For the fuller pantheon see, e.g., *Devayāmata*, f. 40r1: *jayā ca vijayā caiva jayantī cāparājītā | dūtībhiḥ kīṅkaraiḥ sārḍhaṃ samvrtas \*tumburuḥ* (corr : *tumburum* Cod.) *sthitah; Netratantra* 11.1–27; and *Śāradātilaka* 19.87–105b and *Tantrasārasaṃgraha* 23.37–52 (with the four Dūtīs but without the Kīṅkaras). The expression *sārthavāhah* ‘the [international] trader’ in v. 17b (v. 17ab: *praṇavaṃ tumburusahitaṃ sārthavāhā +*) no doubt refers to Tumburu, who is so described in the Buddhist version of this cult taught in the *Mañjuśrīyamūlakalpa* (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: *navyānasamārūḍhā<ḥ> sabhrātrsahapañcamā<ḥ> | karṇadhāro \*rthacit* (tentative conj. : ‘*rthacit* Ed.) *tāsām \*tumburunāmasaṃjñītaḥ* (em. : *tumburur nāma saṃjñītaḥ* Ed.). See also here p. 130. This depiction is also prescribed in the Śaiva *Piṅgalāmata*, f. 28v5–6 (*Citrādhikāra*, v. 35): *jayādyās cakragās tadvat pañktisthā vā likhet | kramāt nāvārūḍhās ca vā likhyās tumburuḥ karṇadhārahāḥ* ‘He should depict Jayā[, Vijayā, Jayantī,] and [Aparājītā] 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.

<sup>23</sup> 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 1994, p. 326. That the era of the date is that of the Licchavi Mānadeva (=Aṃśuvarman) 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 PETECH (1961). Previously it had been assumed that the era was that of Harṣa (A.D. 606).

<sup>24</sup> Yuko YOKOCHI has observed (1999a, pp. 81–82) that the icon of the goddess Mahiṣāsurasamardini 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 Mahiṣāsurasamardini in 68.10–23 of the text corresponds most closely to the image of Mahiṣāsurasamardini from Siddhi-kī-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 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,<sup>25</sup> 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.<sup>26</sup> 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,<sup>27</sup> and a copperplate decree issued by Mahārāja Bhluṇḍa 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.<sup>28</sup>

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 (*bhagavatībhaktaḥ*) rather than Śiva are very rare. At present I am aware only of Nāgabhaṭa, Bhoja, and his successor Mahīpāla I in the ninth century among the Gūrjara-Pratīhāras of Kanyakubja.<sup>29</sup>

Royal devotion to a goddess, typically as a dynasty's lineage deity (*kuladevī*, *vaṃśadevī*, *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.<sup>30</sup> 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.

<sup>25</sup> 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.

<sup>26</sup> Hypothesis first proposed in SANDERSON 1988, p. 667.

<sup>27</sup> See, e.g., the Tiroḍī plates of Pravarasena II, r. c. 400–c. 450, *CII* 5:11, ll. 3–6: *atyantasvāmimahābhairavabhaktasya ... mahārājaśrīrudrasenasya*. 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.

<sup>28</sup> RAMESH and TEWARI 1990:10, ll. 2–6: *bhagavallokodadhipāśupatācāryapraṭiṣṭhā-pitakapiñchikānakagrāmamāṭrsthānadevakulasya piñchikānakam eva grāmaṃ saha bhadradattavāṭakagrāmavāṭakacchena devāgrāhāramātṛnā[m] balicarusaṭṭradhūpagandhapuṣpamālyopayojoyyabhogāya ...*

<sup>29</sup> *EI* 14:13, ll. 6, 7, 7–8: *param bhagavatībhakto mahārājaśrīnāgabhaṭadevas ... param bhagavatībhakto mahārājaśrībhojadevas ... param bhagavatībhakto mahārājaśrīmahendrapāladevas ...*

<sup>30</sup> For some examples see SANDERSON 2007b, pp. 288–290.

gious affiliation, and it was in any case inconstant, coming to the fore only on certain occasions, particularly during the autumnal Navarātra festival that inaugurates the season of military activity, when they and associated goddesses received large-scale animal sacrifices;<sup>31</sup> 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 Śaiva Vidyāpīṭha.<sup>32</sup>

#### 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*, *paramādityabhaktaḥ*, and the like) are also few and they are mostly confined to the sixth and seventh centuries. We have Dharmarāja of Padmakholī in the Ganjam District of Orissa, Dharapaṭṭa, 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 feuda-

<sup>31</sup> 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.

<sup>32</sup> 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 Purāṇic 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 Purāṇic 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., *Tantrāloka* on 28.6d–7b. Nonetheless, we see a distinct tendency for the Mantramārga to seep downwards into this domain providing Śaiva or Śākta Śaiva versions of the Purāṇic rituals that mark such major annual festivals as Śivarātri and Navarātra. A Śākta Śaiva procedure for the celebration of Śivarātri was current in Kashmir, as can be seen from the prescriptions set out in the *Nityādisaṃgraha* 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 Ugracaṇḍā in Paddhatis that incorporate her among such Mantramārgic Śākta deities as Siddhilakṣmī and Kubjikā; see the Newari *Navarātrapūjāvidhi* manuscripts A and B in the bibliography. For her Tantric worship in this context in the tradition of the Paippalādin 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 Tantrified in the *Durgapūjāprayogatattva* section of the *Durgapūjātattva* 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 Jayabhāṭa 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 Jayabhāṭa I (r. c. 595–620), since this was the religion not only of his predecessor and successor but also of his brother Raṇagraha. After Jayabhāṭa II the next three kings of this dynasty, Dadda III (c. 665–690), Jayabhāṭa III (c. 690–715), and Ahirola (c. 715–720), turned to Śaivism, declaring themselves *paramamāheśvaraḥ*. In the ninth century we have royal devotees of the Sun in Rāmabhadra, the immediate predecessor of the Gūrjara-Pratihāra Bhojadeva 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 Vaiṣṇava (*paramavaiṣṇavaḥ*) and, more specifically, as a devotee of Narasiṃha (*paramanārasimhaḥ*).<sup>33</sup>

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 Vaiṣṇava followers of the Pañcarātra, as Saṃhitās. A list of eighty-five such texts is given in an account of brahmanical, Pāñcarātrika (Vaiṣṇava), Saura, and Śaiva scriptural authorities, contained in the Śaiva scripture *Śrikanthīyasamhitā*. 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 *Nityādisaṃgraha* of Rājānaka Takṣakavarta, a Kashmirian digest of scriptural passages bearing on the duties of initiated Śaivas, compiled at some time after the eleventh century.<sup>34</sup>

<sup>33</sup> *EI* 28:16: *sahasraraśmipādabhakto* (Dharmarāja); *EI* 31:39B, l. 8: *paramādityabhaktaḥ* (Dharaṇaṭṭa); *EI* 4:29, ll. 1–3: *paramādityabhaktaḥ* (the predecessors of Harṣa); *CII* 4i:16, l. 4: *dinakaracaranakamalapraṇāmāpanitāśeṣaduritanivaha-* (Dadda I); *ibid.*, l. 52: *dinakaracaranārcanaratasya* (Dadda II); *CII* 4i:18, l. 9: *dinakarakiraṇābhycaranaratasya* (Raṇagraha); *CII* 4i:21, l. 13: *paramamāheśvaraḥ* (Dadda III); *ibid.*, ll. 16–17: *paramamāheśvaraḥ* (Jayabhāṭa III); *CII* 4i:24, ll. 20–11: *paramamāheśvaraḥ* (Ahirola); *EI* 5:24, l. 5: *paramādityabhakto* (Rāmabhadra); *EI* 14:13, l. 6: *paramādityabhakto* (Vināyakapāla); SIRCAR 1983a:27, ll. 35–38: *paramasauraḥ* (Lakṣmaṇasena); *paramasaura* (Viśvarūpasena); *EI* 12:3, ll. 23–25: *paramavaiṣṇava-* (Lakṣmaṇasena); and SIRCAR 1983a:26, ll. 32–33: *-paramanārasimha-* (Lakṣmaṇasena). For the attribution of the temple of Jayāditya at Koṭipura to Jayabhāṭa II see MIRASHI, *CII* 4i, p. liv.

<sup>34</sup> The list of the Saura Saṃhitās in the *Nityādisaṃgraha* 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 *Nityādisaṃgraha* 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 *Saurasaṃhitā* of our period sets out the procedure for the worship of the Sun and no doubt drew on the Saura tradition.<sup>35</sup> But it assigns itself to the canon of the Śaiva scripture *Vāthula/Kālottara*,<sup>36</sup> 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,<sup>37</sup> and insists that Śiva and the Sun are in essence a single deity.<sup>38</sup> Moreover, the worship of the Sun taught in this text was included by the Saiddhāntika Śaivas as a compulsory preliminary (*aṅgam*) of the regular worship of Śiva himself, appearing first in the sources known to me in the *Siddhāntasārapaddhati* of Mahārājādhiraṅga Bhojadeva of Dhārā (r.c. 1018–1060)<sup>39</sup> and then soon afterwards, in dependence on that text, in the

<sup>35</sup> A critical edition of this text is being prepared for publication by Dr. Divakar Acharya. I am very grateful to him for sending me drafts of this edition. The text survives in a Nepalese palm-leaf manuscript with a scribal date that falls in A.D. 949 (NAK MS 1/1231, NGMPP A1161/6).

<sup>36</sup> *Saurasaṃhitā* 1.5: *noktā pūrvam tu yā vatsa gopitā saurasamhitā | tanre tu vāthule sā tu rahasyam na prakāṣitā*. Final colophon: *iti vāthule kriyāpāde saurasamhitāyām . . .*

<sup>37</sup> *Saurasaṃhitā* 1.10–12: *adrṣṭavigrahāc chāntāc chivāt paramakāraṇāt | kriyāsaktir vinīkrāntā paratejasamanvitā || 11 ākāṣe tu yadā hy ulkā srṣṭihetor adhomukhī | tasya tejasamāyogād utpannam tejarūpiṇam || 12 ādityamanisamyogād vahniḥ saṃjāyate yathā | śaktitejasamāyogād bhānuḥ saṃbhavitā tathā*. 10ab = *Paṣkarapārameśvara* (as quoted by Bhaṭṭa Rāmakaṇṭha at *Mataṅgapārameśvaravṛtti, Vidyāpāda*, p. 19, ll. 5-6) and *Śrikanṭhīyasamhitā* (ed. in HANNEDER 1998, p. 240, v. 1).

<sup>38</sup> *Saurasaṃhitā* 1.15: *ādityam tu śivam vindyāc chivam ādityam eva ca | nānātvaṃ yas tu gaccheta yatnenāpi na sidhyati*.

<sup>39</sup> *Siddhāntasārapaddhati*, MS A, f. 3v5–4v2, MS B, f. 4v6–6r2: *OM HRĀM HRĪM SAḤ iti sūryamantreṇa kṛtadehaśuddhiḥ kṛtasakalīkaraṇam arghapātraṃ kṛtvā puṣpādīkam saṃprokṣya raktacandanādinā sūryāya mūlamantrenārgḥam dattvā sūryam pūjayet | tatra gaṇapatigurupūjānantaram OM AM PRABHŪTĀYA NAMAḤ iti pīṭhamadhye, OM AM VIMALĀYA NAMAḤ ity āgneyyām, OM AM SĀRĀYA NAMAḤ iti nairṛtyām, OM AM ĀRĀDHYĀYA NAMAḤ iti vāyavyām, OM AM PARAMASUKHĀYA NAMAḤ ity aiśānyām, OM AM PADMĀYA NAMAḤ iti punar madhye, OM RĀM DĪPTĀYAI NAMAḤ pūrvadale, OM RĪM SŪKṢMĀYAI NAMAḤ agnau, OM RUM JAYĀYAI NAMAḥ dakṣiṇe, OM RŪM BHADRĀYAI NAMAḥ nairṛte, OM REM VIBHŪTYAI NAMAḥ vāruṇe, OM RAIM VIMALĀYAI NAMAḥ vāyavye, OM ROM AMOGHĀYAI NAMAḥ saumye, OM RAUM VIDYUTĀYAI NAMAḥ iśāne, OM RĀM SARVATOMUKHĀYAI NAMAḥ karṇikāyām saṃpūjya visphurām mudrām pradarsya raktavarṇavartulatejobimbamadyastham raktavāsasam śvetapadmopari sthitam sarvābharaṇabhūṣitam ekavaktraṃ*



Śaiva tradition otherwise lost to us is made somewhat greater by the fact that the names Vīreśvara and Bhargaśikhā are applied in Kashmirian sources, both Śaiva and Smārta, to the Sun-god and his consort at Mārtāṇḍatīrtha (modern Maṭan), where King Lalitāditya built his majestic temple of the Sun in the mid-eighth century,<sup>43</sup> 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.<sup>44</sup> However, it is possible that the application of these names merely reflects the pervasive influence of Śākta Śaiva esotericism in the wider Kashmirian community in later times.

There are also strong elements of a solar esotericism in the Kālīkula of the *Jayadrathayāmala* and the Krama.<sup>45</sup> 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: *śrībhargaśikhāṃ saṃvādayati* (-viveka, vol. 1, *Āhnika* 2, p. 22).

<sup>43</sup> *Rājatarāṅginī* 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 *Mārtāṇḍamāhātmya*, the praise-text of this site, refers to Sūrya here as Vīreśvara (*Bhṛṅgīśasamhitā*, p. 15: *eṣa vīreśvaro devaḥ paraḥ paramakāraṇam*; p. 63: *vīreśāya namas tubhyam*; p. 66: *namo vīrādhivīreśa*) and makes Bhargaśikhā the first of his Śaktis (*ibid.*, p. 12, listing Bhargaśikhā, Bhīmā, Bhāsvatī and Bhānavī). The Sun is also invoked as Vīreśvara in the worship of the Grahas that occurs among the preliminaries in Śaiva rituals in Kashmir; see *Kalādikṣāpaddhati* B f. 4v9–10: *tadbahir grahāḥ. tatrādau madhye sūryaḥ OM RAṂ AGNAYE OM HRĀM HRĪM SAḤ VĪREŚVARĀYA NAMAḤ OM HRĀM HRĪM SAḤ VĪRALAKṢMYAI NAMAḤ*. The Bījas HRĀM HRĪM SAḤ are Sūrya's. His consort is invoked as Vīralakṣmī here rather than as Bhargaśikhā because in the context of the ritual the pair are superimposed on the principal deities Amṛteśvara[bhairava] and his consort Amṛtalakṣmī.

<sup>44</sup> For the Paddhati of these rituals see *Karmakāṇḍa*, vol. 4, pp. 140–205. Here too the Sun is invoked as Vīra/Vīreśvara (p. 196): *vīra vīreśa deveśa namas te 'stu tridhātma* | *mahāmārtaṇḍa varada sarvābhayavaraprada . . .*

<sup>45</sup> See, e.g. *Jayadrathayāmala* 4.4.8–17: *sa ravir bhāsurādhāras tadādhārā hi kālīkā | śadare vipulādhārā soḍaśoddyotasannibhā || 9 sphuradvamanasaṅgrāsarāvīkī sṛṣṭīkārikā | sa ravir devatākāro ravir eka<s> tadākṛtiḥ || 10 raviḥ pradīpakāloke sūryamadhyāt samutthītaḥ | raver antargato bhānur bhāsayaty akhilaṃ jagat || 11 bhānavī kaulinī yā sā tatpuñjabharitaṃ jagat | tatrotpannā mahāmantrā bhairavāṣṭāṣṭayonayaḥ || 12 na prakāśe na cākāśe nobhaye nobhayojjhite | sarvāvaraṇanirmukto sarvago bhāti bhāskaraḥ || 13 amṛtaṃ prāvṛtaṃ yena racitaṃ ca kulākulam | sa raviḥ sūryaturyānte bhrājate raudradāmarāḥ || 14 svasaṃvitparamādityanīyoditamarīcibhiḥ | bhacakraṃ bhāsitaṃ yena sa vai kālāñjaro bhavet; Ciñciñmatasārasamuccaya, ff. 30v7–21r4 (7.166–172 [Uttaraḡharāmnāya (Kālīkula) section]): 166 raviḥ pradīpakāloke sūryamadhyāt vinīrgataḥ | raver antargato bhānur bhāsayaty akhilaṃ jagat || 167 bhānavī kaulinī yā sā tatpuñjabharitaṃ jagat | tatrotpannā mahāmantrā bhairavāṣṭāṣṭayonayaḥ || 168 raviḥ bhānumayī devī kauleśī kulagahvarī | kṣobhānandavīrāme tu paśyate kulasamṛtatim || 169 mahāvīyomārṇave śaive bhānavīkuṇḍamadhyataḥ | tatra pralīnāḥ sarve te bhairavāṣṭāṣṭayonayaḥ || 170 bhānavīkuṇḍamadhye*

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 Purāṇic 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.<sup>46</sup>

#### THE DECLINE OF VAIṢṆAVISM AND THE RISE OF THE TANTRIC PAÑCARĀTRA FOLLOWING ŚAIVA MODELS

Royal preference for Vaiṣṇavism, expressed in inscriptions by the epithets *atyantabhagavadbhaktah*, *paramabhāgavatah*, or *paramavaiṣṇavaḥ*, 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,<sup>47</sup> and it was probably under their influence that it gained a foothold in the fifth century among the Śaiva Vākāṭaka rulers of Nandivardhana in eastern Vidarbha, through the marriage in the last decade of the fourth century of the Vākāṭaka Rudrasena II to Prabhāvatīguptā, the daughter of the *paramabhāgavataḥ* Gupta emperor Candragupta II (c. 380–474).<sup>48</sup> Gupta influence may also explain the appearance of the Bhāgavata faith at the end of the fourth cen-

---

*tu layacakram svabhāvataḥ | vilīne svasvabhāvākhye tatsvabhāvodayaṃ tataḥ*  
|| 171 *bhāvābhavadvayottīrṇā yā virauty āsarīriṇī | sā cidā niḥsvabhāvasthā*  
*sūryākulā kṛśodarī* || 172 *tatsvarūpoditaṃ cakram cidbhānvarkagatisthitam |*  
*pratibimbam ivābhāti viśvagrāsaikalampaṭam; Kālikulakramasadbhāva* 2.37cd:  
*bhāskarair dvidaśair yuktā śikhā bhargasya cottamā; Eraka, Kramastotra*, quoted  
in *Tantrāloka*viveka on 4.165c–167: *astoditadvādaśabhānubhāji yasyāṃ gatā*  
*bhargasīkhā śikheva | praśāntadhāmnī dyutināśam eti tāṃ naumy anantāṃ*  
*paramārkakālīm*. On the literature of the Kashmirian Kālikula see SANDERSON  
2007a, pp. 250–370.

<sup>46</sup> See here p. 120.

<sup>47</sup> *CII* 3:8, ll. 1–2: *paramabhāgavatamahārājādhirājaśrikumārāgupta-*; ll. 20–23:  
*paramabhāgavato mahārājādhirājaśricandraguptas tasya puttras tatpādānu-*  
*ddhyāto mahādevyāṃ dhruvadevyāṃ utpannah paramabhāgavato mahārājādhī-*  
*rājaśrikumārāguptas tasya puttras tatpādānuddhyātaḥ paramabhāgavato mahā-*  
*rājādhirājaśrīskandaguptaḥ*.

<sup>48</sup> On Śaivism and Vaiṣṇavism among the Vākāṭakas of Nandivardhana and the influence of the Vaiṣṇava Prabhāvatīguptā on the religion of this dynasty see BAKKER 1997.



tury among the Śālankāyana kings of Veṅgīpura 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*.<sup>49</sup> Other early Vaiṣṇava kings are the Māṭharas of Kalinga,<sup>50</sup> the Traikūṭakas of Nāsik, Koṅkaṇa, and Lāṭa,<sup>51</sup> the Śarabhapuriyas of Dakṣiṇa Kosala,<sup>52</sup> and the Parivrājaka Mahārājas of Dabhālārājya (Dāhala) in the fifth and sixth centuries,<sup>53</sup> perhaps the early Maukharis of Kanyakubja before the reign of Īśānavarman (c. 550–76),<sup>54</sup> the Nalas of western Orissa (c. 450+–700),<sup>55</sup> the early Cālukyas of Vātāpi (Bādāmī) in the sixth and early seventh century,<sup>56</sup> and the early Pallavas of Kāñcī up to and including Siṃhaviṣṇu II (c. 550–610).<sup>57</sup> After Pulakeśin II and Siṃhaviṣṇu both the Cālukyas and Pallavas were Śaivas,<sup>58</sup> as

<sup>49</sup> *EI* 42:11, ll. 7–9: *bhagavaccitra<rathasvāmya>nuddhyāto ... paramabhāgavatas śālankāyanavamśaprabhavo vijayavarmā*. For this hypothesis of Gupta influence, which rests on slenderer evidence than that of Gupta influence on the Vākāṭakas, see S. SANKARANARAYANAN in *EI* 42:11, p. 92.

<sup>50</sup> TRIPATHY 1997:2: *bhagavatsvāminārāyaṇapādānūdhātāḥ*; 3: *nārāyaṇasvāmināḥ pādabhaktāḥ paramadaivata<ḥ>*.

<sup>51</sup> MIRASHI, *CII* 4i, p. xlv; *CII* 4i:8, ll. 1–2: *bhagavatpādakarmmakaro ... mahārājadahrasena<ḥ>*; *CII* 4i:9, ll. 1–2, 7–8: *bhagavatpādakarmmakaraḥ ... mahārājavyāghrasena<ḥ>*.

<sup>52</sup> *EI* 31:35, ll. 1–2; *EI* 22:6, ll. 3–4; *EI* 31:18, l. 3.

<sup>53</sup> *EI* 8:28.

<sup>54</sup> Of his predecessors Harivarman, Ādityavarman, and Īśvaravarman, we know that the second at least was *paramabhāgavataḥ*.

<sup>55</sup> *EI* 21:24 (Poḍāgaḍh inscription of the Nala Skandavarman, fifth century) and *EI* 26:3 (Rājim stone inscription of the Nala Vilāsatuṅga, c. 700); SINGH 1994, pp. 89–90.

<sup>56</sup> Kīrtivarman I (r. 566–597) completed the Viṣṇu cave-temple at Vātāpi. His successor Maṅgalīśvara-Raṇavikrānta (r. 597–608) is styled *paramabhāgavataḥ* in an inscription in the Vaiṣṇava cave 3 at Bādāmī 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]): *śrīmaṅgalīśvararanavikrāntaḥ ... paramabhāgavato \*layanam* (corr. FLEET: *layano* Ep.) *mahāviṣṇugrham ... krtvā ...* On the Vaiṣṇavism of the early Cālukyas before Vikramāditya I (654–c. 681) see BOLON 1979, pp. 254–256.

<sup>57</sup> Cārudevī, wife of Buddhavarman son of Skandavarman I (c. 330–350) (MAHALINGAM 1988:4, ll. 7–9: gift of land to a temple of Nārāyaṇa); Siṃhavarman II, c. 436–477 (MAHALINGAM 1988:8, ll. 15–17: *paramabhāgavataḥ*); Yuvarāja Viṣṇugopa, mid-fifth century (MAHALINGAM 1988:6: ll. 9–17; MAHALINGAM 1988:7, ll. 18–21: *paramabhāgavataḥ*); Nandivarman I, c. 495–520 (MAHALINGAM 1988:10, ll. 9–10: *paramabhāgavataḥ*); Buddhavarman, father of Kumāraviṣṇu III (MAHALINGAM 1988:11, ll. 6–7: *bhagavadbhaktisambhāvitasarvakalyāṇasya*); Kumāraviṣṇu III c. 520–540 (MAHALINGAM 1988:11, ll. 12–14: *paramabhāgavataḥ*); Siṃhavarman III c. 540–550 (MAHALINGAM 1988:12, ll. 14–18: *paramabhāgavataḥ*); Siṃhaviṣṇu c. 550–610 (MAHALINGAM 1988:76: *bhaktiyārādhitaviṣṇuḥ siṃhaviṣṇuḥ*).

<sup>58</sup> For the Śaivism of Cālukya Pulakeśin II's successors Vikramāditya I (654–c. 681), Vinayāditya I (681–696), Vijayāditya (696–733), Vikramāditya II (733–744), and

were the later Maukharis.<sup>59</sup>

After the seventh century royal Vaiṣṇavism is sporadic, with the prominent exception of the Kārkoṭas of Kashmir (c. 625–855/6). The conclusion that this dynasty was Vaiṣṇava 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 *Rājataranṅiṇī* of the Kashmirian historian Kalhaṇa, who did have access to, and did utilize, the local epigraphic record of religious foundations and dynastic history.<sup>60</sup> 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 Durlabhasvāmin (4.6) of Durlabhavardhana (r.c. 626–662), the Tribhuvanāsvāmin (4.78) of Candrāpīḍa (r.c. 712-720/1), the Muktasvāmin (4.188) of Lalitāditya-Muktāpīḍa (725-761/2), his silver Parihāsakeśava at his new town Parihāsapura (4.195, 202), his golden Muktākeśava (4.196, 201), and a Viṣṇu at his new town Darpatapura (4.183), the Vipulakeśava (4.484) of Jayāpīḍa (r.c. 773/4-804/5), and his Caturātmakeśava and Anantaśayana Viṣṇu at his new town Jayapura (4.508), the Amṛtakeśava established after his death by his mother Amṛtaprabhā 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 Cippaṭajayāpīḍa, who ran the country for thirty-seven years during the reign of the puppet king Ajitāpīḍa (r.c. 813/4–850/1): Utpalāsvāmin

---

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.

<sup>59</sup> On the Śaiva affiliation of the Maukharis Īśānavarman, Śarvavarman, and Avanti-varman 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 Vaiṣṇava up to the early seventh century before turning to Śaivism is that of the Varmans of Prāgjyotiṣa. Bhūtivarman of that line was *paramabhāgavataḥ* according to his Baḍagaṅgā rock inscription of 553/4 (*EI* 27:5, ll. 1–2): *śrī paramadaivataparamabhāgavatamahārājādhirājāśvamedhajājin[āṃ] śrībhūtivarmadevapādānām*. 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): *lakṣmīḥ kṣībavilāsa[nīta]vidhinā saṃskṛtya ca svīkṛtā bhūyo yena maheśvarāśrayanayaḥ sphāyipratāpārciṣā*.

<sup>60</sup> *Rājataranṅiṇī* 1.15: *dr̥ṣṭaiś ca pūrvabhūhartṛpratiṣṭhā\*vāstuśāsanaīḥ* (conj. : *vāstuśāsanaīḥ* Ed.) | *praśastipattaiḥ śāstraiś ca śānto 'śeṣabhramaklamaḥ* '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 (-*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 Mammāsavāmin (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 Jyeṣṭheśvara 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).<sup>61</sup>

Vaiṣṇavism gained ground again only towards the end of our period, and in subsequent centuries.<sup>62</sup> 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*.<sup>63</sup> 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 Saṃhitās of the surviving corpus of Pāñcarātrika 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.<sup>64</sup>

<sup>61</sup> 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.

<sup>62</sup> 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.

<sup>63</sup> *Mahābhārata* 12.322.24; 12.326.100; 12.360.76; 12.337.1; 12.370.59, 63, and 67.

<sup>64</sup> It was this tradition that was subsequently adapted in South India as the basis of texts such as the *Īśvarasaṃhitā*, *Pādmasaṃhitā*, and *Pārameśvarasaṃhitā*, whose purpose, absent in the earlier Saṃhitās, was to provide scriptural authority for a Pāñcarātrika 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 *pavitrāropanam*, special rites of Mantra-propitiation (*mantrārāadhanam*), 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 *vetālasāadhanam*.<sup>65</sup>

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 *Devāmṛtrapañcarātra*, the *Vāsudevakalpa* of the *Mahālakṣmīsamhitā*, the *Jayottara*, the *Jayākhyā*, the *Sātvata*, and the *Pauṣkara*. Now, of these, three, namely the *Jayottara*, the *Jayākhyā*, and the *Sātvata*, 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 Vaikuṅṭha in the *Jayākhyā* and *Jayottara* and Śaktyātman or Śaktīśa in the *Sātvatasamhitā*, in which the principal anthropomorphic face is flanked by the faces of Narasiṃha and Varāha, with a fourth face, that of the sage Kapila, at the rear.<sup>66</sup> 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.<sup>67</sup>

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.<sup>68</sup> The principal Mantra of

<sup>65</sup> A *vetālasāadhanam* is taught in *Jayottara* 8.23–26b.

<sup>66</sup> *Jayākhyāsamhitā* 6.73c–64 (JS) (= *Jayottara* 1.20 [J]): *dhyāyec caturbhujam \*vipra* (JS: *devam* J) *śāṅkhacakraḡadādharām || caturvaktraṃ sunayanam sukāntam padmapāṇinam | vaikuṅṭham \*naraśimhāśyaṃ* (JS: *naraśimham ca* J) *vārāham kapilānanam; Sātvatasamhitā* 12.9, 14c–15: *śaktīśo 'py atha saṃcintyaḥ puṅḡarīkanibheḡṣaṇaḥ | icchārūpadharaś caiva saumyaḥ prahasiṭānanaḥ || . . . naraśimhena vaktreṇa bhavabhītivighātakṛt || puṣṇāti sarvabhūtāni vārāheṇāmṛtātmanā | kurute paścimasthena kāpilenopasaṃhṛtim.*

<sup>67</sup> See SANDERSON 2005b, pp. 283–284, drawing on SIUDMAK 1994.

<sup>68</sup> *Svāyambhuvapañcarātra*, exposure 11b3: *samvat 147 āṣāḡhaśukla ekādaśyaṃ*

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 manifestly adapted from the venerable Śaiva Mantras of that name.<sup>69</sup>

*śukradine +++ nakṣatre \*likhitam (corr.:likṣatam Cod.) iti* ‘Copied on Friday, under the asterism +++, on the eleventh Tithi of the bright half of the month Aṣāḍha in the [expired] year 147’. That the unstated era of this date is the Newari, which began on 20 October, 879, is confirmed by palaeographical comparison with other Nepalese manuscripts of the early eleventh century. I am very grateful to Dr. Diwakar Acharya for providing me with a digital copy of this manuscript and his own transcription, and also for the information that a second manuscript of this text photographed by the NGMPP (B 237/16) is merely a copy of the first. The title *Svāyambhuvapañcarātra* appears nowhere in the surviving folios but is reconstructed here from the analytic equivalent seen in the colophon of the eighth Adhyāya: *iti pañcarātre \*svāyambhuve (corr.:svayambhuve Cod.) aṣṭamo <h> <h> <h>*. The other surviving Adhyāya colophons refer to the work simply as *pañcarātram* or *pañcarātra mahājñānam*. The meaning is ‘the *Pañcarātra* of the Self-born’, i.e. ‘the *Pañcarātra* taught to Brahmā’. The text is indeed instruction given in response to questions posed by Brahmā. The instructor is Śiva/Īśvara. Exposure 3a1–2 (the beginning): Oṃ NAMO BHAGAVATE VĀSUDEVĀYA || ...*praṇipatya haraṃ deva<m> ...stutvā nāmasahasreṇa brahmā vacanam abravīt*; exposure 4a2–3: *\*brahmaṇo vacanaṃ (em.:brahmācanam Cod.) śrutvā īśvara<h> \*pratyaḥbhāṣata (em.:pratyaḥbhāṣyate Cod.) | śṛṇu brahma<n> prayatnena viṣṇo<h> <h> sthāpanam uttamam | pañcarātramaḥājñānam sarvaśā[streṣu] cot-tamam*.

The *Devāmṛtapañcarātra*, which is closely related textually to the *Svāyambhuvapañcarātra* and is probably dependent on it, survives in a single, undated Nepalese manuscript, probably of the twelfth century. Here too I am indebted to Dr. Diwakar Acharya, who provided me with a transcript that he has prepared.

<sup>69</sup> The five Vaiṣṇava Brahmas are as follows (*Svāyambhuvapañcarātra*, exposure 10a1–2): Oṃ NAREṆAREṆARAṆṆĀTHA NARA YASMĀN NAROTTAMA *prathamabrahmā* | Oṃ YAJÑĀYA NAMO YĀNĀYA DHARMĀYA NAMAḤ \*PUṆYĀYA (corr.:PUNYĀYA Cod.) NAMAḤ | VRATĀYA NAMAḤ | NIYAMĀYA NAMAḤ | MĀRGĀNUSĀRIṆE NAMAḤ *dviṭṭiyabrahmā* | Oṃ KĀLEBHYO \*’THA KĀLEBHYAḤ (corr.: THA KĀLABHYA Cod.) KĀLAKĀLĀNTAREBHYAŚ CA SARVVATA [+ + + + NA]MAS TE RUDRARUDREBHYAḤ *trīṭṭiya brahmā* | Oṃ TATSAMĪYOGĀYA VIDMAHE HRĪŚIKESĀYA \*DHĪMAHI (corr.:DHĪTMAHE Cod.) TAN NO \*VIṢṆUḤ (corr.:VIṢṆU Cod.) PRACODAYĀT *caturthabrahmā* | RODHAKA SARVVAVIDYĀNĀM DEVADĀNAVĀDHIPATI MAHĀPURUṢA NAMO STU TE *pañca<ma>brahmā*. The four Brahmas after the first are evidently modelled on the Śaiva Brahmas in the order (1) Vāmadeva (VĀMADEVĀYA NAMO JYEṢṬHĀYA NAMO RUDRĀYA NAMAḤ KĀLĀYA NAMAḤ KĀLAVIKARAṆĀYA NAMO BALAVIKARAṆĀYA NAMO BALAPRAMATHANĀYA NAMAḤ SARVABHŪTADAMANĀYA NAMO MANONMANĀYA NAMAḤ), (2) Aghora (AGHOREBHYO ’THA GHOREBHYO GHORAGHORATAREBHYAŚ CA SARVATAḤ ŚARVA SARVEBHYO NAMAS TE RUDRARŪPEBHYAḤ), (3) Tatpuruṣa (TATPURUṢĀYA VIDMAHE MAHĀDEVĀYA DHĪMAHI TAN NO RUDRAḤ PRACODAYĀT), and (4) Īśāna (ĪŚĀNAḤ SARVAVIDYĀNĀM ĪŚVARAḤ SARVABHŪTĀNĀM BRAHMAṆO ’DHIPATIR BRAHMĀ ŚIVO ME ’STU SADĀ ŚIVAḤ). The first Brahma has nothing in common with the remaining Śaiva Brahma, that of Sadyojāta.

The Śaiva prototypes are already found in the Atimārga of the Pāñcārthika Pāśupatas. Indeed they constitute the whole Mantra-system of that tradition. However, it is clear that the *Svāyambhuvapañcarātra* 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 (*kalānyāsaḥ*), a Mantramārgic feature, and under names specific to one Mantramārgic tradition, that of the *Svacchandatantra*, the principal scripture of the Mantrapīṭha.<sup>70</sup>

The *Svāyambhuvapañcarātra* 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 Pāñcarātrika literature, since in stark contrast to the case of the Śaiva scriptures, Pāñcarātrika commentarial works in which we could seek such evidence are almost completely absent until a much later period among the Śrīvaiṣṇavas 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.<sup>71</sup> But that, though it cites a number of early Pāñcarātrika scriptural sources, does not cite this. However, there is evidence in a Śaiva source that this Pāñcarātrika 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*,<sup>72</sup> the highly influential work on the Saiddhāntika Śaiva

<sup>70</sup> Ibid., exposure 10a3–5: *kalānyāsaṃ caturthan tu | śrṣṭi vṛddhi mati lakṣmī medhā kānti svadhā sthitā | rajo rakṣā rati pālyā kāmā tṛṣṇā mati jñayā | avidhi kāya tāta ca bhrāmaṇī mohanī tathā | + + + + + sthāḥ kṣudhā mṛtyu jvarabhayā | nirvitiś ca pratiṣṭhā ca | śānti vidyā tathāiva ca | tarā sutārā taraṇī tārayanti svatāraṇī | aṣṭatrinśa\*kalopeta (em. :kalāpetāḥ Cod.) ācāryaḥ \*samudāhṛtaḥ (corr. :samudāhṛtāḥ Cod.). Cf., to emend the names, *Svacchandatantra* 1.53–59b (/Svacchandalalitaḥairava IFI T. 507, p. 6; NAK MS 1–224, f.3v4–4r1, the latter with different *kalāḥ* of Īsana) and *Netratantra* 22.26–34.*

<sup>71</sup> 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 *Īsvaraḥpratyabhijñārikā* 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.

<sup>72</sup> 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 :pañcarātre B) ca sarvam etad udīritam.*

rituals<sup>73</sup> that he composed in the eleventh century, probably in 1073,<sup>74</sup> while he held the office of abbot in the kingdom of the Kalacuris of Tripurī at the illustrious Saiddhāntika monastery of Golagī (*golaḡīmaṭṭhaḡ*), in the Rewa District of Madhya Pradesh.<sup>75</sup>

My conclusion that Somaśambhu was referring to our *Svāyambhuvapañcarātra* 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 *Svayambhūpañcarātra* 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 *Svayambhūpañcarātra* features an unusual arrangement of three circuits of Mantra-deities that agrees exactly with that of our *Svāyambhuvapañcarātra* 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 (*mūlamantraḡ*); the outer eight are the eight weapons (*astrāṇi*) held by the presiding deity; and the nine of the innermost circuit (*garbhāvaraṇam*) 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 Piṅgalāstra (NW).<sup>76</sup> Since this arrangement is highly

<sup>73</sup> 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 *Kriyākramadyotikā* of Aghoraśiva, the *Jñānaratnāvalī* of Jñānaśiva, and the *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 *Agnipurāṇa* (SANDERSON in BRUNNER 1998, p. lix, fn. 81); and much of it was taken over in the late south-Indian Saiddhāntika scriptures *Cintyaviśvasādākhya* and *Uttarakāmika* (BRUNNER 1998, p. lviii–lix).

<sup>74</sup> For a discussion of the date of Somaśambhu’s Paddhati see SANDERSON 2007a, pp. 420–421, footnote 640.

<sup>75</sup> For the name Golagī and the location of the monastery see here p. 264.

<sup>76</sup> The relevant passage in the *Svāyambhuvapañcarātra* (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 *Devāmṛtapañcarātra* [D]): \*yajanaṃ (em. D and here, exposure 8a3: ++ naṃ Cod.) sampravakṣyāmi \*divyaṃ (D: devaṃ Cod.) nārāyaṇasya \*tu (D: tuḡ Cod.) | tribhir āvaraṇaiḡ \*kāryaṃ (em.: kāya Cod.: kārā D) durlabhaṃ \*tu surāsuraiḡ (D: sasurāsuram Cod.) | madhye cakram \*pratiṣṭhāpyaṃ (em.: pratiṣṭhāyāṃ Cod.: pratiṣṭhāpya D) \*dvādaśāraṃ (corr. [D: arai<r> dvādaśabhir yutam]: dvādaśāna Cod. ) suśobhanam | tanmadhye ka-

unusual, especially in its set of nine ancillaries, it is extremely unlikely that Somaśambhu's *Svayambhūpañcarātra* is not the *Svāyambhuvapañcarātra* 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 proktaṃ patrāṣṭakasakarṇikam | sarvātmā \*sakalo (em. : sakalā Cod.) \*devo (corr. : deva Cod.) \*divyamālāsasamanvitaḥ (conj. : divyamālāsanātanah Cod.) | śriyā madhye tu hr̥dayaṃ hūṃkāreṇa tu pūjayet | śira<h> pūrvadale \*dadyād dakṣiṇe tu śikhāṃ (D : da + + + + + ṃ Cod.) nyaset | paścime kavacaṃ \*dadyād (corr. : dadyāv Cod.) astraṅ caivottareṇa tu | gāyātry āgneyadig\*bhāge (corr. : bhāga Cod.) sāvitṛīm īṣvare svayaṃ | \*netraṅ (corr. : netraṅ Cod.) caiva tu \*nairṛtyāṃ (corr. : nairityāṃ Cod.) piṅgalāstraṃ tu \*vāyave (corr. : vāyavet Cod.) | guhyād guhyataraṃ guhyaṃ garbhāvaraṇam uttamaṃ | \*dviṭīyaṃ (corr. : dviṭyāṃ Cod.) \*sampravakṣyāmi (corr. : sampravakṣyāmiḥ Cod.) viṣṇu\*mūrtiḥ (corr. : mūrti Cod.) prapūjayet | dvādaśāre tathā cakre nyase<d> dvādaśa mūrtayah | \*keśavaṃ tu are pūrve omkāreṇa (D : ke + + + + + reṇa Cod.) tu pūjayet | dviṭīyan tu ṅakāreṇa \*pūjya (conj. : jñeyāṃ Cod.) nārāyaṇan \*tathā (corr. : tathāḥ Cod.) | ṛtīyaṃ mādhaveṃ \*pūjya (em. : pūjyaṃ Cod.) mokāreṇa \*mahātmanā (D : mahātmanah Cod.) | bhakārākṣaradevena govindan tu \*caturthakam (D : caturthakaiḥ Cod.) | pañcaman tu gākāreṇa viṣṇu<ṃ> caiva prapūjayet | vakārākṣaradevena ṣaṣṭhe vai madhusūdanam | saptame vāmanaṅ \*caiva (corr. : caivaḥ Cod.) tekāreṇa tu pūjayet | \*yaḥed vākārabījena (conj. : + j . dvārabījena Cod.) aṣṭame tu \*trivikramam (corr. : trivikramaḥ Cod.) | śrīdharan navamaṅ caiva sukāreṇa tu pūjayet | daśame tu hr̥ṣīkeṣaṃ dekāreṇa tu pūjayet | ekādaśe tu \*vākāre (conj. : vākāra Cod.) padmanābhaṃ \*prabhuṃ (corr. prabhu Cod.) viduḥ | dvādaśe <tu> bhakāreṇa nāmnā dāmodaraṃ smṛtam | \*dviṭīyāvaraṇam khyātāṃ (D : dviṭīyāvaraṇa khyātāṃ Cod.) \*ṛtīye 'strāni (D : ṛtīyena strāni Cod.) vinyaset | śaṅkha<ṃ> caiva nyase<t> \*pūrve (em. : pūrvvaṃ Cod.) \*āgneyyāṃ tu gadāṃ nyaset (D : āgneyā + + + + + Cod.) | \*dakṣiṇena (corr. : + kṣiṇena Cod.) bhave<c> cakraṃ khaḍgaṃ \*nairṛtyagocare (corr. : nairityagocaret Cod.) | padma<ṃ> paścimato vidyā<d> vāyavyāṃ tu hala<ṃ> nyaset | musala<ṃ> \*cottarato (em. in spite of the metre : cottato Cod. D) dadyād īśānyā<ṃ> \*sārṅga (corr. : sārāṅga Cod.) vinyaset | etad guhyataraṃ \*yāgaṃ (corr. : yāgāṃ Cod.) durlabhaṃ paramam 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): *vinyasya cādītas cakraṃ dvādaśāraṃ subhāsvaram || 28 tasya madhye punar deyaṃ padmam aṣṭadalaṃ tataḥ | hr̥ṇmantraṃ karṇikāyāṃ ca śiraḥ pūrvadale tataḥ || 29 śikhāṃ ca dakṣiṇe patre paścime kavacaṃ nyaset | astram uttarato nyasya gāyātrīm agnīpatrahe || 30 sāvitṛīm īṣapatre ca netraṃ ca nairṛte dale | tataḥ ca vāyupatre ca piṅgalāstraṃ vinikṣipet || 31 garbhāvaraṇam ity uktam adhunāvaraṇāntaram | dvādaśāre ca cakre 'smiṅ keśavādyaṅ yathākramam || 32 praṇavādyair yathākāram uktapūrvaiḥ svanāmabhiḥ | prāgādītas ca vinyasya khaḍgaṃ gadāṃ anantaram || 33 cakraṃ śaṅkhaṃ ca padmaṃ ca halaṃ ca musalaṃ tataḥ | sārṅgaṃ ca vinyased evaṃ ṛtīyāvaraṇam 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 *Jayākhya*. When detailing the process of initiation it describes the *pāśasūtram*, 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 *kālāḥ*, and rendered non-pervasive by *niyatīḥ*.<sup>77</sup> Now the first three of these factors (*rāgaḥ*, *avidyā*, and *kalā*) are the Śaiva Mantramārga's three 'shrouds'

<sup>77</sup> The only edition of the *Jayākhya* (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. 35v7–36r4, and a lemma in a Nepalese palm-leaf manuscript of 1187/8 of the *Jñānalakṣmī* of Sādhaka Candradatta, pupil of Ekāyanācārya Nārāyaṇagarbha (C): *susitaṃ sūtram ādāya lākṣālaktakabhāvitam* || 129 *saṃmukhaṃ cotthitaṃ śiṣyaṃ \*samapādaśirodharam* (corr. [=C]: *śemapādaśirodharam* N : *samapādaśironnatam* Ed.) | *kṛtvāṅguṣṭhadvayaśyāgrāt samārabhya \*dviḥjottama* (Ed.: *dviḥjottamaḥ* N) || 130 *yāvāc chikhāvasānaṃ tu sūtra\*mānaṃ* (Ed.: *māna* N) *samāharet* | *kuryād \*ekaguṇaṃ* (Ed.: *vekaguṇaṃ* N) *tad \*vai* (Ed.: *ve* N) *dviḥguṇaṃ triḥguṇaṃ tu vā* || 131 *\*tris tris tad* (conj.: *tristriśmad* N: *tritriśha* Ed.) *gūṇitaṃ vātha \*pañcaviṃśatidhāvā* (N: *pañcaviṃśati cāthavā* Ed.) | *avyak-taliṅgasūtraṃ tu \*tad rāgāvidyākalātmakam* (em.: *tadrāgrāvidyākalātmakam* N: *prāgāvidyākalātmakam* Ed.) || 132 *\*nityaṃ jaḍaṃ* (Ed.: *nityajade* N) *vyāpakam ca tasmin viśvam pratiṣṭhitam* | *\*tatraivāstaṃ vrajed* (corr.: *tatrevāstam vrajed* N: *tatrāptam ayate* Ed.: *tatrāstam ayate* conj. KRISHNAMACHARYYA) *bhūyas tasmād eva pravartate* || 133 *tatrasthāṃ cintayet sarvām abhinnāṃ tattvapaddhatim* | *\*tattvodbhavās* (N: *tatrodभवās* Ed.) *tu ye vipra \*pāsā* (em.: *pāsā* Ed.: *teṣām* Ed.) *bandhātmakā dṛḍhāḥ* || 134 *rāgena rañjitās \*citrā* (Ed.: *cimtā* N) *avidyāsampradīpitāḥ* | *vicchinnās caiva kālena \*niyatīvāvyāpakās* (conj.: *niyatāvāvyāpakās* N Ed.) *tathā* 'O best of brahmins, 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 (*rāgāvidyākalātmakam*). 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 Niyati'.

(*kañcukāni*), except that there the second is generally termed *vidyā* rather than *avidyā*; and the other two factors, *kālaḥ* and *niyatīḥ* 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’ (*aśuddho ’dhvā*), and immediately above the individual soul (*puruṣaḥ*), constituting the factors that enable the soul to undergo embodiment in that impure world.<sup>78</sup> Even the substitution of *avidyā* for the Śaivas’ *vidyā* does nothing to dilute the obviously Śaiva 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 *Jayākhya*, 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*’ unmistakably echoes *loci classici* on the functions of *rāgaḥ* and *vidyā* in the Mantramārga’s scriptures.<sup>79</sup>

The *Sātvata* and the *Pauṣkara* 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 Śaiva material. Nonetheless, there are parallels in which the Śaiva version seems more likely to have been the model of the Pāñcarātrika than *vice versa*. Thus the nineteenth chapter of the *Pauṣkara* teaches as the text’s major initiation Maṇḍala (*mahāyāgaḥ*) an arrangement of eight lotuses around a central ninth, calling it the *navapīṭhamaṇḍalam*, *navābjamaṇḍalam*, or *navanābhamaṇḍalam*,<sup>80</sup> and a

<sup>78</sup> For *rāgaḥ*, *vidyā*, and *kalā* as the three ‘shrouds’ (*kañcukatrāyam*) of the Śaivas see, e.g., *Mataṅgapārameśvara*, *Vidyāpāda* 11.33: *rāgavidyākālākhyaena kañcukatrāyena vai*; and *Rauravasūtrasaṃgraha* 1.3–4: *rāgavidyākālāvyaktaḥ buddhisamudbhavam*, where they are the three ‘shrouds’ (*kañcukāni*) of the bound soul. For the addition of *kālaḥ* and *niyatīḥ* seen in the last verse of the *Jayākhya* passage (16.134) see, e.g., *Mataṅgapārameśvara*, *Vidyāpāda* 14.2: *kañcukatrāyāviddham kālana kalitam śanaiḥ | niyatyalīngitam yāti pumbhāvenātmavartinā*; and *Tantrāloka* 9.204: *māyā kalā rāgavidye kālō niyatir eva ca | kañcukāni ṣaḍ uktāni*.

<sup>79</sup> Cf. *Svāyambhuvasūtrasaṃgraha* 32.10–11: *kalodbalitacaitanyo vidyādarśita-gocaraḥ | rāgeṇa rañjitaś cāpi buddhyādikaraṇais tataḥ || māyādyavani-paryantatattvabhūtātmavartmani | bhūṅkte tatra sthito bhogān bhogaikarasikaḥ pumān*; *Kiraṇa* 1.16c–17a: *tayodbalitacaitanyo vidyākhyaṭitagocaraḥ rāgeṇa rañjitaś cāpi*; and *Kubjikāmata* 13.3: *rāgeṇa rañjitatmā vai niyatya yo niyāmitaḥ avidyāprerito gacchet svargaṃ vā svabhram eva vā*.

<sup>80</sup> *Pauṣkarasaṃhitā* 1.24ab: *yady ekaṃ tu mahāyāgaṃ navanābham samudya jet*; 10.34cd: *navapīṭhe mahāyāge taṃ ca kṛtsnam vadāmi te*; 19.26: *yair uddiṣṭam mahāyāge navābje*.

long invocatory Mantra consisting of eighty-one units distributed one by one on the centre (*nābhiḥ*) and eight petals of each of the nine lotuses. This arrangement and correlation, which, to my knowledge, is found in the Pāñcarātrika literature only in the *Pauṣkara*, is central to the Śaiva tradition of the Mantramārga, being the hallmark of a number of its earlier scriptures, where the Maṇḍala is taught under the same names,<sup>81</sup> 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 (*pīṭhaḥ*) of the Maṇḍala are equated with nine Tattvas: Śiva, Sadāśiva, Íśvara, Vidyā, Māyā, Kāla, Niyati, Puruṣa, and Avyakta (Prakṛti). In the *Pauṣkara* that element has been dropped, no Vaiṣṇava set of nine Tattvas being available for this purpose and the Śaiva set being unassimilable because it includes unmistakably Śaiva elements such as Sadāśiva and Íśvara. 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’.<sup>82</sup> Māyā is a Śaiva not a Pāñcarātrika Tattva.

Furthermore, in the *Pauṣkara*, the *Sātvata*, and the *Vāsudevakalpa* of the *Mahālakṣmīsaṃhitā* we find the term *spandah* ‘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 Vaiṣṇava.<sup>83</sup>

<sup>81</sup> *Maṭaṅgapārameśvara*, *Kriyāpāda* 1.51c: *maṇḍalaṃ navapīṭhākhyam*; Kṣemarāja, *Svacchandoddyota* vol.2 (Paṭala 5), p.22: *navanābham navanābhisthānasthapadmam etat puramaṇḍalam*. Cf. *Niśvāsaguhya* 11.14ab (*Niśvāsattattvasaṃhitā* f. 83v1): *ekāśītipado yāgo navavyūheti \*saṃjñītaḥ* (conj.: *saṃsthitāḥ* Cod.).

<sup>82</sup> *Pauṣkarasaṃhitā* 19.24c–26b, 27ab, 31ab, 37c–38b: *jñātum icchāmi \*vidyākhyamantrāṇām* (*vidyākhyā* em.: *vidyākhyam* Ed.) *lakṣaṇam vibho* || 25 *yaiḥ padmakalpanā kāryā \*padair* (conj.: *padmair* Ed.) *nirvartitaiḥ prabho* | *brahmaprakāśakānām tu mantrāṇām atha lakṣaṇam* || 26 *yair uddiṣṭam mahāyāge navābje pūjanaṃ tathā* | ... 27 *madhyapadme padānām ca navakaṃ parikīrtitam* | ... 31 *māyāmāye 'tha* (conj. 'nte Cod.) *kamale caturthe tu padaṃ smṛtam* | ... *iti vidyāpadānām ca svarūpeṇa prakāśitam* || 38 *atha brahmapadānām ca lakṣaṇam cāvadhāraya*.

<sup>83</sup> See *Pauṣkarasaṃhitā* 27.274–276: *śāntasaṃvitsvarūpasya spandānandamayātmanah* | *tavācyutaṃ hi citspandam svayam pariṇataṃ smaret* || 275 *sahasraśaśisūryāgniprabhayā projjvalaṃ sthīram* | *marīcicakrasaṃpūrṇacidgarbhaṃ sarvatomukham* || 276 *cidambarāntarāvasthaṃ suśāntaṃ bhagavatpadam*; *Sātvatasāṃhitā* 3.15cd: *evaṃ jñātvā sthitiṃ brāhmīm svānandāspandalakṣaṇām* (conj.: *svānandaṃ spandalakṣaṇām* Ed.); also 5.99–101b: *lolībhūtam abhedena smaret turyātmanā purā* | *nityoditam ca supade sthitam aspandalakṣaṇam* || 100 *athārcitum yam icchet tu viśeṣavyaktīlakṣaṇam* | *saṃkalpya tu svabuddhyā tu tatkālasamanantaram* || 101 *dhruvā sāmārthyaśaktir vai spandatām eti ca svayam*; *Vāsudevakalpa* at 165ab: *cicchaktau tu layaṃ kṛtvā svānandāspandagocare*; 238–241b: *mānasena tu \*yāgena* (conj.: *yogena* draft Ed.) *dravyaiḥ saṃkalpajaiḥ śubhaiḥ* | *hṛdambujapare turye \*cidbhāsārūpam* (corr.: *cidbhāsā rūpam* draft Ed.) *uttamam* || 239 *kadambagolakākāraṃ*

Nor was the influence of the Śaivism of the Mantramārga confined to the formative period of the Tantric Pañcarātra. For, as I have shown elsewhere, the *Lakṣmītantra* and *Ahīrbudhnyasaṃhitā*, works composed in the South, derive their distinctive doctrinal character from the assimilation of the dynamic non-dualism of the works of the Kashmirian Śākta Śaivas from Utpaladeva (fl. c. A.D. 925–975) to Kṣemarāja (fl. c. 1000–1050).<sup>84</sup>

#### ROYAL PATRONAGE OF BUDDHISM

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

#### *The Viṣṇukuṇḍis of Āndhra*

Among the eight successive Viṣṇukuṇḍis (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, Vikramendrarvarman I (r. c. 502–527), and the seventh, Vikramendrarvarman II (r. c. 555–572). In the Tummala-guḍem 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 brahmins 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

---

*sūryāyutasamaprabham* | **svānandāspandarūpam** ca saṃcintyātmānam ātmanā || 240 *parānandasvabhāvastho veti yaḥ pūjanam vibhoḥ* | *tenārcitenārcitaṃ vai dvisaptabhuvanātmakam* || 241 *viśvaṃ dyāvapṛthivī ca sadevāsuramānuṣam*; and 274c–275: *tanmadhye viṣṭarasthaṃ ca lakṣmīṃ saṃpūjya pūrvataḥ* || *vinyaset svaśarīrā ca gurur vai prāṇayogataḥ* | **ānandaspanda\*rūpam** (corr. : *rūpam* draft Ed.) *cāpy amṛtāmṛtarūpinīm*. On *spandaḥ* in Śaṭkas 2–4 of the *Jayadrathayāmala* see SANDERSON 2007a, pp. 365–366, 406, fn. 579. The term also occurs in the earlier first Śaṭka, f. 190v4–5 (45.121–123b): *nistarāṅgārṇavākārah paritrpta<ḥ> parāparaḥ* | *suśāntamūrtiḥ sarvātmā nirvāṇeṣo tinirmalaḥ* || 122 *tasya śaktiḥ svakaṃ vīryaṃ ciddhāmānandagocaram* | *vyaktaṃ vyaktivibhedena* **spandanānandasundaram** || 123 *taddharmadharmini jñeya śaktir ādyā śivasya sā*. For evidence that the first Śaṭka of the *Jayadrathayāmala* once formed an independent whole to which Śaṭkas 2–4 were added in Kashmir at a later date see SANDERSON 2002, pp. 2 and 22, n. 13, and 2005b, pp. 278–283.

<sup>84</sup> For the evidence see SANDERSON 2001, pp. 35–38. For some other Śaiva features in Pañcarātrika texts see RASTELLI 2007, pp. 209, 214, and 224–225.

expenses of a Buddhist monastery founded by his chief queen Paramadevī.<sup>85</sup> A second set of plates discovered at Tummalagudem 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'.<sup>86</sup> 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

<sup>85</sup> SANKARANARAYANAN 1977:1, ll. 8–24: *anekadevāyatanavihārasabhāprapātādāko-dapānārāmapratisaṃskārāpūrvakaraṇenālaṃkṛtasakaladigantareṇa bhikṣu-dvijānāthayācavayādhitadinakṛpañajanopabhujyamānanyāyādhiḡatavibhava-dhanasamudayenāsakṛd asaṃkṛt svasarvasvatyāginā ... sakalasattvadhātutrāṇā-yotpāditamahābodhicittena mahārājaśrīgovindavarmaṇā ... svasyā agramahiṣyāḥ paramadevyā vihārasya dipadhūpagandhapuṣpadhvajapānabhojanasāyanāsana-glānabhaiṣajyakhaṇḍasphuṭitaśrīṇasaṃskārādikuśalamūlānucchedārthaṃ dvāv ermad[ā]lapreṅkaparunāmādheyau grāmau udakadānapūrvakam atisṛṣṭau '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 Preṅkaparu have been donated to the monastery of his chief queen Paramadevī 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, brahmins, the unprotected, supplicants, 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'.*

<sup>86</sup> SANKARANARAYANAN 1977:8, ll. 10–18: *paramasaugatasya mahārājaśrīvikrame-ndrasya sūnor ... śrī-indrabhaṭṭāarakavarmaṇaḥ priyasūnus ... śrī[mā]n vikrame-ndrabhaṭṭāarakavarmā ... ittham avabodhayati 'Vikramendrabbhaṭṭāarakavarman, beloved son of Indrabhaṭṭāarakavarman, the son of paramasaugataḥ Mahārāja Vikramendra informs you as follows'; ll. 24–33: atibahuprakāramanoramodāarakarmādbhutastūpavihāracūlāmaṇibhir alaṃkṛtasakaladakṣiṇāpathasya ... śrīgo[vi]ndarājasya mūrtimatīm śrīyaṃ praty aviṣayikṛtamanorathayā para-ma[bha]ṭṭārikāmahādevyā śrīmadīndrapuram uccair alaṃkartukāmāyeva prati-ṣṭhāpīte śrīmati paramabhāṭṭārikāmahāvihāre 'smābhi[h] ... cāturdaśāryavara-bhikṣusaṃghaparibhogāya ... irundoṛo nāma grāmo dattaḥ 'I have donated the village called Irundoṛa for the use of the community of excellent monks of the four directions in the venerable Paramabhāṭṭārikāmahāvihāra that was founded by Paramabhāṭṭārikāmahādevī 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 *paramamāheśvaraḥ*, as is his father Indrabhaṭṭāarakavarman,<sup>87</sup> drawing to our attention that if a king supported Buddhism he did not necessarily cease to support other faiths or abandon his own.

*The Maitrakas of Valabhī*

Of the land-grant documents of the Maitrakas of Valabhī three quarters are records of grants to brahmins, but the remaining quarter report grants made by these kings to Buddhist institutions.<sup>88</sup> Guhasena (r. c. 553–569) has the epithet *paramopāsakaḥ* ‘devout lay Buddhist’;<sup>89</sup> Śīlāditya I Dharmāditya (r. c. 595–612) is praised for his support of Buddhism in the east-Indian *Rājavyākaraṇa* of the Buddhist Tantric *Mañjuśriyamūlakalpa*<sup>90</sup> and by the Chinese Huili in his account of the Indian travels of Xuanzang;<sup>91</sup> and the latter, who visited the kingdom of Valabhī 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.<sup>92</sup> Moreover, Valabhī 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 Valabhī during the reign of Guhasena.<sup>93</sup> In their inscriptions, how-

<sup>87</sup> The Chikkula plates of Vikramendravarman (SANKARANARAYANAN 1977:7), ll. 15–19: *parama[mā]heśvarasya mahārājasya śrī-indrabhaṭṭāarakavarma[ḥ] priyajye-ṣṭhaputro ... paramamāheśvaro mahārāja[ḥ] śrīmān vikramendravarmanā evam ā-jñāpayati.*

<sup>88</sup> SCHMIEDCHEN 2007, p. 360.

<sup>89</sup> SCHMIEDCHEN 1993, p. 84.

<sup>90</sup> *Mañjuśriyamūlakalpa* 53.537d–540: *samudratīraparyantaṃ lādānāṃ janapade tathā || 38 śīlāhvo nāma nṛpatiḥ buddhānāṃ śāsane rataḥ | puriṃ valabhya samprāpto dharmarājā bhaviṣyati || 39 vihārān dhātuvarān citrān \*śreyase (em.: śreyasāṃ Ed.) prāṇināṃs tathā | kārayiṣyati yuktātmā bhūpatir dharmavatsalaḥ || 40 pūjāṃ ca vividhākārāṃ jinabimbāṃ manoramām | pūjayed dhātuvarān agryān lokanāthebhyo yaśasviṣu | nāsau mantrasiddhas tu kevalaṃ karmajottamaḥ* ‘In the land of the Lāṭas up to the shore of the [western] ocean a king called Śīla, devoted to the teaching of the Buddhas, will become a Dharmarāja in the city of Valabhī. 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 *Mañjuśriyamūlakalpa* 53.627a: *gaudadeśe ’smin*; and 53.810a: *prācyadeśe ’smin*.

<sup>91</sup> BEAL 1914, p. 148.

<sup>92</sup> *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.

<sup>93</sup> On the dates of Sthiramati and the evidence that a monastery was established for him see FRAUWALLNER 1961, pp. 136 ff.

ever, Śīlāditya I Dharmāditya, Dhruvasena II, and generally Guhasena too, appear like almost all the other Maitrakas with the epithet *paramamāheśvaraḥ*.<sup>94</sup>

*The Kārkoṭas of Kashmir*

No inscriptions have survived from the reigns of the kings of the Kārkoṭa dynasty of Kashmir. But from the account of this dynasty given by the Kashmiran historian Kalhaṇa we learn that although, as we have seen, the temples they established with their names were Viṣṇus,<sup>95</sup> 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 Prakāśadevī, queen of Candrāpīḍa (r. c. 712–720/1); the Rājavihāra ‘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 Caṅkuṇa; a Vihāra and a Caitya established by the same in the capital; and a large monastery and three Buddha images established by Jayāpīḍa (r. c. 773/4–804/5) in his new capital Jayapura.<sup>96</sup>

<sup>94</sup> See, e.g., the Alīnā copper-plate inscription of Śīlāditya 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), Śīlāditya (I), Kharagraha (I), Dharasena (III), Dhruvasena (II), Dharasena (IV), Dhruvasena (III), Kharagraha (II), Śīlāditya (II), Śīlāditya (III), Śīlāditya (IV), Śīlāditya (V), and Śīlāditya (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, Droṇasiṃha, Dhruvasena I, and Dharapaṭṭa. Of these the first two have the epithet *paramamāheśvaraḥ*; Dhruvasena is here a Vaiṣṇava (*paramabhāgavataḥ*) rather than a Buddhist (*paramopāsakaḥ*); and Dharapaṭṭa is a devotee of the Sun-God (*paramādityabhaktaḥ*). 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 Dharapaṭṭa, 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).

<sup>95</sup> See here, p. 60.

<sup>96</sup> *Rājatarāṅgiṇī* 4.3 (Anāṅgabhavana); 4.79 (Prakāśikāvihāra); 4.200–205 (Rājavihāra etc.); 4. 210 (Kayyavihāra); 4.211 and 215 (the foundations of Caṅkuṇa); and 4.507 (the foundations of Jayāpīḍa). For the vestiges of Lalitāditya’s Rājavihāra, his Caitya, and Caṅkuṇa’s Stūpa at Parihāsapura (Paraspor) see Krishna DEVA in *EITA* vol. 2, pt. 1, pp. 366–367; plates 722–727. Caṅkuṇa is evidently a rendering of the Chinese military title *jiangjun* ‘General’ rather than a name.

*The Licchavis of Nepal*

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;<sup>97</sup> a view confirmed by a local chronicle, which attributes to him the establishing of Buddhist images;<sup>98</sup> and in the first half of the seventh century Xuanzang claims that the king of Nepal was a sincere believer.<sup>99</sup> The *Gopālarājavamaṣāvalī*, the earliest of the local chronicles, compiled during the reign of Jayasthitimalla (1382–1395),<sup>100</sup> claims that the Caitya at Guṃvihāra and a monastery, the Mānavihāra, were established by Mānadeva, the Caitya of the Sīnagu-vihāra (the Svayambhūnāth Caitya) by Vṛṣadeva,<sup>101</sup> the Dharmadevacaitya (the Cābahīl Caitya) by Dharmadeva, a monastery and the Khasaucaitya (the Bodhnāth Caitya)<sup>102</sup> by Śivadeva, the Phuṭovihāra and a Caitya by Campādeva, the Rājavihāra by Aṃśuvarman, 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

<sup>97</sup> LKA 148, l. 9: *sugataśāsanapakṣapātī*.

<sup>98</sup> LÉVI 1990, vol. 2, p. 98.

<sup>99</sup> *Xiyu ji*, vol. 2, p. 81.

<sup>100</sup> The *Gopālarājavamaṣāvalī*, 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.

<sup>101</sup> 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 sīnaguvihāra caityabhaṭṭārike pratiṣṭhita sampūrṇa kṛtam*. The identification of this with the famous Svayambhūnāth Caitya is evident from the name Sīnagu, which corresponds to Syaṅgu, its modern Newari name.

<sup>102</sup> This identification follows from the fact that the Bodhnath Stūpa is known as Khasa Caitya in Newari. On these early Nepalese Caityas—this term rather than Stūpa is the normal uage in Nepal—see GUTSCHOW 1997, pp. 85–99.



(Būgadyaḥ/Karuṇāmaya-Matsyendranāth).<sup>103</sup> Unsurprisingly, the Amarāvati-mahāvihāra (Būga Bāhāḥ) at Bungamati, the home of Bugmalokeśvara, claims to have been founded by him.<sup>104</sup>

Mānadeva's dated inscriptions range in date from 459 to 505/6,<sup>105</sup> and we know from his Cāṅgunārāyaṇa inscription that Vṛṣadeva was his great-grandfather and Dharmadeva his father.<sup>106</sup> 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.<sup>107</sup> The epigraphical dates of Śivadeva range from 590/1 to 604/5.<sup>108</sup> There is another Licchavi with the same name, with inscriptions ranging from 694 to 705,<sup>109</sup> 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.<sup>110</sup> The inscriptions of Aṃśuvarman range from 593 to 615;<sup>111</sup> and

<sup>103</sup> *Gopālarājyavamsāvalī* f. 20v5: Caitya at Guṃvihāra; f. 21r1: Mānavihāra; f. 20v2–3: Caitya at Svayambhū; f. 21r3: Dharmadevacaitya; f. 21v1: Khasaucaitya; f. 21v2: Phuṭovihāra and Caitya; f. 22v1: Aṃśuvarman's Rājavihāra; f. 22v3: Devalavihāra; f. 22v5: Śivadeva's monastery; and ff. 22v5–23r1 (the festival of Būgadyaḥ): *śrī narendradeva varṣa 35 tasya ācāryabamdhudattadvayena śrībugmalokeśvarabhaṭāarakasya jātrā kṛtā bhavati* 'Narendradeva: [reigned for] 35 years. Jointly with his Ācārya Bandhudatta he established the festival of Lord Bugmalokeśvara'. On the festival of Būgadyaḥ, also known (in Nepali) as Rāto ('Red') Matsyendranāth, which is still a major event in the Kathmandu valley, see LOCKE 1980, pp. 244–280.

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

<sup>105</sup> 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 (ḌHAKĀL 1990). The earliest Licchavi dates are in the Śaka era, which was used until the time of Aṃśuvarman, 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 Aṃśuvarman'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.

<sup>106</sup> *LKA* 2, side 1, l. 8–side 2, l. 3: *rājābhūd vṛṣadevaḥ ... yasyābhūt tanayaḥ ... rājā śaṅkaradeva ity anupa[mo] ... devī rājyavatī tu tasya nṛpater bhāryā ... yasyām jāta ... śrīmānadevo nṛpaḥ*.

<sup>107</sup> *LKA* 18, l. 18: *kṣetraṃ cākṣayaṃ dattaṃ [śrī]mānavihāre*.

<sup>108</sup> *LKA* 54 and 70.

<sup>109</sup> *LKA* 138 and 143.

<sup>110</sup> *LKA* 133, ll. 4–11 and 134, ll. 4–12: *ayaṃ grāmo ... śrīśivadevavihā[re] catur-diśāryabhikṣusaṅghāyāsmābhīr atisṛṣṭaḥ* 'I have given this village to the congregation of noble monks of the four directions at the Śivadevavihāra'.

<sup>111</sup> *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 Guṃvihāra, 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 Aṃsuvarman onwards have declared their allegiance,<sup>112</sup> Dolāsīkharasvāmin (Cāṅgunārāyaṇa), the principal Viṣṇu of Nepal, then these three Buddhist monasteries, and two others not mentioned by the chronicle, the Kharjūrikāvihāra 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.<sup>113</sup> Narendra, whom the chronicle reports to have instituted the annual chariot festival of Bugmalokeśvara, has dated inscriptions from 643 to 679.<sup>114</sup> 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

<sup>112</sup> See SANDERSON 2005a, p. 417, fn. 254.

<sup>113</sup> *LKA* 77, ll. 6–15: *bhagavataḥ paśupateḥ pu 6 pa 2 dolāsīkharasvāminaḥ pu 6 pa 2 +++ guṃvihārasya 6 pa 2 śrīmānavihārasya pu 6 pa 2 śrīrājavihārasya 6 pa 2 kharjūrikāvihārasya 6 pa 2 ma[dhya]mavihārasya 6 pa 2 sāmānyavihārānām pu 3 pa 1 rāmeśvarasya pu 3 pa 1 haṃsagrheśvarasya pu 3 pa 1 māneśvarasya pu 3 pa 1 sāmbapurasya pu 3 pa 1 vāgmatīpāradevasya pu 3 pa 1 dhārāmāneśvarasya pu 3 pa 1 parvateśvarasya pu 3 pa 1 narasiṃhadevasya pu 3 pa 1 kailāseśvarasya pu 3 pa 1 bhumbhukkikājalaśayanasya pu 3 pa 1 tadanyadevakulānām pu 2 pa 2 ... ‘six Pu[rāṇas] and 2 Pa[ṇas] each for Bhagavat Paśupati, Dolāsīkharasvāmin (=Cāṅgunārāyaṇa), the Guṃvihāra, the Mānavihāra, the Rājavihāra, the Kharjūrikāvihāra, 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 Haṃsagrha (=Viṣṇu Lokapālasvāmin), [Śiva] Māneśvara, Sāmba[śiva], Vāgmatīpāradeva [Śiva], [Śiva] Dhārāmāneśvara, [Śiva] Parvateśvara, Narasiṃhadeva, [Śiva] Kailāseśvara, and the [Viṣṇu] Jalaśayana of Bhumbhukkikā (=the Viṣṇu of Budhanīlkaṅṭh); 2 Pu[rāṇas] and 2 Pa[ṇas] for the temples other than these ...’. The Kharjūrikāvihāra calls to mind the Stūpa which the Buddha predicts in the *Mūlasarvāstivādinaya* will be built by the Kuṣāṇa emperor Kaniṣka at Kharjūrikā four hundred years after his Parinirvāna (*Gilgit Manuscripts*, vol. 3, pt. 1, pp. 1, l. 20–2, l. 5: *bhagavān kharjūrikām anuprāptaḥ | ...eṣa caturvarṣaśataparinirvṛtasya mama vajrapāṇe kaniṣko nāma rājā bhaviṣyati | so ’smin pradeśe stūpaṃ pratiṣṭhāpayati | tasya kaniṣkastūpa iti saṃjñā bhaviṣyati*).*

<sup>114</sup> *LKA* 123–134.

Narendradeva in 643 the king's belt was adorned with a Buddha.<sup>115</sup> 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 *paramamāheśvaraḥ*.<sup>116</sup>

*The Ṭhākurī 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 Ṭhākurī kings. These too, though predominantly Śaiva, supported Buddhist institutions. Only one, Siṃhadeva (r. 1110–1126), has been declared *paramasaugataḥ*,<sup>117</sup> 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,<sup>118</sup> the Jyotirmahāvihāra (Jyo Bāhāḥ) and Dattamahāvihāra

<sup>115</sup> The report of this encounter has been incorporated in chapter 221 of the *Jiu Tang-shu* (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 *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.

<sup>116</sup> *LKA* 133, ll. 1–3: *bhagavatpaśupatibhaṭṭāarakapādānuḡrḥito bappapādānudhyāto licchavikulaketuḥ paramamāheśvaraparamabhaṭṭāarakamahārājādhirājaśrīnarendradevaḥ kuśalī gullaṅgaṅgrāmanivāsinaḥ pradhānapurāḥsarān sarvakuṭumbinaḥ samājñāpayati* ‘Favoured by the venerable lord Paśupati, 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 Gullaṅgaṅ village and commands them [as follows]’. The same formula is seen in 134, ll. 1–4. Only the name of the village differs.

The historicity of Campādeva and Devaladeva, the remaining two kings mentioned by the *Gopālarājavamśāvalī* 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 *Gopālarājavamśāvalī*, which places the first between Śivadeva and Narendradeva and the second before Dhruvavarman—another name found only in this source—and Bhīmārjunadeva.

<sup>117</sup> Colophon of ASB MS 9973 (SHĀSTRĪ 1917, pp. 4–5): *paramasaugataśrīmatsiṃhadevasya vijayarājye*.

<sup>118</sup> PETECH (1984, p. 40) quotes the following colophon of an *Aṣṭasāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā* MS (NAK 3-359) that he wrongly reports as *Catuṣpīthanibandha: samvat 100 60 5 śrāvaṇaśukladaśamyāṃ śukradīne | rājye śrībhāskaradevasya | śrīguṇakāmadevakārite śrīpadmacakramahāvihāre sthitaśākyabhikṣukumāracandraṇa likhitam* ‘Copied by Śākyabhikṣu 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 (PETECH, *loc. cit.*).

(Dau Bāhāḥ) to Rudradeva I (c. 1007–1018) or Rudradeva II (1167–1175), the Hiraṇyavarṇamahāvihāra (Kwā Bāhāḥ) and the Pārāvataamahāvihāra (Itūm Bāhāḥ) to Bhāskaradeva (1039–1048), the Mayūravārṇamahāvihāra (Bhīchē Bāhāḥ) to Śaṅkaradeva (1069–1082), the Tedovihāra (Te Bāhāḥ) to Śivadeva (1098–1126), the Jayamanoharavarṇamahāvihāra (Su Bāhāḥ) and Āsanalokeśvaramahāvihāra, also called Kacchapālagirimahāvihāra (Co Bāhāḥ) to Indradeva (1126–1136), the Cakravarṇamahāvihāra (Cūka Bāhāḥ) to Mānadeva (1136–1140), the Rudravarṇamahāvihāra / Uṅkulimahāvihāra (Uku/U Bāhāḥ), the Maṇipurajaiamahāvihāra, and and the Bandhudattamahāvihāra to Narendradeva (1140–1147), and the Śrīvatsavihāra (Atha Bāhāḥ) to Ānandadeva (1147–1167).<sup>119</sup> However, it is possible in the cases of Śaṅkaradeva, Śivadeva, Mānadeva, and Narendradeva, that the attribution intended was to their Licchavi namesakes.

We have very little evidence for the reigns of these Ṭhākūris, but what there is suffices to remove any suspicion that they were Buddhists to the exclusion of Śaivism. According to the local chronicles Guṇakāmadeva made lavish donations to the temple of Paśupati,<sup>120</sup> Śaṅkaradeva established a temple of a Śiva with his name (Śaṅkareśvara),<sup>121</sup> and Śivadeva gilded the roof of the temple of Paśupati,

<sup>119</sup> For these monasteries and the names of the kings by whom they are said to have been founded (*saṃskārīta-*, *kārīta-*) 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.

<sup>120</sup> Kaiser library *Vaṃśāvalī* fragment (PETECH 1984, Appendix), p. 2: *rājā śrīguṇa-kāmadeva varṣa 85 māsa 6 || tena śrīpaśupatibhattāarakāya ekādaśakoṣaṃ pradattaṃ tatraiva īśāneśvarabhāṭṭāarakāya vāsukibhattāarakasya tāṃmraśaṃṣalī-cchādanam kṛtya tatraiva \*dīrgha\*copārīhikā (conj. : copātrīkā Ed.) kṛtya tatraiva suvarṇapanālī koṭīhomam kṛtas ceti || rājā śrī udayadeva varṣa 6 || rājā śrīnirbhayadeva varṣa 5* ‘King Guṇakāmadeva: 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 Īśāneśvara 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 Nirbhayadeva 5 years || ...’; cf. *Gopālarājāvaṃśāvalī* f. 23v1–2: *rājā śrīguṇakāmadeva varṣa 85 mā 6 tena śrīpaśupatibhattāarakāya ekādaśa koṣa saṃpradattā | tatraiva-m īśāneśvarabhāṭṭāarakāya tāṃrasaṃkhalāsamchādanam kṛtā | tatraiva dīrghacopā<r>hī kṛtāḥ tatraiva suvarṇapanālī [kṛ]tāḥ koṭīhoma pūrṇā kṛtam*. The word *saṃṣalī* (= *saṃkhalī* or *saṃkhalā*) is evidently for Skt. *śṛṅkhalā*, *śṛṅkhalikā* ‘chain’. I have conjectured the meaning ‘sheet’ considering the design of the Paśupati temple, whose roof is covered with interlocking metallic plates. *panālī* = *praṇālīkā*. With \**copārīhī* (conj.) cf. Classical Newari *capārha* (Modern Newari *capāḥ*) ‘rest-house’ (TAMOT *et. al.* 2000, s.v.).

<sup>121</sup> Kaiser library *Vaṃśāvalī* fragment (PETECH 1984, Appendix), p. 4: *rājā śrīśaṅkaradeva varṣa 17 | tena hi nandīsālāyāṃ saṃk<ar>reśvarabhāṭṭā[rakā]ya pratiṣṭhitā devakulam ca pūrṇam kṛtya rāṣṭrasāntikā + + + + vihāras ca prāra<bha>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.<sup>122</sup> Both Indradeva and Ānandadeva have the epithet *paramaśaiva*- attached to their names in the colophons of manuscripts copied during their reigns;<sup>123</sup> and an inscription of 1143/4 records that Ānandadeva, while he was the heir apparent (Yuvārāja), received Śaiva initiation from the Saiddhāntika Guru Rudraśiva of Benares, together with the princes Vasantadeva, Someśvara, Yaśomalla, and Arjunadeva.<sup>124</sup>

struction of the . . . monastery in order to avert danger from the kingdom' (I conjecture *rāṣṭrasāntikāraṇāt* for *rāṣṭrasāntikā* + + ); cf. *Gopālavamśāvalī* f. 24r1–2: *rājā śrī śaṅkaradeva varṣa 15 tena ca naṃdīśālāyāṃ saṅkareśvarabhāṭṭāraka pratiṣṭhitam tāmrasaṃchanna kṛtam devalam || puna bhagavatī manahara bhāṭṭārikā pratiṣṭhitā || rāṣṭrasānti bhavatiḥ* 'King Śaṅkaradeva: 15 years. He established [a Līṅga of] Śaṅkareśvarabhāṭṭāraka at Nandīśālā and covered the temple with a copper roof. He also established Bhagavatī Manahara. This brought about the averting of danger from the kingdom'.

<sup>122</sup> Kaiser library *Vamśāvalī* fragment (PETECH 1984, Appendix III), pp. 4–5: *rājā śrīśīvadeva va[r]ṣa 27 māsa 7 | tena hi paśupatiḥbhāṭṭārakasya suvarṇaśrṃ[khali]chādanam kṛta . . . śrīmatpaśupatiḥbhāṭṭārakasya rajatapadma punar ghaṭita* 'King Śivadeva: 27 years and 7 months. He covered [the temple of] Paśupatiḥbhāṭṭāraka with gilded metal plates and remade his silver lotus'; cf. *Gopālavamśāvalī* f. 24r3–v1.

<sup>123</sup> PETECH 1984, p. 57, colophon of a manuscript of the *Cāndravyākaraṇavṛtti* in Tibet: *śrīmadrājādhirājaparamaśaiva-paramaśaiva-indradevasya śrī-indradevasya vijayarājye*; and PETECH 1984, p. 61, colophon of an *Aṣṭasahasrikā Prajñāpāramitā* manuscript: + + + *paramabhāṭṭārakaparamaśaivamahārājādhirājāśrīmadānandadevapravarddhamānakalyāṇavijayarājye*. The scribal date of completion falls in 1134 in the first case and in 1166 in the second.

<sup>124</sup> Vv. 23–25: *asyāṃ śrīraghuvaṃśamauktika\*maṇir jāto janānandanahaḥ* (ACHARYA: *maṇi . . . dataḥ* REGMI) *sāndras candra ivānvito 'timadhurair ānandadevaḥ karaiḥ | uccaiḥ śaktidharaḥ kumārapadavīm \*prāpto 'pi tair* (ACHARYA: *prāpocitair* REGMI) *\*dīkṣito [dāntaḥ siddhim avarṇa]nīyamahimā* (ACHARYA: *dīkṣita . . . ya mahimā* REGMI) *\*prāpat parām aiśvarīm* (ACHARYA: *prāpa . . . tyaiśvarīm* REGMI) || 24 *\*śaurye 'rjunasamaḥ* (ACHARYA: *saurye 'yaṃ na sama* REGMI) *\*prekṣya guṇāms teṣu guṇapriyaḥ* (ACHARYA: *prekṣagunās te praguṇapriyaḥ* REGMI) | *bhaktim \*arjunadevo 'pi vidadhe vibudheṣv iva* (ACHARYA: *bhaktim arjunam datvā . . . vaḥ*) REGMI) 25 *vasantadevo vijñānī \*dhīmān* (ACHARYA: *śrīmān* REGMI) *someśvaras tathā | yaśomalla\*ś ca* (ACHARYA: *śva* REGMI) *tair eva kumārā dīkṣitā amī*. The plural pronouns here, *tair dīkṣito* in 23c, *guṇāms 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: *śiṣyā babhūvur iha rudraśivā iti*, as is his Guru Mūrtiśiva in v. 8: *bhāṭṭārakā uditamūrtiśivābhīdhānāḥ*. 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 TANḌAN (1999, part 2, pp. 114–123), adopting only some of ACHARYA's improvements. ACHARYA understands the number 64 in the damaged penultimate line (. . . [ca]tuḥṣaṣṭi . . . 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 Ānandadeva, 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 Yaśomalla, those princes too were initiated by the same [Guru].

Neither Arjunadeva nor Yaśomalla 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.<sup>125</sup>

#### *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),<sup>126</sup> 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.<sup>127</sup>

---

the Yuvarāja at the time of his initiation.

<sup>125</sup> See PETECH 1984, pp. 64–67 and 71–72, and the Genealogical Table A, p. 229.

<sup>126</sup> 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.

<sup>127</sup> The Pālas and their successors, the Senas, are regularly described as kings of Gauḍa (*gaudeśvaraḥ*, *gaudendraḥ*, *gaudarājah*, *gaudādhīpaḥ*, *gauḍapatiḥ*, etc.); see, e.g., SIRCAR 1983a:26, l. 33 (Lakṣmanasena); here pp. 108 (Nayapāla) and 109 (Palapāla, Mahīpāla); *Saduktikarṇāmṛta* 1449, 1496. The name Gauḍa in its narrow sense refers to a territory covering parts of West Bengal, being distinguished from Magadha, Vaṅga, and Aṅga. 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 Aṅga, is described as the capital of Gauḍa in the *Anargharāghava* (Act 7, prose before v. 124: *campā nāma gauḍānām . . . rājadhānī*), and Kauśāmbī, about 35 miles south-west of Allahabad, is said to be in it in the *Hitopadeśa* (*Mitralābha*, *Kathā* 5, p. 19: *asti gauḍaviṣāye kauśāmbī nāma nagarī*).

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 *śrīsugatāśrayaḥ* ‘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*.<sup>128</sup> A copper-plate of Tribhuvanamahādevī, the Vaiṣṇava (*paramavaiṣṇavī*) 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;<sup>129</sup> another issued by her records that the earlier kings of her line had adorned the land with many Maṭhas, Buddhist monasteries, and temples;<sup>130</sup> and a third issued c. 980 by the *paramamāheśvaraḥ* 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 Vinītatūṅga.<sup>131</sup>

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

<sup>128</sup> *EI* 15:1 (the Neulpur grant of Śubhākara I), ll. 2–5, and *EI* 28:36 (the Teruṇḍiā 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 (*paramavaiṣṇavī*), namely Tribhuvanamahādevī I, wife of Śāntikara I, and Tribhuvanamahādevī II, wife of Śubhākara IV, and three Śaiva queens (*paramamāheśvarī*), Daṇḍimahādevī, daughter of of Gaurīmahādevī, 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 Teruṇḍiā 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.

<sup>129</sup> *EI* 29:30, Baud plate A of Tribhuvanamahādevī, ll. 5–6: *sutottamas tasya samāśraya[h] śriyaḥ praśāsad ūrvīm śuśubhe śubhākaraḥ | kaler alaṅghyaṃ sukṛtāśrayāya yo vihāram uccair 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.’

<sup>130</sup> SHASTRI 1916:G, ll. 7–9: *nirantaraviracitavidhamatḥavihāraprāsādaprabandhaiḥ purandarapurārohanasopānabandhair iva maṇḍitamahīmaṇḍaleṣv ākhaṇḍalaprabhaveṣu mahārājeṣu vyatīteṣu* ‘After the passing of those Mahārājas, mighty as Indra, who adorned the land with the manifold sequences of Maṭhas, Vihāras, and temples that they constructed without interruption as though with stairways for ascending to the heaven of Indra . . .’

<sup>131</sup> MISRA 1934:I, Talcher plate of Śivakaradeva, ll. 25–29.

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.<sup>132</sup> 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,<sup>133</sup> and this is only the foremost of several Buddhist sites in Orissa in which Tantric Buddhism is evident in the surviving statuary.<sup>134</sup> 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 *Samvarodayā nāma Maṇḍalopāyikā* of Bhūvācārya, which survives in a Nepalese manuscript copied in 1050 in the Mānadevamahāvihāra (Chuka Bāhāḥ);<sup>135</sup> and a manuscript of the *Vimalaprabhā*, the great commentary on the *Kālacakratantra*, 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.<sup>136</sup> Indeed Ratnagiri had a particularly close association with the propagation of that Tantra according to the Tibetan account of the

<sup>132</sup> 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.

<sup>133</sup> MITRA 1984, p. 225–232. On the phases of construction at Ratnagiri see BROWN 1978. On the successive phases of the Mantranaya manifest in the images that have survived at Ratnagiri and other Orissan sites see LINROTHE 1999, pp. 53–57, 70, 108–111, 125–128, 168–169, 195–198, 251–255, 280–283, and 287–288.

<sup>134</sup> Notable are the nearby sites of the Mādhavapuravihāra at Udayagiri and and the Candrādityavihāra at Lalitagiri. On Udayagiri see BANDYOPADHYAYA 2007; and on Lalitagiri see CHAULEY 2000; and *IAR* 1985–6, pp. 62–63; 1986–87, pp. 64–67; 1987–88, pp. 88–90; 1988–89, pp. 65–66; 1989–90, pp. 77–80; 1990–91, pp. 54–55.

<sup>135</sup> *Samvarodayā* f. 56v3–4: *śrīmadratnagirau sthitvā sarvasattvārthahetunā | kṛteyaṃ maṇḍalopāyikā bhūvācā<r>yeṇa dhīmatā | śrīsamvarodayā nāma maṇḍalopāyikā \*samāptā* (corr. : *samāptaḥ* Cod.) || • || *saṃvat a cū \*proṣṭhapadakṛṣṇacaturthyāṃ* (*proṣṭhapada* conj. : *pretipada* Cod.) *rājādhirājapa[ra]m[.]eśvaraparamabhattārakaśrībaladeva + + vijayarāj<y>e likhitam | śrīmānadevamahā\*vihāriyaśākyabhikṣusādhuśrīdevasya* (*vihāriya* conj. : *vihāre* Cod.) *pustakam \*<l>yad atra puṇyaṃ tad bhavatu* (diag. conj.) *mātāpitṛgurūpādhyāyasakalāsattvarāśe<r>anuttara<jñāna>phala\*prāptaya iti* (conj. : *prāpnoti* Cod.).

<sup>136</sup> SHASTRI 1917, pp. 79–80 (ASB MS 10766). The manuscript is dated by the scribe in year 39 of the reign of Mahārājādhirāja Harivarman, on whom see MAJUMDAR 1971, pp. 209–210. Colophon: *mahārājādhirājaśrīmat-harivarmadevapādīyasamvat 39 | sūryagatyā āśādhadine 39*. The postscript: *saṭcatvāriṃśatigate vatsare harivarmanah | māghasya kṛṣṇasaptamyāṃ ekādaśadine gate || mṛtayā cuñcadukayā gauryā svapnena drṣṭayā | kaniṣṭhāṅgulim ādāya \*prṣṭayedam* (corr. : *prṣṭhayedam* SHASTRI) *udīritam | pūrvottare diśobhāge beṃganadyās tathā kule | †pacca-tvaṃ bhāṣitavataḥ† saptasamvatsarair iti*.



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 Paṇḍita 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.<sup>137</sup> A tradition that Cilu studied the *Kālacakratantra* in the Ratnagirimahāvihāra before seeking the *Vimalaprabhā* is recorded by Gzhon nu dpal.<sup>138</sup>

### *The Candras of South-East Bengal*

As for the Candras, they used the wheel of the Buddha's teaching (*dharmacakram*) 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 *paramasaugataḥ*,<sup>139</sup> and his Rāmpāl and Madanpur copper-plate grants describe Suvarṇacandra, the predecessor of Trailokyacandra (r. c. 900–925), as a *bauddhaḥ* 'a follower of the Buddha's teachings'.<sup>140</sup> 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 *paramasaugataḥ*.<sup>141</sup>

### *The Khaḍgas of Samatāṭa*

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

<sup>137</sup> OROFINO 1994, pp. 17–23; *Blue Annals*, p. 755.

<sup>138</sup> *Blue Annals*, p. 755.

<sup>139</sup> *EI* 37:51, ll. 25–26.

<sup>140</sup> *EI* 12:18, l. 6; *EI* 28:9, l. 8; and MAJUMDAR 1971, p. 201.

<sup>141</sup> *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" (*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 *became* a Buddhist but only that he was one: *buddhasya yaḥ śāśakajātakam aṅkasamsthāṃ bhaktyā bibharti || bhagavān amṛtākarāṃśuḥ | candrasya tasya kulajāta itīva bauddha[h] putraḥ 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 (/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 (*dānapāramitā*) that the Buddha gave away his own body as food when he was a hare in a former life, the *śāśajātakam*. 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.

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, Khaḍgodyama, 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.<sup>142</sup> The same inscription tells us that Rājarāja gave land to these three;<sup>143</sup> and another that Devakhaḍga, the father of Rājarāja, made a donation to the same for the longevity of his son.<sup>144</sup> 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 Prabhāvātī, Devakhaḍga's queen.<sup>145</sup>

*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.<sup>146</sup> 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

<sup>142</sup> Ashrafpur plate B (LASKAR 1907), ll. 2–4: *trailokyakhyātakīrtau bhagavati sugate sarvalok[e] + + + taddharme sāntarūpe bhavavibhavabhidāṃ yogināṃ yoga\*gamye* (corr. : *gamyā* Ed.) | *tatsaṅghe cāprameye vividhaguṇanidhau bhaktim āvedya gurvīm śrīmatkhaḍgodyamena kṣitir iyam abhito nirjitā yena* 'Khaḍgodyama, 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'.

<sup>143</sup> Ashrafpur plate B (LASKAR 1907), ll. 6–7: *tatsuto rājarājaḥ dattaṃ ratnatrayāya tribhavabhaya\*bhīde* (conj. : *bhidā* Ed.) *yena dānaṃ svabhūmeḥ* 'His [Devakhaḍga'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 (*gandhakuṭī*) and Stūpas, the Dharma for the copying and teaching of sacred texts, and to the Saṅgha for its sustenance and comfort.

<sup>144</sup> Ashrafpur plate A (LASKAR 1907).

<sup>145</sup> *EI* 17:24,4, ll. 1–2: *tadātmaḥ dānapatiḥ pratāpī śrīdevakhaḍgo vijitārikhaḍgaḥ* | *rājñas tasya mahādevī mahiṣī śrīprabhāvātī* | *śarvāṇīpratimāṃ bhaktyā hemalīptām akārayat* 'His son was the majestic donor (*dānapatiḥ*) Devakhaḍga, whose sword had defeated his enemies. The chief consort of that king, Mahādevī Prabhāvavātī, had [this] image of Śarvāṇī gilded'. The word *dānapatiḥ* 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 Deulbāḍī, near Comilla, together with a Sūrya and small Liṅgas, all of brass.

<sup>146</sup> D.C. SIRCAR in *EI* 32:11, p. 1071–108.

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.<sup>147</sup> Two short inscriptions from Vesālī of the time of his ancestors Nīticandra (r. c. 520–575) and Vīracandra (r. c. 575–578) tell us that the wife of the former, queen Sāvītām-Candraśrī, was a lay Buddhist (*paramopāsikā*) and that the latter established a hundred Stūpas.<sup>148</sup> 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.<sup>149</sup>

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 Ānandeśvaramaṭha and the Ānandamādhavamāṭha, whose names reveal that they were associated with a Śiva and a Viṣṇu established with his name.<sup>150</sup> Moreover, a fragmentary copper-plate inscription (*EI* 37:13) from a

<sup>147</sup> Inscription of the western face of the pillar at the Shittaung Pagoda, Mrohaung, Arakan (JOHNSTON 1944:A), vv. 37c–40: **vajraśaktis tata<h> [kh]yāto rājā devānvayodbhavaḥ || pratipālya jagat sarvaṃ rājyaṃ ṣoḍaśavatsaram | dānaśīlādi-samyukto devalokam sa yātavān || śrīdharmajayasamyukto lokānugrahatatparaḥ | tatpaścād abhavad dhīraḥ śrīdharmavijayo nṛpaḥ || ṣaṭtriṃśad abdāny upabhujya rājyaṃ dharmeṇa nītyā ca jayena caiva | ratnatrayānusmaraṇābhiyogāt sa devalokam tuṣitam prayātaḥ.**

<sup>148</sup> *EI* 32:11, no. 1, ll. 3–4: *devisāvītām-candraśrīyā nāma paremopāsikasya; EI* 32:11, no. 2, ll. 1, 3–4: *satyadharmmānarāgena kṛtaṃ svārtheṇa bhūbhujā ... śrīvīracandradeveṇa mahīmaṇḍalamaṇḍanaṃ | dharmmādhigatarājyeṇa buddhastūpa-satam kṛtaṃ.*

<sup>149</sup> JOHNSTON 1944:A, vv. 46–54.

<sup>150</sup> JOHNSTON 1944:A, vv. 55–56: *pañcāsadbṛhmanāvāsam kṣetrabhṛtyasamanvitam | vādyavādakasamyuktaṃ kāritaṃ maṭhacatuṣṭayam || somatīrthadvijāvāse maṭhaś cānandamādhavaḥ | ānandeśvaranāmāpi naulakk[e] ca maṭha<h> smṛtaḥ.* 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 prescription; see Somaśambhu, BRUNNER 1998, p. 311 (v. 48), =*Kriyākāṇḍakramāvalī*,

site near Mrohaung recording a donation by queen Kimmājjuvdevī 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 *paramamāheśvaraḥ*. 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 Vīracandra, 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).<sup>151</sup> Vīracandra, he argues, is excluded by the fact that one of the two Vesālī inscriptions records his patronage of Buddhism. However, that a king should give to Buddhism and at the same time be declared a *paramamāheśvaraḥ* 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 *paramasaugataḥ* in our period—apart from the imperial Pālas, to whom I shall turn presently—are Bhavadeva of Devaparvata in Samataṭa (r.c. 765–780), the founder of the Buddhist monastery Bhavadevamahāvihāra at Paṭṭikera, modern Maināmatī, 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 Mayūravamaṣa at some time in the tenth to twelfth, the Nandodbhava Dhruvānanda of Jayapura, the successor of the *paramamāheśvaraḥ* Devānanda II, in the late tenth, and Kāntideva of Harikela in the ninth.<sup>152</sup> The inscription that tells us that the last was *paramasaugataḥ* also conveys that Buddhism was the faith of his grandfather Bhadradata. 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 Dhanadata, the donor's father, is

---

ff. 72v7–73r1: *svāmyantaṃ mādhavāntaṃ vā karṭṛnāmnā ca saṃyutam | dhārayen nāma devasya viṣṇoḥ sthāpanam iritam* 'He should bestow a name on the deity conjoined with the name of the patron and ending in -svāmin or -mādhava. I have [thus] explained the installation of Viṣṇus'.

<sup>151</sup> D.C. SIRCAR, *EI* 37:13, p. 64.

<sup>152</sup> SIRCAR 1983a, Supplement:3, ll. 42–43 (Bhavadeva); MITRA 1971, p. 245 (Bhavadevamahāvihāra). *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). *EI* 29:26, ll. 25–26 (Devānanda). *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 Samataṭa 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.<sup>153</sup>

*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), Vighrapāla II (r. c. 972–977), Mahīpāla I (r. c. 977–1027), Nayapāla (r. c. 1027–1043), Vighrapāla III (r. c. 1043–1070), Rāmapāla (r. c. 1072–1126), and Madanapāla (r. c. 1143–1161).<sup>154</sup>

Under these rulers eastern India witnessed an extraordinary development

<sup>153</sup> *EI* 26:45, ll. 3–: ...*jayaty udāro durvāramāraṅgīśarasya jayī jinendraḥ || tad-bhaktibalitaśaktir bhujadvayaurjityavijitaripudarpaḥ | sa jayati dharmāikarataḥ khyātaḥ śrībhadradatto yaḥ || tasya subhāṣitabhāratapurāṇarāmāyaṇārthavit tanayaḥ | nāmnā śrīdhanadattaḥ prakāṣitamahimānvayo yo 'bhūt || tasya gaurī mahābhūbhṛtsutā budhagurustutā | patnī binduratir nāma yā babhūva śivapriyā* 'Victorious is the foremost of the Jinās, 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 Bhadrādatta. His son was Dhanādatta. 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'.

<sup>154</sup> **Dharmapāla:** *EI* 4:34, ll. 29–30; *EI* 17:17, ll. 24–25; *EI* 18:30, l. 28. **Devapāla:** *EI* 17:17, ll. 24–25; *EI* 18:30, l. 29. **Mahendrapāla:** *EI* 42:2, ll. 30–31. **Nārāyaṇapāla:** SIRCAR 1983a:17, ll. 28–29. **Vighrapāla II:** *EI* 29:1A, ll. 27–28. **Mahīpāla I:** *EI* 14:23, ll. 29–30; *EI* 29:1, l. 27; a pedestal inscription (HUNTINGTON 1984, pp. 221–222). **Nayapāla:** colophon of a MS transcribed in BENDALL 1883, p. 175. **Vighrapāla III:** *EI* 15:18, l. 23; *EI* 29:1B, ll. 26–27; *EI* 29:7, ll. 24–25; MS colophon transcribed in BENDALL 1902, pp. 232–233 (because the date of copying is said here to be the 26th year of the reign of Vighrapāla this can only refer to Vighrapāla III). **Rāmapāla:** REGMI 1965–1966, Pt. 1, p. 148 (MS colophon); colophon of *Kubjikāmata*, NAK MS 1-1633, NGMPP B25/22 (transcribed in GOUDRIAAN and SCHOTERMAN 1988, p. 6); a pedestal inscription (HUNTINGTON 1984, pp. 233–234). **Madanapāla:** MUKHERJI and MAITY 1967:30, ll. 31–32. The dates of the reigns given here are those proposed by D.C. SIRCAR (1975–1976), with the addition of those of Mahendrapāla. The existence of a Pāla Mahendrapāla, son and successor of Devapāla, was established only with the publication of the Māldā District Museum copper-plate charter of that king in 1992 (*EI* 42:2) by K.V. RAMESH and S. SUBRAMONIA IYER, following its discovery in 1989.

of Mahāyāna Buddhism in all its branches, particularly in the Tantric Way of Mantras (Mantranaya),<sup>155</sup> 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, Vikramaśīla, Somapura, Trikaṭuka, Uddaṇḍapura, and Jagaddala.<sup>156</sup> That the

<sup>155</sup> The Derge edition of the Tripiṭaka contains 486 works (Tōh. 360–845) in the section of the Kanjur devoted to scriptural Tantric works and 2606 (Tōh. 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 *Gūdhapadā* of Advayavajra, the *Maṇḍalopāyikā* of Padmaśrimitra, the *Vajrajvāloḍayā* of Ānandagarbha, the *Vajravārāhīkalpa*, the *Sarvadevasamāgama*, and the *Herukasādhana* of Kalyāṇagarbha, have been used in this study.

<sup>156</sup> The Nālandāmahāvihāra was located in Bihar about 55 miles southeast of Patna, with the Uddaṇḍapuramahāvihāra close by. The Vikramaśīlamahāvihāra 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 Vikramaśīla is seen in Anupamavajra's *Ādikarmapradīpa*; see here p. 91. That the name of the monastery was Vikramaśīla rather than Vikramaśilā, as it appears in some secondary sources, is clear from, e.g., the scribal colophon of a manuscript of Vajragarbha's *Hevajratantrapiṇḍārtha-ṭīkā* that was penned there: *śrīmadvikramaśīlamahāvihāre lekḥapitam*. The Somapuramahāvihāra was at Pāhārpur about 29 miles northwest of Mahāsthān (ancient Puṇḍravardhana) in Varendrī, the region of northern Bengal between the arms of the Ganges and Karatoyā rivers (*Rāmacarita* 3.10ab: *apy abhito gaṅgākaratoyā-narghapravāhapuṇyatamām*). The Jagaddalamahāvihāra too was in this region; see *Rāmacarita* 3.7: *... jagaddalamahāvihāracitarāgām | dadhatīm lokeśam api mahattāroḍītorumahimānam* [the land (of Varendrī)], whose beauty was heightened by the Jagaddalamahāvihāra, 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 Jagaddalamahāvihāra. See ZAKARIA 1994 and MIAH 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 (=Rāḍhā) (*HBI*, p. 267; MAJUMDAR 1971, p. 525), the region of Bengal south of Varendrī and west of the Bhāgīrathī river, divided into Uttarakāḍhā, 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 Dharaṇīndrabhadra. 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 Bhaṭṭaḥḥaṭī. This name is implausible as it stands. If, as is probable, it is a deformation of Vandyaghaṭīya, then it identifies him as a member of a well-known Rādhīya brahmin lineage of Bengal (> Bandyopādhyāya, Banerjee).<sup>157</sup> 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.<sup>158</sup> 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 Bakhtiyār 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,

---

the whole of Burdwan District, and Dakṣiṇarādhā, covering Bankura District and the non-coastal part of Midnapur District.

<sup>157</sup> In the eulogy of Bhaṭṭa Bhavadeva, the learned minister of Harivarman (c. 1090+), in a stone inscription from Bhubaneswar, Bhavadeva's mother Saṅgokā 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 *Ṭikāsarvasva* on the *Lingānuśāsana* of Amarasimha, the great 16th-century Dharmasāstrin Raghunandana, author of the *Smṛtitattva* (PINGREE 1994, p. 341), Nārāyaṇa (*fl.* c. 1681), author of the *Smṛtisarvasva* or *Smṛtitattva* (PINGREE 1994, p. 181), and Dvija Lakṣmaṇa, who translated the *Ādikāṇḍa* of the *Adhyātmaramāyaṇa* into Bengali.

<sup>158</sup> *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.<sup>159</sup> The *Rgya gar chos '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 Trikaṭuka.<sup>160</sup> 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 *śrīsomapure śrīdharmapāladeva-mahāvihāre* ‘in the Mahāvihāra of Dharmapāladeva at Somapura’,<sup>161</sup> 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 Trikaṭuka monastery. For Haribhadra reports at the end of his *Abhisamayā-lamkārāloka*, his great commentary on the *Aṣṭasāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā*, that he composed it in this monastery during the reign of Dharmapāla and under his patronage.<sup>162</sup>

<sup>159</sup> 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 Vinītadeva; 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.

<sup>160</sup> See *Rgya gar chos 'byung*, p. 160, ll. 9–10 (Somapuravihāra); p. 161, l. 11 (*dpal tsha ba gsum gtsug lag khang* [Trikaṭukavihāra]; cf. p. 167, ll. 7–8: *tri ka \*tu* [corr. : *ṭa* Ed.] *ka tsha ba gsum kyi gtsug lag khang*); p. 165, l. 17 (Vikramaśīlavihāra); *HBI*, p. 266, p. 267, pp. 274–275.

<sup>161</sup> *ARE* 1927–28, pp. 105–106; DIKSHIT 1938, pp. 20 and 90, and plate LIXh; N.G. MAJUMDAR in *EI* 21:16, p. 98.

<sup>162</sup> *Abhisamayālamkārāloka*, p. 994, vv. 6–7: *khyāto yo bhuvī puṇyakīrtinīcayo vidvaj-janālamkṛtas tasmīn sarvaguṇākare trikaṭukaśrīmadvihāre śubhe | dānāl labdha-mahodayasya karuṇādevasya dharmātmanah sādāthyena sukhopadhānanīlaye sthitvā vivekāspade || krudhyatkuṅjarakumbhapīthadalanavyāsaktaśaktyātmanah puṇyābhyaśakrtābhiyogajavaśāt sampatsamādāyinaḥ | rājye rājyabhaṭādivaṃśa-patitaśrīdharmapālasya vai tattvālokaividhāyini viracitā satpāñjikeyaṃ mayā* ‘I have composed this excellent commentary that illuminates reality after taking up residence in the splendid Trikaṭukavihāra 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 Dharmapāla, 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 rendering



In the case of the Somapura monastery it has been argued that we may salvage Tāranātha's credibility by concluding that Devapāla did found this monastery, as Tāranātha claims, and that he gave it his father's name rather than his own out of filial piety.<sup>163</sup> 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 Tāranātha 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.<sup>164</sup> 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".<sup>165</sup> Vikrama here is evidently a *bhīmavat* contraction for Vikramaśīla.<sup>166</sup> However, we may not conclude that everything that Tāranātha attributes to Dharmapāla was Devapāla's doing, and *vice versa*. He reports, for

---

of the swollen globes on the foreheads of the furious elephants [of his enemies], has attained his glorious success by virtue of the dedication produced by his repeated pious works'. For the use of *sthitvā* here cf. the final verse of the *Samvarodayā nāma maṇḍalopāyikā* of Bhūvācārya cited here, p. 82.

<sup>163</sup> N.G. MAJUMDAR in *EI* 21:16, p. 98, fn. 5.

<sup>164</sup> *Rgya gar chos 'byung*, chapters 29 (Devapāla) and 30 (Dharmapāla). Tāranātha 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 Rājyapāla (r. c. 917-952), the successor of Nārāyaṇapāla.

<sup>165</sup> *Ādikarmapradīpa*, ed. Takahashi, p. 153: *vihāre* (T [metri causa] : *vihāre* P, Ed.) \**nṛpadevapālaracite* (T, Ed. : *ndapadevaracita* P) \**śrīvikramākhye* (T, Ed. : *śrīvikramākṣa* P) *sthitāḥ śrīmatsaugataśāsanaikatilakaḥ khyāto 'dviṭiyah kṛtī | \*śīlādhyāś cirabrahmacaryacarito* (P : *śīlādhyasthīratattvadṛṣṭimahito* T, Ed.) *dharmākaraḥ \*śāntadhīs* (P : *sanmatih* T, Ed.) \**tasyādeśakaraḥ samasty anupamaḥ* (T, Ed. : \**tasyādeśakaro babhūva 'nupamas* P) *tenādikarmoddhṛtam* '[This text on] the initial observance has been extracted [from various sources] by Anupama, acting on the instruction of Dharmākara, that renowned, unequalled scholar, richly endowed with morality, of tranquil mind, a life-long observer of celibacy, a resident of the Vikrama monastery constructed by King Devapāla'.

<sup>166</sup> On Vikrama for Vikramaśīla see here p. 88.

example, Dharmapāla's particular reverence for Haribhadra,<sup>167</sup> a relationship that, as we have seen, Haribhadra himself attests. He also claims that Dharmapāla created about fifty religious foundations (*dharmādhikārah*), and that the majority, thirty-five, were for the study of the *Prajñāpāramitā* texts.<sup>168</sup> 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 Uddaṇḍapura, 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;<sup>169</sup> and the

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

<sup>168</sup> *Rgya gar chos 'byung*, p. 165, ll. 14–17: *rgyal srid du 'khod ma thag nas shes rab kyī pha rol tu phyin pa 'chad pa po rnam spyān drangs | slob dpon seng ge bzang po la khyad par du mos | rgyal po 'dis spyir chos gzhi lnga bcu 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 (*dharmādhikārah*) and thirty-five of them were for the exegesis of the *Prajñāpāramitā*'; *HBI* p. 274. For evidence that *chos gzhi* renders Sanskrit *dharmādhikārah* 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.

<sup>169</sup> OBERMILLER 1986, p. 156–157. For the proximity to Nālandā of the monastery of Uddaṇḍapura, which in Tibetan sources is known as Otantapurī, 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 zhig bzhegs* 'He built the Nālandā monastery near Otantapurī'; *HBI*, p. 258. I use Uddaṇḍapura 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 yaṃ śrīnārāyaṇapāladevarāṇyē samvat 54 śrī-uddaṇḍapuravāstavyarāṇaka-uccaputrathārukasya* 'This is the pious gift of Thāruka, son of Ucha, resident at the Great Monastery of Uddaṇḍapura, in year 54 of the reign of Nārāyaṇapāladeva'. Bihār Sharīf is indeed near Nālandā. The form Uddaṇḍapura also occurs in an inscription of the reign of Śūrapāla recording the installation of a Buddha image in the monastery there by a monk Pūrṇadāsa (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 Dharmapāla came before not after Devapāla. Tāranātha assigns it to Devapāla, probably in consequence of the aforesaid confusion, though he also reports a tradition that it was founded by Dharmapāla's father Gopāla, the first of the Pālas.<sup>170</sup>

Tāranātha reports that Dharmapāla 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*.<sup>171</sup> 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 Dharmapāla's grandson, he persuaded the king to institute a regular fire-sacrifice (*homah*) 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.<sup>172</sup> Further evidence of

---

it appears that it began as a small Saṅghārāma donated by the fourth Gupta king, Kumāragupta Śakrāditya, who reigned from 415 to 455. It then grew through the addition of further Vihāras until by Xuanzang's time it had become the foremost Buddhist structure in India, famed throughout Buddhist Asia as a centre of learning. See the analysis of the history of the Nālandāmahāvihāra on the basis of the Chinese sources in KUWAYAMA 1988, pp. 7–11. For a plan of Nālandā with its row of nine identical monasteries and several temples see MICHELL 1990, p. 246.

<sup>170</sup> *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 pūri'i gtsug lag khang bzhengs* 'The Otantapurī monastery was built in the period of this king Gopāla or that of Devapāla'; *HBI*, p. 262.

<sup>171</sup> *Rgya gar chos 'byung*, p. 165, ll. 10–12: *seng bzang yes shes zhabs 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 [Buddhajñānapāda 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 shī lar sngags kyi rdo rje slob dpon chen po sangs rgyas ye shes zhabs dang | der rjes mar me mdzad bzang pos bstan pa bskyangs* 'At Vikramaśīla [first] the Mantra-Vajrācārya Mahāpaṇḍita Buddhajñānapāda and then Dipānkarabhadra protected the teaching [of the Buddha]; *HBI*, p. 325. This figure, known variously as Jñānapāda (Ye shes zhabs), 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 bzang 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).

<sup>172</sup> *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 mtshan 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 Nesarikā 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.<sup>173</sup>

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 Vighrahapāla III (r. c. 1043–1070) as a second Buddha.<sup>174</sup> 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.<sup>175</sup> 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.<sup>176</sup> He also recounts a legend accord-

---

*gtso bor gyur pa'i rdo rje 'dzin pa rnams kyis lo mang por sbyin sreg mdzad* 'He told King Dharmapāla: "There are signs that from the time of your grandson onwards the kingdom will be endangered. If you perform a great ritual of fire-sacrifice you will ensure that the reign [of your line] will endure for many years and also that the Dharma will be disseminated". And so [the king] had the fire-sacrifice done for many years by Vajradharas led by the Ācārya [Buddhajñānapāda], offering substances worth 902,000 tolas of silver'; *HBI*, p. 278. The ritual was evidently a *śāntihomaḥ*, a sacrifice for the averting of disaster. Such rituals are generic but they are made to serve the specific purposes of the patron by writing these into the formula of intention (*saṃkalpaḥ*) that must be recited at the opening of any such ritual; see SANDERSON 2005a, p. 357–358 and fn. 22 in a discussion of the Tantric Śaiva ritual commissioned by the Khmer ruler Jayavarman II (r. 802–c. 835) "in order that this land of Kambuja [Kambujadeśa] should not continue to be a dependency of Javā and so that only one king should be universal ruler [in this region]" (K. 235, Khmer, C ll. 71–75: *vraḥ pāda parameśvara añjen thve vidhi leha leñ kampi kamvujadeśa neḥ āyatta ta javā ley leñ āc ti kamrateñ phdai karom mvāy guḥ ta jā cakravartti*).

<sup>173</sup> *EI* 34:19, ll. 35–38, at the end of an enumeration of the ensigns (*[rāja]cihnāni*) siezed by Govinda III from his enemies, beginning with those of the Pāṇḍya and Pallava kings: *pāṇḍyadeśādhipān matsyaṃ vṛṣabhaṃ pallaveśvarāt | ... tārabhagava\*tīm* (em. : *ti* Ep.) *khyātāṃ dharmād baṅgālabhūmipāt || ittham etāny athānyāni cihnāny ādāya bhūbhujām | garudāṅkaṃ jagattuṅgo vyadhatta sakalaṃ jagat* 'Thus by siezing these and other royal ensigns—the fish from the king of Pāṇḍyadeśa, the bull from the Pallava king ... and the famous Tārā from Dharma[pāla], the king of Bengal—[Govinda III] Jagattuṅga placed the whole earth under [the sway of] his Garuḍa'.

<sup>174</sup> The Bhāgalpur plate of Nārāyaṇapāla (HULTZSCH 1886), ll. 4–5 and the Bargaon plate of Vighrahapāla III (CHOUDHARY 1958, p. 83), ll. 3–4: *sa śrīmān lokanātho jayati daśabalo 'nyaś ca gopāladevaḥ*.

<sup>175</sup> *Mañjuśrīyamūlakalpa* 53.628–631.

<sup>176</sup> *Rgya gar chos 'byung*, p. 156, ll. 18–21: *sku che'i stod la bhaṃ ga la la dbang bs-gyur | smad la ma ga dha yang dbang du bsnungs te | o ta nta pu ri dang nye ba nā le ndra zhes bya ba'i gtsug lag khang zhig bzhengs | yul chen po de gnyis su dge 'dun gyi sde mang du btsugs te bstan pa la mchod pa rgya chen po mdzad do* 'In the

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,<sup>177</sup> went to the monastery of Khasarpaṇa Avalokiteśvara,<sup>178</sup> 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, Dharmapāla, and Devapāla, 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 Mahāpāla, whom he claims to have been the son and successor of Mahīpāla, built the Uruvāsa monastery, described as a branch of the monastery at Uddaṇḍapura, and founded Buddhist establishments at the monasteries of Nālandā, Somapura, and Trikaṭuka.<sup>179</sup> Tāranātha has his Mahīpāla rule for

---

first part of his life he governed Vaṅgāla. In the subsequent part he subjected Magadha. Near Uddaṇḍapura he built a monastery called Nālendra. 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.

<sup>177</sup> *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 Kurkihār cast in the reign of Mahīpāla 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 Cuṇḍā); and there was a temple of Cundā in Paṭṭikera (Maināmatī) near Comilla, which is illustrated in a manuscript of the *Aṣṭasāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā* (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 cundāvara-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).

<sup>178</sup> In *HBI* (p. 257) it appears as “the temple of ārya \*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 ḍa na 'phags pa spyen ras gziḡs dbang phyug 'khar sa pa ni bzhugs pa de grags pa che pas . . .* Perhaps this was the site of the monastery referred to here.

<sup>179</sup> *Rgya gar chos 'byung*, p. 175, l. 2–7: *o ta nta pu ri'i gtsug lag khang du nyan thos kyi dge 'dun rnams gtso bor mchod cing | dge slong lnga brgya dang chos ston pa lnga bcu la 'tsho bo sbyar | de yi lan yag tu u ru bā sa zhes bya ba'i gtsug lag khang bzhengs | der yang nyan thos pa se ndha pa lnga brgya re la 'tsho ba sbyor | bi kra ma shī 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 btsugs* [Mahāpāla] honoured principally the community of Śrāvakas in the Uddaṇḍapuravihāra and [there] pro-

fifty-two years and says that he died at about the same time as the Tibetan king Khri ral,<sup>180</sup> 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,<sup>181</sup> that is to say, up to about 900. Now, there are two Mahīpālas 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 Mahīpāla, no doubt Mahīpāla I, the length of his reign agreeing closely with that attributed to Mahīpāla by Tāranātha, has become Mahīpāla 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 Mahīpāla 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.<sup>182</sup> It is probable, then, that Tāranātha's attribution to Mahāpāla of the expansion of Uddaṇḍapura and the founding of Buddhist establishments at Nālandā, Somapura, and Trikaṭuka is a distortion of a record of the pious works of Mahīpāla I. The supposition is somewhat strengthened by the fact that Tāranātha says that the *Kālacakratāntra* was introduced during the latter half of Mahīpāla's life and that it spread during the reign of Mahāpāla.<sup>183</sup> For it was during the reign of Mahīpāla I that this new Tantric system emerged.<sup>184</sup>

---

vided for five hundred monks and fifty teachers of the Dharma. As a branch of this he built a monastery called Uruvāsa. In this too he provided for five hundred Saindhava Śrāvakas. He accepted that the pre-existing system at Vikramaśīla should remain unchanged; but he made [Uruvāsa] the object of his greatest veneration. He also established several religious foundations at Nālandā, and many others also in Somapura, Nālandra, and the Trikaṭukavihāra'; *HBI*, p. 289.

<sup>180</sup> *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 Mahīpāla, ruled for fifty-two years. By a rough calculation this king died at the same time as King Khri ral in Tibet'; *HBI*, p. 284.

<sup>181</sup> *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.

<sup>182</sup> See SMITH 1962, pp. 412–418; and KULKE in KULKE and ROTHERMUND 1992, p. 118.

<sup>183</sup> *Rgya gar chos 'byung*, p. 175, ll. 7–9: *rgyal po ma hi pā la'i sku tshē'i smad tsam na | pi ṭo ā tsā ryas dus kyi 'khor lo'i rgyud spyān drangs te | rgyal po 'di'i dus su dar bar mdzad* 'The Ācārya Piṭo introduced the *Kālacakratāntra* in the second half of the life of King Mahīpāla 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.

<sup>184</sup> NEWMAN 1987 and 1998; OROFINO 1994, p. 23.

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<sup>185</sup> and repeated by many since that time<sup>186</sup> that the Jagaddalamahāvihāra,<sup>187</sup> 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<sup>188</sup>

Nor is there any that refutes it. In the introduction to the edition of the *Subhāṣitaratnaḥ* 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,<sup>189</sup> 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 \**Bhagavatyaṃnyāyānusāriṇī vyākhyā*, a commentary on the *Aṣṭasāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā* which survives in Tibetan translation (Tōh. 3811):<sup>190</sup> "This *vyākhyā* was composed by Rāja-jagaddala-nivāsī [which thus becomes the writer's name] at the Jagaddala vihāra, which was the place of Rāmapāla's coronation".<sup>191</sup> 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 (*muktāvalī*) [to be an adornment] of the land protected by King Rāmapāla".<sup>192</sup> This does at least convey the

<sup>185</sup> *Rāmacarita* of Sandhyākaranandin, introduction, p. 9.

<sup>186</sup> E.g. MOOKERJI 1951, p. 595; Rahul SANKRITYAYANA cited by KOSAMBI in KOSAMBI and GOKHALE 1957, p. xxxviii; KRISHNAMACHARYA, p. 1 of his Sanskrit introduction to *Tarkabhāṣā* (1942); MITRA 1971, p. 16; cf. HUNTINGTON 1984, p. 196.

<sup>187</sup> It is referred to as a Mahāvihāra in the colophonic verse of Muniśrībhadrā's *Pañcakramatīppaṇī* (*muniśrībhadreṇa cirāj jagaddalamahāvihārasadbhikṣuṇā*) and in 3.7 of the *Rāmacarita* of Sandhyākaranandin (*jagaddalamahāvihārācitarāgām*).

<sup>188</sup> KAJIYAMA 1998, p. 7.

<sup>189</sup> *Subhāṣitaratnaḥ*, p. xxxvii, fn. 8.

<sup>190</sup> *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 pā las 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*.

<sup>191</sup> *Subhāṣitaratnaḥ*, p. xxxvii, fn. 8.

<sup>192</sup> GOKHALE seems to have found his "coronation" in the *dbang* of *mi yi dbang po rā ma pā las*. The word is used in Tantric texts as a short form for *dbang bskur* 'consecration' (*abhiṣekah*), 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

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 Mokṣākaragupta's *Tarkabhāṣā*, in which he informs us that he too was a resident of this monastery (*śrīmadrājajagaddalavihārīya-*).<sup>193</sup> 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 Paṇḍitas at Vikramaśīla, and that there were about a thousand monks permanently in residence, both there and at Uddaṇḍapura, with many more assembling on the occasion of festivals.<sup>194</sup> 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)<sup>195</sup> surrounded by fifty-three small temples dedicated to the inner

---

precedes—*mi yi dbang po* 'king', lit. 'lord of men', rendering Sanskrit *nṛpatiḥ*, *narendrah*, or a synonym—, the fact that *rā ma pā las* after it is instrumental not genitive, and the fact that the emphatic and separative particle *ni* that ends the larger phrase of which this is part and marks it out as the subject militates against its being taken as qualifying the monastery. The expression *mu tig phreng ba* describing the commentary figuratively as a string of pearls is probably also intended to convey its title by paronomasia, i.e. *Muktāvalī*, a title found elsewhere in this literature, for example as the title of Ratnākaraśānti's commentary on the *Hevajratāntra*. The author remains anonymous.

<sup>193</sup> *Tarkabhāṣā*, p. 39. KAJIYAMA (1998, pp.6–11) shows that Mokṣākaragupta was active at some time after c. 1050 and before c. 1292.

<sup>194</sup> *Rgya gar chos 'byung*, p. 189, ll. 13–19: *bi kra ma shī lar pa ṇḍi 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 bzhi 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 rnams 'dus pa stong phrag bcu gnyis re 'byung bar grags* 'There were at least 160 Paṇḍitas 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 (Bodhgayā) 40 adherents of the Mahāyāna and 200 Śrāvaka monks resided permanently, maintained by the king. From time to time as many as 10,000 Śrāvaka monks congregated there. In Uddaṇḍapura 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.

<sup>195</sup> 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 Paṇḍitas, 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 bsrung 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 bsrung 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.<sup>196</sup> Archaeological excavations have revealed that the cell-lined square court of Vikramaśīla<sup>197</sup> measured 1073 feet on each side, that the entire site was spread over an area of more than one hundred acres,<sup>198</sup> and that Dharmapāla’s monastery at Somapura (Pāhārṇpur) was of similar design and plan and of only slightly smaller size,<sup>199</sup> as was the monastery founded by Bhavadeva of Samataṭa at Paṭṭikera (Maināmatī).<sup>200</sup> 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

---

the Bodhi tree, as in the case of the approximately contemporary principal image in the central shrine of Monastery 1 at Ratnagiri, though that is somewhat larger than life-sized, the figure seated in the lotus posture being over two metres in height. See HARLE 1994, p. 163; HUNTINGTON 1985, fig. 19.44. We see another example in the central shrine at Udayagiri (*IAR* 1997–98, Plate 101; 1998–99, Plate 48).

<sup>196</sup> *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 *balyācāryaḥ*, a *pratiṣṭhācāryaḥ*, and a *homācāryaḥ*.

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

<sup>198</sup> MITRA in *EITA*, vol. 2, pt. 2, p. 403; *IAR* 1972–1973, pp. 4–5 (the western outer wall shows a length of 330 metres; p. 5 gives a plan of the excavated structures); *IAR* 1973–4, pp. 8–9 (northern wall measures 330 metres).

<sup>199</sup> 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.

<sup>200</sup> 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.<sup>201</sup>

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;<sup>202</sup> and the wealth from this source would no doubt have been augmented by subsequent land-grants<sup>203</sup> and would certainly have been augmented by other votive donations, bequests from the estates of deceased laymen,<sup>204</sup> and the profits of such non-religious activities as banking and the provision of irrigation and other agricultural facilities.<sup>205</sup>

No doubt they would also have benefitted from the riches accumulated by individual monks in the form of the rewards (*dakṣiṇā*) 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.<sup>206</sup> 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;<sup>207</sup> Zur po che shā kya 'byung nas offered 'Brog mi 100,<sup>208</sup> Rva lo tsā ba gave 100 *srang* to the Nepalese Guru Bha ro phyag rdum for the *Yamāri* cycle instructions; Se

<sup>201</sup> BEAL 1914, p. 112.

<sup>202</sup> BEAL 1914, p. 112.

<sup>203</sup> 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 (*vihāraḥ*) constructed at this site by Mahārāja Bālaputradeva, the Śailendra king of Suvarṇadvīpa (Sumatra). That the regnal year is the 35th is the view of SIRCAR (1983, p. 79, note 38). Hirananda SHASTRI read the numerals as 39 (*EI* 17:17, l. 42).

<sup>204</sup> The *Mūlasarvāstivādinaya* 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 (*akṣayanīvī*) (SCHOPEN, *loc. cit.*).

<sup>205</sup> 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 *Mūlasarvāstivādinaya* requires the funds of permanent endowments (*akṣayanīvī*) for the Buddha, the Dharma, and the Saṅgha to be lent out on interest (*vr̥ddhiḥ*) (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.

<sup>206</sup> For the *dakṣiṇā* for the Tantric funeral ceremony see here p. 102.

<sup>207</sup> *Zhib mo rdo rje*, p. 90, *Blue Annals*, p. 207

<sup>208</sup> *Zhib mo rdo rje*, p. 92

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,<sup>209</sup> and 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.<sup>210</sup>

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 *Mahāvairocanābhisambodhitāntra*, a text produced in the seventh century, at the beginning of the history of the Mantranaya as a fully-fledged path within the Mahāyāna,<sup>211</sup> suggests that this was the case:<sup>212</sup>

After the [*sāntika*] *homaḥ* the Mantrin should request from the disciples a fee (*dakṣiṇā*) 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 *dakṣiṇā* 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 Saṅgha, [for it is] vast in its pure virtues.

But it is striking that references to the Saṅgha 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 Dīpaṅkarabhadra, setting out the procedure for initiation with the Maṅḍala of the *Guhyasamāja*, adds land

<sup>209</sup> *Blue Annals*, pp. 377, 395, and 400.

<sup>210</sup> See, for example, pp. 399–401 of the account of the life of Mar pa in the *Blue Annals*.

<sup>211</sup> The earliest certain evidence of the text is its Chinese translation by Śubhākarasiṃha and Yijing registered in A.D. 725 (Taishō 848). But HODGE (2003, pp. 14–15) points out that Yijing's *Xiyuqiufaguosengzhuan* ('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 *Subāhupariṣcā*, the *Susiddhikara*, and the *Mahāvairocanābhisambodhi*.

<sup>212</sup> *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 dngul dang rin chen dang | rta dang de bzhin glang po dang | rta mo ba lang ma he gos | gzhan yang dngos po ci yang rung | de tshe slob mas gus par ni | dad pa rab tu ldan pa yis | sems la dga' ba bskyed nas su | bla ma ni yon bdul lo | yang na ci nas bla ma de | rab tu mgu bar 'gyur bar bya | de ltar byas nas bdag bsrung ste | slob ma de pos bsgo ba ni | 'di ni bsod nams zhing yin zhes | sems 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,<sup>213</sup> 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.<sup>214</sup> Moreover, the *Mūlasarvāstivādinaya*, 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 Saṅgha. 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.<sup>215</sup> Of course, a wealthy Guru could also donate his wealth to

<sup>213</sup> *Guhyasamājamaṇḍalavidhi*, f. 16v1–2, v. 375c: *bhūgajādisuvarṇādau* ‘land, an elephant or [other mount], gold, and other [valuables]’. The *Mṛtasugati-niyojana* of Śūnyasamādhivajra includes houses, land, and male and female slaves among the gifts that should be given to an officiant who performs the Tantric funerary ceremony (*antyeṣṭih*): *yojanako ’pi svavibhavānurūpaṃ vastrālamkāraśayanāsanagrhakṣetradāsīdāsādikaṃ dakṣiṇām ācāryāya sādaraṃ dadyāt* (f. 4r2–3).

<sup>214</sup> *Laghuśamvara* f. 4r1–3 (3.11–14b): *tatas tu gurave dadyāt tathāgatoktadakṣiṇām | nirjātyaṃ suvarṇaśatasahasraṃ ratnāni vividhāni ca || 3.12 vastrayugmaśataṃ caiva gaja vājī rāṣṭram eva ca | karṇābharāṇa kaṭakaṃ ca kaṇṭhikāṅgulikaiś ca samuttamam || 3.13 yañnopavīta sauvarṇaṃ svabhāryāṃ duhitām api | dāsa dāsī bhagnīm vāpi praṇipatyā nivedayet* ‘Then he should give to the Guru the *dakṣiṇā* 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 SIRCAR 1966, pp. 277–278. My translation of the passage follows the text and interpretation of the commentator Bhavabhaṭṭa. The reading *nirjātyaṃ*, which he interprets as ‘most precious’, is suspect. The MS (*Laghuśamvara*, f. 4r2) reads the much more satisfactory *niryātya* ‘having given’, as does the commentator Kambalapāda (*Sādhanaṇidhi*, f. 11v4); and this is also the reading seen in f. 54v3–5 of the *Samvarodayā 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 gurudakṣiṇaṃ dadyā śiṣya bhāvena nityasaḥ | ātmapatnīm saputraṃ vā bāndhavaiḥ saha ceṭikaiḥ | hasti aśva gavādinām gr̥ha kṣetraś ca go-travān || sauvarṇa rajata tāmrāṇa vastrādi vr̥hidhānyakaiḥ*. The *Vimalaprabhā* on *Kālacakratantra*, *Abhiṣekapaṭala* 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).

<sup>215</sup> The inheritance of the property of deceased monks is treated in the *Mūlasarvāstivādinaya* in the *Cīvaravastu* (*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 *Pañca-viṃśatisāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā* written in gold, two golden copies of the *Aṣṭa-sāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā*, and 100 *srangs* of gold to fund the recitation in perpetuity of eighty-four copies of the *Prajñāpāramitāsaṃcayagāthā* by eighty-four Paṇḍitas of the monastery.<sup>216</sup>

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 *Ratnāvalī*, a Mahāyānist work of uncertain authorship written before the sixth century,<sup>217</sup> advises the unknown king to whom it is addressed on the proper administration of his realm

---

distributed among the monks of his monastery: *bhājayata yūyaṃ bhikṣava upanandasya bhikṣor mṛtapariṣkāram* (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, p. 143, ll. 10–12: *suvarnaṃ ca hiraṇyaṃ ca yac cānyac ca kṛtākṛtaṃ trayo bhāgāḥ kartavyāḥ | eko buddhasya | eko dharmasya tṛtīyaḥ saṅghasya*). That for the Buddha should be used for repairs to the monastery's Buddha shrine (*gandhakuṭī*) 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).

<sup>216</sup> *Blue Annals*, p. 377.

<sup>217</sup> The work is attributed to the Nāgārjuna of *Mūlāmadhyamakakārikā* 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 Vidyākara-prabha in the early ninth century. The *Ratnāvalī* 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 (*dharmādhikṛtaḥ*) who is energetic, without avarice, learned, and virtuous, who will not oppress them”.<sup>218</sup> 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 (*adhikṛtāḥ*), 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”.<sup>219</sup> 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.<sup>220</sup> Ab-

<sup>218</sup> *Ratnāvalī* 4.22: *sarvadharmādhikāreṣu dharmādhikṛtam utthitam | alubdham paṇḍitaṃ dharmyaṃ kuru teṣāṃ abādhakam*. The term *dharmādhikāraḥ*, 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 gzhi* agrees, and as its occurrence earlier in the same passage (4.18) confirms: *dharmādhikārā ye cānye pūrvarājapravartitāḥ | devadronyādayas te ’pi pravartyantām 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 pūrvarājakṛtadharmādhikārapālanāḍṛtair bhavitavyam* ‘Future kings too must take care to maintain religious foundations created by kings of the past’.

<sup>219</sup> *Ratnāvalī* 4.26: *pratimāsaṃ ca tebhyaḥ tvam sarvam āyavyayaṃ śṛṇu | śrutvā \*dharmādhikārādayaṃ kāryaṃ sarvaṃ* (Tib. *chos gzhi sogs kyi don kun nyid*) *svayaṃ kuru*.

<sup>220</sup> In the *Abhijñānaśākuntala* 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 yaḥ pauraveṇa rājñā dharmādhikāre niyuktaḥ so ’ham aviḥnakriyopālabhāya dharmāraṇyam āyātaḥ*. The fifth Dāmodarpur copper-plate inscription, of 533/4, recording a formal request for the purchase of land in the Koṭivaraṣa district to be given to a nearby temple, speaks of it being presented with the full knowledge of the Office of Religion (*dharmādhikāra-buddhyā*) (*EI* 15:7, p. 143). A banker Ralhaṇa has the title *dharmakarmādhikārī* ‘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: *śreṣṭhinā ralhaṇe-nātra dharmakarmādhikārīnā*). The humorous play *Āgamaḍambara*, 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 *dharmarakṣā-dhikāraḥ*, the ‘Office of Superintendent of Religion’ for the whole country (Act 3, Prelude, p. 132: *sakalāe yyeva vaśuṃdhalāe dhammalakṣādhiāle ṇiutte [\*sakalāyā eva vaśuṃdharāyā dharmarakṣādhikāre niyuktaḥ]*). The term *dharmādhikṛtaḥ* occurs in a fifteenth-century inscription from Nilācala, 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 (*paribhogānvayaṃ puṇyam*). 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 (*tyāgānvayaṃ puṇyam*).<sup>221</sup>

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

---

of Kāmākhyā, near Gauhati in Assam, recording a grant of land by a king Mādhava. The inscription opens with the information that the grant has the approval of this official: *dharmādhikṛtenānumatam* (SIRCAR 1979, p. 16, l. 1). Mpu Prapañca reveals in his Old Javanese poem *Deśawarṇana* that there were two Superintendents of Religion in the Majapahit kingdom of east Java, one for the Buddhists (*dharmādhyakṣa kasogatan*), and the other for the Śaivas (*dharmādhyakṣa kashaiwan*). Inscriptions from that kingdom reveal that there was also a board of subordinate religious officials known as the Assessors of Religion (*dharmopapatti* or *dharmādhi-karana*); see SANTIKO 1995, p. 56; cf. here p.119; for references see ZOETMULDER 1982, under *dharmādhyakṣa*, *dharmopapatti* and *dharmādhi-karana*.

<sup>221</sup> On this crucial distinction between *paribhogānvayaṃ puṇyam* and *tyāgānvayaṃ puṇyam* see Vasubandhu, *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya* on 4.121a (*caitye tyāgānvayaṃ puṇyam* ‘In the case of a Caitya there is merit that accrues from surrender’): *caitye sarāgasyātmārthaṃ dānam ity uktam | tatrāsaty upabhoktari katham puṇyam bhavati | dvididhaṃ puṇyaṃ tyāgānvayaṃ tyāgād eva yad utpadyate paribhogānvayaṃ ca deyadharmaparibhogād yad utpadyate | caitye tyāgānvayaṃ puṇyam* (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: *tyāgānvayaṃ*, which arises only from the surrender [of ownership of what is given], and *paribhogānvayaṃ*, 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 *tyāgād*. Vasubandhu does not state conversely in the case of *paribhogānvayaṃ puṇyam* 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 Candrakīrti, who in his *Prasannapadā*, commenting on *paribhogānvayaṃ* in *Madhyamakakārikā* 17.5a, speaks of the goods used as ‘surrendered’ (*parityaktasya*). See *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya* on 4.4ab 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 (*puṇyavṛddhiḥ*) whenever a recipient uses something donated whether or not the donor is aware of it; and SANDERSON 1995c, pp. 38–40.

<sup>222</sup> *Rgya gar chos ’byung*, p. 179, ll. 13–14: *rgyal pos spyan drangs te nā la ndā dang | bi kra ma la shī la’i nub sgo bar bskos shin* ‘The king invited [Vāgīśvarakīrti]

tection were performed on behalf of the monarch at Vikramaśīla. 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 *Guhyasamājamaṇḍalavidhi* of Dīpaṅkarabhadra, the successor of Buddhajñāna at Vikramaśīla, insert ancillary rites specifically for the averting of danger from the monarch.<sup>223</sup> Moreover,

---

to Nālandā and made him the Guardian of the Western Gate of Vikramaśīla'; p. 182, l. 10: *bdus kyi ka chen dang po bram ze rin chen rdo rje ni* 'The brahmin Ratnavajra, the first [occupant of the the position of the] Great Central Pillar of Vikramaśīla'; p. 182, l. 19: *rgyal pos bi kra ma shī la'i \*pa* (corr. : *sa* Ed.) *tra phul* 'The king bestowed [on Ratnavajra] the charter of appointment [as the chief monk] of Vikramaśīla' *HBI*, p. 297 and 301. We may presume that the same applied to those who held office as the Gate Guardians of the other three directions (*Rgya gar chos 'byung*, p. 181, ll. 8–10): and to Jñānaśrīmitra, described as the second to hold office at Vikramaśīla as the Great Central Pillar (p. 183, l. 11). King Bheyapāla (Abhayapāla?), a king otherwise unknown, whom Tāranātha makes the predecessor of Neyapāla (Nayapāla [r.c. 1027-1043], the successor of Mahīpāla I), is reported to have bestowed charters of appointment on only seventy Paṇḍitas of Vikramaśīla (*Rgya gar chos 'byung*, p. 184, ll. 14: *bi kra ma shī lar ni | pa ṇḍi ta bdun cu tsam gyi \*pa tra* (corr. : *sa tra* Ed.) *las ma tshugs te*; *HBI*, p. 304) Tāranātha tells us that for that reason he is not counted among the Seven Pālas (p. 184, ll. 14–15, *HBI*, p. 304), that is to say the seven remembered for their exceptional patronage of the faith. These seven are not listed, but Tāranātha does say which of the Pālas were excluded from the list. The seven that remain are Gopāla, Devapāla, Dharmapāla, Mahīpāla, Mahāpāla, Neyapāla (Nayapāla), and Rāmapāla. Other, later appointments recorded by Tāranātha are those of Dīpaṅkaraśrījñāna as Upādhyāya at Vikramaśīla under Bheyapāla, with responsibility also for Uddaṇḍapura (p. 304), the Prāmāṇika Yamāri under Nayapāla (p. 187, l. 19: *bi kra ma shī lar \*pa tra* (corr. : *sa tra* Ed.) *cher thob* 'He obtained the great charter of Vikramaśīla'; *HBI*, p. 308), and Abhayākaragupta as Upādhyāya, first at Vajrāsana and then at Vikramaśīla and Nālandā, under Rāmapāla (p. 189, l. 10–13; *HBI*, p. 313). I take the term *patra* here (= *patram*, *patrikā*) to mean an official document bestowing an office and hence by extension office or authority bestowed by this means; cf. *patrikā* in *Tantrālokaiviveka*, vol. 3, p. 191, ll. 3–6, the commentary of the Kashmirian *Mahānayaṇaparakāśa* p. 115,8, and *Vāmakeśvarīmatavivarāṇa*, p. 55 (on the theft of such documents by fraudulent Gurus); also the expressions *tāmrapatram* and *śāsanapatram* for a royal charter. With the names of Indian Buddhist authors and translators we commonly encounter the title Mahāpaṇḍita (Mkhas pa chen po / Paṇ chen) (also Mahāpaṇḍitasthavira, Mahāpaṇḍitācārya, and Mahāpaṇḍitabhikṣu). Among Tantric scholars with this title are Atulyavajra, Advayavajra, Abhayākaragupta, Ānandagarbha, Kuladatta, Darpaṇācārya, Dīpaṅkaraśrījñāna, Durjayacandra, Nāropā, Buddhaguhya, Bhavabhaṭṭa, Ratnarakṣita, Ratnākaraśānti, Raviśrījñāna, Vāgīśvarakīrti, Vibhūticandra, Śākyarakṣita, and Śrīdhara. It is perhaps analogous to the Chinese Buddhist title *dashi* (Jap. *daishi*) 'Great Master', which came to be bestowed by the Emperor on distinguished monks from the reign of Yizong (859–873) onwards; see FORTE 1994, pp. 1023–1034.

<sup>223</sup> Ānandagarbha, *Sarvavajrodaya* f. 29r1–2 (a preliminary rite): *\*mānuṣāsthicūrṇa-*



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.<sup>224</sup> In some sense, then, these were state monasteries, not unlike the great imperial monasteries of Tang China and Japan,<sup>225</sup> rather

*homenāsrgviṣasahitena* (em. [Tib., cited in Ed. *mi rus kyi bye ma khrag dang dug dang bcas pa dang*] : *mānuṣāsthicūrṇaho* + + + + *viṣasahitena* Cod., Ed.) *maṇḍalavighnaṃ nivāryātmaśiṣyabhūpālādīśāntikahomaṃ kuryāt* ‘After having removed [all] impeding spirits from the Maṇḍala by offering into the fire powder of human bone mixed with blood and poison he should perform a fire-sacrifice for the warding off of dangers from himself, the candidate(s) for initiation, and the monarch or other [ruler]’; and Dīpaṅkarabhadra, *Guhyasamājamaṇḍalavidhi* f. 16v1, vv. 373–374 (a concluding rite): *saty eva sambhave teṣāṃ pratyekaṃ vāmapāninā | savyāṅguṣṭhakam āgrhya śāntiṃ kuryād vidhānataḥ || trisaptāhutim ekāṃ vā rājño vā bhūpater atha | dikpālasvātmaśāntau ca hutvā yāceta dakṣiṇāṃ* ‘With his left hand he should take hold of the right thumb [of the person who has been initiated] and make offerings into the sacrificial fire in accordance with the prescribed procedure, doing this for each [of the initiates in turn], if that is possible. Having made twenty-one oblations or just one to ward off danger from [each of these and, then from] the monarch or [lesser] ruler, also from [the Vajrācāryas who have officiated as] the Guardians of the Directions and himself, he should request his fee’. The rite of offering at this point a *śāntikahomaḥ* of twenty-one oblations for each of the candidates while holding their right thumbs with the left hand is derived from *Mahāvairocanābhisaṃbodhitāntra*, but the extension of that rite in order to protect the king, the Guardians of the Directions, and the main officiant himself is an innovation not found there; f. 172v5–6 ... 173r3–4: *slob ma sdig dang bral ba kun | de ltar legs par btsud nas ni | de dag zhi bar bya ba’i phyin sbyin sreg cho ga bzhin du bya ... de nas slob ma re re nas | mkhas pas lag pa g.yon pa yis | g.yas pa’i mtho bong bzung nas su | mnyam par bzhag pas sbyin sreg bya | yid ni mnyam par bzhag nas su | sreg blugs re re las kyang ni | gsang sngags cho ga bzhin zlos shing | nyi shu rtsa gcig sbyin sreg bya | na maḥ sa ma nta bu ddhā nām | oṃ ma hā shā \*nti* (em. : nta Cod.) *ga ta shā nti ka ra pra sha ma dha rmma ni rjā ta a bhā ba sva bhā ba dha rmma sa ma tā prā pte svā hā | sbyin sreg rjes la sngags pa yis | slob ma rnam la yon bslang ba* ‘When he has in this way introduced all the sin-free disciples [before the Maṇḍala] he should duly perform a fire-offering to ward of danger from them. ... Then the learned [officiant], should concentrate himself and make offerings into the fire, after grasping the right thumb of each disciple with his left hand. With his mind concentrated he should offer twenty-one oblations for each, reciting according to the Mantra rite NAMAḤ SAMANTABUDDHĀNĀM | Oṃ MAHĀŚĀNTIGATA ŚĀNTIKĀRA PRAŚAMADHARMANIRJĀTA ABHĀVASVABHĀVADHARMASAMATĀPRĀPTE SVĀHĀ. After the fire-offering the Mantrin should request his fee from the disciples’.

<sup>224</sup> *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 (Prajñārakṣita makes offerings to Cakrasaṃvara 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 (Kamalarakṣita drives off a Turuṣka army from Vikramaśīla by throwing enchanted water at them during a Tantric feast [*gaṇacakra*]).

<sup>225</sup> 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;<sup>226</sup> and Mahendrapāla is reported to have established a temple for the emaciated goddess Carcā (Carcikā/Cāmuṇḍā).<sup>227</sup> An eleventh-century Praśasti from Bāṅgarh, ancient Koṭivarṣa in Varendrī, also called Devīkoṭa and Śoṇitapura, informs us that Nayapāla had the Saiddhāntika Sarvaśiva as his royal preceptor (*gauḍarājaguruḥ*), and that when Sarvaśiva retired he passed this office to his brother Mūrṭiśiva. 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 Mahīpāla I, Nayapāla's predecessor, had bestowed a Kailāsa-like monastery on Sarvaśiva's predecessor Indraśiva. Mahīpāla 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 *dakṣiṇā*. It is probable, therefore, that Indraśiva too, like his successors Sarvaśiva and Mūrṭiśiva,

---

*mahāvihāraḥ*]) see FORTE and DURT 1984. For Japanese Tantric Buddhist rituals of state protection (*chingokokka*) see MAY 1967.

<sup>226</sup> *EI* 42:2, ll. 12–13: *yo nirmame \*sugatasadma gr̥haṃ ca* (corr.: *sugatasadmagr̥haṃ ca* Ed.) *gauryā yat kautukaṃ ca tilakaṃ ca jagattraye 'pi*.

<sup>227</sup> *EI* 39:7, the Siyān stone slab inscription of Nayapāla, v. 40: *mahe[ndra]pālacarcā-yā mahendrasadr̥śodayaḥ | yaḥ śailīm vaḍabhīm śaile sopānena sahākarot* 'who, equal in greatness to Mahendra (Viṣṇu), built for Mahendrapāla's Carcā a stone Vaḍabhī temple on [her] hill and a flight of steps [leading to it]'. When D.C. SIRCAR published this inscription he judged that it is probable that the Mahendrapāla mentioned in this verse is the Gūrjara-Pratihāra king of that name (*EI* 39:7, p. 48), who ruled c. 885–908. In the light of the discovery of Mahendrapāla's Māldā 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, Cāmuṇḍā, Carmamuṇḍā, and Karṇamoṭī are listed as synonymous deity-names in *Amarakośa* 1.1.46. The name Carcikā appears in place of Cāmuṇḍā in the *Picumata* in treatments of the eight Mothers (the seven ending with Carcikā [Māheśvarī, Brahmāṇī, Vaiṣṇavī, Kaumārī, Vaivasvatī, Māhendrī, Carcikā], with Paramā/Pūraṇī/Aghoreśī making up the total).

had held the office of royal preceptor.<sup>228</sup> I know of no direct evidence that Mahīpāla's successor Vighrahapāla III had a Saiddhāntika Rājaguru, but it is likely that he did, since in his Āṅgāchi copper-plate inscription he is described as 'devoted to Śiva's worship',<sup>229</sup> 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 Saiddhantika Trilocanaśiva tells us that his preceptorial line descends from a Dharmasāmbhu (Dharmaśiva) who had held office as the royal preceptor of "the king of Gauḍa", a standard expression for the Pāla rulers.<sup>230</sup> Since three preceptorial generations intervene in that account between Dharmasāmbhu and Trilocanaśiva, it is probable that this king was Rāmapāla.<sup>231</sup>

<sup>228</sup> The Bāngarh Praśasti of Mūrtiśiva (SIRCAR 1983b), found at Śivavāṭī (mod. Śībbaḍī) in the vicinity of Koṭivarṣa, ll. 8–9: 9 *śrīmān indrasīvaḥ sphuṭaṃ hariharaprāyāṃ śivendrākṛtiṃ bibhrad vaṃśavibhūṣaṇaṃ samabhavac chiṣyo 'sya puṇyātmanaḥ | yasmai kāñcanapuñjamañjuracitaprāsādameruspshuratkailāsābha-maṭhaṃ dadāv iha mahīpālo nṛpas tattvavit*; ll. 11–12, reporting that Indraśiva's successor Sarvaśiva was the royal preceptor of Nayapāla: *rājño śrīnayapālasya gurus tattvavidāṃ varaḥ | śrīmān sarvaśivas tasya śiṣyo 'bhūd bhūṣaṇam bhuvah*; and ll. 13–14, reporting that Sarvaśiva resigned his office as the Gauḍarājaguru in favour of his brother Mūrtiśiva: 14 *yenāvarjitagaūdarājagurutālakṣmīr nijabhrātari śrīmān mūrtiśive niveśya vipināvāsaṃ svayam vāñchatā | kṣīrodārṇavavamanthanotthitamillallakṣmīm svaśiṣye harāv āropyāharato viṣaṃ paśupater vṛttāntam udghāṭitam*.

<sup>229</sup> *EI* 15:18, ll. 17–19 (v. 12): *pīta-<h> sajjanalocanaiḥ smararipoḥ pūjānuraktaḥ sadā saṃgrāme caturo 'dhikaś ca haritaḥ kālah kule vidviṣām | cāturvarṇyasamāśrayaḥ sitayaśaḥpuñjair jagad rañjayan śrīmadvighrahapāladevanṛpatir jajñe tato dhāmabhṛt* 'From [Nayapāla] was born the illustrious king Vighrahapāladeva, 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'.

<sup>230</sup> See, e.g., in a pedestal inscription of the reign of Palapāla (r. c. 1165–1199): *śrīgauḍeśvarapalapālapādānām* (HUNTINGTON 1984, p. 239, no. 59) and the Sārṇāth inscription of Mahīpāla (HULTZSCH 1885), v. 2: *gauḍādhipo mahīpālah*.

<sup>231</sup> Colophonic verses at the end of Trilocanaśiva's *Somaśambhupaddhativyaḥkhyā* (IFP, MS Transcripts 457 [T1] and 170 [T2]; edition in BRUNNER 1963–1998, Pt. 4, pp. 422–427 [B]): 1 *śrīcedirājabhuvi \*śaivajanākarakhyaśrīgolakīyamathabhāvaśivaś ca yo 'sau (śaivajanākarakhya T2 B : śaivajanākarakhyaś T2 • śrīgolakīyamatha conj. : śrīkoḷakīvimala T1 T2 : śrīgolakīvimala B • bhāvaśivaś ca yo 'sau conj. : bhāvaśivaśaṣṭyasou T1 T2 B) | tadvamśajaḥ śivamatāgamalakṣavettā śrīdharmasāmbhur iti gauḍapatīndranāthaḥ || 2 tasmād asāv analaśaṅkaradeśiko 'bhūd divyāgamāmbunidhir \*hitakalpavṛkṣaḥ (T1 : itikalpavṛkṣaḥ B) | svargaukasām api padaṃ vacasā labhante \*yasyaiva (conj. B : yasyaika T1 T2) janmamaraṇaika\*bhayaṅ (T2 : bhayaṃ T1) nirastāḥ || 3 \*śrīgolakīyasam-tānavyomavyāpī (golakīya T2 B : koḷakīya T1) tataḥ śivaḥ | śrīśomaśambhur ity āsīt kalau lokahitāya vai || 4 jñānaśaktivapus tasmā j jñānaśambhuḥ sadāśivaḥ | yenedaṃ dyotitaṃ sarvaṃ śaivajñānāmālārciṣā || 5 somārkavaṃśanṛpa-mauli\*vilolitāṅghrir (T2 B : vilolitāṅghri T1) vidvajjanānanasarojadivākaro mām*

There is other evidence of these kings' engagement with Śaivism. The poet Saṃdhyākaranandin describes king Madanapāla, Rāmapāla's second son, as a devotee of Śiva;<sup>232</sup> and a pedestal inscription of 1026 recording renovations of Buddhist structures at Sārṇāth by two Pāla princes Sthirapāla and Vasantapāla, also tells us that Mahīpāla I had engaged them to have hundreds of temples of Śiva, Citraghaṇṭā, 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.<sup>233</sup>

| *dīnāndhasūrikṛpaṇātithi\*parijātaḥ* (corr.: *pārijāta* T2B : *vārajāta* T1) *śrījñānaśambhur anīṣaṃ malinaṃ punātu* [1] In the land of the king of Cedi [lived] Dharmāśambhu, a spiritual descendant in the lineage of the famous Bhāvaśiva [=Sadbhāvaśiva/Prabhāvaśiva, founder] of the venerable monastery at Golakī. He mastered one hundred thousand [verses] of the scriptures of the religion of Śiva and became the Lord [Guru] of the King of Gauḍa. [2] His successor was the famous teacher Anaśiva, an ocean of the celestial scriptures, a tree of paradise that granted every wish, one through whose instruction men attained the world of the gods, free of the unique terror of birth and death. [3] His successor was Somaśambhu, a Śiva who for the good of mankind [was the sun whose light] filled the sky of the venerable lineage of Golakī. [4] His successor in [this] Kali age was Jñānaśambhu, the very embodiment of [Śiva's] power of knowledge, [a] Sadāśiva who illuminated this universe with the pure radiance of his understanding of Śiva's teachings'. [5] His feet were caressed by the crowns of kings of the lineages of both the moon and the sun. He was a sun to the lotuses that are the faces of the learned. He was the tree of paradise to the needy, to the blind, to scholars, to the wretched, and to uninvited guests. May Jñānaśambhu ever [continue to] cleanse me [as his disciple], impure as I am'. The king of Cedi referred to at the beginning of this passage is the Kalacuri and his land is Dāhaladeśa, the region of central India approximately comprising within modern Madhya Pradesh the Jabalpur District, and parts of the Satna, Panna, and Rewa Districts.

<sup>232</sup> *Rāmācarita* 4.35b: *śivapraṇayī*.

<sup>233</sup> The Sārṇāth inscription of Mahīpāla (HULTZSCH 1885): *om namo buddhāya | \*vārāṇasīsarasyāṃ* (corr.: *vārāṇasīsarasyāṃ* Ep.) *guravaśrīvāmarāśipādābjam | ārādhyā namitabhūpatiśīroruhaiḥ śaival\*ādhiśam (?) || iśānacitraghaṇṭādīkīrtiratnaśatāni yau | gauḍādhipo mahīpālaḥ kāśyāṃ śrīmān akāraḥyat || saphalīkṛtapāṇḍityau bodhāv avinivartināu | tau dharmmarājikāṃ sāṅgaṃ dharmmacakraṃ punar nnavam || kṛtavantau ca navīnām aṣṭamahāsthānaśailagandhakuṭīm | etāṃ śrīsthirapālo vasantapālo 'nujaḥ śrīmān* 'Obeisance to the Buddha. Sthirapāla and his younger brother Vasantapāla, whom the Glorious Mahīpāla, the ruler of Gauḍa, caused to erect hundreds of fine temples for Śiva, Citraghaṇṭā, and [other] gods in Kāśī after worshipping the venerable Gurava Vāmarāśi's feet, the lotuses that beautify the lake that is Vārāṇasī, with [strands of] duckweed \*clinging to them (?) in the form of the hair of the kings that bow down to them, have made the Dharmarājikā, a new Dharmacakra together with its ancillaries, and a new Buddha-shrine from stones of the eight sacred places, having made their learning bear fruit, refusing to turn back in their quest for enlightenment'. The reading *śaivalādhiśam* is surely a mistake, for if it were sound it could only yield the absurd meaning 'overlord of duckweed'. The meaning required by the context would be secured by *śaivalāsāṅgam*. This has the advantage that it echoes a verse in Kālidāsa's *Kumārasambhava* (5.9), which is likely to have been in the

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 Pāśupatācāryas (*pāśupatācāryapariṣat*) 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.<sup>234</sup>

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 Vaḍabhī temple for a goddess,<sup>235</sup> with a temple of Śiva and an attached two-storied monastery (*maṭho dvibhūmiḥ*) for the accommodation of ascetics to its south (v. 24), a temple with a [golden] finial,

---

memory of the author of the inscription, to the effect that during the austerities that Pārvatī undertook to win the hand of Śiva her face was just as charming with her ascetic's braids as it had been with her elegantly adorned coiffure; for, says Kālidāsa: “The lotus is not beautiful only when when lines of bees hover about it but even when [strands of] duckweed cling to it” (*na śaṭpadaśreṇibhir eva pañkajam saśaivalāsaṅgam api prakāśate*). However, this solution has the weakness that it is not open to any obvious explanation of how the error arose. Perhaps the person who wrote the letters on the stone before they were engraved was thinking of Vāmarāśi's official status in Benares. If that, as is very likely, was as the abbot of a Śaiva monastery, then the error *-ādhiśam* might be the result of the intrusion into his mind of an expression such as *śaivādhiśam*, *śaivamaṭhādhiśam*, or *śaivālayādhiśam*. For the expression *maṭhādhiśaḥ* (= *maṭhādhipatiḥ*) see, e.g., *Rājatarāṅgiṇī* 7.298ab: *bhaṭṭārakamaṭhādhiśaḥ* sādhuḥ vyomaśivo jaṭi; and the anonymous *Kumārāpāladevacarita* v.51a: *taṃ nimantrya maṭhādhiśam* (called *maṭhādhipatiḥ* in v.49b). But this would be more convincing if the reading corrupted were closer to *śaivalādhiśam* in written appearance or pronunciation. Citraghaṇṭā has her temple in Benares near that of Śiva Citragupteśvara as one of the Nine Durgās. The sense intended may be that he had [new] shrines built for all nine of these goddesses.

<sup>234</sup> HULTZSCH 1886, ll. 28–29: *paramasaugato mahārājādhiraśrīvigrahapāla-devapādānudhyātaḥ parameśvaraḥ paramabhāṭṭārako mahārājādhiraśra śrīmannārāyaṇapāladevaḥ* ...; ll. 38–41: *matam astu bhavatām | kalaśapote mahārājādhiraśrīnārāyaṇapāladevena svayaṃkāritasahasrāyatanaṣya tatra pratiṣṭhāpitasya bhagavataḥ śivabhāṭṭārakasya pāśupata-ācāryapariṣadaś ca | yathārhaṃ pūjābalicarusaṭṭranavakarmādyarthaṃ śayanāsanaglānapratyaya-bhaiṣajyapariṣkāradyarthaṃ | anyeṣām api svābhimatānām | svaparikalpita-vibhāgena anavadyabhogārthaṃ ca | yathoparilikhitamuktikāgrāmaḥ* ... I agree with HULTZSCH that *svayaṃkāritasahasrāyatanaṣya* here means ‘[Śiva] for whom he [Nārāyaṇapāla] himself has built a thousand temples’.

presumably for Śiva, since it was equipped with eleven [subsidiary] shrines in which the eleven Rudras were installed (v. 25), a Vaḍabhī temple for the Mother Goddess<sup>236</sup> and a series of temples for the Nine Durgās,<sup>237</sup> a lofty temple for Śiva Hetukeśvara at Devikoṭa,<sup>238</sup> a temple of Śiva Kṣemeśvara with a golden

<sup>235</sup> Verse 23ab: *[su]dhāsubhram kāñcanasiṃhakumbhaśirasam . . .* That a Vaḍabhī temple housing an image of a goddess should be distinguished from others by being surmounted by [two] lions and a finial, and that Vaḍabhī temples are principally for the housing of goddesses, is prescribed in the Śaiva Pratiṣṭhāntras, Tantras, that is, which specialize in temple construction and installation. See *Mayasamgraha*, f. 28r–v (5.86c–89): *vasvaṃśe ṣoḍaśatyāgāt sūryasaṃvardhitāyatīḥ* || 87 *catur-dānāt puraḥ siddhaśukāghro vaḍabhiḥ smṛtaḥ* | *prāsādo vyaktaliṅgeṣu netareṣū-dito budhaiḥ* || 88 *vistārād dviguṇotsedhaḥ phaṃsādikṛtasamvrtiḥ* | ***pārśve siṃha-dvayopeto madhye kalaśabhūṣitaḥ*** || 89 *padaikasārdhabhittir vā sapāda-dviguṇonnatiḥ* || *viśeṣato 'mbikādīnām saṃnidhisthānam īritam*; *ibid.*, f. 29v (vv. 119–121): ***vaḍabhyām ambikādevyāḥ keśarī garuḍo hareḥ*** | *śriyo dvipo vṛṣaḥ śambhoḥ savituḥ kamalo 'thavā* || *tad anyeṣāṃ ca devānām svāyudham vā hitaṃ param* | *svacihnaparamaṃ yad vā nijakalpoktam eva vā* || *yad utpatti-sthitiḥsvaṃsakāraṇaṃ viśvatomukham* | *bhāti sarvātmano mūrdhni sā cūḍā ga-ditā budhaiḥ*; f. 28v (5.89cd), referring to the Vaḍabhī type of temple: *viśeṣato 'mbikādīnām saṃnidhisthānam īritam*. The sections of this and other unpublished Śaiva works (*Brhatkālottara*, *Piṅgalāmata*, *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.

<sup>236</sup> Verse 26: *mātuḥ kṛte 'traiva \*suvarṇakumbhabhrājiṣṇumūrdhām* (em. : *suvarṇa-kumbhabharājiṣṇumūrdhām* Ed.) *valabhīm śilābhiḥ* | [20 syllables obliterated] *devī*.

<sup>237</sup> Verse 27: *śailāni mandirāny atra mandarānkāni yāni ca* | + + + + + + + + *kṛtā yā nava caṇḍikāḥ* ‘and here stone temples of the Mandara kind . . . the Nine Caṇḍikās’. The Nine Caṇḍikās are surely the eighteen-armed form of Mahiṣāsūramardinī Durgā known as Ugracaṇḍā and her eight sixteen-armed ancillaries Rudracaṇḍā, Pracacaṇḍā, Caṇḍogrā, Caṇḍanāyikā, Caṇḍā, Caṇḍavati, Caṇḍarūpā, and Aticaṇḍikā. They are nine to match the nine days of the autumnal Navarātra festival. For these goddesses, also called the Nine Durgās, see *Ag-nipurāṇa* 50.7–11 and 185.3–10; and Vidyāpati, *Durgābhaktitarāṅgiṇī*, p. 198. That Nayapāla had [nine] temples built for these goddesses is in keeping with the preferred option of *Ag-nipurāṇa* 185.3cd: *durgā tu navagehasthā ekāgārasthitāthavā* ‘Durgā may be in nine temples or one’. For a Paddhati for the worship of Ugracaṇḍā and her ancillaries see *Ugracaṇḍāprakarāṇa*.

<sup>238</sup> Verse 28ab: *devikoṭe hetukeśasya śambhor yaḥ prāsādam śailam uccair akārṣit*. For the Hetukeśvara of Devikoṭa/Koṭivarsa (modern Bāngarh) see SANDERSON 2001, fn. 4, p. 7; also *Picumata* f. 8r3–4 (3.119c–123), which requires the installation of Hetukeśvara as Bhairava in the northeastern segment of the initiation Maṇḍala: *īśāne tu diśābhāge koṭivarsam prakalpayet* || 120 *vaṭam tatra samālikhya tatra śūlodakam likhet* | *dikṣu caiva vidikṣu ca śūlaprotā likhet tathā* || 121 *śūla tasyāgrato likhya kuṇḍasyaiva mahātape* | *pattisaṃ pūrvato nyasya vaṭasyādhas tato priye* || 122 *aṣṭapatram likhet padmam tathaiveha na saṃśayaḥ* | ***hetukeśvaram*** *ālikhya sadāśivatanus tathā* || 123 *karnikāyām mahādevi mahābhairavarūpiṇam* | *rudrāṣṭakasaṃopetaṃ pūrvavad devi cālikhet*; and *Niśisaṃcāra* f. 17v (4.20–21): ***koṭivarse*** *karnamoṭī*

final and a water reservoir,<sup>239</sup> a temple of Śiva Varākṣeśvara together with a monastery and reservoir,<sup>240</sup> a temple of Viṣṇu (v. 33), a temple of Ghaṅṭīśa and of Bhairava surrounded by the sixty-four Mothers ‘in his own city’,<sup>241</sup> a temple of Śiva Vaṭeśvara at Campā,<sup>242</sup> and a Vaḍabhī temple on a hill-top with a flight of

*mahābalakulodbhavā | śūlahastā sthitā devi sarvayogeśvareśvarī || tasmin kṣetre sthitā devi vaṭavṛkṣasamāśritā | kṣetrapālo mahākā[yo] hetuko nāma nāmataḥ.* The origin myth of the cult of Hetukeśvara, Bahumāmsā (=Karṇamoṭi/Cāmuṅḍā/Carcikā), and the other Mothers (Mātr̥s) at Koṭivarṣa is narrated in chapter 171 of the early *Skandapurāṇa-Ambikākhaṇḍa*. Śiva promises the Mothers there that he will compose Tantras of the Mothers (*mātr̥tantrāṇi*) to guide their worship. The names of these reveal them to be the Yāmalatantras; see SANDERSON 2001, pp. 6–7, fn. 4.

<sup>239</sup> Verse 30: *kṣemeśvarasyāyatanam kṣemaṅkaro grāvamayaṃ smarāreḥ | cakāra yo mūrḍhni dīptāyataśatakumbhakumbham vyadhāt tatra mahāsaraś ca.* In a passage describing Varendrī (3.1–27) in the *Rāmācarita*, completed in the time of Madanapāla (r. c. 1143–1161) but relating events that occurred during the reign of Rāmapāla (r. c. 1072–1126), Saṃdhyākaranandin devotes six verses to the deities of the region (3.2–7). There Kṣemeśvara appears with Hetviśvara or with Hetviśvara and Caṇḍeśvara as one of only two or three deities individualized by a personal name (3.2–5: *kurvadbhiḥ śaṃ devena śrīhetviśvareṇa devena | caṇḍeśvarābhīdhānena kila kṣemeśvareṇa ca sanāthaiḥ || ... saṃbhāvitākaluṣabhāvām*), the others mentioned being generic: the twelve Ādityas, the eleven Rudras, Skanda, Vināyaka, the Vasus, the Viśvadevas, and the Lokapālas. Hetviśvara here is surely identical with the Hetukeśvara of Koṭivarṣa mentioned above. As a synonymous form it was probably substituted for metrical convenience. It is not clear from the Sanskrit whether Saṃdhyākaranandin intended Caṇḍeśvara to be understood as an alias of Kṣemeśvara or as the name of third local Śiva. I am not aware at present of any external evidence that removes this doubt.

<sup>240</sup> Verse 32: *... maṭham ca sarasīm ca | dhāma varākṣeśvara iti sambhor api śailam uttālam.*

<sup>241</sup> Verse 35: *ghaṅṭīśaṃ yaḥ svanagare nyadhāt kṣemāya dehinām | catuḥṣaṣṭyā ca mātṛṇām parītaṃ tatra bhairavam.* This Ghaṅṭīśa is perhaps a double of the Mahāghaṅṭeśvara/Mahāghaṅṭa identified by the *Picumata* (3.77c–83) as the Bhairava of Virajā, modern Jajpur in the Cuttack District of Orissa, formerly the capital of the Bhauma-Kara kings: *āgneye* (em.: *āgneyam* Cod.) **virajāyāṃ tu trikūṭam tatra cālikhet** | 78 *nānāvṛkṣasamākīrṇam ulūkaiś copaśobhitam | nandiṅ ca chagalaṃ caiva kumbhakarṇam mahābalam || 79 hetukaṃ tatra deveśam śmaśānena \*samam nyaset* (conj.: *samabhyaset* Cod.) | *tatropari likhec chaktim karaṅjam ca mahādrumam || 80 tasyādhastāl likhet padmam aṣṭapatram sakarṇikam | karṇikāyāṃ likhed devam mahāghaṅṭam tu bhairavam || 81 kaṭideśe tathā caiva ghaṅṭāsaptavibhūṣitam | rudrāṣṭakasamopetaṃ bhairavākārarūpibhiḥ || 82 rudrāṅām bāhyato devi yoginyaḥ ṣaṭ samālikhet | yamaghaṅṭa karālā ca mahājīhvā kharānānā || 83 karālī danturā caiva nāmāiś caitāḥ prakīrtitāḥ | rudracakraṃ ca saṃveṣṭya ṣaddikṣu ca kramāt sthitāḥ; and 3.136cd (f. 8v2–3): *āgneye mahāghaṅṭeśvaram likhet*; 30.25cd: *āgneyapaṅkaje caiva mahāghaṅṭeśvaram nyaset.* Ghaṅṭīśa- is evidently Ghaṅṭeśa- modified by Middle-Indic Sandhi (-a / ā + ī- > -ī-).*

<sup>242</sup> Verse 38: *vaṭeśvarasya vikaṭaś campāyām ālayo śmabhiḥ | yena vyadhāyi navamaḥ kulācala ivocchritaḥ.* Campā was the capital of Aṅga in the eastern part of the

steps for the emaciated goddess Carcā (Carcikā) previously established by king Mahendrapāla,<sup>243</sup> the re-excavation of the step-well (*vāpī*) of the sage Mataṅga at Dharmāraṇya, the building of a lofty temple of Śiva Matāṅgeśvara at that site (v. 43),<sup>244</sup> the building of a temple of Lakṣmī (v. 44), the erecting of a golden Trīśūla at Sāgara (v. 45),<sup>245</sup> the building of a temple of the Sun-god (v. 46), the provision of a golden cover for [the Liṅga of] Śiva Vaidyanātha,<sup>246</sup> the installation of a golden finial on the temple of Śiva Aṭṭahāsa (v. 50),<sup>247</sup> the making of a silver image of Sadāśiva, 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] Vaikuṅṭha form (v. 61), and the building of a high Vaḍabhī temple for the goddess Piṅgalāryā.<sup>248</sup> 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.<sup>249</sup>

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

---

modern state of Bihar.

<sup>243</sup> Verse 40: *mahendrapālacarcāyā mahendrasaḍṣodayaḥ | yaḥ śailīm vaḍabhīm śaile sopānena saḥākarot*. Carcā/Carcikā is the fearsome emaciated goddess commonly known as Cāmuṅḍā or Karṇamoṭī; see here p. 231.

<sup>244</sup> Dharmāraṇya is at Gayā in southern Bihar. Its Mataṅga hermitage, its step-well of Mataṅga, and its temple of Matāṅgeśvara are mentioned in *Agnipurāna* 115.34–36.

<sup>245</sup> This is probably Gaṅgāsāgara/Gaṅgāsāgarasaṃgama, 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 *siddhikṣetrāṇi* given in the *Niśvāsataṭṭvasaṃhitā*, f. 42r1–3 (*Niśvāsaguhyasūtra* 1.29–33b).

<sup>246</sup> 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 Jyotirlingas.

<sup>247</sup> Perhaps at Aṭṭahāsa, now Labpur (23°50' N, 87°49' E) in the Bhirbhum District of Bengal. The name of the Śiva at this Śaiva and Śākta sacred site is Mahānāda (e.g. *Mataṅgapārameśvara, Vidyāpāda* 20.53ab: *mahānādasya nāthasya cāṭṭhāsākhyam eva hi | vimalaṃ vimalasyoktaṃ sthānaṃ rudrasya śobhanam*); but Aṭṭahāsa being nearly a synonym as well as the name of the site may have been an alias.

<sup>248</sup> Verse 63cd: *iyam api valabhī grāvabhir uttuṅgā piṅgalāryāyāḥ*.

<sup>249</sup> In addition v. 34 records the founding of a hospital (*ārogyasālā*), and v. 57 gifts to brahmins.



reports that Nayapāla had a Buddhist preceptor in the person of Mahāvajrāsana Puṇyākaragupta.<sup>250</sup>

*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 Bhauma-Kara king Śubhākara I his grandfather Kṣemaṅkara is described both as a Buddhist and as having ensured that the members of the caste-classes and disciplines observed their prescribed roles;<sup>251</sup> in his Teruṅḍiā 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’;<sup>252</sup> 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;<sup>253</sup> and Vighrahapāla III is

<sup>250</sup> *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 nya shri | rab tu byung ba’i mtshan pu nya ā ka ra gu pta’o* ‘This king [Neyapāla] venerated [the teacher] called Mahāvajrāsana. During his time as a lay Buddhist, his name was Puṇyaśrī. His ordination name was Puṇyākaragupta’; *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 Dīpaṅkaraśrījñāna (Atīśa) left for Tibet, which is not far out, since Nayapāla came to the throne in approximately 1027 and Dīpaṅkaraśrījñāna set out for Tibet in 1038.

<sup>251</sup> *EI* 15:1, l. 2: *svadharmāropitavarṇāśramah paramopāsako ... śrikṣemaṅkara-devah.*

<sup>252</sup> *EI* 28:36, ll. 8–10: *paramasaugata[h] ... niratiśayaśāstrānusārapravartitakṛtayugocitāsankīrṇavarṇāśramavyavasthaḥ.*

<sup>253</sup> The Mungir copper-plate grant of Devapāla, KIELHORN 1892, p.255, l.28: ***paramasaugataparameśvaraparamabhaṭṭārakamahārājādhirājaśrīdharmapāladevapādānudhyātaḥ paramasaugataḥ parameśvara<h> paramabhaṭṭārako mahārājādhirāja<h> śrīmān devapāladeva<h>***; and ll. 8–9 (v. 5): *śāstrārthabhājā calato ’nuśāsya varṇān pratiṣṭhāpayatā svadharme | śrīdharmapālena sutena so ’bhūt svargasthitānām anṛṇaḥ pitṛṇām* ‘[Gopāla] became free of his debt to his ancestors in heaven through his son Dharmapāla, who, adhering to the teachings of the [brahmanical] Śāstras, after chastising those [members of] caste-classes that stray makes them adhere to their prescribed duties’. Cf. *Viṣṇudharmottara* 2.65.55: *varṇāśramavyavasthā tu tathā kāryā viśeṣataḥ | svadharmapracyutān rājā 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 Āṅgāchi copper-plate as the support of the four caste-classes.<sup>254</sup> Moreover, most of the surviving inscriptions of the Pālas, Candras, and Bhauma-Karas 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 *koṭihomaḥ*.<sup>255</sup> This is simply adapted to the donor's faith by dedicating the offerings to the Buddha rather than to Śiva or Viṣṇu.<sup>256</sup>

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.<sup>257</sup>

---

who fall from their prescribed duties to carry them out'; and the Bhāgalpur plate of Nārāyaṇapāla, HULTZSCH 1886, v. 2cd: *maryādāparipālanaikanirataḥ śauryālayo 'smād abhūd dugdhāmbhodhivilāsahāsamahimā śrīdharmapālo nrpaḥ* 'After him came King Dharmapāla. 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'.

<sup>254</sup> EI 15:18, v. 13c: *cāturvarṇyasamāśrayaḥ*.

<sup>255</sup> On the brahmanical *koṭihomaḥ* see SANDERSON 2005a, pp. 382–383.

<sup>256</sup> EI 12:18, ll. 28–29: *vidhivad udakapūrvakaṃ kṛtvā koṭihomaṃ bhagavate bhagavantaṃ buddhabhaṭṭārakam uddīśya mātāpitror ātmanaś ca puṇyayaśobhivṛddhaye . . .* 'According to rule, after pouring water [upon the hand of the recipient] and after performing a *koṭihomaḥ* 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 Śaktipur copper-plate of Lakṣmaṇasena, r. 1179–1206), lines 42–44: *vidhivad udakapūrvakaṃ bhagavantaṃ śrīnārāyaṇabhaṭṭārakam uddīśya mātāpitror ātmanaś ca puṇyayaśobhivṛddhaye*; EI 21:28 (the Pālanpur plates of Caulukya Bhīmadeva of Gujarat), A.D. 1063, ll. 5–6: *maheśvaram abhyarcya mātāpitror ātmanaś ca puṇyayaśobhivṛddhaye . . .*. We find a similar case in the Āṅgāchi grant of Vighrahapāla III (EI 15:18, ll. 35–40), but with the omission of the fire-sacrifice: *mātāpitror ātmanaś ca puṇyayaśobhivṛddhaye bhagavantaṃ buddhabhaṭṭārakam uddīśya . . .*

<sup>257</sup> DIKSHIT 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 (Līṅga), XLI d-2, and XLIV a and e, LVle (Mukhaliṅga), and LVIIIa (Umāmaheśvara).

Excavations of the Vikramaśīla monastery also uncovered a mix of Buddhist and predominantly Śaiva non-Buddhist images, the latter Śīva, Umāmaheśvara, Śīva and Pārvatī, Bhairava, Maḥiṣāsūramardīnī, Pārvatī, Kaumārī, Cāmuṇḍā, Gaṇeśa, Kārtikeya, the Navagraha, Vṛṣabha, Viṣṇu, and Sūrya.<sup>258</sup>

*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.<sup>259</sup>

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 Śīva 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.<sup>260</sup> Thus in the Bakul stele of 829 a Buddhist monk Sthavira Buddhānirvāṇa records that his father Samanta has donated two Vihāras to the Buddha and two temples to Śīva.<sup>261</sup> The Dong Duong stele of 875 records that King Jayendavarman *alias* Lakṣmīndra enshrined a Lakṣmīndralokeśvara and an associated Vihāra, yet the bulk of this long inscription is devoted to the praise of the Śīva Bhadreśvara, who, we are told, is the source of this dynasty's power and prosperity.<sup>262</sup> The Nhan-bieu stele records that in 908 Pov

---

<sup>258</sup> *IAR* 1974–75, p. 7; 1975–76, p. 7; 1976–77, p. 11; 1977–78, p. 15; 1978–79, p. 43; and 1979–80, p. 13.

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

<sup>260</sup> 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).

<sup>261</sup> *ISCC*, pp. 237–241.

<sup>262</sup> FINOT 1904a, pp. 84–99.

kluñ Sudaṇḍa[vā]sa and his son Pov kluñ 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 Jayasiṃhavarman I.<sup>263</sup> A stele at  
Mi-son of 1092 records that King Jayendrarvarman (*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 Jayendreśvarī, and an Indragaurīśvarī, both  
probably Śaiva, and between 1085 and the year of the inscription gave to Śiva  
Īśānabhadreśvara 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.<sup>264</sup>

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,<sup>265</sup> 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 *Deśawarṇana*, completed in 1365 by Mpu Prapañca 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,<sup>266</sup> that the administrative heads

<sup>263</sup> HUBER 1911, pp. 299–311.

<sup>264</sup> FINOT 1904b, pp. 970–975.

<sup>265</sup> DE CASPARIS 1992, pp. 482–483; KERN 1885 and 1913, p. 104, ll. 14–15: *matañ yan rake halu śrī lokeśvaradharmmawaṃśa airlaṅgānantawikramottuṅgadewa- sangjñā kāstwan śrī mahārāja, de mpuñku sogata 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 Dharmawaṃśa Airlangga Anantavikramottuṅgadeva in Śāka 941’.

<sup>266</sup> *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 kālāning \*śrawaṇa* [conj. PIGEAUD : *grahaṇa* Cod.] *phalguṇa 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,<sup>267</sup> and that his sovereign was dedicated

---

*grahaṇa phalguṇa*, took the occasion to be an eclipse during the month Phālguṇa. As PIGEAUD saw, this is implausible. He therefore proposed that *grahaṇa* is an error for *śrawaṇa* ‘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)).

<sup>267</sup> *Nāgarakṛtāgama* 12.5; PIGEAUD 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. PIGEAUD 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 (PIGEAUD 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*), Rājaparākrama, *alias* Dharmarāja, and the Dharmādhyakṣa of the Buddhists (*dharmādhyakṣa ring kaso-gatan*) Āryādhirāja Kanakamuni, described as a master of the Buddha’s teachings and grammar (*bodhasāstrawayākaraṇaṇaparisamāpta*). In the second the Dharmādhyakṣa of the Buddhists has become Nādenra, described in the same way (*bodhatarkkawyākaraṇaśāstraparisamāpta*) and we learn that the second name Dharmarāja of the Dharmādhyakṣa of the Śaivas is his *nāma puṣpapāta*, that is to say, the name he acquired during his initiation through the casting of a flower (*puṣpapātaḥ*) in accordance with standard Śaiva procedure (e.g. *Svacchandatantra* 4.62cd: *puṣpapātavaśān nāma kārayet sādhakasya tu* ‘He should name the Sādha in accordance with the casting of the flower’; *Bṛhatkālottara* f. 91v4 : *puṣpapātānusāreṇa saṃjñā \*tatpūrvato* [em. : *tatpātrato* 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 Āryādhirāja [Kanakamuni], as in the first, described as a master of grammar and the [Buddhist] Tantras (*wyākaraṇatantraparisamāpta*), and that of the Śaivas is Ārya Harṣarāja, described as a master of logic and grammar (*nyāyawyākaraṇaśāstraparisamāpta*). 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” (*dharmmaprawakta wyawahārawicchedaka*) in the first and second and as “settlers of law suits as valid or not” (*nyāyānyāyawyawahārawicchedaka*) 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) Jayasmara, (5) Agreśwara, and (6) Munindra. In the second they are (1) Śīwanātha, (2) Agreśwara, (3) Jayasmara, (4) Widyānātha, (5) Śīwādhipa, (6) Śrīghana, and (7) Samatājñāna. 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 Samatājñāna 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 Śīva-Buddha in human form.<sup>268</sup>

Particularly striking are passages that report the deity-images or temples in which the souls of deceased kings had been installed. Ranggha Rājasa (r. 1222–1227), was enshrined in two temples, one Śāiva and the other Buddhist, in a single temple complex at Kangēnengan,<sup>269</sup> and both Śāiva and Buddhist priests were seated beside king Rājasanagara when he sat in audience after worshipping here.<sup>270</sup> Anūṣapati (r. 1227–1248) was installed in a Śīva image at Kiḍal;<sup>271</sup> Viṣṇuvardhana (r. 1248–1268) in a Śīva image at Waleri and a Buddha image

---

Marmanātha and Jayasmara were adherents of the Saura sect (*sorapakṣa*), that is to say, Sūrya 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, Śīwādhipa, one of the two Smaranāthas, and Mahānātha are unknown. It is striking that these judicial boards included no Vaiṣṇavas. The absence of a representative of the Ṛṣi sect, often grouped with those of the Śāivas and Buddhists as one of the three principal denominations in Java (e.g. *Arjunawijaya* 28.1c: *ṛṣi śaiwa sogata; Kuñjarakarna* 22.3c: *sang boddhaśaiwārṣipakṣa*), is not surprising. For its followers were forest-dwelling hermits. The *Kuñjarakarna* associates them with the worship of the [Pāsupata] *pañcakuśika*; see 23.1d: *lwi glar sogata pañcabuddha ṛṣi pañcakuśika wiku śaiwapañcaka*; 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 Śāivas (Ācārya Śīwanātha Tanutama: *mpungku dharmmadhyakṣa ri kaśewan ḍang ācāryya śīwanātha mapañji tanutama*) together with a board of five other Ācāryas, Dharmadewa, Smaradahana, Smaradewa, another Śīwanātha, and Agraja, not one of whom has an obviously Buddhist name (plate 2, recto, ll. 4–7).

<sup>268</sup> *Nāgarakṛtāgama* 1.1bc: *śīwa budda sira sakalanīṣkalātmakā | sang śrīparwwatanātha* ‘The Lord of the Mountain, protector of the unprotected, the holy Śīva-Buddha, who is both manifest [in physical form] and transcendent’. The Lord of the Mountain (*śrīparwwatanātha*) addressed in this verse has been understood, implausibly, as Śīva. 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 Tantar’s *Arjunawijaya*, where the Lord of the Mountain, in this case called Parwwatarājadewa, is identified as the physical manifestation of the ultimate reality that is the Buddha (1.1b: *sang sāḁṣāt paramārthabuddha*).

<sup>269</sup> *Nāgarakṛtāgama* 40.5d: *sang dinārmadwaya ri kagnangan śśewabodḍeng usāna*. PIGEAUD translates *dinārmadwaya* 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. *dharmadwayam*, conveys anything more than the fact that there were two temples. Cf. SANTOSO 1975, p. 54.

<sup>270</sup> *Nāgarakṛtāgama* 36.2b: *para wiku śai sogata āryya nāligih iniring nirekhi tān adoh*.

<sup>271</sup> *Nāgarakṛtāgama* 41.1d: *praḍipa \*śiwabimba* (KERN : *śimbha* PIGEAUD) *śobhita rikang suḍharmma ri kiḍal*.

at Jajaghu,<sup>272</sup> Kṛtanagara, r. 1268–1292, who is depicted as a devout initiated Tantric Buddhist and described after his death as “liberated in the world of Śīva-Buddha”,<sup>273</sup> and was installed in a Śīva-Buddha in “his own place” and, with his queen, Vajradevī, in a Buddhist image combining Vairocana and Locanā at Sagala.<sup>274</sup> Kṛtarājasa Jayavardhana (r. 1293–1309) was installed in a Buddha in the palace and a Śīva at Simpang,<sup>275</sup> and Jayanāgara (r. 1309–1326), who is described as having returned to the world of Viṣṇu,<sup>276</sup> in Viṣṇu in the royal compound, Shilā Pēṭak, and Bubāt, and in a Buddha in the form of Amoghasiddhi in Sukhalīla.<sup>277</sup> We also learn that there was a temple founded by Kṛtanagara at Jajawa, located at the foot of the sacred mountain Kukuwus, which was Śaiva but had a Buddhist pinnacle and contained a Śīva with an image of Akṣobhya above its crown, and that both Buddhists and Śaivas worshipped in it.<sup>278</sup> The in-

<sup>272</sup> *Nāgarakṛtāgama* 41.4b: *ḍinarmma ta sire waleri śiwawimbha len sugatawimbha mungwing jajaghu*.

<sup>273</sup> *Nāgarakṛtāgama* 43.5c: *sang mokteng śiwabuddhaloka*. His commitment to Buddhism is indicated in 42.3c (*samaya len brata mapagēh apākṣa sogata*) and 43.2a (*bhakti ri pada śri śakyasiṃhāsthiti*). As for his involvement in Tantric Buddhism we learn that he received Buddha consecration (*jinābhiṣekaḥ*) and was then given the name Jñānavajreśvara (43.2bc: *lumrā nāma jinābhiṣekanira sang śri jñānavajreśwara*), that he devoted himself to Tantric worship following the otherwise unknown *Subhūtitantra* as his principal guide (43.3b: *mukyang tantra subhuti rakwa tinnḡōt kēmpēn*), and that he celebrated the esoteric Tantric ritual known as *gaṇacakram* (43.3d), an indication that his Tantrism was that of the *Guhyasamāja* or one of the Yoginitantras. His initiation-name appears in the forms Jñānaśivavajra and Vajrajñānaśiva in the Sanskrit inscription (KERN 1910) on the lotus-cushion of an image of himself in the form of the Mantranaya deity Mahākṣobhya installed at Simpang in Surabaya in 1289 (vv. 12–13: *śrijñānaśivavajrākhyas cittaratnavibhūṣaṇaḥ | jñānaraśmivīśuddhāṅgas sambodhijñānapāragah || subhaktya taṃ pratiṣṭhāpya svayaṃ pūrvaṃ pratiṣṭhitam | śmaśāne vurareṇāṃni mahākṣobhyānurūpataḥ*; 19d: *vajrajñānaśivā +*). All three forms of the name have the appearance of a Śaiva-Buddhist hybrid.

<sup>274</sup> *Nāgarakṛtāgama* 43.5d: *rinke sthānanirān ḍinarmma śiwabuddārcca halp nottama*; 43.6: *hyang werocana locanā lwiriran ekārcca prakāśeng prajā*.

<sup>275</sup> *Nāgarakṛtāgama* 47.3b–d: *drāk pīnratīṣṭa jinawimbha sireng purī jro | antaḥpura ywa panlah rikanang suḍarṃma śaiwāpratiṣṭa sira teko muwah ri simping*.

<sup>276</sup> *Nāgarakṛtāgama* 48.3a: *sang nṛpati mantuk ing haripada*.

<sup>277</sup> *Nāgarakṛtāgama* 48.3bcd: *śīghra sirān ḍinarmma ri ḍalm purārccanira wiṣṇuwimbha parama | len ri śilā pṭak mwang i bubāt paḍā pratima wiṣṇumūrṭty anupama ring sukhālīla tang sugatawimbha śobhitan amoghasiddhi sakala*. His installation in Viṣṇu is without parallel among the Singhasari-Majapahit kings; see PIGEAUD 1960–1963, vol. 4, p. 141. However, the kings of Kaḍiri, 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 (*kakawin*) of the Kaḍiri court (HALL 2005, pp. 2 and 8).

<sup>278</sup> *Nāgarakṛtāgama* 56.1b–2c: *kīrtti śri kṛtanāgara prabhū yuyut nareśwara 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 *Jñānasiddhānta* and the Tantric Buddhist *Sang hyang Kamahāyānikan* and *Kalpabuddha*.<sup>279</sup> 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 *sūnya* and *sūnyatā* among those used to characterize the highest reality,<sup>280</sup> 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,<sup>281</sup> and in the fact that the *Kuñjarakarna* of the Buddhist Mpu Ḍusun the supreme Buddhist deity Vairo-

---

*tēkwān rakwa sirāngadiṣṭita śarīra tan hana waneḥ etunyang dwaya śaiwa bodḍa sang amūja ngūni satatā || chinang caṇḍi ri sor kaśaiwan apucak kabodḍan i ruhur mwang ri jro śiwawimbha śobhita haḷpnirāparimitā | akṣobhyapratime ruhur mmakuṭa tan hanolyantikā* 'It was a temple (*kīrtiḥ*) of Lord Kṛtanāgara, the king's great-grandfather. He himself established it. Hence both Śaivas and Buddhists have from the beginning always conducted the worship. The sign is that the temple is Śaiva in its lower section and Buddhist above. Inside is a beautiful Śiva image and above an image of Akṣobhya as (on?) its crown. Of there is no doubt'. On the significance of the Śaiva-Buddhist fusion seen in Kṛtanagara in both inscriptions and literary works see HUNTER 2007.

<sup>279</sup> See SOEBADIO 1971, pp. 12–19 and 55–57 for evidence of this intertextuality; also for a general treatment of the co-existence of the two traditions in Java ZOETMULDER in STÖHR and ZOETMULDER 1968, pp. 262–314.

<sup>280</sup> See, e.g., *Jñānasiddhānta* 3.2–3: *nādaś ca liyate sūnye sūnyam eva tu jāyate | sūnyāc chūnyataram vāpi atyantaśūnyalakṣaṇam || sthūlam sakalatattvam ca sūkṣmaṃ sakalanīṣkalam | paraṃ niṣkalaśūnyam ca ūrdhvātyūrdhātīśūnyakam*; 8.3: *sthūlam śabdamayam proktam sūkṣmaṃ cittamayam bhavet | paraṃ cittavirahitam cittam tyaktvātīśūnyatā*; *Gaṇapatitattva* 2: *śvāso niḥśvāsaḥ samyoga ātmatrayam iti smṛtam | triśivaṃ tripurusatvam aikātmya eva sūnyatā*; 23: *hrdayastham sadāśivaṃ hrdayānte guhyālayam | sūnyātīśūnyam cintyate paraṃ kaivalyam ucyate*; *Mahājñāna* 62: *sūryakoṭisahasrāṃśu hrdayam vimalam śubham | hrdayānte padaṃ sūnyam paraṃ kaivalyam ucyate*; 83: *rātriś ca prakṛtir jñeyā raviś ca puruṣas tathā | dyutiś ca vā mahādevaḥ sūnyam 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 < *Rauravasūtrasaṃgraha* 7.5; *Jñānasiddhānta* 19.5 and *Gaṇapatitattva* 43 < *Kiraṇa* 1.23; *Wrhaspatitattva* 7–10 < *Svāyambhuvasūtrasaṃgraha* 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.

<sup>281</sup> See the example of this cited in SANDERSON 2005a, p. 377.



cana is made to equate the divine pentads of the Śaiva and [Pāśupata] Ṛṣi 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 Śīva,<sup>282</sup> 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.<sup>283</sup> 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 diety Vairocana is one with Sadāśīva, that its four ancillary deities, the directional Tathāgatas Akṣobhya, Ratnasambhava, Amitābha, and Amoghasiddhi, are one with Rudra, Brahmā, Mahādeva, and Viṣṇu respectively,<sup>284</sup> that there is no distinction between the Buddha and Śīva,<sup>285</sup> and that therefore it is the king's duty to support all three sects, the Buddhists, the Śaivas, and the Ṛṣis.<sup>286</sup> Later, in his *Sutasoma*, Mpu Tantular states that the Buddha and Śīva 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.<sup>287</sup>

<sup>282</sup> *Kuñjarakarṇa* 23.1d: *lwir glar sogata pañcabuddha rṣi pañcakuśika wiku śaiwa pañcaka* ‘As the Buddhists have the five Buddhas, the Ṛṣis have the pentad of Kuśika and the Śaivas a pentad of their own’; 23.4bcd: *ngwang wairocana buddha-mūrti śiwamūrti pinakaguru ning jagat kabeh | nāham donkw ingaran bhaṭāra guru kaprakaśita tēka ring sarāt kabeh | anghing byāpaka ring samastabhuwanāku juga warawiśeṣadevatā* ‘I, Vairocana, am embodied both as the Buddha and as Śīva, 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.’

<sup>283</sup> *Kuñjarakarṇa* 22.3.

<sup>284</sup> *Arjunawijaya* 26.4–27.1

<sup>285</sup> *Arjunawijaya* 27.2abc: *ndah kantēnanya haji tan hana bheda sang hyang | hyang buddha rakwa kalawan śiwa rājadewa | kālih samēka sira sang pinakeṣṭidharma.*

<sup>286</sup> *Arjunawijaya* 30.1–2.

<sup>287</sup> *Sutasoma* 139.5: *hyang buddha tan pahi lawan śiwarājadewa | rwānekadhātu winuwus warabuddhawiśwa | bhinnēki rakwa ring apa n kēna parwanōsēn | mangka ng jinata kalawan śiwatattwa tunggal | bhinnēka tunggal ika tan hana dharmā mangrwa.* This has been translated by SUPOMO (1977, p.7) as follows: “The god Buddha is not different from Śīva, 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 Śīva are one; they are different yet they are one, for there is no duality in the *dharmā*”. 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 *Sarvatathāgatattvasaṃgraha* 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 Śīva (*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 (*devatāhaṃkāraḥ*, *devatāgarvaḥ*) through the use of Mantras, Mudrās, visualization, and fire-sacrifice (*homaḥ*); 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 (*siddhiḥ*) such as the averting of danger (*śāntiḥ*), the harming of enemies (*abhicāraḥ*), and the control of the rain (*varṣāpaṇam* and *ativr̥ṣṭidhāraṇam*), 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 Vikramaśīla under the direction of Buddhajñāna during the reign of Dharmapāla (r. c. 775–812) to ensure the longevity of the Pāla dynasty;<sup>288</sup> we have another example in the case of Kīrtipaṇḍita, a Mahāyāna-Buddhist scholar and Tantric expert who according to the Vat Sithor 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;<sup>289</sup> and the Javanese Prapañca 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 Ḍusun in 23.4bcd of the *Kuñjarakarna* cited and translated above: "I, Vairocana, am embodied both as the Buddha and as Śiva".

<sup>288</sup> See here p.93.

<sup>289</sup> K. 111, CĒDÈS 1937–1966, vol. 6, pp. 195–211, v. 36. See SANDERSON 2005a, pp. 427–428.

to increase his people's prosperity and the stability of his realm, and that its reward was the undiminished and undivided sovereignty (*ekachattrā*) of his descendants.<sup>290</sup>

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.<sup>291</sup> Among the Buddhist Tantras at least two major texts teach rituals of initiation, or consecration (*abhiṣekaḥ*) 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 *Mañjuśrīyamūlakalpa* and the *Sarvadurgatipariśodhanatantra*.<sup>292</sup> 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 *Mahāvairocanābhisaṃbodhi* and *Sarvatathāgatātattvasaṃgraha*, 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 *Sarvavajrodya*, 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 (*śreṣṭhī*) or international trader (*sārthavāhaḥ*) twenty-five or half of that, and in the case of an ordinary practitioner (*sādhakaḥ*)

<sup>290</sup> *Nāgarakṛtāgama* 42.3d: *tumīrwa sang atītarāja ring usāna magēhakna wṛdddining jagat*; 43.3c: *pūjā yoga samāḍi pinrihiraṃ amriḥ sthityaṃg rāt kabeḥ*; 43.4cd: *ḍarmmeṣṭāpagēḥ ing jinabrata mahotsāheng prayogakriya nāhan hetuni tusni tusnira paḍaikaccatra dewaprabhu*.

<sup>291</sup> 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 *a*.

<sup>292</sup> *Mañjuśrīyamūlakalpa*, p. 32, ll. 21, 23, and 28–30; *Sarvadurgatipariśodhanatantra*, sections 47b, 48a, and 49a.

twelve or six (about 5 or 2.5 metres).<sup>293</sup>

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 (*paṭaḥ*), manuscripts of sacred texts (*pustakam*), monasteries (*vihāraḥ*), shrines (*gandhakuṭī*), Caityas, reservoirs (*puṣkariṇyādi*), gardens and the like (*ārāmādi*). It also adapted the Śaiva procedures for funerary initiation to produce a Tantric Buddhist funeral

<sup>293</sup> *Sarvavajrodaya*, f. 29r5-29v1: *evaṃ kṛtvā pūrvasevāṃ maṇḍalam ālikhet. . . rājño hastaśataṃ pañcāśaddhastam vā sāmantamahāsāmantānāṃ pañcāśat pañcaviṃśatihastam vā śreṣṭhinaḥ sārthavāhasya vā pañcaviṃśatiṃ tadardham vā sādhakānāṃ dvādaśahastam ṣaḍdhastam vā.*

<sup>294</sup> The details of this wide repertoire of the rituals that a Tantric Buddhist officiant (Vajrācārya) was called on to perform are set out in a number of manuals that are closely comparable to the Paddhatis of the Śaivas, notably the *Kriyasaṃgrahapañjikā* of Kuladatta (TANEMURA 2004b), the *Vajrāvalī* of the great Abhayākara Gupta of Vikramaśīla (1064–1125 according to the chronological tables of Sum pa mkhan po Yes shes dpal 'byor [1704–1788]; works dated in the twenty-fifth, thirtieth, and thirty-seventh years of the reign of Rāmapāla [c. 1072–1126]; *Vajrāvalī* written before the first of these; see BÜHNEMANN and TACHIKAWA 1991, pp. xiv–xvi), which adds procedures for the consecration of reservoirs, gardens, and the like (A, f. 2r1 in the list of topics: *pratimādipratiṣṭhā* | *puṣkariṇyādipratiṣṭhā* | *ārāmādipratiṣṭhā*), and the *Ācāryakriyāsamuccaya* of Mahāmaṇḍalācārya Jagaddarpaṇa, which incorporates much of the *Vajrāvalī* but adds some new material, notably a final section on the funeral ritual for a deceased Vajrācārya (*nirvṛtavajrācāryāntyeṣṭilakṣaṇavidhiḥ*; B, ff. 240v7–244v4), which is an unacknowledged incorporation of the whole of the *Mṛtasugatiniyojana* of Paṇḍita Śūnyasamādhivajra (less its two colophonic verses). One other text giving a Tantric funeral procedure survives in Sanskrit, the *Antasthitikarmoddeśa*, at the end (ff. 15r8–15v11) of the *Guhyasamāja*-based *Maṇḍalopāyikā* of Maṇḍalācārya Padmaśrīmitra of the Khasarpaṇa monastery (f. 15v10–11: *samāptā ca maṇḍalopāyikā* | *kṛtir iyaṃ khasarpaṇīyamaṇḍalācāryapadmaśrīmitrasya*). On these texts and the incorporation of the *Mṛtasugatiniyojana* by Jagaddarpaṇa see TANEMURA 2004a and 2007. On the Śaiva prototype of funerary initiation see SANDERSON 1995a, pp. 31–33 and, for its adaptation, the *Mṛtoddhārādīkṣā*, in which a simulacrum is substituted for the body of the deceased, 2005b, pp. 264–267. A fourteenth-century Paddhati for this *Mṛtoddhārādīkṣā* survives in ff. 88v1–91r1 of the *Gurupustikā* of the Kashmirian Rājānaka Śitikaṇṭha. In an earlier publication (SANDERSON 2007a, p. 395, fn. 549) I proposed that this work, then known to me only indirectly from the *Rājānakavaṃśaprasāmsā* of his patrilineal descendant Rājānaka Ānanda, who reports that it was composed at the request of [king] Saṃgrāmasiṃha, might be preserved in a Śāradā manuscript listed with this title as belonging to the Sayaji Rao Gaekwad Central Library of the Banaras Hindu University (MS CN. 4115). I can now report that this is indeed a manuscript of that work and, as far as I am aware, its *codex unicus*. The name of the author is confirmed on f. 1v11–12: *karmānupūrvismṛtaye keśāṃcid upayoginīm* | *śitikaṇṭhas samasyainām vidhatte gurupustikām*; and the claim that he wrote at the request of Saṃgrāmasiṃha is confirmed on f. 13v15–14r1: *asmākaṃ kulaśiṣyena śrīsaṅgrāmamahībhuḥ* | *abhyarthitānām dīkṣārtham ayaṃ paddhatidohadaḥ*. I am very grateful in this matter to my former pupil Christopher Wallis, who after

rite (*antyeṣṭih*)<sup>294</sup> for initiates,<sup>295</sup> in which, as in the Śaiva case (*antyeṣṭidīkṣā*), the officiant draws the consciousness (*jñānam*) 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,<sup>296</sup> and then sends it out through the top of the head to ascend to liberation or a pure Buddha-field such as Sukhāvati.<sup>297</sup>

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

<sup>295</sup> 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: *mṛtācāryādisattvā ye vajrasattvādiyoginaḥ | vakṣ<y>e cāntasthite<h> kṛtyaṃ teṣāṃ mārganidarśanāt*. It may be done for a man or a woman; f. 15r10–11, v. 9ab: *puruṣatanu<m> nirūpyātha striyo vā samyag eva hi*. Śūnyasamādhivajra does not specify those for whom it is intended. But Jagaddarpaṇa adds a preamble to Śūnyasamādhivajra's text in which he restricts it to Vajrācāryas; f. 240v7: *adhunā parinirvṛtavajrācāryaśārīrasyānteṣṭividhir ucyate*.

<sup>296</sup> *Maṇḍalopāyikā*, f. 15r14, vv. 21c–22b: *tato vijñānam ānīya mantramudrānuyogataḥ || aṅkuṣyādyaīḥ praveśyātha dadyāt sekādikam 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'; *Mṛtasugatiniyojana*, f. 2r3–4: *tato nayet suraktavarṇaṃ* (conj. [Tib. *mdog dmar gsal ba*] : *suraktamsvadhām*) *paralokasaṃsthitam jñānam dharmamukhākṛti yad vā nivātanīṣkampadīpanibham | ānītam taj jñānam mṛtasya hṛdaye praveśayet śirasā* '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*), resembling the unflickering flame of a lamp in a windless place. When that consciousness is nigh he should cause it to enter the heart of the deceased through [the top of] his head'. According to the *Maṇḍalopāyikā*, 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 viśuddhabhūbhāge gomayenopalepite | maṇḍalaṃ catuśraṃ vai kārayet tatra saṃkiret || śuklaṃ pītam rajo vāpi tatra padma\*dalāṣṭakam* (conj. : *dalābhakam* Cod.); f. 15r13, vv. 18c–19: *uttarābhīmukho mantrī saṃpūjya maṇḍalaṃ balim || dattvārghādikam caiva saṃsādhya maṇḍalaṃ kṛtī | sthāpayen maṇḍaladvāri prācyāṃ tu dakṣiṇāmukham*.

<sup>297</sup> In the *Maṇḍalopāyikā*'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 Sukhāvati inhabited by Buddhas and Bodhisattvas; f. 15v2–3: *28 sambuddhabodhisattvādivirṇivīraṇḍakaiḥ | siddhagandharavabhujagaiḥ surair vidyādharair api || 29 pūrṇam nabhastalaṃ vīkṣya \*nipatatpuspavṛṣṭikam* (*nipatat* em. : *nipatataḥ* Cod.) | *tad divyadundubhidhvānamuraja\*mardaladhvani* (*mardala* conj. : *murdala* Cod.) || *30 ucchataveṇuvīṇādīmadhurasvārabhūṣaṇam | tadānandasuvistārāt kurvadbhīr nṛtyam ujvalam || 31 tair akṛṣya ca vijñānam sukhāvatyādikāhvaye | sthāpitaṃ lokadhātau hi buddhabuddhātmaśraye*. The procedure of the *Mṛtasugatiniyojana* differs here; f. 3r1–3: *tad anu \*kuśāgre* (em. [Tib. *ku sha'i rtse mo la*] : *kuśāgraṃ* Cod.) \**mantrī* (em. [Tib. *sngags pas*] : *mantraī* Cod.) *vibhāvya tikṣṇaika\*sūcikaṃ vajram* (corr. : *sūcikavajram* Cod.) | *nikṣipyā vajrarandhre dhyāyāt tad dahanasaṃkāśam || tad anu samāhitacitta<s> taddhṛdi vinyastavisphuraj jñānam | saṃcodayej \*jvaladbhir vajrāgrair mārutoddhūtaiḥ*

*The Mahāvairocanābhisamṃbodhi, the Mañjuśrīyamūlakalpa, and Buddhaguhya*

That this transformation of the Mahāyāna had been achieved by absorbing and adapting non-Buddhist practices was evident from the beginning. For the *Mahāvairocanābhisamṃbodhi*, our first major Buddhist Tantra,<sup>298</sup> 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.<sup>299</sup>

---

(em. [Tib. *rdo rje rtse nas rlung gis bskyod pa yi 'bar ba rnams kyi*]: *jvalad-bhivajrāgraumārutoddhrtair* Cod.) || \**udgacchad tad* (corr. [Tib. *de ni 'phar bar*] : *udgacchantam* Cod.) *dhyāyād dahanārci*<*h*>*spṛśyamānapāradavad | \*ūrdhvāgnena* (?) (Tib. *steng gi sgo nas*) *vimuktiṃ buddhakṣetraṃ viśuddham vā* ‘Then the Mantrin should take a blade of Kuśa grass, visualize a sharp one-pointed Vajra at its tip, place [that tip] at the aperture of the [corpse’s] penis and imagine that it is burning. Then concentrating his mind he should cause the shining consciousness that he has installed in the heart [of the corpse] to be driven [up from the heart] by blazing wind-fanned Vajra-points and he should visualize it rising to liberation or a pure Buddha-field through the upper [aperture], like [a drop of] quick silver touched by tongues of fire’. The ‘upper’ is one of nine apertures through which consciousness can leave the body at death (*utkrāntiḥ*). It is located at the top of the head and is called ‘the golden door’ (*kanakadvāram*) by Bhavabhaṭṭa in his commentary on the *Catuṣpūṭhatantra* (*Catuṣpūṭhanibandha*), f. 52r2: *ūrdhveti kanakadvāreṇa yadā gacchati tadā maraṇād ūrdhvaṃ śīghram eva gater gatyantaram viśiṣṭam gacchati*. The point of exit depends upon the destiny of the deceased. This is the best. According to Śūnyasamādhivajra consciousness that exits at death through this aperture goes to the Immaterial World (*ārūpyadhātuḥ*): *śirasārūpyam gacchet* (f. 3r4). This idea that consciousness may leave the body through various exits in accordance with its destiny is found widely in Brahmanical sources. Early Buddhist sources speak rather of consciousness ceasing at death at these points in the body; see *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya* on 3.43abc. Vasubandhu says there that in the case of Arhats their consciousness disappears in the heart according to some and in the head according to others: *arhantaḥ | teṣām api hrdaye vijñānam nirudhyate | mūrdhnīty apare*.

<sup>298</sup> See here p. 101.

<sup>299</sup> *rNam par snang mdzad chen po mngon par byang chub pa'i rgyud*, f. 177r1–3: *de la gsang ba'i bdag po ma 'ongs pa'i dus na sems can blo zhan pa ma dad pa gang dag bstan pa'i de la dad par mi 'gyur zhing yid gnyis dang som nyi mang ba | thos pa tsaṃ snying po ma 'dzin pa | sgrub ma la mi phyogs pa dag 'byung bar 'gyur te | de dag ni bdag nyid kyang ma rung la gzhan yang phung bar byed pa yin no | 'di skad du 'di ni phyi rol pa rnams la yod de | sangs rgyas rnams kyi gsungs pa ni ma yin no zhes smra bar 'gyur gyi*.

The *Mañjuśriyamūlakalpa*, another early Buddhist Tantric text,<sup>300</sup> 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 Vidyāpīṭha, describing the Mantras of these deities as the highest and most secret of all the non-Buddhist (*laukika*-) Mantras.<sup>301</sup> Moreover, it teaches that any of the

<sup>300</sup> 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 *Garudapaṭalaparivarta* (T. 1276), produced at some time between 746 and 774, is identical with the first sixty percent of the 41st chapter of the *Mañjuśriyamūlakalpa* 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 *Rājavyākaraṇa*, chapter 53 of the published *Majjuśriyamūlakalpa*, cannot be earlier than the late eighth century since it knows of the Pāla king Gopāla (r. c. 750–775) (53.628; and 53.816: *tataḥ pareṇa \*bhūpālo gopālo* [em. : *bhūpālā gopālā* Ed.] *dāsajīvinah | bhaviṣyati*). Since it does not mention his successor Dharmapāla it is unlikely to be later.

<sup>301</sup> *Mañjuśriyamūlakalpa*, introductory prose before 47.1: *sarvalaukikamantrāṇaṃ sārabhūtataṃ paramarahasyaṃ*. 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 Vidyāpīṭha, 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 Dharmakīrti (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 *Gītābhāṣya* on *Bhagavadgītā* 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 *vināyakamātrgaṇacaturbhaginyādīni* ‘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 *Mahāvairocanābhisaṃbodhi* 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<sup>302</sup> will be effective if applied by Buddhists in the Maṇḍala of these converted deities.<sup>303</sup> 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 *Mañjuśrīyamūlakalpa* or, more probably, in a hypothetical proto-text of which the actual text was thought to be an abbreviated redaction.<sup>304</sup>

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 Mañjuḥṣa for living beings who could only be trained by [this] device.<sup>305</sup>

...

All the extensive Kalpas taught in the Gāruḍa Tantras were taught by me in order to benefit living beings.<sup>306</sup>

...

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.<sup>307</sup>

---

SANDERSON 2005a, p. 373–374, fn. 76).

<sup>302</sup> On the Śaiva Gāruḍatantras see here p. 46 and SLOUBER 2007.

<sup>303</sup> *Mañjuśrīyamūlakalpa* 47.98c–99b, 102ab, 103ab: *yāvanti śaivatantre ’smiṃ ye tantre cāpi gāruḍe || brahmādyair ṛṣimukhyaiś ca ...pūjitā kalpavistārā viṣṇurudrasavāsavaiḥ | ...tasmin maṇḍale \*yojya* (conj. : *yojyā* Ed.) *siddhyantīhā na saṃśayaḥ* ‘All the extensive Kalpas that have been taught in this Śaivatantara and, moreover, in the Gāruḍa, and worshipped by Brahmā and others, by the leading Ṛṣis, ... by Viṣṇu, Rudra, and Indra, will be mastered if applied in this Maṇḍala. Of this there is no doubt.

<sup>304</sup> *Mañjuśrīyamūlakalpa* 2.32–34b: *eṣa mantrō mayā proktaḥ sattvānāṃ hitakāmyayā | śulamudrāsamāyuktaḥ sarvabhūtavināśakah || 33 yaṃ mayā kathitaṃ pūrvam kalpam asya purātanam | śaivam iti vakṣyante sattvā bhūtalavāsinaḥ || 34 vividhā guṇavistārāḥ śaivatantre mayoditāḥ.*

<sup>305</sup> 2.31c–32b: *ya eva vaiṣṇave tantre kathitāḥ kalpavistarāḥ || upāyavaineyasattvānāṃ mañjuḥṣeṇa bhāṣitāḥ.*

<sup>306</sup> 2.37: *yāvantaḥ gāruḍe tantre kathitāḥ kalpavistarāḥ | te mayavoditāḥ sarve sattvānāṃ hitakāraṇāt.*

<sup>307</sup> 47.53–54: *sarvaṃ śaivam iti khyātaṃ sarvair bhūtalavāsibhiḥ | mayaiva nigaditaṃ*



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.<sup>308</sup> 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.<sup>309</sup> So it follows that there nothing inherently un-Buddhist in

---

*pūrvam kalpe-m asmiṃ savistare || 54 paścād anyo janaḥ prāhuḥ kalpamantrām prīhak prīhak | \*tumburoḥ (corr. : tumburuḥ Ed.) sārthavāhasya tryambakasya tu \*dhimateḥ (corr. : dhimateḥ Ed.).*

<sup>308</sup> \*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 *Sarvadurgatipariśodhanatejorājakalpa*, and the *Dhyānottara*. The entry on the fourth commentary, that on the *Subāhu[pariṣcchā]*, 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 ddha 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 (Tōh. 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*.

<sup>309</sup> *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 sems can blo zhan pa zhes pa nas | de dag gis sngon sems can rnams la phan par dgongs pai phyir | 'di thams cad bstan par rab tu mi shes so zhes pai bar du lha rnams kyi kha dog gang yin pa dkyil 'khor yang de yin par gsungs 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 *Mahāvairocanābhisambodhi*.

*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,

---

*pa ma yin no zhes zer te | gang 'jig rten gyi | rgyud rnams kyang | sangs rgyas bcom ldan 'das thams cad mkhyen pas sems can rnams so so'i dad pa dang rjes su mthun par mi shes pa zhes pa'i phyir ro zhes pa ste* "The statement that begins "O [Vajrapāṇi,] Lord of the Yakṣas, in time to come [there will arise] people of inferior understanding" refers to people who do not understand all that [the Buddha] has taught for the welfare of past beings. [The Buddha] has taught [here] that the colour of the Maṇḍalas should be the same as those of [their presiding] deities. But some will say that the Maṇḍalas of Īśvara and of fire and the rest are found in the mundane Tantras [of the outsiders] and not at all in the supramundane Tantras [of Buddhism, that is to say,] in the Kriyātantras or Caryātantras, and that therefore they were not taught by the Buddha, [doing so] because they do not understand that the Blessed omniscient Buddha, in conformity with the various faiths of living beings, also taught [these] mundane Tantras'. This doctrine that all teaching is the Buddha's, that he has taught variously in the appearance of the Buddha, Śiva, and others, is set out in the *Mahāvairocanābhisambodhi* in a passage that survives in Sanskrit through its citation in the *Nāmanāntrārthāvalokinī*, Vilāsavajra's eighth-century commentary on the *Nāmasaṃgīti*, on verse 42, f. 31v1–32r2: *tathā cokaṭaṃ śrīvairocanābhisambodhitantre | bhagavantas tathāgatā arhantaḥ samyaksaṃbuddhāḥ sarvajñajñānaṃ prāpya tat sarvajñajñānaṃ sarvasattvebhyo vibhajya nānānāyair nānābhīprāyair nānopāyanayair dharmam deśayanti sma | keṣāṃ cit śrāvākayānanāyaṃ keṣāṃ cit pratyekabuddhayānanāyaṃ keṣāṃ cin mahāyānanāyaṃ keṣāṃ cit pañcābhījñajñānanāyaṃ keṣāṃ cid devopapattaye keṣāṃ cin manuṣyopapattaye yāvan mahoragayakṣarākṣasāsūragandharvagaruḍakinnarādyupapattaye dharmam deśayanti sma | tatra ke cid sattvā buddhavaineyikā buddharūpeṇa paśyanti. ke cid chrāvakarūpeṇa ke cid pratyekabuddharūpeṇa ke cid bodhisattvarūpeṇa ke cin maheśvararūpeṇa ke cid brahmarūpeṇa ke cin nārāyaṇarūpeṇa paśyanti sma | ke cid vaiśravaṇarūpeṇa yāvan mahoragamanuṣyāmanuṣyarūpeṇa paśyanti sma | svakasvakair vacanodāhāraṇāyair vividheryāpatha<ṃ> vyavasthitam | tac ca sarvajñajñānam ekarasaṃ yad uta tathatāvīnirmuktirasam ity āha mahāvairocana iti.* This is closely related to and probably derives from the *vaineyadharmopadeśaḥ*, the eighth *Prakaraṇa* of the second *Nirvyūha* of the *Kāraṇḍavyūha* (pp. 268–269). The *Saddharmapuṇḍarīka* likewise teaches (pp. 251–252) that Avalokiteśvara assumes all kinds of forms, including that of Śiva, in order to teach living beings in consideration of their particular dispositions. STRICKMANN informs us (1996, p. 440, n. 28) that this passage is present in the Chinese translation completed by Dharmarakṣa in A.D. 286. It is probable that it is the model of the passage in the *Kāraṇḍavyūha*. The doctrine that the non-Buddhist teachers are a device (*upāyaḥ*) of the Buddha is also taught in the fourth chapter of the *Bodhisattvagocaropāyaviṣayavikurvaṇanirdeśasūtra*, which survives in two Chinese translations, the first by Guṇabhadra in the fifth century; see ZIMMERMANN 2000, p. 18.

working only to infuse the new liturgical system with ever more clearly Buddhist purpose and meaning. On the contrary, with the *Sarvatathāgatattvasaṃgraha*, 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 Mantranaya, and was in existence in a shorter version by the end of the seventh century and expanded in the course of the eighth,<sup>310</sup> we find the beginning of a process of assimilation of Śākta Śaiva language, practices, iconography, and concepts that would become ever more comprehensive throughout the rest of the Mantranaya's creativity. Here we find for the first time the requirement that candidates enter a state of possession (*āveśaḥ*) 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.<sup>311</sup> The Vajracārya puts the candidate into a state of possession, has

<sup>310</sup> See MATSUNAGA 1978, pp. xvii–xviii.

<sup>311</sup> See, e.g., *Tantrāloka* 29.186c–220; *Tantrālokaviveka* introducing 29.201c–202b: *samāveśaḥ sarvaśāstreṣv avigānenoktaḥ*; SANDERSON 1985, pp. 200–202; 1986, p. 169 and fn. 2; and WALLIS 2008. The centrality of possession in the Śākta 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 (*āveśaḥ*) by the qualities of the deity, analogous to the state of one who is possessed by a Bhūta (*bhūtāviṣṭapurūṣavat* [*Nareśvaraparikṣāprakāśa* on 1.61]); see, e.g., *Paṅṣkarabhāṣya*, p. 232: *svayam āviśyate siddhaḥ puruṣas tu grahair iva | itthaṃ caiva tu kāpālās tat sāmyaṃ muktim ūcire*; and *Śaivaparibhāṣā*, p. 156, ll. 22–24: *kāpālikāḥ samāveśena sāmyaṃ upagacchanti | tathā hi yathā grahāḥ puruṣam āviśanti tathēśvaraguṇā mukteṣv āviśanti*. They are distinguished in this context from the two other Atimārgic traditions, those of the Pāñcārthika Pāśūpatas, who defined liberation as the transference of the state of equality with Śiva in the manner in which one lamp is lit from another (*sāmasyaṃkrāntivādaḥ*), and the Lākulas, who defined it as the arising of this state (*sāmvyotpattivādaḥ*); 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 *Yoginīsaṃcāra* of the Vidyāpīṭha, 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): *duścaram devagandharvais tvayā cīrṇaṃ mahāvratam || 115 varam varepsitam vatsa udyataṃ tu bravīhi me | yadi tuṣṭo 'si bhagavan praviśa mama vighraṃ || 116 vaktram prasārayasveti praviśya bhagavān prabhuḥ | hrdaye bhairavo devo guhyakā tu gale sthitāḥ || 117 mātaro hy aṅga-m-aṅgeṣu yoginyo sandhiṣu sthitāḥ | sākinyo romakūpeṣu pūtanādyā tathāiva ca* [Bhairava says:] You have [now] completed the observance of the [Kāpālika] Mahāvratā, which is hard [even] for the gods and Gandharvas. Choose whatever boon you desire. Tell me without hesitation [what it is]. [The Sādhaka 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 Yoginīs his joints, and the Śākinīs, Pūtanās, and others the pores of his skin'; cf. f. 335r1–2 (87.126c–128b): *bhairavasya mahāmudrā mudrāsānidhyakārikā || 127 prayuktā tu yadā mudrā lakṣaṇena varānane | bhāvātmakavidhānena sadyo*

him cast a flower on to the Maṇḍala 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 Maṇḍala. 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*).<sup>312</sup> The immediate effects of the possession are described as follows:<sup>313</sup>

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.

---

*mantra vijṛmbhati* || 128 *karoti sādhakāveśaṃ 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 *Yoginīsaṃcāra* requires anyone who has gone through its initiation ceremony and then received consecration (*abhiṣekah*) to adopt one of three forms of ascetic observance in order to gain mastery over the Vidyā (*vidyāvratam*): the Bhairavavrata, the Cāmuṇḍāvrata, or the Triṣaṣṭikulavrata, 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: *dvitīyaṃ tu vratam vakṣye ghoram kāpālarūpiṇam* || 8.41 *sire kapālamukuṭam śiramālāvibhūṣitam | kare karṇau tathā pādaū asthikhaṇḍair vibhūṣitam* || 8.42 *vāme kapālam khaṭvāṅgam tathā vai dakṣiṇe kare | śmaśāne vicaren maunī triṣaṣṭi divasāni tu* | 8.43 *vratānte tu varārohe śarīre mātaro dhruvam | viśante devadeveśi 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’.

<sup>312</sup> *Sarvatathāgatattvasaṃgraha*, sections 224–234.

<sup>313</sup> *Sarvatathāgatattvasaṃgraha*, section 226: *āviṣṭamātrasya divyaṃ jñānam utpadyate | tena jñānena paracittāny avabudhyati sarvakāryāṇi cātītānāgata-vartamānāni jānāti hṛdayaṃ cāsyā dṛḍhībhavati sarvatathāgataśāsane sarva-duḥkhāni cāsyā pranaśyanti sarvabhayavigataś ca bhavaty avadhyāḥ sarvasattveṣu sarvatathāgatāś cādhitīṣṭhanti sarvasiddhayaś cāsyābhimukhībhavanti apūrvāni cāsyākāraṇaḥsararatipṛitīkarāṇi sukhāny utpadyante | taiḥ sukhaiḥ keśāṃ cit samādhayo niṣpadyante keśāṃ cid dhāraṇyaḥ keśāṃ cit sarvāsā-piripūrayo yavat keśāṃ cit sarvatathāgatattvam api niṣpadyata iti.*

and, after the bindfold has been removed:<sup>314</sup>

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 *Sarvavajrodāya*, 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.<sup>315</sup>

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 OM SARVAPĀPADAHANAVAJRĀYA 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.<sup>316</sup>

<sup>314</sup> *Sarvatathāgatattattvasaṃgraha*, section 231: *mahāmaṇḍale ca dr̥ṣṭamātre sarvatathāgatair adhiṣṭhyate vajrasattvaś cāsyā hṛdaye tiṣṭhati | nānādyāni ca raśmi-maṇḍaladarśanādīni prātihāryavikurvītāni paśyati | sarvatathāgatādhiṣṭhitatvāt kadā cid bhagavān mahāvajradharaḥ svarūpeṇa darśanam dadāti tathāgato veti | tataḥ prabhṛti sarvārthāḥ sarvamanobhirucitakāryāni sarvasiddhīr yāvad vajradharatvam api tathāgatatvam veti.*

<sup>315</sup> *Sarvavajrodāya*, f. 61r4–v1 (exposures 009a and 008b): *atha pāpabahutvād āveśo na bhavati punaḥ pāpasphoṭanamudrayā tasya punaḥ punaḥ pāpāni sphoṭavyāni | samidbhīr madhurair agniṃ prajvālyā susamāhitāḥ | nirdahet sarvapāpāni tilahomena tasya tu || OM SARVAPĀPADAHANAVAJRĀYA SVĀHĀ iti | dakṣiṇa-hastatale kṛṣṇatilaiḥ pāpapatikṛtiṃ kṛtvā hūmkāramadhyam vicintya tarjanya-aṅguṣṭhābhyam homam kuryāt | tato homakuṇḍān nirgatya jvālāmālākulair vajrais tasya śārīre pāpam dahyamānam cintayen niyatam āviśati | evam api yasyāveśo na bhavati tasyābhīṣekam na kuryād iti.*

<sup>316</sup> Cf. *Tantrāloka* 29.29.210–211b: *athavā kasyacin naivam āveśas tad dahed imam | bahīr antaś cokaśaktyā pated ittham sa bhūtale || yasya tv evam api syān na tam atropalavat tyajet* ‘Or, if some rare person does not become possessed by this

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.<sup>317</sup>

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 SATTVA NṚTYA VAJRA (DANCE, O SATTVA; 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].<sup>318</sup>

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: *yāvanmātraṃ vihvalaṃ ca vedhayet pāsapañjaram | pāsastobhāt pataty āśu bhūtale nātra saṃśayaḥ; Jayadrathayāmala, Śaṭka 4, bhairavānanāvīdhau bhūmikāpaṭalaḥ*, f. 191v (v. 105ab): *śaktikṣobhāt tadā yogī viddho pataty bhūtale; Devīdvyardhasatikā* f. 16v: 197 *tatkṣaṇāt patate bhūmau chinnamūla iva drumah; Chummāsamketaparakāśa*, first surviving verse: *[ta]ddr̥k̥pātamahodayāt | bhūmau sampatitaḥ kṣiprāc chinnamūla iva drumah; Ūrmikaulārṇava* f. 9r3: *\*pañcāvasthāgataḥ* (em. : *pañcāvasvagataḥ* Cod.) *sākṣāt sa viddhaḥ patate bhūvi*; f. 19v5–6 (2.230–231): *pracalanti \*mahāpāsā* (corr. : *mahāpāsam* Cod.) *aveśaṃ tasya jāyate | ānando hy udbhavaḥ kampo nidrā ghūrmis tu pañcamī || tattvaviddhasya deveśi pañcāvasthā bhavanti hi | sa viddhaḥ patate bhūmau vajrapātād ivācala<h>*; the Kaula *Vṛddhasvacchanda* ff. 17v24–18r2, Ed. 10.15c–17a (using this MS alone): *jñātvā śrīśaktisaṃkrāmam sadevāsūramānuṣān || \*vedhayen* (em. : *vedayen* Cod. Ed.) *nātra sandehaṃ pātayet parvatāny api || \*saktisaṃkrāmayogena* (Cod. : *cakrāt saṅkrāmayogena* Ed.) *\*chinnamūla* (Ed. : *chinnamūlam* Cod.) *iva drumah || patanti dehinaḥ sarve*; 10.25ab, Ed. 10.25ab: *sa viddhaḥ patate bhūmau \*vajrāghātād ivācalaḥ* (em. : *vajrāghātam ivācalam* Cod. Ed.).

<sup>317</sup> *Sarvavajrodaya*, f. 61v2–3: *tataḥ samāviṣṭam jñātvācāryeṇa* HE VAJRASATTVA HE VAJRARATNA HE VAJRADHARMA HE VAJRAKARMA *iti vajrasattvasamayamudrām baddhvocāraṇīyam | punar NṚTYA SATTVA NṚTYA VAJRA iti | sa ced āviṣṭaḥ śrīvajrasattvamudrām badhniyāt | tadācāryeṇa \*vajramuṣṭimudropadarśanīyā (nīyā corr. : nīyāḥ* Cod.) *| evaṃ sarve śrīvajrasattvādayaḥ \*sānnidhyaṃ* (corr. : *sānnidhyaṅ* Cod.) *kalpayanti | tato 'bhipretavastu pṛched anena | jihvāyām \*tasyāviṣṭasya* (em. : *tasyāviṣṭasyāviṣṭasya* Cod.) *vajraṃ vicintya brūhi vajra iti vaktavyam | tataḥ sarvaṃ vadati.*

<sup>318</sup> The inducing of possession in persons so that they may be used as oracles, is not restricted in Tantric Buddhism to the context of initiation. It is also seen as an independent procedure in which the medium is a young boy or girl. We find it in the Tantra *Subāhupariṣṭhā* in a section partly translated and partly paraphrased from the Chinese by STRICKMANN (1996, pp. 222–226), a work that was translated

into Chinese (T. 895) by Śubhākarasiṃha 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. Gandhamādana 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 unguents, 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 *Hōbōgirin*, p. 7.

Here too the model is Śaiva, as the preamble and content of this text suggest. Putting children into a possession-state is already present in the earliest literature of the Śaiva Mantramārga, where we find the use of Kṣatriya and brahmin boys for this purpose; see *Niśvāsātattvasaṃhitā* f. 82v1–2 (*Niśvāsaguḥya* 10.116–117b): *athāveśaṃ kartukā[mah] + + kṣatrumārahakam | snāpayitvā tam ekam tu śuddhadehaḥ savāsakam || pūrvāmukhaṃ sthāpayitvā hy udakenāveśayet;* f. 112v6 (*Niśvāsaguḥya* 17.30): *athāveśaṃ kartukāmo brāhmaṇakumāra[kam + u]dakena snāpya tenaiva tāḍyamānam āveśayed vācayā mokṣaḥ*. The ritual also appears in narrative literature. The *Kathāsaritsāgara* (70.55–63) tells a story of an ash-smeared ascetic, a pupil of Śuddhakīrti, who has mastered many Mantras and claims to have done this with a Kṣatriya boy (56cd: *śubhalakṣaṇam āsādyā kaṃcīt kṣatrumārahakam*), who in his trance revealed the whereabouts of many miraculous herbs and elixirs (57: *sa kumāraḥ samāviṣṭaḥ prṣṭo nānāvidhāni me | siddhausadhīrasakṣetrāṇy udīryedam 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 Vīras, 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 *Sarvatathāgatasamgraha* to the context of initiation. The term *āveśaḥ* is used repeatedly in the text to denote the state that

ing oracular] possession in one who is healthy (*svasthaḥ*) [in body and mind] (70.56ab: *so 'haṃ kadāpy akaravaṃ svasthāveśaṃ prasaṅgataḥ*), and it appears under this name frequently in the Vidyāpīṭha, where in accordance with that literature's Śākta character the medium is, as in the *Su ji li yan mo xi shou luo dian shuo jia lu lu a wei she fa*, a young girl. We see this in *Jayadrathayāmala*, *Ṣaṭka* 2, f. 19r9–v3 (6.54c–59): *kanyāṃ sulakṣaṇopetāṃ dhūtāvāsāṃ manoharāṃ* || 55 *svalaṃkṛtāṃ ataḥ kṛtvā rātrāv eva mahēśvari | dattvā dhūpaṃ tato vidyām āvart'ye<t> sādhaśvaraḥ* || 56 *tāvad āvartayed ghorāṃ yāvad āveśaṃ āpnuyāt | divyabhaumāntariḥ\*ādyam* (conj. : *ādyā* Cod.) *āveśaṃ kurute kṣaṇāt* || 57 *hastārdaṃ ca kṣitīm tyaktvā tiṣṭhate vikṛtānāṃ | tadā mahālipiśītais tarpayet suravandite* || 58 *prahvaś ca praṇato bhūtvā pṛcchet sādhaśattamaḥ | sadāśivādikṣityante yāvan manasi rocate* || 59 *tat sarvaṃ kathayed devi yad anyam vā hṛdi sthitam | evaṃ pṛṣṭvā visarjeta praṇamya paramēśvari* 'Then, at night, O Mahēśvari, the lord among Sādhaśas 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. With 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 Sadāśiva down to Earth, and other matters that are concealed in his heart. When he has interrogated her in this way, O Paramēśvari, he should prostrate himself in veneration and allow her to leave'; and *Jayadrathayāmala*, *Ṣaṭka* 3, f. 99v2–6 (14.70–76): *atha sādhayituṃ vāñche<t> svasthāveśanam uttamam | tadā kanyāṃ samānīya sarvalakṣaṇalakṣitāṃ* || 71 *āsane tām pratiṣṭhāpya sugupte varamandire | raktakṛṣṇāmbaraḥarāṃ raktasrakkaṇṭhaśobhitāṃ* || 72 *śubhāsanasthāṃ tām kuryāt palāliparipūrītāṃ | avyucchinnāṃ dahed dhūpaṃ vidyām āvartayet tataḥ* || 73 *tadā sā kampate kanyā ghūrṇate hasate punaḥ | ghaṇṭāṃ pravādayet tatra mahāmantra\*vidhau* (conj. : *vikai* Cod.) *sthitāḥ* || 74 *tata āviśate tūrṇaṃ devadevī kṛśodarī | tyaktvā bhūmim tiṣṭhate sā tadā \*sā* (corr. : *sā* Cod.) *praṇataḥ pumān* || 75 *tarpayet paramēśānīm nānābalyopahārataḥ | tadā sādhaśakamukhyāya vadate \*manasepsitam* (corr. : *manasīpsitam* Cod.) || 76 *bhūtaṃ bhavyaṃ bhaviṣyaṃ ca kālatrayam athākhilam | brahmāṇḍodaragā vārtā<ḥ> sādhaśakāya vadaty asau* 'If he desires to accomplish the supreme rite of *svasthāveśaḥ* 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 Sādhaśaka 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 Sādhaśaka 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'.



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.<sup>319</sup>

...

When he has given rise to *āveśaḥ* in this way whatever form he meditates on as his own will automatically become Buddha in form.<sup>320</sup>

...

When *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.<sup>321</sup>

...

Once he has generated *vajrāveśaḥ*, if with concentrated mind he makes a slight clap with his palms in the Vajrāñjali [gesture] he can subject to his control even a mountain.<sup>322</sup>

...

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.<sup>323</sup>

Two other features of this seminal text evidence the influence of Śākta Śaivism. The first is the fact that after teaching the Vajradhātumaṇḍala 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 Vajradhātviśvarī and, around her in the four directions, Akṣobhya by Vajravajriṇī, Ratnasambhava by Ratnavajriṇī, Amitāyus by Dharmavajriṇī, and Amoghasiddhi by Karmavajriṇī.<sup>324</sup> In the preamble Vajrapāṇi makes the following joyous declaration (*udānam*):<sup>325</sup>

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*).

<sup>319</sup> *Sarvatathāgatatattvasaṃgraha*, section 167: *yat sattvāveśayogād dhi kṣipraṃ bodhir avāpyata iti*.

<sup>320</sup> Section 238: *tathaiṅvāveśam utpādya yad rūpaṃ svayam ātmanaḥ | \*bhāvayen (em. : bhāvayan Ed.) bhavate tat tu buddharūpaṃ api svayam*.

<sup>321</sup> Section 238: *vajrāveśe samutpanne vajrabimbamaṇḍalaṃ jalam | bhāvayet kṣiprasiddhas tu jalasyopari caṅkramet*.

<sup>322</sup> Section 247: *vajrāveśaṃ samutpādya tālaṃ dadyāt samāhitaḥ | vajrāñjalitalaiḥ sūkṣmaṃ parvato 'pi vaśaṃ nayet*.

<sup>323</sup> Section 247: *tathaiṅvāveśavidhinā vajrabandhe (conj. : bandha Ed.) prasārite | agrāṅgulisamāsphoṭād dhanet kulaśataṃ kṣaṇāt*.

<sup>324</sup> *Sarvatathāgatatattvasaṃgraha*, sections 319–327.

<sup>325</sup> *Sarvatathāgatatattvasaṃgraha*, section 322: *aho hi bodhicittasya sarvasattva-hitaiṣitā | yad vineyavaśād virāḥ strirūpaṃ 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 Maṇḍalas 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 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 Maṇḍala 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.<sup>326</sup>

---

<sup>326</sup> 1 Section 288: *bodhicittadṛḥhotpādād buddho 'ham iti cintayan | ratyā tu pūja-*

*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 (*nidānavākya*) of any scripture claiming to be Buddhist, is not one of the familiar sites of revelation such as Rājagṛha, Dhānyakaṭaka, or, as in the *Sarvatathāgatattvasaṃgraha*, the Akaniṣṭha heaven, but the vaginas of the goddesses Locanā, Māmakī, Pāṇḍaravāsini, and Tārā, that is to say, a timeless, unlocated bliss.<sup>327</sup>

[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.<sup>328</sup>

---

*yann ātmā labhed buddhasukhāny api*; **2** Sections 549–553: *sarvakāyapariśvaṅgasukhapūjāḥ svayaṃbhuvām | niryāṭayan bhavec chīghraṃ vajrasattvasamo hi saḥ || dṛḍhānurāgasamṃyogakacagrahasukhāni tu | niryāṭayaṃs tu buddhānām vajraratnasamo bhavet || dṛḍhaprītisukhāsakticumbitāgryasukhāni tu | niryāṭayaṃs tu buddhānām vajradharmasamo bhavet || dvayendriyasamāpattiyogasaukhyāni sarvataḥ | niryāṭayaṃs tu pūjāyāṃ vajrakarmasamo bhaved iti*; **3** Section 1825: *viśvarūpasamādhiṃ tu bhāvayan susamāhitaḥ | dvayendriyasamāpattiyā maṇḍale tu sa sidhyati*; **4** Section 2168: *kāmānām avirāgas tu samayaḥ sumahān ayam | tathāgatakule śuddho nātikramyo jinair api*; **5** Section 2175: *rāgac chuddhataro nāsti dharmāḥ sarvasukhapradaḥ | tathāgatakule 'py eṣa dharmāḥ siddhikaraḥ paraḥ*; **6** Section 2506: *surataśramakhinnas tu tat saukhyaṃ suratodbhavam | catuḥpraṇāmapūjāyāṃ niryāṭya laghu sidhyati*; and **7** Section 2651: *antargatena manasā kāmāśuddhiṃ tu bhāvayan | svaretobindubhir buddhān pūjayan siddhim āpnuyāt*. Other passages advocating sexual intercourse in worship are to be found in sections 475–479, 525–529, 929–932, 1184, 1790–1792, 1918–21, 2071–2074, 2158–2159, 2177, 2360–2363, 2415–2416, 2419–2421, 2425, 2439, 2443, 2445, 2504, 2508, 2510, 2512, 2516, 2672, 2720, 2950, and 2951.

<sup>327</sup> *Guhyasamāja*, preamble: *evaṃ mayā śrutam ekasmin samaye | bhagavān sarvatathāgatakāyavākcittahṛdayavajrayoṣidbhageṣu vijahāra*.

<sup>328</sup> 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 btsun mo'i bha ga rnam la* (as in the *Guhyasamāja*), the *Kṛṣṇayamāri* (*sarvatathāgatakāyavākcittasarvavajrayoṣidbhageṣu*), and in those of the Yoginītantras that have a *nidānavākya*: the *Hevajra* and *Samputodbhava* (both as in the *Guhyasamāja*), the *Vajrāmṛta* (f. 1v1: *sarvatathāgatakāyavākcittahṛdayavajrāmṛtaguhyapadmeṣu*), *Vajrārālī* (*rDo rje ā ra li*, f. 171r2–3: *de*

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;<sup>329</sup> and both initiation and subsequent practice now involve copulation with a female partner, as in the Śāktism of the Śaivas.<sup>330</sup> A further borrowing from the Vidyāpīṭha is evident in the introduction of a crucial element of what that tradition calls ‘non-dualistic practice’ (*advaitācāraḥ*) 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.<sup>331</sup>

---

*bzhin gshegs pa thams cad kyi shes rab kyi pha rol tu phyin pa'i bha ga la* [\**sarvatathāgataprajñāpāramitābhage*]), *Caṇḍamahāroṣaṇa* (*sarvatathāgatākāyavākcittahṛdayavajradhātviśvarībhage*), *Abhidhānottara* (f. 1v3: *sarvatathāgatavajrakrodhadākaḍākinīguhyahṛdayeṣu*), *Samvarodaya* (*sarvatathāgatākāyavākcittavajrayoginībhageṣu*), and *Dākārṇava* (f. 1v1: *mahāvīreśvarasarvatathāgatavīrakāyavākcittayoginībhageṣu*).

<sup>329</sup> This is the case in both of the major Maṇḍalas based on this Tantra, that of saffron-coloured Vajrasattva-Maṅjuvajra and that of black Akṣobhya. For the full iconography of these pantheons see *Niṣpannayogāvalī* A, pp. 1–7; B, pp. 1–12. The principal difference between them is that in the Akṣobhyamaṇḍala only Akṣobhya, the central deity (*cakreśvaraḥ*) and the ten wrathful Kroddharājas that form the outer protective circle are represented embracing consorts (*sasvābhaprajñāḥ*), 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 Maṇḍalas are three-faced and six-armed and all except the Kroddharājas, who stand in the aggressive Pratyālīḍha posture, are seated in the Vajraparyāṅka 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.

<sup>330</sup> 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 *vidyāvratam*; see 16.93: *ṣoḍaśābdikāṃ gr̥hya sarvālaṅkārahūṣitām | cāruvaktrāṃ viśālākṣiṃ prāpya vidyāvratam caret* ‘After obtaining a girl of sixteen with a charming face and wide eyes, adorned with every adornment, he should practice the Vidyāvratā [with her]’. The supplementary 18th chapter, however, the *Samājottara*, gives an account of the initiation involving copulation in its vv. 113–127.

<sup>331</sup> See, e.g., *Guhyasamāja* 4.21: *viṇmūtrasukraraktādīn devatānāṃ nivedayet | evaṃ tuṣyanti sambuddhā bodhisattvā mahāsayāḥ* ‘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 *Vajrahṛdayālaṅkāra*, Paṭala 3 [rDo rje snying po rgyan gyi rgyud f. 39v3–4]: *bshang gci khu ba khrag rnamṣ ni | dung chen po ru bzhag byas te | lha rnamṣ la ni dbul bar bya* ‘He should place faeces, urine, semen, and blood in a human skull [*mahāśaṅkhe*] and offer them to the deities’); 6.21: *viṇmūtrāhāraḥkrtyārtham kuryāt siddhiphalārthinaḥ | sidhyate ’nuttaram tattvaṃ 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: *samayāt kṣared retaṃ tu vidhinā pibet phalakāṅkṣiṇaḥ* ‘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: *pañcāmṛta-prayogena vajrasattvatvam āpnuyāt* 'By the use of the Five Nectars he will attain Vajrasattva-hood'; 16.7ab: *avaśyam eva dātavyam viṇmūtrādyam viśeṣataḥ* 'One must especially offer [to the Maṇḍala] such substances as faeces and urine'; 17.47: *viṇmūtraśukrarakṭānām jugupsām naiva kārayet | bhakṣayed vidhinā nityam idaṃ guhyam trivajrajam* 'He must not feel disgust at faeces, urine, semen, and blood. He must regularly consume [them] according to the rite. [For] this is secret of the three Vajras [of body, speech, and mind]'; 18.67c–68b: *siṃhavad vicaren mantrī nirviśaṅkena cetasā | nākāryam vidyate hy atra nābhakṣyam vidyate tathā* 'He should wander [fearlessly] like a lion, with a mind free of inhibition. For him there is nothing that he may not do, nothing that he may not eat'. On *advaitācārāḥ/niḥśaṅkācārāḥ* and the use of such substances, the Five Nectars (*pañcāmṛtam*), in the rites of the Śākta Śaivas see SANDERSON 2005c, pp. 110–113, fn. 63; and, e.g., Vimalaprabodha, *Kālikulakramārcana*, f. 65r3–v4: *atha nityanaimittikakāmyārcane kuladravyaganam likhyate | palāṇḍum laśunam gr̥ñjam lambuṣam lavatarkasam | vāmāpuspaṃ puṣpabandham aṣṭau dravyāṇi kaulike || śivāmbu surā raktamadyam mahātailam ca śīdhukam | kuṇḍagolodbhavam śukram peyāny aṣṭau kulāgame || matsyam māmsam mahāgottham sthalaajākāsanīrajam | mahāmāmsam mṛgam caiva bhakṣyāṇy aṣṭau kulakrame || mātaṅgī kajjalī śauṇḍī kaṇḍukī carmiṇī dhvajā | chippi veśyā susambaddhā grāhyaitāḥ kālikākule || niḥśaṅkācāramārgena pūjanaṃ ca bhaved yadi | tadāsau sidhyate \*devī (em. devī Cod.) tair \*bhuktvā bhāvitā yadi (conj. : bhuktaṃ bhāvitaṃ yadi Cod.) || tatpānasparśanāhārāt pāśacchedakarī smṛtā | \*gopitaṃ (conj. : gopitais Cod.) tan mayā pūrvam advaitācārasobhanam*. Cf. in the Mantranaya, e.g., the *Sarvadevasamāgamatantra* (lost in Sanskrit, apart from citations, and not translated into Tibetan) quoted in the *Tattvasiddhi* of Śāntarakṣita, A f. 96v3–6, B f. 39v11–13 (Tib. f. 30r5–7): *\*nirvikalpena bhāvena (em. [Tib. rnam par mi rtog sems kyis ni] : nirviśaṅkena bhāvena AB) sarvakarmāṇi sarvadā | \*ācaren (conj. : ācāran B : ācāra A [Tib. spyod pa]) nirviśaṅkena tapasām \*uttamottamam (em. [Tib. mchog gi mchog] : uttamamstapaḥ B : uttamātapa A) || \*viśayān sevamānasya (em. [Tib. yul rnam \*bsten (corr. : bston Cod.) par gyur pa na] : viśayāṅgavimānasya AB) nirvikalpena cetasā | \*kutsādhikaṃ na vā cet tat (tentative conj. [cf. Tib. smod par gyur pas mi gnod pa] : kutsādhikaṃ na vā cetas B : kutsādhikanāceta A) tat tapo \*duratikramam (corr. : duratikramaḥ AB) || yas tu sarvāṇi karmāṇi \*prajñāyā (em. [Tib. shes rab kyis] : prajñāyā B : prajñāyāyā A) viniyojayet | \*sā ca śūnyapade yojyā (em. [Tib. de yang stong pa'i gnas su sbyar] : sarvāḥ śūnyapade yojya B : sarvasūnyapade yojya A) \*tapo (em. [Tib. dka' thub] : tathā AB) hy eṣa mahātmanām || \*prajñāsamkrāntirūpeṇa (B [Tib. shes rab 'pho ba ngos pos ni] : prajñāsamkrāntirūpana A) nirvikalpena cetasā | \*niḥśaṅkācārasamcāras (em. [Tib. dgos pa med par kun spyod] : niḥśaṅkācārasaṅcāraḥ AB) \*tapas teṣām (B [Tib. de'i dka' thub yin] : tapatapateṣām A) mahātmanām*. A version of this passage is contained in the *Vajradāka*, f. 3v2–4 (1.57c–62b): *sopāya<ṃ> sarvakarmāṇi nirviśaṅkaś cared yadā || 1.58 nirvikalpena bhāvena vratānām uttamotta\*mam (em. : maḥ Cod.) | nirvikalpena bhāvena sarvakarmāṇi sarvadā || 1.59 ācare<n> nirviśaṅkena tat teṣām \*uttamaṃ tapaḥ (conj. : uttamāttataḥ Cod.) | viśayān \*sevamānasya (em. : sevamānayo Cod.) nirviśaṅkena cetasā || 1.60 \*keṣoṇḍukānubhāvena (em. : keṣoṇḍukasvabhāvena Cod.) tat \*tapo (em. : tayo Cod.) duratikra\*mam (corr. : maḥ Cod.) | yas tu sarvāṇi karmāṇi prajñāyā viniyojayet || 1.61 sā ca śūnyapade yojyā tapo hy etat mahātmanām || prajñā\*samkrāntarūpānām (conj. : samkāśarūpāṇi Cod.) nirvikalpena cetasā || 1.62 niḥśaṅkācāra\*samcāras (corr. : samcāraḥ Cod.) tapas teṣām \*mahātmanām (corr.*

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 *Guhyasiddhi* of Padmavajra, written in all probability in the eighth century,<sup>332</sup> 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 *Niśvāsa*—give them Maṇḍala initiation [following this scripture], and then return to them the *dakṣiṇā* that they will give him, taking a girl from them in its place:<sup>333</sup>

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

: *mahātmanah* Cod.).

<sup>332</sup> Portions of the *Guhyasiddhi* have been quoted in the *Caryāmelāpakapradīpa* of Āryadeva: *Caryāmelāpakapradīpa*, pp. 71–72 (*imam evārthaṃ dyotayann āha śrīguhyasiddhau:*) = *Guhyasiddhi* 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.

<sup>333</sup> *Guhyasiddhi* 8.8c–16b: *paryateḍ anyadeṣeṣu* (conj. [cf. 8.2cd: *paviṣya cānyadeṣeṣu*]: *divyadeṣeṣu* Ed. [Tib. *bzang po’i yul du ’khyam par bya*]) *yatra na jñāyate kvacit* || 9 *paviṣya \*cāntyajātīnām madhye* (em. [Tib. *mthar skyes nang du ’jug par bya*]: *cāntyajādīnām madhye* Ed.) *ye tripurāntake | bhaktā jānanti naivānyam daivatam paramārthataḥ* || 10 *\*siddhāntabhāvitā nityam* (em. [Tib. *rtag tu rang gi grub mtha’ bsgom (\*svasiddhāntabhāvakā nityam)*]: *siddhyante bhāvitā nityam* Ed.) *snānadevārcane ratāḥ | kiṃcidakṣaramārgeṇa \*prasaktāḥ* (conj.: *prasakte* Ed.) *śāstradarśane* || 11 *evam paviṣya tanmadhye sādhamo drḍhaniścayaḥ | caṇḍālagāṇarūpeṇa bhāvayan bodhim uttamām* || 12 *\*darśayec ca tatas teṣām dharmam siddhāntapūrvakam* (em. [cf. Tib. *chos dang grub mtha’ sngon ’gro ba | de nas de la ston par byed*]: *darśayec ca tatas teṣām dharmasiddhāntapūrvakam* Ed.) | *kālottarādi\*samsiddham* (em.: *samsuddham* Ed.) *no cen niśvāsasambhavam* || 13 *pātyitum ca viśvāse sarvāms tams tantracoditān | kṛtvā caivātmanah śiṣyān dīkṣamaṇḍalapūrvakam* || 14 *tato yat saṃcitam dravyam tair dattam gurupūjane | tat teṣām arpayitvā tu pūrvam vitena saṃyutam* || 15 *grhītvā kanyakām teṣām cāruvaktrām sulocanām | tām kṛtvā mantrasadbhāvabhijñām samayasammatām* || 16 *cared vidyāvratam dhīmān buddhatvakṛtaniścayaḥ*. I have emended *antyajādīnām* to *antyajātīnām* with the support of the Tibetan because the *-ādi-* is inapposite: in 8.7 the Sādhaka is told to enter the home of an untouchable (*antyajālayaḥ*); and in 8.1 he is told that it is an untouchable girl (*antyajā*) that he is to acquire. I take *dharmam siddhāntapūrvakam* 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 (*caṇḍālagāṇaḥ*), 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*;<sup>334</sup> 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.<sup>335</sup>

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 Sarvabuddhasamāyogaḍākinījālaśaṃvara: Heruka and his Yoginīs, Kāpālīka iconography, the Gaṇamaṇḍala, and the beginning of Śaiva-Buddhist intertextuality*

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

<sup>334</sup> Literally “that which has arisen from the outbreath (*niḥśvāsaḥ/niśvāsaḥ*) [of Śiva]”. Both forms of the name of this scripture, *Niśvāsa* and *Niḥśvāsa*, are attested.

<sup>335</sup> Padmavajra is elaborating on *Guhyasamāja* 16.93: *ṣoḍaśābdikāṃ gr̥hya sarvālaṅkārahūṣitām | cāruvaktrāṃ viśālākṣīṃ 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’.

<sup>336</sup> 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-chō-gyō yuga jūhatte shūki* (T. 869) *Key Points of the Eighteen Assemblies of the Yoga of the Vajrasekharasūtra*; 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.

<sup>337</sup> It is referred to by Āryadeva as a Mahāyogatantra in his *Caryāmelāpakapradīpa*, p. 82: *adhunā prapañcatācaryā śrīsarvabuddhasamāgamayogaḍākinījālaśaṃvara-mahāyogatantrād avatāryate*. This term serves to distinguish it from the Yogatantras, namely the *Sarvatathāgatattvasaṃgraha* 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. Dīpaṅkaraśrījñāna defines this class (*rnal 'byor chen po'i rgyud*) as comprising the *Guhyasamāja* and its explanatory Tantras (*vyākhyātāntrāṇi*), which he lists as the *Guhyendutilaka*, the *Kṛṣṇayamāri*, the *Paramādyā*, the *Sarvadevasamāgama*, the *Sarvarahasya*, the *Vinayāmogha[siddhi]*, the *Vajrajñānasamuccaya*, the *Vairocanamāyājāla*, the *Laghukhasama*, the *Advaya[samatā]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 par 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 'dul ba don yod 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 sogs pa rgyud sde stong phrag bcu gnyis te rgyas par byas na grangs pa med do.*) An alternative terminology distinguishes these more esoteric Yogatantras as Yogottaratatantras, perhaps originally in the meaning 'Supplementary Tantras (*uttaratantrāṇi*) of the Yoga [class]', and refers to the Yoginītantras as Yoganiruttaratatantras, giving the ascending series Kriyātantra, Caryātantra, Yogatantra, Yogottaratatantra, and Yoginiruttaratatantra; see, e.g., Rāmapāla, *Sekanirdeśapañjikā*, introducing verse 1, describing his teacher Maitreyanātha (Advayavajra) as an unsurpassed master of all of these: *iha mahāpaṇḍitāvadhūtaśrīmaitreyanāthaḥ kriyācaryāyogayogottarayoganiruttaratantresu anuttaraguruḥ*; Ratnākaraśānti, *Muktāvalī*, p. 223, on *Hevajra* 2.8.10: *sarvam iti pañcavidham: kriyācaryāyoga\*yogottarayoganiruttarabhedena* (yogottara corr. [=Cod., f. 45v6] : *yogāntara* Ed.); Kāṇha, *Yogaratanmālā*, p. 156 (on *Hevajra* 2.8.10): *sarvamantranayam iti pañcavidham kriyācaryāyogayogottarayoganiruttarabhedena*; Advayavajra, *Gūḍhapadā*, f. 6r6–7: *vajram pañcajñānātmakam | iha pañcajñānaśabdena kriyācaryāyogayogottarayoga\*niruttarāṇi* (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 Buddhajñānapāda according to Gzhon nu dpal (*Blue Annals*, p. 367), says that he writes his *Nāmamantrārthāvalokinī* after studying the Pāramitānaya and the Kriyā-, Caryā-, and Yogatantras (A f. 1v1–2: *yogacaryākriyātantram tathā pāramitānayaṃ . . . vilokya*), but the last evidently includes texts such as the *Guhyasamāja*, *Vajrabhairava*, and *Sarvabuddhasamāyoga*, since he quotes these and other related works. \*Buddhaguhyā (*rNam par snang mdzad chen po mngon 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 *Vidyādharaṇī*, and Yogatantras, which emphasize internal meditation (*nang gi sbyor, adhyātmayogaḥ*), giving the example of the *Sarvatathāgatattvasaṃgraha*, and says that the *Mahāvairocanābhisaṃbodhi*, later classified as a Caryātantra, is a Yogatantra in as much as it emphasizes the practice 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 *Piṇḍārtha* commentary on the *Mahāvairocanābhisaṃbodhi* he gives the *Vajrapānyabhīṣeka* among examples of Kriyātantras (see the translation in HODGE 2003, p. 449). This too was later



use of that tradition's system of the four types of Mudrā (Mahāmudrā, Samayamudrā, Dharmamudrā, and Karmamudrā) in Sādhana texts based on this Tantra, such as the *Vajrajvālodayā* of Ānandagarbha and the *Herukasādhana* of Kalyāṇagarbha.<sup>338</sup> 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.<sup>339</sup>

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 Mantramārga into *kriyā*, *caryā*, *yogaḥ*, and *jñānam* or *vidyā*, perhaps with the notion that the fourth corresponds to the Pāramitānaya.

<sup>338</sup> As far as I am aware, only one other Sādhana text of this Heruka has survived in Sanskrit. This is the anonymous *Herukasādhana* of *Sāadhanamālā* 241. Ānandagarbha'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 *Samputodbhava*, which in f. 80v5–81v2, in its eighth Kalpa, the *Sarvakriyāsamudayakalparāja*, 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 Vajravārāhī, 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 Maṇḍala was not included by Abhayākara Gupta in his *Vajrāvalī* and *Niṣpannayogāvalī* in the first quarter of the eleventh century. For the position that the four Mudrās are the distinctive fundamentals of the Sādhana system of the Yogatantras see, e.g., Mkhas Grub rje's *rGyud spyi*, pp. 228–248.

<sup>339</sup> 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 rdor 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 *Catuṣpīṭha*, the *Mahāmudrātilaka*, 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 *Dākinīvajrapaṅjara*, 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*, *Guhyakośa*, *Vajrāmṛta*, 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 bdud rtsi 'byung 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 Dīpaṅkaraśrījñāna'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 *Yoganiruttaratāntras* (*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<sup>340</sup> 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 Ānandarāghava 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 HRĪḤ. The central face is fierce (*rau-*

---

*dang sangs rgyas thod pa dang dgyes pa'i rdo rje bum phrag lnga pa la sogs pa rgyud sde stong phrag bcu gnyis bzhugs te rgyas par bya ba na grangs med do* 'The Yoganiruttaratantra, endless in its full extent, contains 12,000 [texts], principally the *Mahākhasama* in 100,000 [verses], the *Cakrasaṃvara*, the *Vajradāka*, the *Vajracatuṣpīṭha*, the *Mahāmāyā*, the [*Sarva*]buddhasamāyoga, the *Buddhakapāla*, and the *Hevajra* in 500,000 verses'. On the term Yoganiruttara see here p. 146.

<sup>340</sup> 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 'uncaused' (*hetuvarjitam*), '-ru-' means 'formless' (*rūpanirmuktam*), and '-ka' means 'free of sense-faculties' (*karanojjhitam*); see Vajrapāṇi, *Laghutantraṭīkā*, p. 45; Bhavabhaṭṭa, *Cakrasaṃvarapañjikā*, 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 HE HE RU RU KAṂ that are found in Cakrasaṃvara's Mūlamantra: OM ŚRĪVAJRA HE HE RU RU KAṂ HŪṂ HŪṂ PHAṬ ḌĀKINĪJĀLAŚAṂVARAM SVĀHĀ. Against this it may be said that the name appears without this doubling of the first two syllables in the earlier *Sarvatathāgatātattvasaṃgraha*, section 794, in the Mantra for the taming of all the Mother goddesses: OM HERUKA VAJRASAMAYA SARVADUṢṬASAMAYAMUDRĀPRABHAṆJAKA HŪṂ PHAṬ. It might seem more reasonable, then, to see HE HE RU RU KAṂ 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 Parāpārā, an important Mantra of the Śākta Śaiva Vidyāpīṭha: OM AGHORE HRĪḤ PARAMAGHORE HŪṂ GHORARŪPE HAḤ GHORAMUKHI BHĪMA BHĪṢAṆE VAMA PIBA HE RU RU RA RA PHAṬ HŪṂ HAḤ PHAṬ (*Siddhayogeśvarimata* 3.23–39; *Mālinīvijayottara* 3.42–50; *Tantrāloka* 30.20–24b; *Triśirobhairava* quoted by Jayaratha thereon) and its variant taught in *Kubjikāmata* 18.4–24: AIṂ AGHORE HRĪṂ HSAḤ PARAMAGHORE HŪṂ GHORARŪPE HSAUṂ GHORAMUKHI BHĪMA BHĪṢAṆE VAMA VAMA PIBA HAḤ HE RU RU RA RA HRĪṂ 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 HE VAJRA PAŚYA 'O Vajra[-being], behold!' that is uttered when the blindfold is removed from the candidate's eyes in the presence of the Maṇḍala (*Sarvatathāgatātattvasaṃgraha*, 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: OM ĀRALI RIGI PHEṂ PHEṂ PHEṂ BHYO SVĀHĀ (*Ri gi ā ra li'i rgyud* f. 187v2) and OM VAJRA ĀRALI PHAṬ . . . PHEṂ PHEṂ SVĀHĀ (*Ri gi ā ra li'i rgyud* f. 187v7). The name of the Heruka Buddhakapāla of the Tantra of that name has likewise been conjured out of the feminine vocative BUDDHAKAPĀLINI/-KĀPĀLINI that appears in its Mantras; see (*Niṣpannayogāvalī*, p. 31: OM BUDDHAKAPĀLINI ĀḤ HĪ HAI HŪṂ PHAṬ; *Buddhakapālatantra*, e.g., f. 5r1: OM BUDDHAKĀPĀLINĪ MAṬA 2 ĀḤ PHAṬ SVĀHĀ *puṣpanivedanamantṛaḥ*).

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 Kāpālika'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 chaplet of skulls with the Buddha [Akṣobhya] 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.<sup>341</sup> Kalyāṅagarbha, 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.<sup>342</sup> An anonymous Sādhana text,

<sup>341</sup> *Vajrajvālodayā*, f. 172v1–2: *bhagavato mahāmudrāṃ baddhvā purata ākāśadeśe* HRĪ<H>kāreṇa viśvapaḍmaṃ niṣpādyā tasyopari pañcasūcikam jvālāvajram HŪM A iti | tato vajrāhaṃkāra<ṃ> bhāvayet JVĀLĀVAJRO 'HAM HŪM iti | tatas tad vajram śrīherukam ātmānaṃ bhāvayet ŚRĪHERUKO 'HAM HŪM iti; f. 173r4–v4: caturmukham aṣṭabhujam | tatra prathamam mukham raudram dakṣiṇa<ṃ> dvitīya<ṃ> mukham pramoḥa\*pramodina<ṃ> (?) pṛṣṭhataṣ ṭṛtīyakam bhakṣaṇa-mukham vāmataṣ caturtham śṛṅgāramukham | etac ca mukha\*catuṣṭayaṃ (conj. ISAACSON : catuṣṭaya Cod.) gītyā nirdiṣṭam iti | dvābhyāṃ bhujābhyāṃ vāyupaṭadhāraṇayogena sārdrabhairavacarmadharam dvābhyāṃ dhanurbāṇadharam dakṣiṇaṭṛtīyena trisūcikajvālāvajrollālanatatarparam caturthena mahāraktapari-pūrṇakapāladharam vāmatṛtīye ghaṇṭāsahitavajrakhaṭvāṅgadharam caturthena mahāmāṃsapari-pūrṇakapāla\*dharam (corr. : dharaḥ Cod.) | divihujam ekamukham <vā> vāmaskandhe yajñopavitayogena ghaṇṭāvajrakhaṭvāṅgaśobhitaṃ dakṣiṇakareṇa \*tripatākāyuktena (corr. : tripatāka Cod.) pañcaśūcijvālāvajradharam | vāmakareṇa mahāmāṃsapari-pūrṇakapāladharam | kapālamālā-makuṭābuddhacūḍāmaṇi<ṃ> uccaviśvapaḍmāsanopaviṣṭam vāmapādam bhūmi-stham kṛtvā dakṣiṇapāda<ṃ> sattvaparyāṅkayogena nyasya | tatpādatalaṃ vāmoruṇā saṃpuṭikaraṇayogenāvasthāpya nīlajvālāvajramayaṃ raktajvālābhamaṇḍalaṃ mahāpralayakālograśmaśānāgnisadrśam dīptakeśam raudrādirasa-saṃyogavicitramukhavibhramam | savibhramabhrūbhṛkuṭi<ṃ> pradīptāloka-nartitadrṣṭim iti.

<sup>342</sup> Kalyāṅagarbha, *Herukasādhana*, pp. 470–471: *adhomukhasya śavasyopari viśvapaḍmaṃ tasyopari sūryamaṇḍalaṃ tanmadhye samupaviṣṭam \*ekāsyordhvabhujadvaṣyam (ekāsyo em. : ekasyo Ed.) iti vacanād ardhaparyāṅkinam bhasmoddhūlita<ṃ> raktaprabhāmālinam piṅgalordhvakeśam ... sārdranaramastakamālā-kṛtasragdāmaṃ daṃṣṭrākaraḥlavadaṇam caladvartulākāraraktākṣam savibhramabhrukūṭinam.*

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 Kāpālīka ornaments known as the Mudrās, and that his posture indicates that he is dancing.<sup>343</sup>

He is surrounded in the style of the Vidyāpīṭha by twenty Vajradākinīs:<sup>344</sup> first, in the innermost circuit the eight Gaurī, Caurī, Pramohā, Vetālī, Pukkasī, Caṇḍālī, Ghasmarī, and Herukasamṇiveśā/Herukasamṇibhā; then the four Cāpadhāriṇī, Khaṭvāṅgadhāriṇī, Cakradhāriṇī, and Citrapatākādhāriṇī; then four offering goddesses: Puṣpā, Dhūpā, Ālokā, and Gandhā; and finally four theriocephalic gate-guardians: Turāṅgamā, Vajramukhī, Vajramāmakī, and Bhasmapralayavetālī.<sup>345</sup>

<sup>343</sup> *Sāadhanamālā* no. 241: *tato hrīḥkāraṇiṣpannam nīlakarālavajram hrīḥkāradhi-  
ṣṭhitavarātake dhyātvā tatsarvapariṇatam nīlam naracarmabhṛtam kapālamālā-  
kṣobhyaśiraskam jvaladūrdhvapiṅgalakeśam raktavartulākṣam antrasamgrathita-  
muṇḍamālāvalambitam narāsthiracitābharaṇam dvibhujāikamukham daṃṣṭrā-  
karālavadanam ...viśvapadmasūrye vāmapadam tasyaivorau dakṣiṇacaraṇam  
vinyasya nṛtyam kurvantaṃ herukavīraṃ bhāvayet.* There are numerous two-  
armed Herukas conforming to the iconographical prescriptions of these Sādhana  
in surviving statuary from eastern India, though this connection with the tradition  
of the *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 LINROTHE 1999, pp. 249–260, figs. 175–183, and 185–188,  
and HUNTINGTON 1984, fig. 215. The last lacks the prostrate corpse.

<sup>344</sup> *Vajrajvālodayā*, f. 176r7–v1: *sarvaṃ śrīgauryādivajradākinīgaṇam nirmāya  
prajvalitordhvakeśam | raktajvālābhamaṇḍalam mahāpralayakālograśmasānāgni-  
sadrśam samkrudham ekakapālaikabuddhamakuṭam svacihnadharam yathā-  
sthāne niveśayet.*

<sup>345</sup> The *Sarvabuddhasamāyoga* deploys a complex six-family Maṇḍala consisting of six sub-Maṇḍalas. The six families, each with its own sub-Maṇḍala, are those Vajrasattva, Vairocana, Heruka, Padmanarteśvara, Vajrasūrya, and Paramāśva. Two Maṇḍala traditions deploy this pantheon. In one Vajrasattva occupies the central sub-Maṇḍala and in the other Heruka. In each sub-Maṇḍala one of these six occupies the centre surrounded by twenty goddesses. The last twelve goddesses are the same in each, namely Śuṣirā, Nṛtyā/Viṇā, Vitatā, and Ghanā, followed by Puṣpā, Dhūpā, Ālokā, Gandhā, Turagā, Vajramukhī, Vajramāmakī, and Bhasmapralayavetālī, 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 Cāpadhāriṇī, Khaṭvāṅgadhāriṇī, Cakradhāriṇī, and Citrapatākādhāriṇī are substituted for the first four, the musical offering-goddesses Śuṣirā, Nṛtyā/Viṇā, Vitatā, and Ghanā. The first eight of the twenty, then, stand apart as the retinue specific to each Tathāgata. The eight from Gaurī to Herukasamṇiveśā formed the basis of the retinue of Hevajra in the Yoginītantra *Hevajra*, with the difference that there we see Śabarī rather than Pramohā and Ḍombī rather than Herukasamṇiveśā. See 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 *Sarvabuddhasamāyoga* and the *Paramādyā*.

According to Ānandarābha<sup>346</sup> Gaurī (E) is fair in colour and tranquil-faced.

See also TANAKA 1996, pp. 199–201 for the Tibetan names of all the goddesses (and their Mantras) in the six sub-Maṇḍalas, and the listings of the names and positions of all the deities of the two six-family Maṇḍalas in BSOD NAMS RGYA MTSO 1991, pp. 106–113. In the Heruka-centred Maṇḍala set out there each of the six deities presiding over the sub-Maṇḍalas has a consort: Heruka + Īśvarī, Vairocana + Locanā, Vajrasūrya + Māmakī, Padmanartesvara + Pāṇḍaravāsini, Paramāśva + Tārā, and Vajradhara + Śaṃvarī; and the total of deities is 135, since two extra goddesses, counted as one, Citrapadmā and Citravajrā, are found in front of the central deity in the sub-Maṇḍala of Paramāśva, and there are eight additional deities in the outer enclosure, since there too there are four offering goddesses within its corners and four animal-headed goddesses guarding its gateways. Theriocephalic female gate-guardians are a common feature in the Maṇḍalas of the Yoginītantras; see, e.g., *Samvarodaya* 13.29c–31b; Jayabhadra, *Cakrasamvarapañjikā*, p. 113 on 2.8 (Kākāsyā, Ulūkāsyā, Śvānāsyā, Sūkarāsyā); *Niṣpannayogāvalī*, p. 15 (Hayāsyā, Sūkarāsyā, Śvānāsyā, and Siṃhāsyā in the 17-deity Maṇḍala of Hevajra) and p. 90 (Sūkarāsyā, Gṛdhrāsyā, Jambukāsyā, Garudāsyā, Vyāghrāsyā, Ulūkāsyā in the Maṇḍala of Kālacakra).

<sup>346</sup> *Vajrajvālodaya*, ff. 177r4–178r5: *pūrvadigbhāge gaurī gauravarṇā śāntadr̥ṣṭīḥ saumyamukhā yaugapadyenaiva tiṣṇadhanurbāṇaparikṣepān mahāprasahya-sira<ś>catuṣṭayaṃ pātayantī pratyālīdhasṭhānasthā | dakṣiṇe caurī raktavarṇā raudradr̥ṣṭīmukhā yajñopavītayogena vāmaskandhe khatvāṅgaṃ dhārayantī | kapālamālāmukutā vāmakrodhamuṣṭinā hr̥dy aṅkuśadhāriṇī dakṣiṇakareṇa madhyāṅgulyāṣṭārācakram utkarṣayantī vāmapādena trailokyam laṅghayantī | paścime pramohā ādivarāhamukhā pramohadr̥ṣṭīḥ kṛṣṇā caturbhujā madya-pūrnakapālavāmakarā dakṣiṇakare vajradhāriṇī punar vāmadakṣiṇabhujābhyāṃ \*parasparābaddhābhyāṃ (corr. : paraṃparābaddhābhyāṃ Cod.) pṛthivy-uddharaṇam kurvanty ālīdhapadāvasthitā | uttare vetālī sitavarṇāṃ harṣamukhīm mṛtakotthāpanadr̥ṣṭīḥ dakṣiṇakareṇa candrakāntābhakapālacaṣakenā-mṛtavāridhārāṃ pātayantīm vāmakareṇa vajrapatākākaradhāriṇīm yatheṣṭapadāvasthitā | tasminn eva mandale pūrva\*koṣṭhe (corr. : koṣṭha Cod.) pukkasi viśvavarṇā nṛtyamukhī nṛtyadr̥ṣṭīḥ dakṣiṇavajramuṣṭinā pañcasūcika-jvālāvajradhāriṇī | vāmakareṇa mārutoddhūtakalpavṛkṣalatādhāriṇī kapālamālādīpari-pūrnasadhūmaśmaśānamadhye nṛtyaprayogena | dakṣiṇe caṇḍālī nīlavarṇā vāta-maṇḍalikārūdhā savibhramamukhī ūrdhvadr̥ṣṭīḥ dakṣiṇamuṣṭinā vajrasūlam ādāya | vāyupaṭadhāraṇena vātamaṇḍalikāpramokṣeṇa sādhyā\*praṇāmādayo patantī (?) | paścime ghasmarī kṛṣṇa\*varṇā (corr. varṇnām Cod.) mṛta-carvaṇamukhī bhakṣaṇadr̥ṣṭīḥ vāmakareṇa vajrajvālāgnikuṇḍadhāriṇī | dakṣiṇe vajramuṣṭinā khaḍgam ādāya pratyālīdhapadāvasthitā | uttare śrīherukarūpa-samñibhā vāmakareṇa \*caṣākapālam (caṣāka conj. : capāśa Cod.) ādāya vāmaskandhe khatvāṅgaṃ dhārayantī | dakṣiṇe tripatākākarareṇa pañcasūcika-jvālāvajram ādāya śrīherukapade dvibhujāikamukhī samsthitā | āgneyakoṣṭhake \*cāpadhāriṇī (em. : copodhāriṇī Cod.) | raktavarṇā vāmakareṇa vajradhanur ādāya dakṣiṇena \*vajracāpasahitena (corr. : vajracāpāsahitena Cod.) dhanu<r>guṇākaraṇayogena \*vajrabānān (corr. : vajrabārṇnān Cod.) kṣipantī | nairṛte khatvāṅgadhāriṇī kapālamālāmukutābuddhacūḍāmaṇi<r> \*dr̥ṣṭitāra (?) bhasmaśubhravarṇā dakṣiṇakareṇa ca pañcasūcika-jvālāvajra<m> pāṇyā kṣipantī | \*vāyavye (em. : vāyave krodhamuṣṭinā tarjanitatparā | vāyavye Cod.) \*cakradhāriṇī (corr. : cakradhāri Cod.) gauraharitarṇā vāmakrodhamuṣṭinā tarjanatatparā \*dakṣiṇakaramadhyamāṅgulyāṣṭārācakram (dakṣiṇa corr. : dakṣiṇe Cod.) utkarṣayantī | aiśāne koṇe citrapatākādhāriṇī | \*kanakopalavarṇā (varṇā*

Eight-armed, she cuts off each of the four heads of Brahmā by simultaneously firing arrows from four bows.<sup>347</sup> Caurī (S) is red and fierce-faced. Wearing a chaplet of skulls she holds a goad-hook (*aṅkuśaḥ*) 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.<sup>348</sup> Vetālī (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. Pukkasī [E] is multi-coloured (*viśvavarṇā*) 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-buffed tendril from the wish-granting tree of paradise (*kalpavṛkṣalatā*). Caṇḍālī (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) is black and eating a corpse. In her left hand she holds a blazing sacrificial fire-vessel (*agnikuṇḍa-*) and with her right grasps a sword. Herukasamṇibhā (N), 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. Cāpadhāriṇī (SE) is red and, holding a Vajra bow with her left hand, fires Vajra arrows by drawing back the bowstring with her right. Khaṭvāṅgadhāriṇī (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

---

conj. : *varṇa* Cod.) *daḥṣiṇakareṇa \*saṃghaṭa(?)vicitravārṇapatākā<ṃ> dhārayanti.*

<sup>347</sup> 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 *mahāprasahya-* is obscure but evidently it denotes Brahmā since the victim is said here to have four heads (*mahāprasahyaśira<ś>catuṣṭayam pātayanti*). Both these inferences are supported by Hūmkāravajra, who is explicit in both regards in his *\*Herukasādhana* (f. 203v2): *zhal bzhi phyag brgyad brjid pa'i stongs | g.yon brkyang gar gyis bzhugs mdzad cing | mda' bzhi dus gcig bkang ba la | tshangs pa'i mgo bzhi spyangs pa ste.*

<sup>348</sup> According to Hūmkāravajra'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 bzhi 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 pa dma la.*

her right. Cakradhāriṇī (NW) is light green and holds aloft an eight-spoked discus on the middle finger of her right hand and threatens [the wicked] with her left fist clenched in anger. Citrapatākādhāriṇī (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 Turaṅgamā, Vajramukhī, Vajramāmakī/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.<sup>349</sup>

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-*

<sup>349</sup> Ānandagarbha's text is corrupt and lacunose at this point in the manuscript, omitting Vajramukhī and Vajramāmakī (f. 178r5–v2): *vāmamuṣṭinā ?ghaṭy?āvasthitā ?try?āmāñjalīnā puṣpadhūpadīpagandhacihnadhāriṇyaḥ aśvagojāsābhūti-samjñitāsattapūjādevī | pūrvadvāramadhye turaṅgāsana vāmahastena padmahastā hayagrīvaharitam aśvamukhaṃ dhārayantī | dakṣiṇe kare sthitena vajrāṅkuṣeṇa sarvakrodhakulam ākarṣayantī | paścime \*dvāra ālokāṃ (corr. : dvāre lokāṃ Cod.) candrasūryamaṇḍala?rū?payuktavajra\*sphoṭanena (conj. : sphoṭanaṃ Cod.) sarvaṃ krodhakulaṃ bandhayantī | uttaradvāre bhasmapralayavetālī \*vāmakareṇa (corr. : nāmākareṇa Cod.) kapālamadhye viśvavajrasthaṃ buddhabimbaṃ dhārayet | dakṣiṇe kare sthitavajraghaṇṭāvādanayogena sarvakrodhakulaṃ vaśīkurvanti \*avasthitā (corr. : avasthitāḥ Cod.) | \*sarvās caitāḥ (corr. : sarvañcetāḥ Cod.) pratyāliḍhasthānasthā<ḥ> sadṛṣṭibhāvarasānvitā<ḥ>. A complete but less detailed description of these eight can be seen in the Tibetan translation of the \**Herukasādhana* of Hūmkāravajra, 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 Turaṅgamā, by Ānandagarbha and Hūmkāravajra (f. 204r5: *shar sgo rta mgrin 'phang mtho dkar | g.yas na rta gdong g.yon lcags kyu*), and Vajramukhī, by Hūmkāravajra, who names this goddess Phag gdong 'Boar-face' (Sūkarāsyā) (f. 204r6: *lhor sgor phag gdong snon 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 MTSO 1991, p. 110). These animal-headed guardians exemplify the character of this Tantra as transitional between the Yogatantras 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 Vajrāveśa, the male gate-guardians of the Vajradhātumaṇḍala of the Yogatantra *Sarvatathāgatattavasamgraha*; see TANAKA 1996, p. 271. For those attributes see the \**Herukasādhana* of Hūmkāravajra, f. 204r5–7 (I have restored the Mantras, which invoke the goddesses as the personifications of these attributes, to their correct Sanskrit form): Oṃ \*VAJRĀṅKUṢĒ (corr. BA DZRA AṂ KU SHA Cod.) JAḤ | *shar sgo rta mgrin 'phang mtho dkar | g.yas na rta gdong g.yon lcags kyu | Oṃ VAJRAPĀŚĒ HŪM | lhor sgor phag gdong sngon mo ste | g.yas pas mche ba g.yon zhags 'dzin | Oṃ \*VAJRAŚRĀṆKHALE (corr. : BA DZRA SHRĪ KHA LE Cod.) VAṂ | nub sgor snang byed dmar mo ni | phyag gnyis nyi zla lcags sgrog 'dzin | Oṃ \*VAJRAGHAṆṬĒ (corr. : BA DZRA GA ṆṬĒ Cod.) HOḤ | byang sgor thal byed mdog ljang du | sang rgyas gzugs dang dril bu'o.**

*tathāgattattvasaṃgraha*,<sup>350</sup> 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 *gaṇamaṇḍalam*, orgiastic worship in an assembly consisting of a male and a group of female adepts (*yoginīgaṇah*) personifying the deities of the cult, with a jargon of special terms and gestures known as *chommāḥ* to be used in these gatherings.<sup>351</sup> Both these features, collective orgiastic worship of deity-personifying Yoginīs and the use of *chommāḥ*, are distinctive features of the Śākta Śaivism of the Vidyāpīṭha.<sup>352</sup>

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 Anuṣṭubh 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.<sup>353</sup> It is also in the *Sarvakalpasamuccaya*, the supple-

<sup>350</sup> See *Sarvatathāgatattvasaṃgraha*, sections 165–176 and *Niṣpannayogāvalī*, p. 46 (Vajradhūpā, Vajrapuṣpā, Vajrālokā, and Vajragandhā).

<sup>351</sup> The practice and the jargon are outlined by Āryadeva in his *Caryāmelāpakapradīpa* (pp. 82–60: *prapañcatācaryā*) 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 Śaṃvarī, Ahoṣukhā, Pradīpā, Śīṣyā, Buddhābodhi, Dharmacakrā, Trailokyā, and Kāmalatā.

<sup>352</sup> On such worship in Śākta Śaivism see SANDERSON 2007a, pp. 280–288; and *Tantrāloka* 28.6–111, 372c–385b (*yoginīmelakah*, *cakrayāgaḥ*, *mūrtiyāgaḥ*), 29.66, 78–79. On *chommāḥ* in these traditions see SANDERSON 2007a, p. 333 and the sources quoted in footnotes 331–332.

<sup>353</sup> The Tantra begins as follows (*Sangs rgyas thams cad mnyam par sbyor ba*, f. 151r1–2: 1.1 *sems dpa' sangs rgyas kun gyi dngos | rdo rje sems 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 bcos ldan 'das | gcig bu rab tu phye ba'i lha | sangs rgyas thams cad mnyam sbyor ba | mkha' 'gro sgyu ma bde ba'i mchog (\*rahasye parame ramye sarvātmani sadā sthitaḥ | sarvabuddhamayaḥ sattvo vajrasattvaḥ paraṃ sukham || asau svayambhūr bhagavān eka evādhidaivataḥ || sarvabuddhasamāyogaḍākinījālasaṃvaraḥ)*. Cf. the opening verses of the *Laghu-saṃvaratantra*, which are evidently based on it: *athāto rahasyaṃ vaksye samāsān na tu vistarāt | śriherukasamāyogaṃ sarvakāmārthasādhakam || 1.2 uttarād api cottaraṃ ḍākinījālasaṃvaram | rahasye parame ramye sarvātmani sadā sthitaḥ || 1.3 sarvaḍākinīmayaḥ sattvo vajrasattvaḥ paraṃ sukham | asau hi svayambhūr bhagavān viro ḍākinījālasaṃvaram*; and the following citation of the *Sarvabuddhasamāyoga* in the *Caryāmelāpakapradīpa*, p. 82: *athātaḥ sampravakṣyāmi sarvato viśvam uttamam | sarvabuddhasamāyogaṃ ḍākinījālasaṃvaram || rahasye parame ramye sarvātmani sadā sthitaḥ | sarvabuddhamayaḥ śrīmān vajrasattvodayaḥ sukhaḥ*. 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 *Vīṇāśikha* of the *vāmasrotaḥ* division of the Vidyāpīṭha.<sup>354</sup>

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.<sup>355</sup> This

---

*bde mchog bshad*. For the requirement of a preamble see, e.g., the Mahāyānist *Dharmasamgītisūtra* as quoted by Abhayākara Gupta in the introduction to his *Abhayapaddhati* f. 1v: *kālaśeśadeśakapaśatsāmagrī hi deśanāyā nidānam enām vinā deśanānupapatteḥ. tatra evaṃ mayeti mama dharmāḥ samgātavyaḥ . . . ity uktam bhagavatā dharmasamgītisūtre* ‘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 *Dharmasamgītisūtra* . . . : ‘My teachings must be recited with [the opening phrase] “Thus I [. . .]”’; and the unnamed *Sūtra* quoted by Tathāgatarakṣita on *Yoginīsaṃcāra* 1.1: *mayi parinirvṛte bhikṣava evaṃ mayetyādikayā mama dharmāḥ samgātavyaḥ* ‘O monks, after I have been completely extinguished [by death] you should recite my teachings with the words “Thus I . . .”’.

<sup>354</sup> This has been demonstrated in TOMABECHI 2007. The Śaiva passage is *Vīṇāśikha* 52–58. That in the *Sarvakalpasamuccaya* is DK, Rgyud ’bum, vol. *ka*, ff. 194v6–195r5.

<sup>355</sup> *Śamvaratantra* (= *Sarvabuddhasamāyogaḍākinījālaśamvara*) quoted in *Jñānasiddhi* 18.10–18 (pp. 153–154): *sarvaśuddhyadhīmokṣeṇa prasahya balavān adhaḥ | parākramakramaṇāt tu sarvalokān pramadayet || anyam tu duṣṭaraudrogram sattvadhātum anekadhā || pāpāś corair avaskandhaiḥ sarvam eva viśodhayet | cchalena māyayā caiva prasahya balavān adhaḥ || pañcāyudhanibandhaiś ca sarvalokān jāyet tadā | vijitya sakalām siddhiṃ jagat sthāvarajaṅgamam || vicitravinayopāyaiḥ svaparān anupālayet | kāmīnām bhavet kāmo raudrāṇām raudram uttamam || saumyānām paramam saumyam hathānām hathavikramāḥ | **parameśam** samākramya prasahya balavān adhaḥ || **umādevīm** samākṣya copabhogair bhunakty asau | **nārāyaṇam** samākramya prasahya balavān adhaḥ || **rūpinīm** tu samākṣya upabhogair bhunakty asau | **prajāpatim** samākramya prasahya balavān adhaḥ | **praśāntadevīm** āsādy upabhogair bhunakty asau || **kāmadevaṃ** samākramya prasahya balavān adhaḥ | **ratipṛitidhṛtyaiśvaryaṃ** samākramya bhunakty asau. This corresponds to*

rhetoric of appropriation is reflected in the Mantras of Heruka's Vajradākinīs. Pramohā, who, as we have seen, has the boar face of Viṣṇu's Ādivarāha incarnation, is invoked as Vajranārāyaṇī, Caurī as Vajracāṇḍeśvarī, and Ghasmarī as Vajramāheśvarī.<sup>356</sup> Furthermore, Heruka's first appearance in the Mantranaya is in the *Sarvatathāgatattvasaṃgraha*, 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 *Sarvabuddhasamāyogaḍākinījālaśaṃvara*.<sup>357</sup> The very title of the work alludes to this assimilation, since it is evidently calqued on those of two Vidyāpīṭha scriptures, the *Sarvavīrasamāyoga* and the *Yoginījālaśaṃvara*.<sup>358</sup>

*The Yoginītantras and the Full Appropriation of Vidyāpīṭha 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 Parameśa's (Śiva's) consort is Bhīmādevī (f. 159r2: *lha mo bhi mo*) and Nārāyaṇa's (Viṣṇu's) is Rukmiṇī (f. 159r3: *ru gmi ni*).

<sup>356</sup> *Vajrajvālodayā*, f. 176v: HUṂ VAJRAṆĀRĀYAṆI JHIR *iti* (em. : *jhirati* Cod.) *pramohāṃ*); *ibid.*: HUṂ VAJRACĀṆḌEŚVARI KHAṬVĀNGI MAHĀVAJRI KAPĀLAMĀLĀMUKUTE RULU RULU HUṂ *iti caurīm*. Ghasmarī is invoked as Vajramāheśvarī in the Mantras of the retinue of Heruka given in the *Saṃputodbhava* : OM VAJRAMĀHEŚVARI HAṂ HAṂ HAṂ HAṂ HAḤ RULU RULU RULU BHYO HŪM PHAṬ BHAKṢAYA SARVADUṢṬĀN NIRMATHA HRDAYAṂ HŪM PHAṬ SVĀHĀ | *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 Vajranārāyaṇa, [Vajra]cāṇḍīśvara, and Vajrapadmodbhava, that is to say, Vajrayānist transformations of Viṣṇu, Rudra, and Brahmā, together with their consorts Vajrasrī, Vajragaurī, and Vajratārā, join Ākāśagarbha and Khavajriṇī to form the retinue of Vajrasattva in the central section of the abridged Maṇḍala (*bsdus pa'i dkyil 'khor*) of the Yogatantra *Paramādyā*, a text with which the *Sarvabuddhasamāyoga* is closely related (TOMABECHI 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 rtog pa'i dum bu* (\**Śrīparamādyamantrakalpakhāṇḍa*) (Tōh. 488) according to Ānandagarbha's *mChog dang po'i rgya cher bshad pa* (\**Paramādyatikā*) (Tōh. 2512).

<sup>357</sup> *Sarvatathāgatattvasaṃgraha*, section 794: OM HERUKAVAJRASAMAYA SARVADUṢṬASAMAYAMUDRĀPRABHAṆJAKA HUṂ PHAṬ *sarvamātṛṇām iti*; *Vajrajvālodayā*: OM HERUKAVAJRASAMAYA H<R>ĪḤ SARVADUṢṬASAMAYAMUDRĀPRABHAṆJAKA HUṂ PHAṬ *iti svamantreṇa śrīherukaṃ niveśayet*.

<sup>358</sup> On these two scriptures see SANDERSON 2007a, pp. 234–236 and footnotes 21–22. The expression *sarvavīrasamāyogaḍākinījālaśaṃvaram*, without the substitution of *-buddha-* for *-vīra-*, is seen in the Yoginītantras of Cakrasaṃvara. It appears in, e.g., *Laghuśaṃvaratantra*, f. 8r3 (8.1) and f. 24v4 (31.13ef): *tataḥ sarvavīrasamāyogaḍākinījālaśaṃvaram*; and *Saṃvarodaya* 3.6cd: *sarvavīrasamāyogaḍākinījālasatsukham*. In the last *satsukham* is a tacit semantic analysis of *śaṃvarah*.

*Laghuśaṃvara* also called *Cakrasaṃvara* and *Herukābhidhāna*, the *Hevajra*, the *Catuṣpīṭha*, the *Vajrāmṛta*, the *Buddhakapāla*, the *Mahāmāyā*, 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).<sup>359</sup> 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.<sup>360</sup> The principal among these, those that received commentaries, are for the *Hevajra* the *Dākinīvajrapañjara* and the *Mahāmudrātilaka*, and for the *Laghuśaṃvara* the *Herukābhilyudaya*, the *Vajradāka*, the *Abhidhānottara*, the *Yoginīsaṃcāra*, the *Saṃvarodaya*, and the *Dākārṇava*. Another major Yoginītantra, the *Samputodbhava*, on which we have an important commentary, the *Āmnāyamañjarī*, by Abhayākara Gupta (1064–1125),<sup>361</sup> pertains to both cycles.<sup>362</sup>

<sup>359</sup> 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.

<sup>360</sup> 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 rtsod pa can*). The great majority are claimed in their colophons to be translations prepared in the early eleventh century by 'Brog 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 'bras 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-Dániel Szántó has recently identified the original Sanskrit of one, the *Anāvīlātāntra*, among the contents of a palm-leaf codex preserved in the Tokyo University Library (verbal communication).

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

<sup>362</sup> Thus, though counted as an explanatory Tantra of the Cakrasaṃvara cycle, it is grouped with the *Hevajra* and *Dākinīvajrapañjara* as one of the three Tantras of Hevajra (*kye rdo rje rgyud gsum*) 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 *Catuṣpīṭha*, the *Guhyasamāja*, the *Vajrabhairava*, and, as we

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/Bhavabhaṭṭa, Bhavyakīrti, Durjayacandra, and Tathāgatarakṣita, among ten persons whom he holds to have occupied the office of chief Vajrācārya at Vikramaśīla in rapid unbroken succession, and claims that Jayabhadra was the first of the ten (Jayabhadra, Śrīdhara, Bhavabhadra (/Bhavabhaṭṭa), 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,<sup>363</sup> by the Tibetan translation, and by

---

have seen, the *Sarvabuddhasamāyogaḍākinījālaśaṃvara*.

<sup>363</sup> In Bhavyakīrti's *Cakrasaṃvarapañjikā* 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) \**oḍḍiyānajālandharapullīramalayādiṣu* (*bDe mchog nyung ngu*, f. 239r2: *au ḍya na | dzā la ndha ra dang pu li ra ma la ya sogs*), since he comments here (f. 36v6): *o ḍyā na du ni 'od ldan ma'o | dzā la ndha rar ni gtum mig ma'o | pu llī ra ma la ya la sogs*, whereas Jayabhadra says that Pullīramalaya has not been mentioned but must nonetheless be understood to be intended (p. 137: *pullīramalayo na nirdiṣṭaḥ sarvapīṭhānām pradhānatvād upadeśād vāvaseyaḥ*). 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 *Śūramanojñā* 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 *Mahāvīryutpatti*, 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

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 Sādhaka's identifying with the three Buddha bodies (Dharmakāya, Sambhogakāya, and Nirmāṇakāya), 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 Vikramaśīla held their positions after the time of Buddhajñānapāda and Dīpaṅkarabhadra, 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 Ratnākaraśānti, who taught the Tibetan translator 'Brog mi Śākya ye shes (993–1077?)<sup>364</sup> and the Indian Dīpaṅkaraśrījñāna<sup>365</sup> (982–1054), and was a slightly older contemporary of Jñānaśrīmitra, 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 Dīpaṅkarabhadra and Ratnākaraśānti is almost two centuries. We might be inclined to count back from Ratnākaraśānti rather than forward from Dīpaṅkarabhadra, 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 Kamalarakṣita 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 *manojña-* for *yid du 'ong*. 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. *Vīramānoramā* is synonymous and meets this requirement.

<sup>364</sup> *Zhib mo rdo rje*, p. 84.

<sup>365</sup> *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 Dmar ston, pupil of Sa skya Paṇḍita Kun dga' rgyal mtshan (1182–1251) tells us<sup>366</sup> that Durjayacandra, who by this calculation would have held office from 940 to 952, was the teacher of Prajñendaruci, 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,<sup>367</sup> that is to say around 1007 if Rin chen bzang po was born in 958, as his biography claims and Gzhon nu dpal accepts,<sup>368</sup> and then, after spending one year in Nepal with Śāntibhadra<sup>369</sup> and eight at Vikramaśīla with Ratnākaraśānti,<sup>370</sup> to have studied with Prajñendaruci for three or four,<sup>371</sup> 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 Prajñendaruci, 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 Prajñendaruci 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<sup>372</sup> and should be considered more reliable than that of hagiographical biographies.

Even more difficult to reconcile is the report in the *Chos 'byung* of Pad ma dkar po (1527–1592) that Durjayacandra taught the Mantranaya at Vikramaśīla to the translator Rin chen bzang po.<sup>373</sup> 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.<sup>374</sup> It is probable, then, that while we are indeed closer to the truth if

<sup>366</sup> *Zhib mo rdo rje*, pp. 86–88.

<sup>367</sup> *Blue Annals*, p. 205, ll. 26–31.

<sup>368</sup> *Blue Annals*, p. 68, ll. 3–6.

<sup>369</sup> *Zhib mo rdo rje*, p. 84, ll. 6–10; *Blue Annals*, p. 205, ll. 32–35.

<sup>370</sup> *Zhib mo rdo rje*, p. 86, l. 10; *Blue Annals*, p. 206, ll. 18–19.

<sup>371</sup> *Blue Annals*, p. 206, ll. 32–33 (three years); *Zhib mo rdo rje*, p. 88, ll. 7–8 (four years).

<sup>372</sup> Tōh. 1185, 1236, 1251, 1310.

<sup>373</sup> TUCCI 1988, p. 35.

<sup>374</sup> TUCCI 1988, pp. 3–4.

we calculate back from the Door-keepers than forward from Buddhajñāna and Dīpaṅkarabhadra, Tāranātha has placed the later teachers from Durjayacandra onwards too early.

This suspicion gains further support from what we know of the life of Tathāgatarakṣita. If Tāranātha's report were accurate, provided that we calculate backwards from the six Door-keepers, then he would have held office at Vikramaśīla c. 964–976. But we learn from the colophon of the Tibetan translation of his commentary on the *Yoginīsaṃcāra* 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.<sup>375</sup>

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, Bhavyakīrti, and Līlāvajra, 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 *Mañjuśrīnāmasaṃgīti*,<sup>376</sup> and this view has recently been repeated by GRAY.<sup>377</sup> The latter recognized that most of the former's claimed citations are actually not of the *Laghuśaṃvaratantra* but of the *Sarvabuddhasamāyogaḍākinījālaśaṃvara*, 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 *Mañjuśrīnāmasaṃgīti*, 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: *hasticarmāvaruddhaṃ 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 *gajacarmapaṭādradhṛk* 'wearing as his upper garment the moist hide of an

<sup>375</sup> *Blue Annals*, p. 211.

<sup>376</sup> DAVIDSON 1981, pp. 7–8.

<sup>377</sup> GRAY 2007, pp. 12–14.

elephant', to which *Laghuśaṃvara* 2.16c corresponds only in sense and then not exactly.<sup>378</sup> As for the second citation,<sup>379</sup> the word *kaṅkālaḥ* does appear in the *Laghuśaṃvara*, as the name of one of the twenty-four Vīra consorts of the twenty-four Dākinīs,<sup>380</sup> 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 (*gajacarmapaṭārdradhṛk*) 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.<sup>381</sup> One must also overlook the evidence of the *Laghuśaṃvara* itself. For that refers to a *Cakrasaṃvara* in a list of its own predecessors.<sup>382</sup> I conclude, therefore, that there is no more than

<sup>378</sup> Vilāsavajra, *Nāmamantrārthāvalokinī* A f. 57r1–2, on *Mañjuśrīnāmasaṃgīti* 69d (*gajacarmapaṭārdradhṛk*): *gajacarmapaṭārdradhṛg iti śrīcakrasaṃvare | gajasya carma gajacarma paṭaś cāsāv ādraś ca | gajacarmaiva paṭārdrah gajacarmapaṭārdrah | taṃ dhārayatīti gajacarmapaṭārdradhṛk*. This error has been pointed out by SZÁNTÓ (2008b, p. 217).

<sup>379</sup> Vilāsavajra, *Nāmamantrārthāvalokinī* A f. 55v6, on *Mañjuśrīnāmasaṃgīti* 67cd (*daṃṣṭrākarālaḥ kaṅkālo halāhalaḥ śātānaḥ*): *kaṅkāla iti śrīcakrasaṃvare*.

<sup>380</sup> *Laghuśaṃvara* f. 35r4–7 (48.9c–12): *vajrasattva vairocana padmanarteśvaras tathā | śrīvajraherukaś caiva ākāśagarbha hayagrīvam eva ca || 10 ratnavajra mahābala virūpākṣa bhairavas tathā | vajrabhadra subhadraś caiva <va>jrahūmkāram eva ca || 11 mahāvīra vajrajaṭilam tu aṅkurika vajradehaka | vajraprabha amitābhaḥ surāvairiṇo vikaṭadamṣṭriṇam eva ca || 12 **kaṅkāla** mahākaṅkāla khaṇḍakāpālinādi tu caturviṃśatīvirāṇaṃ sarvaṃ vyāptam akhilaṃ jagat*.

<sup>381</sup> Such works cited in Vilāsavajra's commentary are the *Krodhendutilaka* (A f. 57r5), the *Guhyakośa* (A f. 57v1), the *Vajraghanocaya* (B f. 39r6), the *Ṣaṭprajñānayaśaṃvara* (B f. 40v3), the *Sarvatantrasamuccaya* (A f. 57r4), and the *Vajrakirīṭi* (A f. 56v6). Similarly, in the *Tattvasiddhi* of Śāntarākṣita we find the *Sarvadevasamāgama*, the *Laukikalokottaravajra*, and the *Vimuktisamudghāṭana*, and in the *Caryāmēlapakapradīpa* of Āryadeva the *Vajramukhīmahāyoga* and the *Vinayāmoghasiddhi*.

<sup>382</sup> *Laghuśaṃvara* 27.23–24a as transmitted in *Abhidhānottara*, Paṭala 43, A f. 140r1–2f, B f. 180v3–4: *tattvasaṃgrahe yad uktam ca tathoktam 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 *Paramādyā*, the *Vajrabhairava*, the *Sarvatathāgatasamgraha*, the *Guhyasamāja*, and the *Sarvabuddhasamāyogaḍākinījālaśaṃvara*, since it names these,<sup>383</sup> and tacitly incorporates verses from the last three in its earliest accessible redaction.<sup>384</sup> These borrowings do not rule out the possibility that the

---

| *guhyatantre samākhyātam haritantre tathaiva ca || mahābhairavatantre ca japavratādisiddhidam | tad idam dhyānamātreṇa mantrī sādhayate kṣaṇāt.* The reading *cakrasaṃvare* (*cakrasamvare* Cod.) is confirmed by Bhavabhaṭṭa in his commentary on this verse (*Cakrasaṃvarapañjikā*, p. 495).

<sup>383</sup> *Laghuśaṃvara* f. 4v2–3 (3.22): *abhisikto bhavet tatra sarvatantraikam uttaram | tattvasamgrahaḥ śaṃvare vāpi guhye vā vajrabhairave*; and f. 23v7 (30.24): *vidyārājacakravartī ayam mantra na bhūyo na bhaviṣyati | tattvasamgraha paramādye śaṃvare guhye vā vajrabhairave.* The *Śaṃvara* here is the *Sarvabuddhasamāyogaḍākinījālaśaṃvara*. The title is commonly so abbreviated; see also Indrabhūti's comment on the first passage (*'Khor lo sdom pa'i rgyud kyi rgyal po bde mchog bsdus pa zhes bya ba'i rnam par bshad*, f. 38r7): *bde mchog ni sgyu ma bde mchog go* 'The *Śaṃvara* is the *Jālaśaṃvara*'. In his *Cakrasaṃvaravṛtti* Indrabhūti takes the *Guhya* here to be the *Guhyasamāja* or the *Guhyendumañtilaka/Guhyendutilaka* (Tōh. 477) (f. 38r7): *gsang ba ni 'dus pa 'am zla gsang thig le'i nor bu'i rgyal po'o.* In his *Cakrasaṃvaratikā* Devagupta takes it to be "the *Guhyasamāja* etc." (f. 80r5): *bsdus pa la sogs par.* But in his *Cakrasaṃvarapañjikā* Bhavabhaṭṭa glosses *guhyatantre* in 27.23 as *guhyakośādau* 'in the *Guhyakośa* etc.'

<sup>384</sup> (1) *Laghuśaṃvara* (LŚ) f. 1v5 (1.7c–8b): *antargatena manasā kāmasiddhiṃ tu bhāvayet | svaretobindubhir buddhān bodhisattvāṃś ca pūjayet < Sarvatathāgata-tattvasamgraha*, section 2651: *antargatena manasā kāmasiddhiṃ tu bhāvayan | svaretobindubhir buddhān pūjayan siddhim āpnuyāt*, but influenced in the second line by *Guhyasamāja* 7.26: *svavajraṃ padmasamyuktaṃ dvayendriyaprayogataḥ | svaretobindubhir buddhān vajrasattvāṃś 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 bzad par bshad do < Guhyasamāja* 5.78: *mahāmāṃsena sarveṣāṃ nāśanaṃ vajrajaṃ smṛtam | eṣo hi sarvakrūrāṇāṃ nāśako dāruṇaḥ smṛtaḥ*; (3) *bDe mchog nyung ngu*, f. 234v4 (LŚ 31.12): *sa ni spyan zhes bya bar bshad | chu khams mā ma kī ru brjod | me ni gos dkar mor bshad de | rlung ni sgrol mar rab tu brjod < Guhyasamāja* 17.51: *pṛthivī locanā khyātā abdhātur māmakī smṛtā | pāṇḍarākhyā bhavet tejo vāyus tārā prakīrtitā*; (4) LŚ f. 1v (1.1–3) < *Sarvabuddhasamāyogaḍākinījālaśaṃvara* (SBSDJŚ) 1.1–2 etc. (see here p. 154); (5) LŚ f. 1v5–6 (1.8c–9b): *darśanasparśanābhyāṃ ca śravaṇe smaraneṇa ca || mucyate sarvapāpais tu evam eva na saṃśayaḥ < SBSDJŚ* as quoted in *Jñānasiddhi* 15.50: *darśanasparśanābhyāṃ ca śravaṇasmaraṇeṇa ca | sarvapāpair vimucyante \*yujyante* (em. : *pūjyante* Ed.) *sarvasiddhibhiḥ* (= *Sangs rgyas thams cad mnyam par sbyor ba* f. 152v3 [2.16]); (6) LŚ ff. 1v7–2r1 (1.11c–13b): *madhu raktaṃ sakarpūraṃ raktacandanayojitam | gaṇamadhye pratiṣṭhan tu [+ sarvocchīṣṭarasāyanam* in the earlier redaction incorporated in the *Abhidhānottara* A f. 146r1–3 (46.3–5b)] *sarvavajrāṅkacihnadhṛk | anāmāṅguṣṭhavaktrābhyāṃ lehayed yogavit sadā || somapānavad āsvādyā siddhim āpnoti śāśvatīm < Sangs rgyas thams cad mnyam par sbyor ba* f. 158v4–5 (SBSDJŚ 6.15–17): *dmar*

*Laghuśaṃvara* 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 Cakrasaṃvara 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 Śaṃvara none is demonstrably earlier than the tenth century.<sup>385</sup> Finally (3), there is, as we have seen, no evidence of commentarial work on the *Laghuśaṃvara* before c. 900. Of course, none of these facts proves conclusively that the *Laghuśaṃvara* 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 *Laghuśaṃvara* 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 *Laghuśaṃvara* 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-

---

*chen dang ni ga bur bcas | tsa ndan dmar por sbyar ba dag | tshogs kyi dbus su bzhag pa ni | ra sa ya na kun slong ba | rang gi lha yo sbyor ldan pas | srin lag dang ni mthe bo'i rtses | zhi ba'i btung pa bzhin myangs na | rtag pa yi ni dngos grub thob (\*mahāraktaṃ sakarpūraṃ raktacandanayojitam | svādhidaivatayogena sarvocchiṣṭarasāyanam | anāmānguṣṭhavaktrābhyām <+++++++> | somapānavad āsvādyā siddhim āpnoti śāśvatīm); and (7) LŚ f. 12r6–7 (13.2): yad yad indriyamārgatvaṃ yāyāt tat tat svabhāvataḥ | paramāhitayogena sarvaṃ buddhamayaṃ vahet <SBSDJŚ as quoted in Caryāmelāpakapradīpa, p. 90: yad yad indriyamārgatvaṃ yāyāt tat tat svabhāvataḥ | asamāhitayogena sarvabuddhamayaṃ vahet.*

<sup>385</sup> A Kashmirian Śaṃvara of leaded brass inlaid with copper and silver in the Los Angeles County Museum of Art from the Nasli and Alice Heeramaneck 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'. LINROTHER (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 LINROTHER.

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 *Mahāvairocanābhisam̐bodhi*, *Sarvatathā-gatatattvasaṃgraha*, *Guhyasamāja*, and *Sarvabuddhasamāyoga*. It assumes, then, that the Yoginītantras 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.<sup>386</sup> Thus 5.4 yields BHAGABATE rather than BHAGAVATE: *pañcamasya yac caturtham̐ prathamasya tr̐tīyam | trayovim̐śas tathaiva ca caturthasya yah̐ 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 BHAGABĀṂ rather than BHAGAVĀṂ (for BHAGAVĀN): *koṣṭhakād̐ daśamaṃ caiva vilomena tu sād̐hakaḥ | koṣṭhakā ekonaviṃśatimaṃ tathā trayovim̐śatikōṣṭhakād̐ | dvitīyakoṣṭhasaṃyuktaṃ bindunā ūrdhvabhūṣitaṃ* (f. 23v4–5) ‘The Sād̐haka 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 (ĀṂ)’.

Variant readings giving the correct spellings in these cases are found. In 5.4 Jayabhadra and Bhavabhaṭṭa read *ekonnatrim̐śa-* (*sic*) and *ekonatrim̐śati* ‘the twenty-ninth’ (VA) rather than the *trayovim̐śa-* ‘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* [= *ekonatrim̐śaṃ tathaiva ca*]) and the redaction

<sup>386</sup> This is so in Bihārī, Maithilī, Bengali, Kumāunī, Nepālī, Assamese, and Oṛiyā.

of this passage in Paṭala 54 of the *Abhidhānottara* (A f. 166r3: *ekonnatrinśam tathai va ca*). Likewise in 30.21 we find Jayabhadra giving *ekonatriṃśati-* (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.<sup>387</sup>

Also indicative of the east-Indian provenance and development of this corpus are the form *chaṃdoha-* in place of *saṃdoha-*,<sup>388</sup> and the pervasive promiscuity of the forms *-śaṃvara-* 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 *saṃvr-*, 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 saṃvr̥notīti cakrasaṃvaraḥ*), telling us further that the name is extended to the Tantra because this deity is its subject.<sup>389</sup> As for the form Śaṃvara, that too is widely supported.

<sup>387</sup> 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 *Catuṣpīṭha*, the Mantra syllables VADAVE being encoded there as BAḌABE. 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 *kibiḍaho* 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*, *Catuṣpīṭha*, 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.

<sup>388</sup> See here p. 180.

<sup>389</sup> Bhavabhaṭṭa, *Cakrasaṃvarapañjikā*, explaining the title with the prefixed honoric Śrī- when it occurs in the final colophon in the words *śrīcakrasaṃvaranāmnī mahāyoginītantrarāje* ‘in the great king among the Yoginītantras called *śrīcakrasaṃvara*’ in the final colophon: *śrīḥ puṇyajñānasambhāraḥ | cakraṃ dharmacakram | śrīmac cakram śrīcakram | tena kāpathāt sattvānāṃ manaḥ saṃvr̥notīti śrīcakrasaṃvaraḥ śrīherukaḥ | tadabhidhāyivāt tantram api tathocyate* ‘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

Ratnākaraśānti explains it as meaning ‘the Highest (*varam*) Bliss’ (*śam*) when analysing its occurrence in the neuter in the compound *ḍākinījālaśaṃvaram*,<sup>390</sup> and Bhavabhaṭṭa when analysing its occurrence in the masculine gender at the end of the same (*ḍākinījālaśaṃvaraḥ*) takes it to mean ‘[Heruka,] who protects Bliss (*śaṃ vṛṇotīti śaṃvaraḥ*) [by keeping it free of all defects]’.<sup>391</sup> This line of analysis, which applies a meaning of *śam* that is well-attested in non-sectarian lexicography,<sup>392</sup> 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’.<sup>393</sup> That the *-śaṃvara* form is not only old but also original is established

gnosis]. Heruka is called Śrīcakrasaṃvara [here] because he restrains [*saṃvṛṇotīti saṃvaraḥ*] 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’.

<sup>390</sup> Ratnākaraśānti, *Mahāmāyāṭīkā* on 23d: *śaṃvaram sukhavaram mahāsukham* ‘[*śam* means ‘bliss’ and *-varam* ‘best’. So] *śaṃvaram* means ‘the best bliss’ (*sukhavaram*) [, i.e.] ‘the Great Bliss’ (*mahāsukham*)’. The same analysis is tacitly given in such parallel expressions as *ḍākinījālasatsukham* in *Saṃvarodaya* 3.6d and 26.10cd; and *Vajradāka* 1.1cd: *sarvadākinīmayāḥ sattvo vajradākaḥ param sukhām*; 1.12cd, 1.50, 1.71cd: *sarvadākinīsamāyogavajradākaḥ param sukhām*.

<sup>391</sup> Bhavabhaṭṭa, *Cakrasaṃvarapañjikā* on 1.2: *ḍākinī śūnyatā. jālam upāyaḥ | jālena hi matsyādibandhanasiddhiḥ | upāyena hi kleśamīnādir niyamākimcitkaraḥ kriyate | tābhyāṃ śaṃ sukhām avadyebhyo bahiṣkrtya vṛṇotīti ḍākinījālaśaṃvaraḥ* ‘[The meaning of the name] Ḍākinījālaśaṃvara [applied to Heruka here] is ‘he who protects (*-varaḥ* [*vṛṇotīti varaḥ*]) bliss (*śam*) by means of the Ḍākinī and the Net (*jālam*)’. The term Ḍākinī [here] means ‘[Emptiness],’ ‘the fact that [all things] are void of [intrinsic reality]’ (*śūnyatā*); and the term ‘Net’ refers to the method (*upāyaḥ*) [, 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 (*kleśāḥ*), 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’.

<sup>392</sup> See, e.g., Hemaçandra, *Anekārthasaṃgraha*, *Parīṣiṣṭakāṇḍa* 21a: *śaṃ kalyāṇe sukhe ‘tha; Vardhamāna, Gaṇaratnamahodadhivṛtti*, p. 39, on 1.15: *śaṃ duḥkhopaśame; Yāska, Nighaṇṭubhāṣya*, p. 521 (on *Rgveda* 5.4.5: *śaṃ no bhavantu vājīnaḥ*): *sukhāḥ no bhavantu vājīnaḥ*.

<sup>393</sup> *Sangs rgyas thams cad mnyam par sbyor ba*, f. 154r6–7 (1.10): *śaṃ zhes bya ba bde bar bshad | sangs rgyas kun gyi bde chen yin | sgyu ma thams cad rab sbyor ba | mchog tu bde bas bde ba’i mchog (sukhaṃ śam iti vikhyātaṃ sarvabauddhaṃ mahāsukham | sarvajālasamāyogaḥ sukhavareṇa śaṃvaraḥ)* ‘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 Vilāsavajra while explaining the epithet *mahāsukhaḥ* in his *Nāmamantrārthāvalokinī*, f. 57v1–2: *mahāsukha iti śrīśaṃvare | tatra mahāsukha iti yat tāthāgatam anāsravaṃ sukhāṃ tan mahāsukha ity ucyate | tatraivoktaṃ sukhāṃ śam iti vikhyātaṃ sarvabauddhaṃ 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*,<sup>394</sup> which, as we shall see, was a major unacknowledged source for the redactor of the *Laghuśaṃvara*. That the form intended there is -śaṃvara- rather than -saṃvara- is certain, because the text provides a semantic analysis that takes the first syllable to mean bliss (*sukham*).<sup>395</sup>

However, these are not the only views. Jayabhadra, commenting on 1.2 of the *Laghuśaṃvara*, takes the same expression to be *Ḍākinījālaśaṃvara*, understanding it to refer to the *Laghuśaṃvara* itself and explaining it as ‘The Concealment of the Array of Ḍākinīs’, deriving the last element of the compound from *saṃvr-* ‘to envelop’,<sup>396</sup> and while the Tibetans usually render the

---

The first Pāda is also supported by Bhavabhaṭṭa, who quotes it without attribution, when explaining *ḍākinījālaśaṃvaram* in *Laghuśaṃvara* 1.2: *śaṃ sukham iti cākhyātam iti vacanāt*.

<sup>394</sup> Yoginījālaśaṃvara in this text is a form of Bhairava and the term refers by extension to his Mantra and the associated system of practice (*vrataṃ*). See *Picumata* f. 251r5–v1 (56.4c–6b): *śṛṇu devī pravakṣyāmi sarvayogiprasāadhanam | yāgamantrasamopetaṃ yoginījālaśaṃvaram | yena vijñātamātreṇa trailokye khecariṇīpadam | āsādyā kriḍate mantrī kulasiddhisamanvitaḥ* ‘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 Yoginīs. As soon as the Mantra adept has mastered this he will reach the domain of the Khecariṇīs and move freely through the triple universe, possessing [all] the supernatural powers of the [Yoginī] clans’.

<sup>395</sup> *Picumata* f. 251v2–3 (56.12–13b): *samūhaṃ jālam ity uktam yoginīnām mahodayam | śaṃ sukhaṃ vara dātrtvā<t> \*samūhatvavivakṣayā (samūhatva em. : samūhatvaṃ Cod.) | \*yogeshiyogabhāvastham (yogeshiyoga conj. : yogayogīśa Cod.) yoginījālaśaṃvaram | mantram tu kathitam devī bhairavasyāmitātmakam* ‘The expression Yoginījāla [in Yoginījālaśaṃvara] means the exalted totality of the Yoginīs, *jālam* ‘net’ denoting ‘multitude’ [here]. The *śaṃ* of -śaṃvara means ‘bliss’ (*sukham*). The Yoginījālaśaṃvara[mantra] is so named because it is the bestower (*-vara*) of that bliss, [*-vara-* being formed as an agent noun from the verb *vr-* ‘to give’]. It is the granter of this bliss to the Yoginījāla in as much as it is located in the inner state of \*the Yoga of the Yogeśvarīs, the plurality of these being intended in the sense of their totality (conj.). The Mantra of Bhairava [that bears this name] is infinite [in its power]’.

<sup>396</sup> Jayabhadra, *Cakrasaṃvarapañjikā* on 1.1–2b (*athāto rahasyaṃ vakṣye samāsān na tu vistarāt | śrīherukasamyogaṃ sarvakāmārthasādhakam | uttarād api cottaram ḍākinījālaśaṃvaram* ‘Next I shall teach the secret, in brief rather than at length, the congress of Śrīheruka, the accomplisher of all desires, the *Ḍākinījālaśaṃvara*, higher even than the higher’): *uttarād api cottaram iti deśyadeśakayor abhedāt | yāny uttaratantrāṇi samājādīni teṣām apy uttaratvād uktam | ḍākinījālaśaṃvaram iti | ḍākinīyaḥ sarvās tricakravayavasthitāḥ | tāsām jālaḥ samūhas tasya saṃvaraḥ | saṃvaraṇaṃ gopanaṃ ity arthaḥ* ‘It is referred to as higher even than the higher because it is 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] *Ḍākinījālaśaṃvara*, it means the concealing of the net, that is to say, of the totality of all the Ḍākinīs that are established

Cakra- name 'Khor lo sdom pa and so support the form Cakrasaṃvara, we also find 'Khor lo bde mchog in their translations, which supports the alternative Cakraśaṃvara.<sup>397</sup>

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.<sup>398</sup> 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 (*śaṃvara* / *saṃvara*), 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 *vr̥* preceded by the preverb *sam*. That this was the case is demonstrated by a passage in the *Samvarodaya* in which the two semantic analyses, explaining *śaṃvara*- and *saṃvara*- respectively, are given for one and the same word.<sup>399</sup>

ŚAṂVARA/VAJRARUDRA AND VAJRAVĀRĀHĪ: THE TRANSFORMATION OF BHAIRAVA AND HIS CONSORT. What marks the new start seen in the Yoginī-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 *Laghuśaṃvara* the icon of Heruka has several blatantly obvious features of the iconography of Śiva (/Bhairava) in addition to those manifest in

---

in the three circuits [of the Maṇḍala of Cakrasaṃvara], *saṃvaraḥ* being derived from the verb *saṃvr̥-* 'to conceal' in the sense of the action of concealing'.

<sup>397</sup> In the DT 'khor lo sdom pa (*cakrasaṃvara*-) occurs about 250 times and 'khor lo bde mchog (*cakraśaṃvara*-) 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).

<sup>398</sup> See, for Māgadhī, Vararuci, *Prākṛtaprakāśa* 11.2: *śasoḥ śaḥ* 'ś is used in place of both ṣ 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 Apabhramśa, *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 *suṅṅa* for Skr. *śūnya*. It is likely that the occasional distinction between *ś* and *s* was learned window-dressing and that both consonants were pronounced *ś*.

<sup>399</sup> *Samvarodaya* 3.17c–19b: *saṃvaraṃ sarvabuddhānām evaṅkāre pratiṣṭhitam || kāyāvākcetasām karma sarvākāraikasamvaram | saṃvaraṃ sukhavaraṃ bodhir avācyam anidarśanam || rahasyaṃ sarvabuddhānām milanaṃ saṃvaraṃ 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 (*ḍamaruḥ*), a battle-axe, a chopping knife, and a trident, a skull-topped staff (*khaṭvāṅgaḥ*), 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 (*nāgayajñopavītaḥ*), and a chaplet of skulls (*kapālamālā*) above his forehead, his hair arranged in a high crown-like mass of ascetic's braids (*jaṭāmukuṭaḥ*) adorned at the front with two crossed Vajras (*viśvavajram*) and the new moon. His consort Vajravārāhī 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 Yoginīs, Ḍākinīs, Vīreśvarīs, or Vīriṅīs 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 Uḍḍiyāna in the north to Rāmeśvara at India's southern tip, from Sindhu in the west to Devīkoṭṭa in the east. The whole is surrounded by a ring of eight cremation grounds.<sup>400</sup>

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

<sup>400</sup> This description of Heruka and Vajravārāhī follows that given by Jayabhadra in his *Cakrasaṃvarapañjikā*, p. 109, on *Laghuśaṃvara* 1.10. for the iconography of the Yoginīs and Vīras see Bhavabhaṭṭa's *Cakrasaṃvaravivṛti* on *Laghuśaṃvara*, Paṭala 4 (vol. 1, pp. 44–47). See also *Niṣpannayogāvalī*, 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 Kuṣāṇa and Kuṣāṇo-Sassanian periods in Gandhāra and Afghanistan.<sup>401</sup> 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,<sup>402</sup> 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*,<sup>403</sup> 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.<sup>404</sup> His wearing a bleeding elephant hide is also a commonplace by that time, being mentioned along with his crematorial characteristics in the works of the poet Kālidāsa.<sup>405</sup> 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,<sup>406</sup> does appear in the *Skandapurāṇa*-

<sup>401</sup> 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 Kuṣāṇa period, see GHOSE 2002, pp. 70–96.

<sup>402</sup> KREISEL 1986 (Mathura, c. 400), p. 82; BAKKER 1997, pp. 149–151 (Mansar, c. 400–450).

<sup>403</sup> *Mahābhārata* 3.8.111a (*triśūlapāṇeh*); 13.14.119 (*bālendumukutaṃ ... tribhir netraih kṛtoddyotaṃ*), 12.122.24b (*śūlajaṭādharah*), 7.172.59c (*jaṭāmaṇḍalacandra-mauliṃ*).

<sup>404</sup> See, e.g., *Mahābhārata* 13.127.18a (*vyāghracarmāmbāradharah*); 14.8.30d (*mahādevaṃ caturmukham*), 13.14.116c (*aṣṭādaśabhujam sthānum*), 14.8.28a (*virūpākṣam daśabhujam*), 13.17.40a (*daśabāhus tv animiṣo*); 12.36.2c (*kapālapāṇiḥ khaṭvāṅgī*), 10.7.4d (*khaṭvāṅgadhāriṇam*); 13.15.11cd (*tikṣṇadaṃṣṭraṃ ... vyālayajñopavitam*), 14.8.21a (*tikṣṇadaṃṣṭrāya karālāya*); 10.6.33c (*kapālamāliṇam*); 10.7.4a (*śmaśānavāsinam*); 13.14.153c (*śuklabhasmāvaliptāya*).

<sup>405</sup> *Meghadūta* 36c: *hara paśupater ādranāgājinecchāṃ* 'Remove Śiva's desire for his [blood-]wet elephant hide'; *Kumārasambhava* 5.67d: *gajājinaṃ śoṇitabinduvarṣi ca* '[his] elephant hide that showers drops of blood'; 5.77b: *trilokanāthaḥ pitrsadmagocarah* 'The Lord of the Three Worlds frequents cremation grounds'; 5.69c, 5.79b: *citābhasmarajaḥ* 'the ash-dust of funeral pyres'; and 5.71b: *kapālinah* 'decked with skulls'. Rudra/Śiva frequently has the epithet *kṛttivāsas*- 'wearer of the hide' in the *Mahābhārata*. The *Matsyapurāṇa* (Paṭala 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 *ekavīravidhānam*, it is said to be that of the elephantine Śaiva-brahmanical deity Gaṇapati (B f. 34v1: *aparabhujadvayena gaṇapaticarmāmbara\*dharam* (corr. : *dharā* Cod.) and (B f. 40v2–3: *aparabhujadvayena gaṇapaticarmāmbaradharah*).

<sup>406</sup> There is a reference to it in a supplementary passage of 26 verses inserted within a

*Ambikākhaṇḍa*,<sup>407</sup> probably composed in the sixth or perhaps the first half of the seventh century.<sup>408</sup> Other features in addition to these, namely the garland of severed or desiccated heads, the chopping knife, the rattle-drum, the Kāpālika bone-ornaments, the consort, the skull-bowl full of blood and entrails, the retinue of Yoginīs, their pairing with Vīra consorts, the sacred sites, the theriocephalic gate-guardians, and the encircling cremation grounds, are commonplaces of the iconography of the Vidyāpīṭha 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 *Laghuśaṃvara* 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,<sup>409</sup> 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 Kālarātri, their own pre-Buddhist identities as the principal deities of the Vidyāpīṭha.<sup>410</sup>

---

hymn to Śiva (13.14.150–166) after 13.14.153 in the Maithilī and Bengali versions, the Devanāgarī version of the commentator Nīlakaṇṭha, in several manuscripts of the composite version, and the Kumbhakonam edition (*Anuśāsanaparvan*, Appendix I, no. 6, l. 45): *brahmaśiropahartāya* ‘[obeisance] to the remover of Brahmā’s head’.

<sup>407</sup> 5.1–63 (ed. Adriaensen, Bakker, and Isaacson, pp. 132–141).

<sup>408</sup> See here p. 51.

<sup>409</sup> Jayabhadra, *Cakrasaṃvarapañjikā* on Paṭala 12: *kṛtapūrvasevo mantrirāṭ 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 Paṭala 27: *jñānahetujam iti | jñānasya prakarṣaparyantam | tasya hetuḥ kāraṇam bhagavān vajrarudraḥ | tasmā j jāto bhavātīty arthaḥ* ‘*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 (*rasāḥ*) with Vajrasattva, Tathāgata, Vajradhara, Lokeśvara, Vajrasūrya, Vajrarudra, Śākyamuni, Ārali (or perhaps Ārali), and Śāśvata (Vairocana) respectively. Vajrarudra’s is the sentiment of terror (*bhayānakarasāḥ*) 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 sems dpa’ steg 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* (\*śṛṅgāre vajrasattvo hi vīre caiva tathāgataḥ | vajradhrk karuṇāyām tu hāsye caiva lokeśvaraḥ | vajrasūryas tathā raudre vajrarudro bhayānake | śākyamunis tu bībhatse ārallir adbhute tathā | praśānte śāśvataś caiva).

<sup>410</sup> Kālarātri 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 Vidyāpīṭha.<sup>411</sup> Thus in certain other Kalpas in which Heruka is united with Vajravārāhī 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 *ekavīravīdhānam*, the procedure in which the two deities alone are worshipped as 'solitary heroes' (*ekavīra-*), that is to say, without the the retinue of the thirty-six Yoginīs and twenty-four Viras. Here Heruka has twelve arms and Vajravārāhī 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.<sup>412</sup> In the seventh Paṭala a two-faced, six-armed Vajrasattva transforms into a six-faced, twelve-armed Heruka Mañjuvajramahāsukha accompanied by a Vajravārāhī 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.<sup>413</sup> We see the same equality in the tenth Paṭala, where both Heruka and Vajravārāhī are five-faced and ten-

<sup>411</sup> See SANDERSON 1988, pp. 668–678.

<sup>412</sup> *Abhidhānottara* B f. 40r3: *athānya<ṃ> saṃpravakṣyāmi ekavīravīdhānakam* | ... (f. 40r6) *śriherukam ātmānaṃ bhāvayet | caturmukhaṃ dvādaśabhujam* | ... (f. 41r1–3) *tasyāgrato ālikālisthitā bhagavatī vajravārāhī raktavarṇā caturvaktrā caturbhujā trinetra muktakeśi | nagnā khaṇḍamaṇḍitamekhalā | vāme bhujāliṅganakapālaṃ ca duṣṭamārādyasṛgbodhicittaparipūrṇaṃ dakṣiṇe tarjanīvajrakartikā | aparabhujadvaye ḍamarukhaṭvāṅga<m>*. The retinue is absent only in the sense that the deities are not positioned around Heruka and Vajravārāhī. Instead the twenty-four Yoginī-Vīra couples are installed from the head of Heruka down to his feet, and the four Yoginīs of the innermost circuit and the eight of the outermost are installed in the twelve objects in his hands.

<sup>413</sup> *Abhidhānottara* B f. 50v5–6: *tatparāvṛtṭyā sadvajraṃ vajrasattvaṃ vibhāvayet | trimukhaṃ ṣaḍbhujam caiva trinetraṃ karuṇārasam* | ... (ff. 52v5–53r3) *anena codito nātho bījam utpannam uttamam | kuṅkumākāravārṇābhamaṃ vajracihnasamutthitam* | \**ṣaṇmukhaṃ* (corr. : *khanmukhaṃ* Cod.) *dvādaśabhujam vārāhyāsamalamkṛtam* | \**ṣaḍa(?)vīramahāvīraṃ ardhaparyāṅkasamsthitam* | *trinetraṃ hasitam raudraṃ karālaṃ bībhatsam \*lelihānanaṃ* (em. : *lelihānalaṃ* Cod.) *karuṇārasam | bhairavaṃ kālarātriṃ ca pādākrāntatale sthitam | athavālīḍhasamsthānakṛtayogaṃ \*mahādbhutam* (conj. : *mahādbhūtaṃ* Cod.) | ... (f. 53r5–v2) \**brahmaṇaḥ* (em. : *brāhmaṇa* Cod.) *kṛttim utkṛtṭyā prṣṭhaprāvṛta-vigrahaṃ | raudrabhairavacarmeṇa \*kaṭim* (corr. : *kaṭir* Cod.) *āveṣṭya saṃsthitam | kapālakhaṭvāṅgadhara<ṃ> asi-utpalaśaradhāriṇam | aṅkuśapāśaḍamarumuṇḍa-cāpadharaṃ tathā | tadvaktrāyudhavārāhyā mahārāgapade sthitā | jaṅghādvaya-samāśliṣṭā mahāsurata\*sundarī* (corr. : *suṃdharā* Cod.) | *muṇḍasragdāmadehogrā ṣaṇmudrācihnabhūṣitā | evaṃ bhāvayate yogī mañjuvajramahāsukham*.

armed,<sup>414</sup> 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;<sup>415</sup> and in the twentieth, in which a red five-faced and twelve-armed Heruka embraces a Vajravārāhī with same colour and hand-attributes.<sup>416</sup>

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 Yoginīs, like her, wear garlands of freshly severed heads,<sup>417</sup> or by only the inner circuit of four, or with no retinue

<sup>414</sup> *Abhidhānottara* B ff. 71r3–72v5: *vajrasattvaparāvṛṭṭyā herukatvaṃ vibhāva-  
yet | pañcānaṃ daśabhujam vārāhyāsamalamkṛtam ... (f. 72v4–5) tadvarṇa-  
bhujā\*saṃsthānā* (corr. : *saṃsthānaṃ* Cod.) *muktakeśi tu nagnikā vyāghracarma-  
nivasanā khaṇḍamaṇḍitamekhalā | kapālamālinī raudrī karuṇārāgasuwihvalā.*

<sup>415</sup> *Abhidhānottara* B ff. 79v3–80r6: *śadvaktraṃ vīraṃ bibhatsaṃ śṛṅgārahasitaṃ  
raudraṃ lelihānanam | ṣaṇmudrāmudritaṃ dehaṃ nānābharaṇamaṇḍitam |  
vārāhyā \*tu samāpannaṃ* (em. : *nusamāpannā* Cod.) *jānudvayasuveṣṭitam ... (f.  
80r2) rudracarmāmbharadharaṃ ... (f. 80r5–6) tadvarṇabhujasaṃsthānā mukta-  
keśi tu nagnikā.*

<sup>416</sup> *Abhidhānottara* B f. 113r3–v4: *herukākāram ātmānaṃ ḍākinīcayaparāvṛtam |  
mahograṃ raktavapuṣaṃ pañcajñānodbhavodbhavam | raktaṃ nīlaṃ ca haritaṃ  
pītaṃ sāntasitorhvakam | trinetraṃ dvādaśabhujam ālīḍhapadasaṃsthitaṃ |  
... (f. 113v3–4) agrato vajravārāhyā tadvarṇāyudhadhāriṇī.*

<sup>417</sup> This is the main Kalpa taught in the *Abhisamayamañjarī* (pp. 131, l. 9–133, l. 1). I propose the following emendations and corrections to the text of the published edition: for *mithyā drṣṭiprahāṇā vikṛtaikānanāṃ* (p. 131, l. 15) read *mithyā-  
drṣṭiprahāṇād vikṛtaikānanāṃ* ; for *cakrikūṇḍalakaṇṭhikārucakakhaṭvāṅga-  
mekhalākhyapañcamudrādharaṃ* (p. 131, l. 18) read *cakrikūṇḍalakaṇṭhikārucaka-  
khaṇḍāṅkamekhalākhyapañcamudrādharaṃ*; for *iti kecit | maṇḍalanāyikātvena  
ṣaṇmudritāṃ ity eke* read *iti maṇḍalanāyikātvena ṣaṇmudritāṃ ity eke* (p. 132, l. 3); for *vajrāvalīdvayamadyākrta-* read *vajrāvalīdvayamadyīkrta-* (p. 132, l. 9); and for *aṣṭavijñānāṃ nairātmāsvarūpatvena* read *aṣṭavijñānāṃ  
nairātmāsvarūpatvena* (p. 132, l. 12).

at all.<sup>418</sup>

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 (*ardhanārīśvaramukhā*), 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 (*juvālāmudrā*) 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 (*kamalāvartaḥ*). 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 Pāṇḍaravāsin 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 (*ardhanārīśvaryaḥ*). 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

<sup>418</sup> *Abhisamayamañjarī*, p. 142, ll. 13–19.

crow, owl, dog, and sow, stand naked in the warrior-pose, dwarfish, 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 Yoginīs 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-drum in their right. <sup>419</sup>

The cult of the independent goddess (Bhagavatī) appears to have been a particularly vigorous development, to judge from the exceptionally large number of variant forms that emerged.<sup>420</sup> Within the earlier scriptural literature the *Abhidhānottara* contains several sections devoted to Sādhanas of Vajravārāhi,<sup>421</sup> in the *Herukābhyudaya* eleven of its forty-four chapters are devoted to her Mantras and their procedures,<sup>422</sup> 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 Vajravārāhī or Vajrayoginī (Tōh. 1541–1606). Śākyarakṣita, a pupil of Abhayākaragupta (1064–1125), after detailing the Sādhana of several of her forms in his *Abhisamayamañjarī*,<sup>423</sup> adds that these are but a few of the many that were current in his time:<sup>424</sup>

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

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

<sup>420</sup> See ENGLISH 2002 for an illustrated survey of these variants.

<sup>421</sup> Paṭala 12/9: Vārāhī Vajrayoginī (4-faced, 12-armed; *ardhanārīśvarīmukhā*); 22/19: Mṛtasamjīvanī (4-faced or 8-faced, 16-armed); 36/33: Vajravārāhī (3-faced and 6-armed or 6-faced and 12-armed, surrounded by Guhyottamā etc.); 37/34: Vajravārāhī surrounded by Yāminī etc.

<sup>422</sup> Paṭalas 6, 8–11, 23–24, 29–31, and 34.

<sup>423</sup> The *Abhisamayamañjarī* is ascribed to Śubhākaragupta 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).

<sup>424</sup> *Abhisamayamañjarī*, p. 152: *tad \*evamādayaḥ* (em. : *evam ādāya* Ed.) *siddhopaśeṣaparamparāyātā vineyāśayabhedād anantā bhagavatya āmnāyā boddhavyāḥ | dīnmatram idaṃ darśitam.*

the Maṇḍala of Vajradevī (Vajravārāhī).<sup>425</sup> Nor was this confined to the sub-continent. 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.<sup>426</sup>

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 *Vajravārāhīkalpa*, of about three thousand verses, which interweaves the *Ḍākārṇava* and the *Samvarodaya*, and incorporates thirteen non-scriptural Sādhana texts of Vajravārāhī and one of Nairātmyā, the consort of Hevajra;<sup>427</sup> the closely related *Yoginījāla*, of about one thousand verses; and the collection of forty-six Sādhanas of Vajrayoginī known as the *Guhyasamayasādhanamālā*.<sup>428</sup> 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 *Vārāhyabhyudayatāntra*, a short work of three hundred verses counted among the explanatory Tantras of the *Laghuśaṃvara* but consisting almost entirely of passages lifted from the *Samputodbhava*, the *Abhidhānottara*, and the *Samvarodaya*;<sup>429</sup> and the second

<sup>425</sup> 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 Cakrasaṃvara initiation is followed by a separate Vajradevī initiation is confirmed by the evidence of the *Dikṣāvidhi*, the manual in the Newari language that guides these rituals.

<sup>426</sup> See ENGLISH 2002, pp. xxii–xxvii.

<sup>427</sup> I have not yet undertaken a thorough analysis of the whole text. The interweaving that I report is of *Ḍākārṇava*, Paṭala 2–3 and *Samvarodaya* 2–3 in the first 3 Paṭalas. The *nidānavākya*m of the *Samvarodaya* is borrowed with the substitution of *vārāhibhageṣu* for the *Samvarodaya*'s *yoginībhageṣu*. I have noted the incorporation of the following Sādhana 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.

<sup>428</sup> 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 Sādhana in the collection, the *Ḍākinīguhyasamayasādhana* of Anaṅgayogin.

<sup>429</sup> The correspondences are as follows (S = *Samputodbhava*; LŚ = *Laghuśaṃvara*; AU = *Abhidhānottara*; SU = *Samvarodaya*): 1.5–6b = S 6.3.26–27b; 1.17 = S 6.3.44c–45b; 1.18ab = 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 4.24–38f; 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 *Vidyādhārikramavajrayoginīsādhana*, which appears in the Kanjur (Tōh. 380) between the major Tantras of the Cakrasaṃvara cycle and those of contested authenticity,<sup>430</sup> included perhaps, in spite of its genre, because it states in its opening words that it is part of the otherwise unattested *Mahāmāyājālorhvajaṭottaratānta*, which, it claims, was extracted from the *Trilakṣa*, that it to say, from the vast mythical Ur-text of this cycle, the *Trilakṣābhidhāna*.<sup>431</sup>

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 (*nidānavākya*) that is lacking in the *Laghuśaṃvara* itself. Bhavabhaṭṭa, taking care not to claim direct access to that mythical source, saying only that his knowledge of its *nidānavākya* has reached him through the lineage of his teachers (*guruparamparā*),<sup>432</sup> 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 *Laghuśaṃvara* too. But he reports a contrary view that Vajravārāhī was the teacher and Mahāvajradhara her pupil.<sup>433</sup> 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 (Devī/Bhairavī). In the explanatory Tantras of the Cakrasaṃvara cycle this model is made explicit in the *Vajradāka*, where Vajrasattva/Vajradāka teaches in response to the questions of Devī, and in the *Ḍākārṇava* and *Vajravārāhīkalpa*, where Vireśvara responds to the questions of Vireśvarī. But in the *Caturyoginīsamputa*, another of the satellite Tantras of this cycle, the goddess Vajriṇī (Vajravārāhī) is the teacher and Vajrin (Heruka) the questioner.<sup>434</sup> That this inversion seen in the view reported by Bhavabhaṭṭa and

<sup>430</sup> In Sanskrit it is preserved as the twenty-first Sādhana in the *Guhyasamaya-sādhanamālā*, ff. 85r4–86r1.

<sup>431</sup> *Guhyasamayasādhanamālā*, f. 62r2: *athātaḥ saṃpravakṣyāmi trilakṣākṣṛṣṭamahāmāyājālorhvajaṭottaratāntre . . .*

<sup>432</sup> Bhavabhaṭṭa, *Cakrasaṃvarapañjikā*, introduction: *mahāvajradharo deśakah. . . bhagavatī vajravārāhy adhyeṣikā vajrapāṇiḥ saṃgatā . . . vajravārāhy-ādhyeṣitasya bhagavataḥ prativacanam etad athāta ityādi . . . adhyeṣikā devīti ko niyama iti cet | guruparamparāto hi śrūyate mūlatāntre saivādhyeṣiketi | tata ihāpi saiveti gamyate.*

<sup>433</sup> *Ibid.*, following the preceding citation: *bhagavān adhyeṣako bhagavatī deśiketi kecit. acintyarūpo hi tathāgatānām abhiprāyaḥ* 'Some say that the Lord [Mahāvajradhara] was the requester and the Goddess [Vajravārāhī] the teacher. For the intention of the Tathāgatas is inscrutable'.

<sup>434</sup> *Caturyoginīsamputa* 2.15d–16: *atha sā vajriṇī devī idaṃ vākyaṃ udīrayet | abhiṣekaṃ \*sukathitaṃ* (conj. [=legs par brjod nas Tib.] : *kathitaṃ* Cod.)



in the *Caturyoginīsaṃputa* 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 *Kālikulakramasadbhāva*, the *Kālikulapañcaśataka*, and the *Manthānabhairava*.

THE ADOPTION OF THE VIDYĀPĪṬHA'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 Vidyāpīṭha's Kāpālika mode of post-initiatory observance (*caryāvratam*). Buddhist Sādhakas now carry the skull-bowl (*kapālam*) and skull-staff (*khaṭvāṅgaḥ*), and put on the Mudrās of human bone and a brahmanical thread (*yajñopavītam*) made of the twisted hair of corpses or human sinew, and dust their bodies with ash.<sup>435</sup>

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

<sup>435</sup> E.g. *Yogaratanmālā* on *Hevajra*, p. 155: *caryākāle gaṇacakraḍau vā pañcānām mudrāṇām dhāraṇā*; *Laghuśaṃvara* f. 37v3 (51.2): *nivasanaṃ pañcamudrādi gātrasya*; *Abhidhānottara* B f. 10v2–2 (3.18): *pañcamudrādhāro nityaṃ kapālakṛtasekharah | kapālakhaṭvāṅgadhārī ca bhasmoddhūlitavigrahaḥ*; Bhavabhṭta, *Cakrasaṃvarapañjikā* on *Laghuśaṃvara* 51.21a: *pañcamudrādīti. kaṇṭhikācūḍakeyūrakuṇḍalabrahmasūtrāṇīti*; Jayabhadra, *Cakrasaṃvarapañjikā* on *Laghuśaṃvara*: p. 128: *pañca mudrā rucakaśiromaṇikuṇḍalakaṇṭhikāyajñopavītāḥ pañca | sarvadā tair avirahito bhavet*; *Yoginīsaṃcāra* 6.12c–13d: *kaṇṭhikārucakakuṇḍalaśiromaṇivibhūṣitāḥ yajñopavītaṃ bhasmeti mudrāṣaṭkaṃ prakīrtitaṃ*; *Khrag 'thung mngon par 'byung ba* f. 13r4 (*Herukābhūdaya* 15.27): *nub 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 Sādhaka Hero (*vīrah*) [should] always [be] naked at night (*rātrau ca satataṃ nagnaḥ* [?]), equipped with the Mantras and Mudrās (*mantramudrānvītaḥ*), and wearing the five [bone] Mudrās (*pañcamudrāśamanvītaḥ*)'; *Hevajra* 1.3.14: *cakrī kuṇḍala kaṇṭhī ca haste rūcaka mekhalā | pañcabuddhaviśuddhyā ca etā mudrāḥ prakīrtitāḥ*; 1.6.2a: *śīrasi cakrī dhartavyā* (= *śiromaṇiḥ*, a circlet of bone; the *mekhalā* is a filigree made of small pieces of bone worn around the hips); *Hevajra* 1.6.16cd: *bhasma keśapavītraṃ ca yogī bibharti caryayā*; *Muktāvalī* ad loc.: *keśapavītraṃ keśayajñopavītam*; *Vajrāvalī* B, p. 218: *athavā nr̥naharumayaṃ keśakṛtaṃ vā brahmasūtraṃ* 'or the sacred thread may be made of human sinew or hair'; *Abhisamayamañjarī*, pp. 131–132: *cakrikūṇḍalakaṇṭhikārucakakuṇḍalāṇī śiromaṇivibhūṣitaḥ | yajñopavītaṃ bhasmeti mudrāṣaṭkaṃ prakīrtitaṃ iti kecit*. For the Śaiva case see, e.g., *Svacchandodyota* on 3.2b: *mudrālaṅkārahūṣitāḥ śikhākaraṇaprakoṣṭhapraṭiṣṭhāpitapañcamudraḥ*; *Picumata*, f. 101r3 (21.104): *karnau śīrasi bāhūbhyāṃ asthikhaṇḍair vibhūṣitāḥ*; a verse cited by Yāmunācārya in his *Āgamaprāmānya*, p. 93 (Y), edited here by collation with the closely related verse cited by Nirmalamāṇi as cited by Brunner in *Somaśambhupaddhati* vol. 3, p. 681, n. 7 (N): \**kaṇṭhikā* (em. : *karnīkā*

The pan-Indian topography of the Śākta Śaivas' sacred sites, their Pīṭhas, Kṣetras, Upakṣetras, Saṃdohas/Chandohas,<sup>436</sup> and the like, is also adopted. Two lists of such sites are found: one in the *Vajraḍāka* and the other in the *Laghuśaṃvara*.<sup>437</sup> Also adopted is the practice of visiting these sacred sites (*pīṭhabhramaṇam*)<sup>438</sup> in search of meetings with the Yoginīs/Dākinīs that are

Y : *kunḍikā* N) *kunḍalam caiva \*rucakaṃ* (Y : *uragaṃ* N) ca *\*śikhāmaṇiḥ* (*ṇiḥ* N : *ṇim* Y) | *\*bhasma yajñopavītaṃ* ca (Y : *keśayajñopavītaṃ* ca N) *\*mudrā-ṣaṭkaṃ pracakṣate* (Y : *mudrā ete mahāvratāḥ* [*< mahāvrate*]) 'The [Kāpālikas] teach that the six Mudrās are (1) the necklace, (2) the earrings, (3) the bracelets, (4) the hair-jewel, (5) ashes and (6) the sacred thread [made from human hair]'. This followed in Y by a second verse: *kapālam atha khaṭvāṅgam upamudre prakīrtite* | *ābhir mudritadehas tu na bhūya iha jāyate* 'The skull-bowl and skull-staff are called the sub-Mudrās. One whose body is sealed by these [eight] is not born again in this [world]'; *Jayadrathayāmala*, *Ṣaṭka* 3, f. 201v3: *dvitīyaṃ tu vratam vakṣye ghorakāpālarūpiṇa* *<m>* | *śire kapālamukuṭam śiromālāvibhūṣitam* | *kare karṇau tathā pādaḥ asthikhaṇḍair vibhūṣitau* | *vāme kapālam khaṭvāṅgam tathā vai dakṣiṇe kare*. The six Mudrās minus the ashes, that is to say, the five of the Buddhist lists, are defined, but not numbered, in *Jayadrathayāmala*, *Ṣaṭka* 1, f. 139r1–3 (23.33–36b), in the order earrings, bracelets, hair-jewel, sacred thread of human hair, and necklace: *vīrāṇām nṛpaśārdūla tantrē 'smin bhairavārcite* | *śubhraśāṅkhe prakartavye dvyaṅgule karṇike śubhe* | *\*rucake* (em. : *caruke* Cod.) *dvyaṅgule śaste turyāṅguṣṭhaḥ śikhāmaṇiḥ* | *trivṛnnarakacotpannas tripañcasarikāḥ samah* | *kaṅṭhāj jaghanasaṃsparśi* (\**ja* corr. : *jaṅ* Cod.) *śastah pañcavato 'pi ca* || *svṛttamanīsamghā\*ta* (corr. : *taḥ* Cod.) *saṃghātaikāvalī samā* | *dhāryā sādhakacandreṇa śeṣabhūtā tadīccha\*yā* (em. : *gā* Cod). The 80th chapter of the *Picumata* describes, but does not number, (1) the hair-jewel, (2) earrings, (3) a necklace (*kaṅṭhamudrā*), (4) the sacred thread, and (5) ornaments of bone on hands, arms and hips. The last takes the place of the bracelets (*rucake*) listed elsewhere and in Vajrayānist texts (*Picumata* ff.311v-312r): *cūdāmaṇikapālena śikhāyām yo niveṣitah* | *īśvaras tatra vijñeyo adhidevo varānane* | *jñānaśaktiḥ kriyākhyā ca karṇike parikīrtite* | *kaṅṭhe sthitā tu yā mudrā aham tatrādhidevatam* | *rudro māṭṛgaṇaiḥ sārḍham jñātavyas tu varānane* | *anantā hy upavīte tu śaktiḥ sarvādhvagā parā* | *hastabāhukaṭīsthaiś ca viṣṇur jñeyo 'dhidevatam* | *śaktayo vividhākārā jāṭānām adhidevatam* | *etan mahārthadaṃ devī yo vijānāti tattvataḥ* | *śivavat sa tu boddhavyo viruddhācaraṇo 'pi yaḥ*.

<sup>436</sup> The Śaiva term *saṃdohaḥ* for one class of site consistently appears in Buddhist treatments in the form *chandohaḥ* (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 *chañcibā* < Skt. *saṃcayati*; Bengali *chātu* < Skt. *saktuḥ*; Oriya *chāc*, *chacā* < Skt. *satya-*; Bengali *chut*, Bengali and Oriya *chutā* < Skt. *sūtram*; Oriya *chaṇa* < Skt. *śaṇaḥ*; Bengali *chādlā* < Skt. *sādvalam*; and Bengali *chikal*, *chikli* < Skt. *śṛṅkhala-*, *śṛṅkhalikā*.

<sup>437</sup> On these lists see here pp. 192–203.

<sup>438</sup> See, e.g. *Samvarodaya* 8.29b,d: *pīṭhādideśagamanena viśuddhadeham ... vande sadā guruvaṃ śirasā 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: *pīṭhopapīṭhasevanān nirmalo bhavati mānavah* | *bhraman nimitam saṃlakṣya nirvikalpena dhīmataḥ* '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;<sup>439</sup> classifying such women as belonging to one

*pīthe kṣetre ca cchandohe melāpakaśmaśānake || pūjyapūjakasaṃbandhe amṛtam argham uttamam || ... pratiṣṭhāhomakāleṣu pīṭhabhramaṇagocare || naimitte yoginīpūjye mantrasādhanatatkṣaṇe | evaṃ bahuvīdhā jñeyā tasya doṣo na vidyate* 'In a Pīṭha, Kṣetra, Chandoha, Melāpaka, a cremation-ground, or an encounter between worshipper and worshipped, wine is the highest guest-water. ... on the occasion of installation ceremonies, when wandering through the Pīṭhas, during worship of the Yoginīs occasioned by some event, and when doing the Sādhana 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. *Nīśisaṃcāra*, f. 10v2–3: *evam eva prakāreṇa ghorasādhanatātparam | kṣetra paryaṭamānasya sādhakasya mahādhiye | śabdam dadāti yaḥ kaścit tasya praśnaṃ vadāmy aham* 'O you of great understanding, I shall teach [you] the requests [that should be addressed] to any [divine being] who speaks to the Sādhaḥa as he wanders in this manner visiting the Kṣetras, intent on the Ghorasādhana'; *Tantrāloka* 29.40ab: *iti saṃketābhijñō bhramate pīṭheṣu yadi sa siddhīsuḥ* 'If a person seeking Siddhis wanders from Pīṭha to Pīṭha knowing these signs[, the *chummāḥ*] ...

<sup>439</sup> Jayabhadra, *Cakrasaṃvarapañjikā* on 26.1, p. 125: *yāvanti kṣetropakṣetrāṇi yogapīṭhāni tatra vyavasthitā dūtyaḥ siddhidās cumbanāvagūhanād etaḥ viśeṣeṇeti yāvat* 'Dūtīs are present in all the Yogapīṭhas, the Kṣetras, and Upakṣetras. These bestow Siddhi, especially through kissing and copulating [with the Sādhaḥa]'; *Laghuśaṃvara* 41.4c–5, reconstructed from the lemmata in the *Cakrasaṃvarapañjikā* of Bhavabhaṭṭa, the commentary *Sādhananidhi* of Kamalāpāda (K), this passage as incorporated in *Vajraḍāka* f. 41v2 (18.2) (V), and the Tibetan translation (T): *sarvottareṣu pīṭhādi dākīnyas tu sarvavyāpinī | deṣe deṣe \*bhijāyante* (V, *mngon par skye* T : *jāyante* K) *jñānayuktāḥ svayoniṣu | dākīnyas tāḥ samākhyātāḥ vajramaṇḍalanāyikāḥ* 'In all these superior [sites] in various regions, namely the Pīṭhas and the rest, women are born who are endowed with knowledge in their mother's wombs. It is these that are called Dākīnīs, leaders of the Vajramaṇḍala'. Cf. *Tantrasadbhāva* f. 115v3–4 (16.279c–280): *vijñāna-mudayaṃ āsāṃ kathyamānaṃ nibodha me | pīṭhajās cāṣṭabhir varṣaiḥ ksetrajā dvādaśādbdikāḥ | dvāre ṣoḍaśabhir devi yonijāḥ saptaviṃśati* 'Listen to my account of the emergence of the enlightenment of these [Yoginīs]. Those born in Pīṭhas [achieve it] at the age of eight, those born in Kṣetras at the age of twelve, [those born in] Dvāras at the age of sixteen, and those born of [lowly] wombs at the age of twenty-seven'. Cf. *Tantrāloka* 15.97cd–100b: *bāhye tu tādrśāntaḥsthayoga-mārgaviśārādāḥ || devyaḥ svabhāvāj jāyante pīṭhaṃ tad bāhyam ucyate | yathā svabhāvato mleccā adharmapathavartinaḥ || tatra deṣe niyatyetthaṃ jñānayogau sthitau kvacit | yathā cātanmayo 'py eti pāpitāṃ taiḥ samāgamāt || tathā pīṭhas-thito 'py eti jñānayogādīpātratām* 'In the outer [Pīṭhas, Kṣetras and the rest as opposed to these that were disposed 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 Pīṭha becomes the beneficiary of enlightenment, meditation-trance, and [Siddhis]'; and 29.40: *iti saṃketābhijñō bhramate pīṭheṣu yadi sa siddhīsuḥ | acirāl labhate tat tat prāpyaṃ yad yoginīvanāt* 'If a person seeking Siddhis wanders from Pīṭha to Pīṭha 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;<sup>440</sup> the consumption and offering of meat and alcoholic liquor in their rites;<sup>441</sup> the consumption of foul substances without inhibition as an initiatory test of nondual awareness;<sup>442</sup> the sacrifice and consumption of the flesh

of Yoginīs whatever he wishes’.

<sup>440</sup> *Laghuśaṃvara*, Paṭalas 16–24 (> *Abhidhānottara*, *Samputodbhava*, *Śaṃvarodaya*, *Mahāmudrātilaka*, *Vajradāka*); and parallel passages in the Vidyāpīṭha texts *Yoginīśaṃcāra*, *Tantrasadbhāva*, *Siddhayogeśvarīmata*, and *Picumata*. For full references see SANDERSON 2001, pp. 42–43 (Table I).

<sup>441</sup> Bhavabhaṭṭa, *Cakrasaṃvarapañjikā*, p. 497: *āsu pūjanīyā madyaiś ca māṃsair api vajradevyaḥ | tāḥ pūjitā bhaktimato janasya śrīherukasyābhiratiṃ gatasya samtuṣṭacittā 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<ḥ> samayottamaiḥ | \*madyair* (em. : *padma* Cod.) *nānāvidhai<ś> caiva surāpānais tathottamaiḥ | \*vīramelāpakaṃ (vīra* corr. : *vīrā* Cod.) *divyaṃ yoginī vividhottamā<ḥ> | kapālakhatvāṅgakarā<ḥ> kartikāḍamarukottamā<ḥ> | vādyai<r> nānāvidhair divyai<r> bhojyabhakṣyarasottamaiḥ || vividhais cumbanālingais coṣyalehyottamottamaiḥ | evaṃvidhaṃ śmaśānaṃ tu yakṣavetādarākṣasaiḥ || balim tatraiva dātavyaṃ \*herukarūpam* (em. : *heruko rūpam* Cod.) *udvahet | ḍamaruvajraghaṇṭā<ṃ> ca vādyanṛtya<ṃ> prakurvati || digvāsā mudrayā yukto hūmphaṭkilalāyate | āliḍhapadayogena jvālāmudrāṃ tu bhāvayet || mukham āpūrya samayaiḥ* ‘The illustrious assembly of Vīras [with Yoginīs should be celebrated] with [the eating of] the various superior sacramental meats [detailed above], with various wines and excellent draughts of rice-beer. The various Yoginīs, holding the skull-bowl, skull-staff, a chopping-knife, and a rattle-drum [should be gratified] with various forms of music, the savours of excellent foods soft and hard, with kisses and embraces, with foods to be sucked and licked. Such [should be] the cremation ground [on this occasion]. There he should offer Bali to the Yakṣas, Vetālas, and Rākṣasas. He should assume the form of Heruka. He should [sound] the rattle-drum and Vajra-bell, dance, and make music and dance. Naked together with his consort (*mudrā*) he utters the syllables HUM PHAṬ and cries of joy. Standing in the warrior pose he should make the Flame Mudrā with his hands, having filled his mouth with the sacramental meats’. Paṭala 16 of the *Śaṃvarodaya* is devoted to the preparation and use of alcoholic drinks. At its end (16.51abc) it says: *madyapānaṃ vinā pūjā homaś caiva ghr̥taṃ vinā | sadgurum ca vinā dharmaṃ* ‘There cannot be worship without drinking wine, fire-sacrifice without clarified butter, or religious practice without the Guru’. Cf. the scriptural passages on the indispensability of wine in Kaula worship cited by Jayaratha on *Tantrāloka* 29.1–13. One of those passages says that beer is the Goddess and wine Bhairava; *surā ca paramā śaktir madyaṃ bhairava ucyate* (p. 9, line 2). Cf. *Śaṃvarodaya* 16.12cd: *yā surā \*vajrayoginyā* (conj. : *vajrayoginyo* Ed.) *yo madaḥ sa ca herukaḥ* ‘Beer is Vajrayoginī and wine is Heruka.’

<sup>442</sup> See, e.g., Kumāracandra, *Herukābhayudayapañjikā*, p. 156: *tatreṭi maṇḍale ’mbhojabhājane saṃskṛta<ṃ> biḍālavidādikaṃ dakṣiṇābhīmukhācārya vāso-baddhāsyam śiṣyam ānīya oṃkāradigāyatryā rakṣitvā \*potaṅgīpratipotāṅgī-praśnottarakriyāpūrvakaṃ* (corr. : *potāṅgīm pratipotāṅgīm* Ed.) *praveśya tadāsyē nivesayet* ‘There, that is to say, before the Maṇḍala, the Ācārya, facing south,

of human beings believed to have been reincarnated seven times for this purpose (*saptāvartaḥ*), recognized in both traditions on the basis of similar physical characteristics, and the use of their skulls as skull-bowls;<sup>443</sup> the practice of visualizations in which the Sādhaka enters the body of a victim through the channels of his vital energy (*nāḍī*), extracts his vital essences, and draws them into himself;<sup>444</sup> 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 POTANĠĪ, the *chommā* of welcome] and having received [the *chommā*] PRATIPOTANĠĪ in response, he should bring him before [the Maṇḍala] and place that substance in his mouth'. For the Śaiva literature see the passages cited in SANDERSON 2005c, pp. 113–114, fn. 63.

<sup>443</sup> See, e.g. *Laghuśaṃvara* 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; *Herukābhyudaya*, Paṭala 13 (*Khrag 'thung mngon par 'byung ba* f. 10r7–v6); *Hevajratāntra* 1.11.10–11; *Mahāmudrātilaka* f. 23r3–4 (12.20–21): *tādrśaṃ yatnāt saptajanmānam ānayet | nānāpūjopahāreṇa pūjayet taṃ samāhitaḥ || tasyottamāṅgam utkr̥tya kārayet padmabhājanam | tatraiva pātre madanaṃ pāyayet prajñayā 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): *athānyaṃ \*caiva* (conj. : *caika* Cod.) *karmākhyam pravakṣyāmy ādarāc chr̥ṇu | yena prāśitamātreṇa āśu siddhiḥ pravartate || susnigdhaś ca sugandhāṅgaḥ sugandhasvedamaṇḍitaḥ | satyavādī salajjātmā niveśati ciraṃ sadā | kṛpāparaḥ kṣāntiyutaḥ satyavādī nirāśrayaḥ | saptajanmā trijanmā vā.* In the Vidyāpīṭha literature see the treatments of this topic in *Jayadrathayāmala Śaṭka* 3, *Yoginīsaṃcāra*, *Kālañjānapaṭala*; *Tantrasadbhāva*, *Adhikāra* 7; and *Tantrāloka* 16.63–64 and Jayaratha's introduction to this passage.

<sup>444</sup> See, e.g., *Herukābhyudayaapañjikā* on *Herukābhyudaya*, Paṭala 13 p. 155: *svadehāt ḍākinīḥ sphārayitvā sādhye gudena praveśya navadvārair nāḍīmārgēna paśoḥ sādhyasya \*bījaṃ* (conj. : *bījaṃ jīvaṃ bījaṃ* Ed.) *śukrādikam grāhayitvā niṣkāśya svadehe praveśayet* 'He should emanate the Ḍākinīs 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 *Herukābhyudaya*, Paṭala 42, p. 167: *athavā sādhyam ākr̥ṣya tacchukrādi pītvā bhakṣayet* '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): *vārāhyātmabhāvena tarjanya nābhi vedhayet | ḍākinīyādi tu cakrasthā devya<ḥ> \*sūcyākr̥tis* (em. : *sūcyākr̥tās* Cod.) *tathā || navadvāre \*praveśyaitā* (conj. : *praveśya tāṃ* Cod.) *\*vedhayed* (corr. : *vidhayed* Cod.) *dhr̥dayapañkajam | yoginyā hata\*mātre* (conj. : *mātram* Cod.) *tu pibet kṣatajam uttamam || hataṃ ca bhakṣayet so hi buddho bhaviṣyati nānyathā* 'By identifying with Vārāhī he should pierce the navel [of the victim] with his index finger [in the gesture of threat] and cause the Ḍākinīs 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 *utkrāntiḥ* in Śaiva sources and thence in the Buddhist Yoginītantras (Tib. 'pho ba);<sup>445</sup> the adaptation of this practice as a

that [thus] he will become a Buddha'; *Mahāmāyā* 2.10–14b. On the extraction of the vital essences by such yogic means in Vidyāpīṭha sources see, e.g., *Picumata* f. 10v1–4 (3.198c–207): *praviṣya ca puram divyam \*japtvā* (em. : *japtā* Cod.) *cāṣṭaśataṃ punaḥ* || 199 *avadhūtatanur bhūtvā prayogam idam ārabhet* | *paśubījasamāyuktaṃ Ū-kāreṇaiva bheditaṃ* || 200 *karṣaye tu samādhistho raktaughaṃ raktayā saha* | *tena raktena mantrajñāḥ paripūrṇakapālake* || 3.201 *sugandhahakusumair yukte tenārghaṃ tu pradāpayet* | *devīnām devadevāya sarvasiddhyarthakāraṇam* || 3.202 *datte 'rghē tu prasiddhyeta trailokyaṃ nātra saṃśayah* | *athavā caiva Ū-kāraṃ paśubījasamanvitam* || 3.203 *codayitvā udānena avadhūtatanuḥ \*sadā* (corr. : *sadāḥ* Cod.) | *nirācāreṇa bhāvena paśudehaṃ viśet tataḥ* || 3.204 *tatrastho grahaṇam kuryāt bhūtānām mantracintakah* | *apānena tataḥ śīghraṃ svadehaṃ pravīśed budhaḥ* || 3.205 *pañcabhūtāni cākṛṣya pūjayīta kapāladhrk* | *raktena prathamā <m> devī <m> dviṭīyā <m> māmsabhakṣaṇe* || 3.206 *trīyā tvak-ca-bhakṣā tu caturthī medabhakṣanā* | *snehena tarpayed devaṃ pañcavyomāntasaṃsthitam* || 3.207 *etat te paramaṃ guhyaṃ yogeśīnām tu pūjanam* | *siddhyarthaṃ caiva mantrīnām khecaratvajīgīṣuṇām* 'After entering before the celestial Maṇḍala he should repeat the Mantra eight hundred times. When [in this way] he has become one whose body has transcended all duality he should commence the following procedure. In deep meditation he should draw out a stream of the [victim's] blood with the [Mantra of] Raktā conjoined with the Victim-seed with Ū as the [final] vowel. The Mantra adept should place fragrant flowers in a skull, fill it with that blood, and present it as the guest-offering to the goddesses and Bhairava as the means of accomplishing all Siddhis. Alternatively he should propel the letter Ū combined with the Victim-seed up [along the central channel] with the ascending vital energy and in the state that transcends convention he should enter the victim's body. Once within it the adept should take hold of the gross elements [of the victim's body] while meditating on the Mantra and then swiftly return into his own body by drawing in his breath. When he has drawn them into himself the Kāpālika (*kapāladhrk*) should worship [his deities with them]. He worships the first goddess by offering her the blood, and the second by offering her the flesh to eat. The third eats the skin and the fourth the fat. With the fluid of the body he should gratify the god [Kapālīśabhairava] who resides beyond the five voids [along the central channel]. This worship is the highest secret of the Yogeśvarīs. [I have taught it] to you so that Mantra adepts that seek to master the state of the Khecara may succeed'. See also *Tantrasadbhāva*, ff. 181v5–182r2 (27.1–10); *Jayadrathayāmala*, *Ṣaṭka* 3, f. 184r6 (*Yoginīsaṃcāra* 5.40): *yasmātra karmaṇo siddhī raktākarsaṇapūrvikā* | *tarpaṇam devatānām ca* 'For in this [system] the success of the ritual and the gratification of the deities requires the extraction of [the victim's] blood'; *Tantrāloka* 16.35c–51b, describing the yogic process in detail; and *Netratantra* 20, which describes how Yoginīs extract life-essences from their victims in this way in order to offer them up to Mahābhairava and thereby liberate them.

<sup>445</sup> *Catuṣpīṭha* ff. 68v–70r (*Guhyapīṭha*, Paṭala 3) and Bhavabhaṭṭa thereon (*Catuṣpīṭhanibandha* ff. 50v4–52v7); *Vajradāka* ff. 50r7–52r3 (Paṭala 21); *Samputodbhava* ff. 78r5–80r6 (Kalpa 8, Prakaraṇa 3); *Samvarodaya* 5.67–69 and 19.35c–47. In Tibetan tradition this practice is one of the *nā ro chos drug* or Six Teachings of Nāropā (956–1040), commonly known in English as his Six Yogas. These have been the object of extensive Tibetan exegesis. For English translations of some of these works, including the *Chos drug gi man ngag* attributed to

means of assisting the dying and the dead—we have seen a ritualized realization of this in the Mantranaya’s funeral ceremony taught by Padmaśrīmitra and Śūnyasamādhi<sup>446</sup>—; and the practice of transferring one’s consciousness out of one’s body to pass into and animate a corpse (*parakāyapraveśaḥ*).<sup>447</sup>

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 (*nāḍī*), variously numbered, with three pre-eminent: two vertical lateral channels, *lalanā* and *rasanā*, and a hidden third extending between up the centre of the body to the head, called *avadhūtī* or *caṇḍālī*, 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*<sup>448</sup> nor indeed in the *Laghuśaṃvara*,

---

Tilopā, the *sNyan rgyud rdo rje'i tshig rkang* attributed to Nāropā, and the *Nā ro chos drug gi 'khrīd 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 *Catuṣpīṭha* (and Bhavabhāṭṭa’s commentary), the *Vajradāka*, the *Samputa* (= *Samputodbhava*), and the *Samvarodaya*. MULLIN translates the Tibetan rendering of these titles into English. He identifies his ‘Mystic Kiss Tantra’ as the *Caturyoginīsamputa*. 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 (*utkrāntiḥ*) 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 Atimārga and in the Mantramārga; see *Pāsupatasūtra* 5.30–40; *Pampāmāhātmya* 11.54–71 (explaining that passage); *Skandapurāṇa-Ambikākhaṇḍa*, *Adhyāya* 182; *Rauravasūtrasaṃgraha*, Paṭala 9; *Sārdhatrisatikāḷottara* 11.13–19b; *Dviśatika-Kāḷottara* ff. 2v9–3r6; *Trayodaśaśatika-Kāḷottara* ff. 30r9–31r7; *Kirāṇa*, Paṭala 59; *Mataṅgapārameśvara*, *Caryāpāda*, Paṭala 9; *Picumata*, Paṭala 100; *Mālinīvijayottara* 17.25–33; *Tantrasadbhāva* f. 36r11–v10 (9.294–321); *Tantrāloka* 28.292–302; and, in Java/Bali, *Jñānasiddhānta*, chapters 3, 5–7, and 20.

<sup>446</sup> See here pp.126–128. For the Śaiva adaptation of this practice as a means of liberating the dying see, e.g., *Tantrāloka* 19.1–56 (*sadya-utkrāntidīkṣā utkrāmaṇī dīkṣā*).

<sup>447</sup> *Vajradāka* f. 51r1–3 (21.19–22). In the Śaiva literature see *Niśvāsātattvasaṃhitā* f. 22v4 (*Niśvāsamūla* 7.20), (>) *Svacchanda* 7.328c–329b; *Picumata* f. 11v (3.228–232b); (5.95–101); f. 356r4–v3 (96.19–35); *Tantrasadbhāva* ff. 181v5–182r3 (27.1–11); *Mālinīvijayottara* 21.9–19; and *Tantrāloka* 28.294–300. This practice too is one of the ‘Six Yogas of Nāropā’ (*nā ro chos drug*); see Tsong kha pa, *op. cit.* translated in MULLIN 1996, p. 215–216.

<sup>448</sup> 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 Yoginītantras, notably in the *Hevajra*, the *Samputodbhava*, the *Mahāmudrātilaka*, and the *Kālacakra*.<sup>449</sup>

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 (*yuganaddhavāhitā*) is the way to liberation, equated with the lateral pair.<sup>450</sup> 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 VIDYĀPĪṬHA. In the light of this evidence of the pervasive similarities between the Yoginītantras and the Śaivism of the Vidyāpīṭha, and considering the fact that these similarities set the Yoginītantras apart from all earlier forms of Buddhism, the reader will not be surprised to know that there is also evidence that this tradition incorporated

<sup>449</sup> That the Yoga of the energy channels was one of the principal features that distinguished the Yoginītantras was asserted by the learned of the Mantranaya itself; see Śraddhākaravarman cited here on p.239; also Mkhas grub rje, *rGyud spyi*, p. 256, ll. 6–7: *phung kham s 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 passage the distinction is between the esoteric Yogatantras (Mahāyogatantras, Yogotartatantras) headed by the *Guhyasamāja* and the Yoginītantras or Yoganiruttaratantras exemplified by the Tantras of Śamvara 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 divisions on the grounds that there are Yoginītantras (Mother Tantras) that also teach the purification of the Skandhas and the rest. That is true. We find this, for example, 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 Yoginītantras sought to encompass the tradition of the *Guhyasamāja* by incorporating many of its elements. He does not, we may note, support his argument 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 SCHAİK (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.

<sup>450</sup> 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 *Jñānodayatantra*, 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 *Laghuśaṃvara* and its satellites. I have reported and tabulated elsewhere correspondences with passages in five Śaiva scriptures: (1) the *Yoginīsaṃcāra* of the third *Ṣaṭka* of the *Jayadrathayāmala*,<sup>451</sup> (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 *Nīśisaṃcāra*, all of which are texts of the Vidyāpīṭha. There are also a few correspondences with earlier texts of the Buddhist Mantranaya;<sup>452</sup> but unlike those the *Laghuśaṃvara*'s parallels with the Vidyāpīṭha 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

<sup>451</sup> The *Yoginīsaṃcāra*, 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 *Yoginījālaśaṃvara*. For it claims at its beginning to be about to explain what has already been taught in that Tantra. *Jayadrathayāmala*, *Ṣaṭka* 3, f. 169r8 (*Yoginīsaṃcāra* 1.1–6b): *devy uvāca* || *purā tu śaṃvare tantre yad uktam paramēśvara* | \**tan na* (em. : *tatra* Cod.) *jñātam mayā deva guhyatantrasya vistarāt* || 2 *katham sa bhairavo dehas tvayi deva mahābalaḥ* | *katham devyo yajanty enaṃ kulās tāsām kati smṛtāḥ* || 3 *katham kramam mahāgūḍha* <*m*> *cāram tāsām katham vibho* | *carusiddhiḥ katham tāsām etan me brūhi vistaram* || 4 *evam ākarṇya deveśyāvadanāmburuhacyutam* | *vacomṛtam mahādevo bhūyo vacanam abravīt* || 5 *sādhu sādhu mahābhage sarvajñānārthabhājane* | *mahārahasyam atulam yoginīcāram uttamam* || 6 *pravakṣyāmi samāsenā śṛṇuṣu* ' *ekāgramānasā* 'The goddess said: Paramēśvara, I have not understood the teaching that you gave of old in the *Śaṃvaratantra*, because of the great length of [that] esoteric text. What is the nature, O god, of your mighty embodiment as Bhairava? How do the goddesses worship it? How many are their families held to be? How is the most secret procedure of their worship? How, O lord, do they rotate? And how is one to obtain the sacramental substances for them? Explain this to me at length. Having heard thus the nectar in the form of words that fell from the lotus of the mouth of the goddess Mahādeva replied and said: I congratulate you, illustrious and worthy receptacle of the teachings of omniscience. I shall concisely teach you the incomparable great secret, the unsurpassed Rotation of the Yoginīs. Listen with attentive mind'. The last part of the first chapter of the *Yoginīsaṃcāra* gives an account of the many classes of female supernaturals as the constituents of the body mentioned in the list of questions and ends with the words: *ity evaṃ yoganiyamam yoginījāla*\**śaṃvare* (corr. : *saṃcare* D) | *yathotpannam tu kathitam* \**niyogam* (em. : *niryogam* D) *śṛṇu sāmpratam* (D f. 172v4–5, 1.72c–f) 'Thus I have explained to you the arising of the order of the pantheon of powers as [taught] in the *Yoginījālaśaṃvara*. Hear now its application(s)'. See also D f. 199v6–7 (7.124c–125b): *uktāni yāni karmāni yoginījālaśaṃvare* || *ayutam japtvā tu sarvāni karoty eva hi līlayā* 'After repeating the Mantra ten thousand times he easily accomplishes all the rites that I have taught in the *Yoginījālaśaṃvara*'.

<sup>452</sup> 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 Yoginī, Ḍākinī, and Lāmā, and vocabularies of special words and gestures (*chommāḥ*) for communicating with them when encountered (Paṭalas 15–24), the rules (*samayāḥ*) that bind initiates as they engage in post-initiatory *caryā* (Paṭalas 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 *saptāvartaḥ* or *saptajanmā* (Paṭala 49).<sup>453</sup>

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 (*homaḥ*), and the use of the Mantras and the name of the target (*sādhyānāma*) 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 (< *Herukābhyudaya* 15.6–10) < *Picumata* 84.9c–16.
2. The initiation ceremony: *Laghuśaṃvara* 1.15–4.1 < 8.3–28 of the *Yoginīsaṃcāra*.
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.

<sup>453</sup> For my tabulation of these correspondences see SANDERSON 2001, pp. 41–47. See also SANDERSON 1985, p. 214, note 106; SANDERSON 1988, pp. 678–679; and SANDERSON 1994, esp. pp. 92–96.

- (c) *Laghuśamvara, Paṭala* 36 < *Picumata* 26.45c–48b.
- (d) *Laghuśamvara, Paṭala* 37 < *Picumata* 29.1ab, 30.1, 29.35, 29.38–48b, 29.50 [cf. 20.56–57], 29.61ab.
- (e) *Laghuśamvara, Paṭala* 50, up to v. 19 (the point at which the earlier redaction of the text ends) < *Picumata* 5.17–18, 5.23c–28, 5.63, 5.67, 5.70.

Comparison of the textual parallels reveals that it is the Cakrasamvara 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.<sup>454</sup> 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.<sup>455</sup>

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

<sup>454</sup> DAVIDSON 2002, p. 386, n. 105; and GRAY 2005, p. 8, n. 19.

<sup>455</sup> 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.<sup>456</sup>

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 *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.<sup>457</sup> Lack of clarity is hardly likely to be 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.<sup>458</sup>

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

---

<sup>456</sup> See here p. 216.

<sup>457</sup> 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 *lectio difficilior potior* does not extend to nonsense, . . .”.

<sup>458</sup> See here p. 207.

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 *Yoginījālaśamvara*, the *Sarvavīrasamāyoga*, the long version of the *Siddhayogeśvarīmata*, and the *Pañcāmṛta*.<sup>459</sup> 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.<sup>460</sup> 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

<sup>459</sup> On these sources see SANDERSON 2007, pp. 234–237, footnotes 15–16, and 21–22.

<sup>460</sup> See, for example, the list of Tantras ‘venerated by the circle of Yoginis’ given in the first chapter of the *Yoginīśamcāra* as sources on the matters it covers (*Jayadrathayāmala*, *Ṣaṭka* 3, ff. D 170v2–171r3 [1.29–42b]): *mūla-tantram kubjikā ca yoginījālaśamvaram | \*aṭṭaśambaranāmānam* (ABCE : *aṭṭaśasvaranāgānam* D) *haṭṭadhūlis tathāparā || 1.30 calākṣaram mahātantram viśvakriḍāvātāarakam | mahāmāyottaram nāma sarvavīramatam tathā | 1.31 alamgrāsam mahātantram \*kuñcikodghātam* (em. : *kruñcikodghātam* ABCDE) *eva ca | siddhacakram prakāśam ca paṭam tūram \*tathāparam* (em. : *yathāparam* ABCDE) || 1.32 *siddhakaulam mahājālam tathā bhairavagahvaram | kulagahvaranāmānam kulaḍāmarabhairavam || 1.33 jhāṅkārakulam atyugram tathā siddhāmatam śubham | kācanāmatam evānyat kusumālikasamjñitam || 1.34 siddhayogeśvarītantram trikasārottaram tathā | picutantram mahāraudram vimalocchuśmasamjñitam | 1.35 khaḍgarāvanānāmānam tathānyam takamaṇḍalam* (em. : *ṭakamaṇḍanam* ABCDE) | *karoti muṇḍamālākhyam śīracchedam bhayānakam || 1.36 hāhārāvottaram tantram krodham unmat-tabhairavam | ruruyāmalam atyugram tathānyam rudrayāmalam || 1.37 umāyāmalam evānyad gaurīyāmalam eva ca | skandayāmalam evānyam tathā bhairavayāmalam || 1.38 viṣṇuyāmalam eva syān nandiyāmalam eva ca | śukrayāmalam evānyac chakrayāmalam eva ca || 1.39 kapālīśamatam nāma meghanādīśvaram tathā | haṃsayāmalanāmānam caṇḍogram hātakeśvaram || 1.40 mahāvāmeśvarītantram laṅkeśimatam uttamam | lampāṭadyam ca raktādyam tathā haḍḍāmatam param || 1.41 durvāsamatam evānyam evamādyā hy anekāśaḥ | ete tantravarāḥ proktā yoginīcakravanditāḥ || 1.42 eṣu tantravareṣu eva tāsām cāram 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.



this Śaiva pantheon and its ancillaries intact, the only major deviation being that it has four sites that differ from those in the *Niśisaṃcāra*. Particularly striking in the *Vajradāka*'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 Devikōṭṭa, and Vettāḍā/Vetālā of Nagara (Pāṭaliputra/Kusumapura),<sup>463</sup> 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, Caṇḍākṣī, Mahocchuṣmā, Karālā, Danturā, Bhīmavaktā, and Mahābalā, information that is revelant only in the Śaiva context, since these are the four Guhyakās and their attendants that form the inner retinue of Kapālīśabhairava and Caṇḍā Kāpālīnī in the *Picumata* of the Vidyāpīṭha<sup>464</sup> and are not encountered to my knowledge in any Buddhist

(em. [cf. *eruṇḍipīṭhapāda* | *udare* KKK] : *heruṇḍya* Cod.) *udare priye* | \**alampuraṃ* (Cod. KKK : *alipuram* TĀV : *hālā* TĀ) *nābhimadhye* \**saṃdohailāpuram priye* (Cod. [cf. *elāpurapīṭhapāda medasi* KKK] : *kandordhve paramesvari* TĀV) | 19 *kandādhāre tu gokarṇaṃ* \**marudeśaṃ* (corr. : *maruddeśaṃ* Cod. : *marukośaṃ* TĀ) *bhagāntare* | *atha meḍhropari bhadre jñātavyaṃ sādhakena tu* | 20 *dakṣiṇe* \**sakthni* (TĀV : *sakti* Cod.) \**nagaraṃ* (corr. : *nagare* Cod.) \**vāme syāt* (TĀV : *vāmeśyāḥ* Cod.) \**paundravardhanam* (corr. TĀV : *paudravarddhane* Cod.) | *vāmaskandhe purastīram* \**prsthāpuram* (Cod. [cf. *prsthāpurapīṭhapāda dakṣaskandhe* KKK] : *elāpuram* TĀV) *tu dakṣiṇe* | 21 \**kuḍyākeśī* (TĀV : *uḍyākeśī* Cod.) \**jānumadhye* (Cod. [cf. *kuṇḍakeśīpīṭhapāda jānumadhye* KKK] : *dakṣajānau* TĀV) \**sopāraṃ* (Cod. : *sopānaṃ* TĀ TĀV) \**cottare* (em. [=TĀV] : *cāntare* Cod.) *smrtam* | \**kṣīrikā* (corr. : *kṣīrikāṃ* Cod.) \**vāmahaste* (Cod. [cf. *kṣīrikāpīṭhapāda vāmahaste* KKK] *tu* \**māyāpuryā* (corr. : *māyāpuryān* Cod.) *tu dakṣiṇe* | 22 *āmṛatakeśvaraṃ gulphe vāme rājagrhaṃ śubham* | *pādādhāre tu brahmāṇī kālāgnyaavadhidhārakī*.

<sup>463</sup> The name of the goddess of this city is Vettavāsīnī in the *Niśisaṃcāra* (f. 17v [4.43]; em. : *vettavāsīnī* Cod.) Vetrakacchanivāsā in the *Kubjikāmata* (22.37c; em. [MSS E and K] : *cetrakacchanivāsā* BCDJG : *caitrakacchanivāsā* Ed.), and Vetrā in the *Kālikākulakramārcana* (em. : *vatrā* Cod.). In the Buddhist version we see Vettāḍā in the *Vajradāka* (em. : *vettaheti* Cod.) and Vetāḍā in the *Ḍākārṇava*. The *Vāsavadattā* of Subandhu (p. 16, l. 2 to p. 17, l. 4) independently identifies her as ‘the Kātyāyayānī called Vetālā’: *kusumapuraṃ . . . yatra . . . kātyāyānī vetālābhīdhā*. 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 Vetāla’, *vettāḍa-* and *vetāḍa-* being well-attested variant forms of *vetāla-*. I propose that the latter evolved from the former through a vernacular synonym \*Vettālā corresponding to Sanskrit Vetrālayā. Cf. Panjābī and Hindī *ālā* from Skt. *ālayaḥ*; Panjābī *śivālā*, Maithilī and Hindī *siwālā* from Skt. *śivālayaḥ*; and Panjābī *dewālā* from Skt. *devālayaḥ*. The Mahāyānist *Mahāsaṃnipātasūtra*'s *Candragarbhāsūtra*, preserved only in a Chinese translation made by Narendrayaśas in 566, gives in its 18th chapter (*Mahāsaṃnipātasūtra*, chapter 55) a listing of the presiding deities of 55 places extending from India through Central Asia to China (55a–58a [prose]; 59a–60a [verse resumé]). The name of the guardian goddess of Pāṭaliputra is said there to be Bi-lu-chi or Bi-lu-tuo (LÉVI 1905b, p. 265). It is tempting to see this as a deformation of the same name caused by an inadvertent inversion of the last two syllables. But I am not qualified to judge the matter.

<sup>464</sup> See, e.g., *Picumata* f. 19r2–3 (4.254c–256): *guhyaḥkādyam tato vakṣye nāmato*

context outside this text-passage and its derivatives. Thus, for example, the *Nīśiṣaṃcāra* (4.10–13), covering Kolāgiri (Kolhāpur) and Jayantī, reads:

10 **kolāgiryā**<ṃ> **mahālakṣmī karālā**yonisaṃbhavā |  
 kālarūpā sthitā devī daṇḍahastā subhīṣaṇā ||  
 11 *tasmin kṣetre sthitā devī parvatāgrasamāśritā* |  
**agniketi** ca vikhyātaḥ kṣetrapālo mahātape ||  
 12 **jayantyā**<ṃ> **danturā**yonī<r> **javālāmukheti** viśrutā |  
 khaḍgahastā sthitā devī sarvasattvabhayaṃkarī ||  
 13 *tasmin kṣetre sthitā devī nimbavr̥kṣasamāśritā* |  
**mahāpreteti** vikhyātas *tasmin kṣetre mahābalaḥ* ||

ff. 16v4–17r3

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

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

12 **kollagiryāṃ mahālakṣmī karālā**yonisaṃbhavā |  
 karālarūpā sthitā devī vikṛtā cātibhīṣaṇā ||  
 13 *tasmin nagare sthitā cogrā parvatāgrasamāśritā* |<sup>465</sup>

*varṇatas tathā* || 255 *raktā karālī \*caṇḍākhyā* (corr. : *caṇḍākhyāṃ* Cod.) *mahocchuṣmā tathaiiva ca* | *ucchuṣmatantre nāmāni guhyakānāṃ na saṃśayaḥ* || 256 *karālā danturā caiva bhīmavaktrā mahābalā* | *guhyakānucarā hy etāḥ kiṃkaryo 'nukramena tu* 'Next I shall explain the [retinue] that begins with the Guhyakās, giving their names and colours. In [this scripture,] the *Ucchuṣmatantra*, the names of the Guhyakās are, without doubt, Raktā, Karālī, Caṇḍākhyā (/Caṇḍākṣī), and Mahocchuṣmā. Karālā, Danturā, Bhīmavaktrā, and Mahābalā: these are respectively their attendant servants'. The *Ucchuṣmatantra* is the *Picumata* itself (f. 185r4: *ity ucchuṣmatantre picumate nāḍīsaṃcārapāṭalaḥ ṣaṭ-triṃśatimāḥ*). The four secondary goddesses that attend the Guhyakās are also called their Dūtīs. I have not emended *caṇḍākhyāṃ*, because although Caṇḍākṣī is the standard form of the name there are several other places in this text in which the goddess is called Caṇḍākhyā.

<sup>465</sup> Both the *Nīśiṣaṃcāra* and the *Vajradāka* read *parvatāgrasamāśritā* (*rDo 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 *nimbavr̥kṣasamāśritā* 'by a Nimba tree' in the next verse. It is tempting to emend, therefore to *parvatāgrasamāśritā* 'in front of a Box [tree]', since this is so close to the transmitted reading. However, two considerations oppose this: (1) in a passage on Kollāgiri in the *Picumata* (f. 7r3–4 [3.84–87]), which agrees in giving Mahālakṣmī as the goddess, Agnika as the Kṣetrapāla, and *daṇḍaḥ* as the weapon, the sacred tree of the site is said to be a Vaibhītaka (84 *dakṣiṇena likhen mantri mahāghoraṃ bhayāvaham* | *mahāraudraṃ śmaśānaṃ tu nāmnā kollagiri tathā* || 85 *tatra daṇḍam samālikhya madhye vaibhītakadrumam* | *nānavr̥kṣasamakīrṇaṃ kollāgiryoparis tathā* || 86 *citibhiḥ prajvalantībhiḥ samantāt parivāritam* | *dikṣuś caiva vidikṣuś ca bahis tasya mahāyaśe* || 87 *tasyādastāl likhet padmam aṣṭapatraṃ sakarṇikam* | **agnikam** *kṣetrapālaṃ tu mahālakṣmībhayāvaham*); and (2) in the *Kubjikāmata*'s parallel version of this material Mahālakṣmī is described as 'residing on a hill' (22.25: *ag-*



**agnimukheti** vikhyātaḥ kṣetrapālo varānanaḥ |

14 **juvālāmukhī** vikhyātā |

khaḍgahastā sthitā ghorā nimbavṛkṣasamāśritā |

kṣetrapālo mahākāyo **mahāvrateti** viśrutāḥ ||

f. 42r2–4

**13c** vikhyātaḥ corr. : vikhyātā Cod. **14b** khaḍgahastā sthitā em. : khaḍgahastasthitā Cod.

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 *Vajraḍāka*'s version but not in the *Niśisaṃcāra*, 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 *Vajraḍāka*'s passage was not the *Niśisaṃcāra* as we find it in its single surviving Nepalese manuscript but rather a closely related redaction either within another version of the *Niśisaṃcāra*, such as we find in the paraphrases and citations of a work of this name in the *Tantrāloka* of Abhinavagupta and Jayaratha's commentary,<sup>466</sup>

---

*nikena samopetāṃ daṇḍahastāṃ nagaukasām* | kolāgiryē mahālakṣmīṃ naumi lakṣmīvīvardhanīm). The hypermetrical reading *karālarūpā* in 12c, which was also that of the Tibetan translation (*rDo rje mkha' 'gro* f. 49r6: *gtsigs pa'i gzugs can*), is no doubt an error for *kālarūpā*, echoing *karālā* in the preceding quarter.

<sup>466</sup> See the paraphrase of the *Niśisaṃcāra*'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 Uḍḍiyāna, Caṇḍālīnī 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 (*somasambhava*), and Svayambhū (*svayambhuyonisambhavā*), and in the case of the fourth omitting to assign her to any deity.<sup>467</sup> 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 *Laghuśamvara* 41.6–15. The verses first list these places (6–8b) and then state the classes of Yoginīs and other female supernaturals said to be present in them, though without covering them all.<sup>468</sup> The Śaiva source, or rather a later redactional variant of it, is seen in the following passage in the *Tantrasadbhāva*:

---

Kolāgiri, Jayantī, Ujjayinī, Prayāga, Varāṇā, and Kotīvarṣa (/Devikoṭṭa) (the eight Kṣetras); Virajā, Erudī, Hatapura, Elāpura, Gokarṇa, Marukeśvara, Nagara (Pāṭaliputra), and Puṇḍravardhana (the eight Saṃdohas); and Parastīra, Prṣṭhapura, Kuṇḍī, Chośmāra, Kṣīrika, Māyāpurī, Āmrāṭikeśvara, and Rājagṛha (the eight Upakṣetras). The list in the redaction known to Abhinavagupta and Jayaratha has Prayāga, Varāṇā, Aṭṭahāsa, Jayantī, Vārāṇasī, Kālīṅga, Kulūtā, and Lāhulā (the eight Kṣetras); Virajā, Erudī, Hālā, Elāpura, Kṣīrapurī, Nagara, Māyāpurī, and Marudeśa (the eight Saṃdohas); and Jālandhara, Nepāla, Kaśmīra, Gargikā, Hara, Mlecchadigdvāravṛtti, Kurukṣetra, and Khetaka (the eight Upasaṃdohas). It is striking that this introduces a number of Himalayan regions, namely Kulūtā (Kulu), Lāhulā (Lahul), Nepāla, Kaśmīra, and also Gargikā, if that refers to Garhwal. Mlecchadigdvāravṛtti 'the pass (?) to the region of the barbarians' is also likely to refer to a location in the Himalaya or Hindu Kush.

<sup>467</sup> *Vajradāka* f. 43r1–2 (18.43): \*oḍyāyane \*mahādevī (corr. : mahādevi Cod.) guhyākhyāyonisambhavā | vajrasṛṅkhaladharā devyā sughorā divyarūpinī; f. 43r2–3 (18.45): jālandhare tu caṇḍālīnī jñeyā mudra kaṭṭārikodyatā | somasambhava mahādevi sarvaiśvarya\*pradāyikā (em. : dāyikā Cod.); f. 43r7–v1 (18.55): bhoṭaviṣaye sahajākhyā makaradhvajadhāriṇī | svayambhuyonisambhavā saumyāsyā divyarūpinī; f. 43v1–2 (18.57): mālave tu tathā sekā mudrāmudgara\*dhāriṇī (corr. : dhāraṇī Cod.) | sādhakānāṃ \*priyā (corr. : prayā Cod.) nityaṃ ṭjasasvini prasāsyāḥṭsyuḥ.

<sup>468</sup> 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).

*kulūtāyām araṇyēse sindhudeśe nageśvare ||*  
 62 *samudrakuṣyāṃ saurāṣṭre pretapuryāṃ himālaye |*  
*kāñcyāṃ lampākaviṣaye kaliṅge kauśale sthale ||*  
 63 *triśakunis tathā caudre kāmarūpe ca mālave |*  
*devikoṭṭe sudhārāme godāvaryās taṭe 'rbude ||*  
 64 *eṣu deśeṣu yāḥ kanyāḥ striyo vā klinnayonayah |*  
*sarvās tāḥ kāmarūpiṇyo manovegānuvṛttayah ||*  
 65 *śeṣeṣu yās samutpannāḥ śākinyo ghoramātarah |*  
*ṣaḍ yoginyah kulūtāyāṃ araṇyēse ca mātārāḥ ||*  
 66 *sindhudeśe bhagīnyas tu nageśe kulanāyikāḥ |*  
*samudrakuṣyāṃ kāmpilyah saurāṣṭre ḡrhadevatāḥ ||*  
 67 *pretapuryāṃ mahākālyo rūpiṇyo himavadgirau |*  
*kāñcyāṃ ambāḥ samākhyātā lampākaviṣaye 'mṛtāḥ ||*  
 68 *kaliṅge vratadhāriṇyah kauśale piśitāśanāḥ |*  
*cakravākyāḥ sthale proktās triśakunyāmarāḥ smṛtāḥ ||*  
 69 *deśadvaye ca śākinyo nāyikā vīranāyikā<h> |*

...

126 *yās cānyās ca vinirdiṣṭā raudrā bhairavamātarah |*  
*mahāmanthānarudras tu tāsāṃ maṇḍalanāyakah<sup>469</sup> ||*

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

**62a** *samudrakuṣyāṃ* corr. : *samudrakuṣyā* Cod. **62c** *kāñcyāṃ* em. : *kañcyā* Cod. **63a** *caudre* corr. : *coḍre* Cod. **64a** *eṣu* em. : *eṣa* Cod. **68b** *triśakunyāmarāḥ* conj. [Aiśa Sandhi for *triśakunyāmarāḥ*] : *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 Paṭala 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,<sup>470</sup> the

<sup>469</sup> 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 Sthānayoginīs 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.

<sup>470</sup> *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 sau rā ṣṭa | de bzhin lha yi khyim dang ni | yi dags grong dang kha ba'i gnas | kā ṅci 'am la mpā ka yi yul | ka li ngga dang ko sa la | tri sha ku ne o tre dang | kā ma rū pa mā la wa lha mo'i mkhar dang rā ma'i dbang | go da ba ri a rbu da | au ḍya na dzā la ndhar dang*

lemmata in the surviving Sanskrit commentaries, and a rewriting of parts of the passage in the *Vajradāka*.<sup>471</sup>

41.6 *kulatāyāṃ arāṇye ca sindhudeśe nagareśvare |*  
*suvarṇadvīpe saurāṣṭre tathā ca gṛhadevatā*  
*pretapuryāṃ himālaye ||*  
 7 *kāñcāyāṃ lampākaviṣaye kaliṅge c[ai]va kosale |*  
*triśakunis tathā oḍre kāmarūpe [ca] mālave ||*  
 8 *devikoṭṭe rāmeśvare godāvaryāṃ [tathā]rbude |*  
***oḍḍiyānājālandharapullīramalayādiṣu ||***  
 9 *eteṣu deśeṣu kanyā yā vīrādvayavyāpinī |*  
*sarvās tāḥ kāmarūpiṇyo manoveganivṛttayaḥ ||*  
 10 *ṣaḍ yogīnyāḥ kulatāyāṃ marudeśe ca mātārāḥ |*  
*sindhudeśe [ca] lāmās tu nagare kulanāyikāḥ |*  
 11 *lampāke saurāṣṭre kuladevatāḥ |*  
*pretapuryāṃ mahākālyo dākinī saha rūpiṇī ||*  
 12 *himagirau kāñcāyāṃ sabālikāḥ |*  
*pañcālaviṣaye gṛhadevatā ||*  
 13 *kaliṅge vratadhāriṇyāḥ kośale piṣitāsanāḥ |*  
*pretapuryāṃ vajradākyaḥ sthaleśvare ||*  
 14 *triśakunyāṃ [ca] amarāḥ pullīramalaye |*  
*kanakagirau antyajāḥ striyāḥ sahasrāṇy ekaviṃśatiḥ ||*

| pu llī ra ma la ya sogṣ | yul 'di dag gi bu mo gang | dpa' bo gnyis med rnal 'byor ma | de kun 'dod pa'i gzugs can te | yid kyi shugs kyis 'jug pa yis | rnal 'byor ma drug ku lu tar | myang ma yul na ma mo rnams | si ndhu'i yul na lā ma ste | rigs kyi gtso mo na ga rar | la mpā ka dang sau rā ṣṭra | rigs kyi lha mo rnams yin no | yi dags grong dang nags chen por | mkha' 'gro rū pi ka ru bcas | kha ba'i ri dang kā ṅcir ni | byis bcas ma ru bshad pa ste | pā ṅca la yi yul dag na | khyim gyi lha mo ka li nggar | brtul zhugs 'dzin pa rnams yin no | ko sa lar ni sha za ba | yi dags grong du de bzhin du | rdo rje mkha' 'gro sbom dbang phyug | tri sha ku ner du ma skyes ma | pu li ra ma la ya de bzhin | gser rir sme sha can rigs skyes | bud med stong phrag nyi shu gcig | lhag ma gzhan dag ji snyed pa | dpal ldan he ru ka yi ni | 'khor lo'i rnal 'byor ma yin no | he ru ka dpal sbyor ba che de yi dkyil 'khor gtso mo yin.

<sup>471</sup> *Vajradāka* f. 41v3–6 (18.3c–10b): *ṣaḍ yogīnyas tu sādhakāḥ mlechhabhāṣaṃ tu bhāṣitam | 18.4 kulatāyāṃ tu marudeśe ca yā mātārāḥ || sindhau ca nagare \*ca yāḥ* (corr. : *caryā* Cod.) *kulanāyikāḥ | 18.5 lampāke saurāṣṭre yā<ḥ> kuladevatāḥ | himagirau \*kāñcāyāṃ yāḥ sabālikāḥ* (em. : *kāñcāyāṃ yā bālikā* Cod.) | 18.6 *pañcāla gṛhadevatāyāṃ yā kanyā sahararūpiṇī | kaliṅge \*kośale* (corr. : *kaśale* Cod.) *caiva vratadhāriṇī \*piṣitāsanā* (em. : *piṣitāsinā* Cod.) | 18.7 *pretapuryāṃ triśakunau ca sthūleśvarī khaṇḍa\*rohikā* (em. : *rohitā* Cod.) *sthitā | \*pūrṇagirau* (corr. : *pūrṇagirau* Cod.) *jālandhare caṇḍālajāḥ striyāḥ | 18.8 oḍre kāmarūpe ca mahākanyāḥ devikoṭṭe rāmeśvare ca yā kanyā matā | \*godāvaryāṃ arbude ca* (corr. : *godāvaryāmbude va* Cod.) *dākinī paramēśvarī | 18.9 suvarṇadvīpa<ṃ> \*yathoddiṣṭam* (corr. : *yathodhiṣṭam* Cod.) *udyāyanaṃ tathaiva ca | eteṣu deśeṣu yā kanyā vīrādvayavyāpinī | 18.10 sarvās tāḥ kāmarūpiṇyo \*manoveganivṛttayaḥ* (corr. : *manoveganivṛttayaḥ* Cod.).

15 *anyāpi śeṣās ca yāvatyāḥ śrīherukasya yoginī* |  
*mahāmanthāna tāsām maṇḍalanāyikā* ||

The words within square brackets are purely conjectural

TESTIMONIA: BhBh = Bhavabhaṭṭa ad loc.; DG = Devagupta ad loc.; JBh = Jayabhadra ad loc.; KP = Kambalapāda ad loc.; Tib. = *bDe mchog nyung ngu*; VD = *Vajradāka* f. 41v3–6 (18.3c–10b).

LEMMATA: **6a** *kulatāyām ityādinā* BhBh • *aranyaṃ marubhūmiḥ* JBh **6d** *gṛhadevateṭi saptamīlopāt* BhBh **8a** *āraṇo rāmeśvaraḥ* JBh **8cd** *oḍḍiyāna-jālandharapullīramalayā ādibhūtā yeṣāṃ ta oḍḍiyāna-jālandharapullīramalayādāyo 'rbudādayaḥ* BhBh; *pullīramalayo na nirdiṣṭaḥ* JBh **9ab** *eteṣu deṣeṣu* KP, BhBh, VD • *yā kanyā vīrādvayavyāpinī* VD, BhBh, KP; *bu mo gang dpa' bo gnyis med rnal 'byor ma* (*yā kanyā vīrādvayayoginī*) Tib.; **9c** *kāmarūpiṇya iti* BhBh, VD **9d** *manoveganivṛttaya iti* BhBh, KP, VD **10a** *śaḍ yoginyāḥ* BhBh, KP, JBh, VD **10b** *marudeśe* BhBh, KP • *mātārā iti* BhBh; *mātaraḥ kākāsyādyāḥ* JBh **10ab** *kulatāyāṃ marudeśe ca mātaretyādi* KP, VD **10c** *lāmās tv iti* JBh; *lāmā iti* BhBh **10d** *kulanāyikāḥ* JBh, BhBh **11ab** *la mpā ka dang sau rā ṣṭra* Tib.; *lampāke saurāṣṭre yā<h> kuladevatāḥ* VD; *lampāyāṃ saurāṣṭre kuladevatāḥ* BhBh; **11c** *mahākālo mahābhairavaḥ* **11cd** *pretapuryāṃ mahākanyā ḍākinīsaharūpiṇīti* BhBh; *ḍākinībhir iti saharthe ṭṛṭiyā* | *kiṃbhūtābhiḥ saha* | *rūpiṇyaḥ* | *rūpiṇīty anyā rūpiṇyaś cumbikāsabālikāprabhṛtayaḥ pṛthagbhūtāḥ saha rūpiṇībhir iti draṣṭavyāḥ* **12ab** *himagirau kāñcyāṃ sabālikā iti* BhBh **12cd** *pañcālaviṣaye* | *gṛhadevatā gṛhadevatāyāṃ* BhBh; *pañcāla iti* JBh **13a** *ka li nggar* | *brtul zhugs 'dzin pa rnam s yin no* (*kaliṅge vratadhāriṇyaḥ*) Tib.; *kaliṅge ca vratadhāriṇyaḥ* BhBh **13b** *kośale piśitāsānāḥ* BhBh **13cd** *pretapuryāṃ vajradākinyaḥ* BhBh **14bcd** *pullīramalaye kanakagirāv iti* | *ihāntyajāḥ striyaḥ* | *sahasrāṇy ekaviṃśatir iti bāhulyasūcanārtham* BhBh; *sahasrāṇy ekaviṃśatir iti* KP **15ab** *śeṣānyeṣu yāvatyāḥ śrīherukacakrayoginītyādi* KP, BhK (*lhag ma gzhan dag ji snyed pa* | *dpal ldan he ru ka yi ni* | *'khor lo'i rnal 'byor ma yin no*), DG (*lhag ma gzhan rnam s yin snyed pa* | *dpal ldan he ru ka yi ni* | *'khor lo'i rnal 'byor ma yin no*); *śeṣānyeṣu hī yāvantya iti* | *śrīherukasya yoginīti prathamābhavacanalope* BhBh; *anyā api śeṣās ca devatyāḥ śrīherukayoginyāḥ* JBh (cf. DG: *lha mo gzhan dag ji snyed pa* | *dpal ldan he ru ka yi ni* | *zhes bya ba la sogs pa smos so* | *ji ltar zhen* | *he ru ka yi sbyor chen las* | *de yi dkyil 'khor gtso mo yin* | *zhes bya ba la sogs pa la*) **15cd** *mahāmanthāna iti śrīherukasya manthānayogyāḥ* | *tāsām iti nirdhāraṇe ṣaṣṭhī* | *maṇḍalanāyikā iti tricakravartinyaś caturviṃśatir ḍākinyaḥ* JBh; *mahāmanthānaṃ prajñopāyasvarūpatvam upāyo vā* | *tenānvitāḥ śrīherukaḥ prajñārūpaḥ tasya sambandhinīnāṃ tāsām madhye maṇḍalanāyikā vajravārāhī samāpanneti bhāvaḥ* | *mahāmanthānaṃ nirmāṇaṃ nirvibhaktikaṃ* | *tāsām nirmāṇaṃ śrīherukenaiva sampādyāṃ yataḥ* | *śrīherukamahāmudrā-maṇḍalanāyiketi kecit* BhBh

In the Buddhist version the total of twenty-one sites has been raised by the addition of Oḍḍiyāna, Jālandhara, and Pullīramalayā at the end of the first section (8cd). The reason for the addition is not made explicit in the *Laghuśaṃvara* itself; but the fourth Paṭala had listed twenty-four Yoginīs from Mahāvīryā to Pracandā;<sup>472</sup> and in the ritual system followed by the commentators and the

<sup>472</sup> *Laghuśaṃvara* f. 4v4–6: *\*tato* (JAYABHADRA : *tataḥ* Cod.) *ḍākinyo bhuvanāni vijṛmbhayanti* | 4.1 *mahāvīryā cakravartinī mahābalā suvirā cakravarmīṇī* |

corpus of explanatory Tantras the sacred sites, as we have seen, are likewise twenty-four because each is the location of one of these Yoginīs. 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.<sup>473</sup> It is clear then that his text mentioned only Oḍḍiyāna 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

*śauṇḍinī khaṇḍarohā cakravegā khagānanā* || 2 *haya\*karṇā* (corr. : *varṇṇā* Cod.) *subhadrā ca \*śyāmādevī* (corr. : *syāmāthavī* Cod.) *tathaiva ca | surābhakṣī vāyuvegā tathā mahābhairavā* || 3 *airāvati drumacchāyā lankeśvarī kharvarī tathā | vīramatī mahānāsā prabhāvati caiva caṇḍākṣī pracaṇḍā ca sādhaḥ* || 4 *etāḥ siddhās tu vai pūrvaṃ caturviṃśati dākinyaḥ*. This list too has parallels in the Vidyāpīṭha, though I have found only partial matches. Thus the *Yoginīsaṃcāra* of *Jayadrathayāmala*, *Ṣaṭka* 3, gives the following list of twenty-four Yoginīs whose names when uttered draw in the Śmaśānabhūtas (f. 202r5–7 [9.58–61]): *śarabhān<an>ā suvīrā ca vajribhā \*rāsabhā* (conj. : *rāsibhā* Cod.) *tathā | \*cakravartī* (corr. : *cakravartī* Cod.) *ca \*śauṇḍī* (em. : *pauṇḍī* Cod.) *ca khaḍgakarṇā mahātapa* || 59 *cakravegā mahāyāmyā subhadrā gajakarṇikā | carā vai somādevī ca gavākṣī vāyuvegagā* || 60 *airāvati mahānāsā daṃṣṭrālī ca sukarkaśā | vedhanī ca tathā bhāṭṭā droṇā kākenakā tathā* || 61 *yatra nāmāni yoginām uccāryante mahātape | tatra śmaśānabhūtās ca sāmṇidhyaṃ yā<n>ti tatkaṣaṇāt*. The eight names in bold characters are those that are among the twenty-four of the *Laghuśaṃvara*. Compare also the names Śarabhānanā, Khaḍgakarṇā, Gajakarṇikā, and Somādevī with the *Laghuśaṃvara*'s Khagānanā, Hayakarṇā, and Śyāmādevī. The names of four of the *Laghuśaṃvara*'s Dākinīs are found among the fourteen inner goddesses of the *Picumata*, i.e., the four Guhyakās, their four Dūtis, and the six Yoginīs, namely Caṇḍākṣī (the third Guhyakā), Mahābalā (the fourth Dūtī), and Cakravegā and Mahānāsā (the fifth and sixth Yoginīs). For the first eight see 4.254c–256 cited here p. 193. For the six Yoginīs see f. 19r3 (4.257): *kroṣṭukī vijayā caiva gajakarṇā mahāmukhī | cakravegā mahānāsā ṣaḍ yoginyaḥ prakīrtitāḥ*. **Suvīrā** appears in *Kubjikāmata* 21.45c and *Matasāra* f. 138r1, **Khagānanā** as one of the eight Śaktasiddhās of the Kālikula/Krama, **Laṅkeśvarī** in *Matasāra* f. 81r1 as one of eight Yoginīs in a variant of the inner retinue of the *Picumata*, and **Prabhāvati** in *Kubjikāmata* 11.115a and 12.23b.

<sup>473</sup> See here p.158. Kāṇha, *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 *Ṣaṃvarodaya* 9.14. In the treatment of the thirty-two sacred sites of the Hevajra system in the tenth Paṭala of the *Mahāmudrātilaka* we find Pūrṇagiri and Pullīra denoting the same place (f. 17r5–v1: *oḍḍiyānaṃ pīṭhaṃ ākhyātaṃ pīṭhaṃ jālandharaṃ smṛtaṃ | pīṭhaṃ pūrṇagiris caiva kāmarūpaṃ tathaiva ca ... f. 18r1–2: śirasi sthitaṃ vajrapīṭhaṃ śikhāyāṃ jādīsaṃjñitam | pullīraṃ mastake jñeyaṃ bhrūmadhye kāmarūpakam*). On the location of Pūrṇagiri, in the Deccan, see SANDERSON 2007a, pp. 298–299. In Śākta Śaiva sources it is one of the principal Pīṭhas and is often referred to, but never under the name Pullīramalaya/Pullīra.

the names of these two places to fill a whole line (8cd).<sup>474</sup> The later reading, *oḍḍiyānajālandharapullīramayādiṣu*, attested by the Tibetan translation and by the lemmata in the commentaries of Bhavyakīrti and Bhavabhaṭṭa, supplies the missing Pullīramalaya and, incidentally, is an almost metrical half-verse: its first half (*oḍḍiyānajālandhara*) 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 ‘Oḍḍiyāna, Jālandhara, Pullīramalaya, and others’. But that would not sit well with the closed list of twenty-four Yoginīs to which the sacred places were required to correspond. Thus it has been interpreted by Bhavabhaṭṭa to mean ‘beginning with Oḍḍiyāna, Jālandhara, and Pullīramalaya’, 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 Yoginīs in twenty-four sites. All that was needed to make this fit the system known to the commentators was to claim that the *Laghuśaṃvara* is deliberately concealing the true order of the items, both the names of the Yoginīs in Paṭala 4<sup>475</sup> and the names of the sacred sites in Paṭala 41. For in their system that order is not Oḍḍiyāna, Jālandhara, and Pullīramalaya followed by the twenty-one from Kulutā to Arbuda, as the *Laghuśaṃvara* itself indicates, but the added three in reverse order followed by the twenty-one in reverse order, with the order of the Yoginīs also reversed, so that the true sequence is from Pracaṇḍā in Pullīramalaya to Mahāvīryā in Arbuda.<sup>476</sup>

<sup>474</sup> 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 Vidyāpīṭha, 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 (Aīśa) 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 Aīśa form that fitted the metre when the Paninian would not, as, for example, in the case of the not infrequent use of Aīśa genitives plural in *-ām* in place of the Paninian *-ānām*.

<sup>475</sup> On the passage listing the twenty-four Yoginīs/Ḍākinīs in Paṭala 4 Jayabhadra comments (*Cakrasaṃvarapañjikā*, p. 115): *tricakravyavasthitānāṃ ḍākinīnāṃ pṛthak pṛthak nāmāni kathyante | mahāvīryetyādinā vilomena kathitam* ‘The names of each of the Ḍākinīs that occupy the three circuits are now taught. This has been done in the reverse order, beginning with Mahāvīryā [and ending with Pracaṇḍā]’. The order in which Mahāvīryā is the last and Pracaṇḍā the first, the order of their ritual application, is, however, indicated later in the text, in f. 35r7 (48.13): *yoginyaḥ pracaṇḍādayas tathā*.

<sup>476</sup> Bhavabhaṭṭa, *Cakrasaṃvarapañjikā*, f. 126v1–3 (Ed. p. 547): *oḍḍiyānajālandhara-*

Most of the few other differences between the version in *Laghuśaṃvara* 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 Triśakuni (16.62c–63b: *kāñcyāṃ lampākaviṣaye kaliṅge kauśale **sthale** | triśakunis tathā caudre kāmarūpe ca mālave*), whereas the *Laghuśaṃvara* lacks it (41.7: *kāñcyāṃ lampākaviṣaye kaliṅge c[aiiva] kosale | triśakunis tathā odre kāmarūpe [ca] mālave*), and instead between Saurāṣṭra and Pretapurī has Gṛhadevatā (41.6: *kulatāyāṃ arāṇye ca sindhudeśe nagareśvare | suvarṇadvīpe saurāṣṭre **tathā ca gṛhadevatā** pretapuryāṃ himālaye*), which the *Tantrasadbhāva* lacks (16.61c–62b: *kulūtāyāṃ arāṇyeśe sindhudeśe nageśvare | samudrakukṣyāṃ saurāṣṭre pretapuryāṃ himālaye*). Two features are immediately obvious here. The first is that the additional words *tathā ca gṛhadevatā* 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 Gṛhadevatā, 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 *gṛhadevatāḥ* ‘household deities’ are said to be present in Saurāṣṭra in a verse in which the items Saurāṣṭra, *gṛhadevatāḥ*, and Pretapurī are stated in that order (16.66c–67b: *samudrakukṣyāṃ kāmpilyas **saurāṣṭre gṛhadevatāḥ | pretapuryāṃ mahākālyo rūpiṇyo himavadgirau** ‘In Samudrakukṣī Kāmpilī, in Saurāṣṭra Gṛhadevatās, in Pretapurī Mahākālīs, in Himālaya Rūpiṇīs’*). Evidently the redactor has read the sequence *saurāṣṭre gṛhadevatāḥ pretapuryāṃ* as though these were three sites rather than one site followed by its resident supernaturals and another site. Probably his manuscript read *gṛhadevatā* rather than *gṛhadevatāḥ* and he took it as a stem-form to be understood as locative, a licence of kind seen elsewhere in both the *Laghuśaṃvara* and its Śaiva sources, as, apparently, in the unmetrical insertion that this error prompted: *suvarṇadvīpe saurāṣṭre tathā ca **gṛhadevatā** pretapuryāṃ himālaye*. Bhavabhaṭṭa duly comments on the occurrence of *gṛhadevatā* in that

---

*pullīramalayā ādibhūtā yeṣāṃ ta odḍiyānājālandharapullīramalayādayo ’rbudādayaḥ kulatāntāḥ | bhāvaś cāyaṃ \*pullīramalayam ādim* (Cod. : *pullīramalayādim* Ed.) *kṛtvā jālandharauḍḍiyānārbudādiṣu santīty upadeśārtham vyatikramanirdeśaḥ | etena maṇḍalē śārīre ca pullīramalayādiṣu yoginīnyāsaḥ kathitaḥ; ff. 126v6–127r1* (Ed. p. 547) *pullīramalayādiṣu praçaṇḍādaya* OM KARA KARA PRACANḌE HŪM HŪM PHAḌ *ityādīmantrajā bhāvyaḥ*.



part of the passage with the words *gṛhadevateti saptamīlopāt* ‘[We have the form] *gṛhadevatā* [here] because zero has been substituted for the ending of the locative’.

The direction of redaction is also unmistakable in the passage of the *Laghuśaṃvara* (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*:

| A   | B  |
|---|--|
| 8.3 <i>girigahvaraguhyeṣu</i>   | 1.15 <i>girigahvarakuñjeṣu</i>   |
| <i>mahodadhitateṣu ca<br/>ādisiddhe śmaśāne vā<br/>ālikhen maṇḍalaṃ śubham</i>  | <i>mahodadhitateṣu vā<br/>ādisiddhe śmaśāne ca<br/>tatra maṇḍalam ālikhet</i>  |
|   | <i>iti herukābhidhāne<br/>maṇḍalāvātārapaṭalaḥ prathamah</i>   |
| 8.4 <i>śmaśānabhasmanā miśraṃ<br/>kapilāgomayaṃ śubham<br/>raktodakavimisreṇa<br/>tena bhūmiṃ pralepayet</i>                                      | 2.1 <i>tatra pānagomayena<br/>maṇḍalabhūmi pralepayet<br/>śmaśānabhasmanā yuktaṃ<br/>pañcāmṛtasamanvitam<br/>2.2 upalipyā tato bhūmiṃ<br/>tatra maṇḍalam ārabhet<br/>śmaśānaṃ tu samācaret<br/>2.3 cityaṅgāracūrṇena<br/>śmaśāneṣṭakasaṃyutam<br/>ālikhen maṇḍalaṃ divyaṃ<br/>ācāryaḥ susalakṣaṇaḥ</i> |
| 8.5 <i>śmaśānabhasma saṃgṛhya<br/>śmaśāne ’ṣṭadalaṃ śubham<br/>śmaśānāṅgāracūrṇaṃ tu</i>  |  |
| <i>trirekhaṃ maṇḍalaṃ likhet</i>  |  |
| 8.6 <i>ekahastaṃ dvihastaṃ vā<br/>caturaṣṭakaraṃ tathā<br/>Cf. B 2.12cd<br/>sūtrayed rudhirāktena<br/>śavasūtreṇa sūtradhṛk<br/>Cf. B 2.11cd.</i> |  |
| 8.7 <i>akrodhano śucir dakṣo<br/>ācāryo jñānapāragaḥ<br/>kapālamālābharaṇo<br/>raudrabhasmāvaguṇṭhitaḥ</i>  | 2.4 <i>samyagjñānatantrañjaḥ<br/>śrīherukamantrañjaḥ<br/>akrodhanaḥ śucir dakṣo<br/>yogajño jñānapāragaḥ<br/>2.5 kapālakṛtamūrdhajaḥ<br/>bhasmānuliptāṅgaḥ</i>   |

Genesis and Development of Tantrism

8.8 *pañcamudrāvratadharo  
bhairavāṅgair vibhūṣitaḥ  
mahābhūtāstrajālena  
samantāt pariveṣṭitam*

8.9 *ālikhen maṇḍalavaram  
ghorasiddhipradāyakam*

*caturaśram caturdvāram*

*madhye padmavibhūṣitam*  
8.10 *aṣṭapatram tu tat padmam  
karṇikādhiṣṭhitam śubham  
tasya madhye nyased devi  
bhairavam bhīmavikramam*  
8.11 *dakṣiṇābhimukhaṃ dīptaṃ  
bhīmarūpaṃ bhayāvaham*

*tasyāgrataḥ sthitā devī  
aghorā ghoravikramā*  
8.12 *bhairavābhimukhāṃ kruddhāṃ  
raudrarūpāṃ nyaset tataḥ*

...

8.19c *tataḥ śiṣyān praveśayet  
sopavāsāñ śucīn snātān  
arcayed uttarāmukhān*

8.20 *kapālena śiraḥ sprṣtvā  
saṃpuṭāṃ hrdaye nyaset  
khaṭvāṅgena tu sarvāṅgān  
ālabhet putrakasya tu*

*saṃbhavān mātrair vibhūṣitagātraḥ*

*mudrāmantrair alaṃkṛtam*  
2.11 *ālikhen maṇḍalam ghoram  
mahāsiddhipradāyakam  
tato mṛtakasūtreṇa  
mahārudhirarañjitenā vā*  
Cf. A 8.6cd

2.12 *sūtrayen maṇḍalam ghoram  
herukasya param puram  
ekahastam catur aṣṭam ca*  
Cf. A 8.6ab

*caturasram tu samantataḥ*  
2.13 *caturdvārasamākīrṇam  
catustoraṇabhūṣitam  
vicared dviguṇam mantrī  
yajed dākinījālasamvaram*

2.14 *tasya madhye pratiṣṭhāpya  
sapatram karṇikojjvalam  
puṣkaraiś ca kesarānvitam*

2.15 *karṇikāyāṃ nyased vīram  
mahābhairava bhīṣanam  
tejaskaṃ tu sudīptāṅgam  
aṭṭaṭṭahāsamahāravam*

2.16 *kapālamālābharaṇam  
divyam trinetrām caturmukham  
hastīcarmāvaruddham ca  
vajrasaṃbhinnasabhruvam*

2.17 *khaṭvāṅgakṛtahastam tu  
śatamālārdhabhūṣitam  
tasyāgrataḥ sthitāṃ devīṃ  
vajravārāhīṃ sughorām*

2.18 *mahābhairavābhimukhāṃ kṛtvā tu  
trimukhīṃ raudrarūpiṇīm*

...

8.21 *agrato vādayed ghaṇṭāṃ  
paṭahim ḍamaruṃ tathā*

*vastracchannamukhaṃ devi*

*puṣpāñjalidharaṃ tathā  
8.22 pradakṣiṇīkṛtya puraṃ*

*dakṣiṇāmūrtim āsritaḥ  
tato dāvāpayet puṣpān  
devasyopari putrakam  
8.23 yasmims tat patate puṣpaṃ  
tat tasya kulam ādiśet*

*hr̥nmantraparijaptena  
tilakān teṣu kārayet  
8.24 raktena darśayet tasya  
mukham udghāṭya maṇḍalam  
yad yasya devatāsthānaṃ  
tat sarvaṃ tasya darśayet  
8.25 samayāñ śrāvayitvā tu  
praṇipatya puraṃ guroḥ  
suśrāvya pūrvavidhinā  
saṃsiddhaputrakān vitam  
8.26 guruṃ saṃpūjya vidhivad  
vittasāṭhyavivarjitaḥ*

*pragr̥hya kulajān mantrān  
vratāṃś ca samayāṃś tathā  
8.27 tāvad ārādhayed devi  
yoginyo mātaro gurum*

*mātrdūtyo vratāṃś caiva  
yāvadantaṃ krameṇa tu*

3.2 *ghaṇṭānādam ālambya  
puṣpadhūpair alaṃkṛtām  
ghaṇṭāṃ vādayet susvarām  
paṭahikām vāpi sādhakah  
3.3 hāhākāraṃ ca kārayet  
evam vidhivat pūjya  
maṇḍalaṃ sarvakāmikam  
3.4 saṃchādya paṭavastreṇa  
mukhaṃ teṣāṃ tu putrakām  
puṣpapūrṇāñjalim prakṣipet  
3.5 pradakṣiṇaṃ ca tataḥ kṛtvā  
sādhakah susamāhitaḥ  
praveśayet tat puravaraṃ ramyaṃ  
dakṣiṇāmūrtim āsritya  
3.6 puṣpāñjalin tataḥ kṣipet  
maṇḍalasyopari  
yasmin patati tat puṣpaṃ  
kulaṃ tatra vinirdiśet  
3.7 śrītherukādipīṭha darśayet  
tataḥ pūjāyen mudrām  
ācāryah susamāhitaḥ  
3.8 śiṣyāñān tu dvitīye ahani  
raktena trijaptena  
tilakaṃ tasya kārayet  
mukham udghāṭya śiṣyaṃ  
darśayen maṇḍalaṃ tataḥ  
3.9 yad yasya devatāsthānaṃ  
tatra tāṃ darśayet samyak*

*praṇipatya tataḥ paścād*

3.11 *tatas tu gurave dadyāt  
tathāgatoktadakṣiṇām*

...

3.15c *tatas tasya tuṣyanti*

*ḍākinyo yogamātarah  
ḍākinyo lāmayaś caiva  
khaṇḍarohā tu rūpiṇī*

8.28 *ārādhana*kramād yāti

*triṣaṣṭicarūśodhitāḥ*

*bhairavībhuvanā devī*

*sarvaśaktibhir āvṛtaḥ*

4.1 *tato dākinīyo bhuvanāni*

*vijṛmbhayanti mahāvīryā*

APPARATUS CRITICUS OF A

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

**8.3c** *ādisiddhe śmaśāne* B : *ādisiddhai śmaśānair* ACDE **8.7a** *akrodhano* em. : *śakrodhano* Codd. **8.10d** *bhairavaṃ* em. : *bhairavī* Codd. **8.11d** *vikramā* em. : *vikramān* AC : *vikramāṃ* B : *vikramāt* DE. Cf. *Picumata* 1.2d: *aghorī bhīmavikramā* **8.19d** *uttarāmukhān* em. : *uttarāmukham* C : *uttarāṃmukham* ABDE **8.20b** *saṃpuṭāṃ* corr. : *saṃpuṭā* Codd. **8.20c** *sarvāṅgān* em. : *sarvāṅgā* ACD : *sarvāṅgo* B **8.21a** *vādayed* conj. : *vādaye* Codd. **8.21b** *paṭahīṃ* em. : *paṭaho* Codd. • *ḍamaruṃ* em. : *ḍamaras* Codd. **8.21d** *dharaṃ* em. : *varaṃ* Codd. **8.22d** *putrakam* em. : *putrakāḥ* Codd. **8.25a** *samayān* em. : *samayaṃ* Codd. • *śrāvayitvā* B : *śrāvayitvās* Codd. **8.25d** *saṃsiddhaputrakān*em. conj. : *saṃsiddham putrakāṃvitam* A : *saṃsiddham putrakāṃcītam* BCDE **8.28a** *ārādhana* conj. : *aropanā* Codd. • *kramād yāti* conj. : *kramaprāpti* Codd.

APPARATUS CRITICUS OF B

Cod. : f. 2r3–. TESTIMONIA : AbhU = *Abhidhānottara* 46.10–57 (A f. 146r6– [*<Laḡhuśamvara* 2.1–]); BhBh = *Bhavabhaṭṭa* ad loc.; BhK = *Bhavyakīrti* ad loc.; IBh = *Indrabhūti* ad loc.; JBh = *Jayabhadra* ad loc.; ŚV = *Śāśvatavajra* ad loc.; Tib. = *bDe mchog nyung ngu*; VV = *Viravajra* ad loc.

**1.15c** *ādisiddhe* BhBh : *ādisiddha* Cod. **2.1a** *tatra pānagomayena* Cod. AbhU, BhBh, ŚV (*chu dang ba byung blangs* ‘water and cow dung’) : *\*tatrāpātagomayena* Tib. (*der ni lei ba ma lung bas*), BhK (*de la lei ba ma ltung bas*) **2.1b** *pralepayet* Cod., AbhU : *upalepayet* BhBh **2.3a** *cityaṅgāra* BhBh : *cityāṅgāra* Cod. : *cityāṅgāraka* AbhU **2.3b** *saṃyutam* conj. (= AbhU); cf. *Picumata* 5.116cd: *kākaṃviṣṭa samādāya śmaśāneṣṭakasam̐yutam*) : *saṃyuktaṃ* Cod. **2.4a** *samyagjñānatantrajāṅgāḥ* Cod., BhBh : *samyagjñāneṣu tattvajñāḥ* AbhU **2.4c** *akrodhanaḥ* JBh AbhU : *akrodhas ca* Cod. BhBh **2.11d** *mahārudhirarañjītena vā* Cod., Tib. (*de nas sems med srad bu ’am | ru di ra ni chen pos brlan*) *mahārudhirarañjītena vā* BhBh : *mahārudhirarañjītam* AbhU, Tib. **2.13d** *yajed* JBh : *japed* Cod. : *pūjayed* BhBh, Tib. (*mkha’ ’gro dra ba’i bde mchog mchod*) **2.17c** *tasyāgrataḥ sthitāṃ devīm* JBh, BhBh, Tib. (*de mdun gnas pa’i lha mo ni*) : *tasyālingatāsthitā devī* Cod. **2.18a** *mahābhairavābhīmukhāṃ kṛtvā tu* JBh : *mahābhairavābhīmukhīm* AbhU, VV (*rab ’jigs byed che la phyogs*) : *śrīherukābhīmukhāṃ kṛtvā tu* Cod. BhBh : *\*mahāśrīherukābhīmukhīm* Tib. (*he ru ka dpal che la phyogs*) : *\*śrīherukajñānābhīmukha-* (*he ru ka dpal ye shes phyogs ni* IBh **3.2c** *vādayet* Cod. : *nādayet* BhBh **3.3a** *pūjya* BhBh : *sampūjya* Cod. **3.4b** *putrakāṃ* em. [Aīsa gen. pl.; =AbhU] : *putrakān* BhBh : *putrakānāṃ* Cod. **3.7a** *śrīherukādīpīṭha* BhBh (*śrīherukādīpīṭheti dvitīyālope*) : *śrīherukādīṃ pīṭhan* Cod. **3.7bc** *tataḥ pūjāyem mudrāṃ ācāryaḥ susamāhitaḥ* BhBh, Tib. (*de nas slob dpon legs par ni | mnyam par bzhag ste phyag rgya mchod*): *tataḥ pūjāyem mudrācāryaḥ susamāhitaḥ* Cod. : *tato hi pūjāyem mudrāṃ ācāryaḥ susamāhitaḥ* AbhU : *tataḥ pūjāyem mudrāṃ svamudrāṃ susamāhitaḥ* JBh **3.9a** *yad yasya* JBh, BhBh : *yo yasya* Cod., AbhU.

Here we see several tell-tale signs. In the Buddhist version the disciples undergoing the initiation are referred to as *putrakāḥ* (3.4ab: *saṃcchādyapaṭavastreṇa mukhaṃ teṣāṃ tu putrakāṃ* ‘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: *karṇikāyāṃ nyased vīraṃ mahābhairava 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 devi bhairavaṃ bhīmaṅvikramam* ‘O Devī, 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 *mahābhairava bhīṣaṇam*, with *mahābhairava* as a stem-form substituted for the accusative *mahābhairavaṃ* for metrical convenience, a common licence in this register of the language, but as *mahābhairavabhīṣaṇam*, preferring a pleonasm ‘most frightening [and] terrible’ to a reading that shows the name of the deity of the Vidyāpīṭha, a clear sign of incomplete assimilation.

The Śaiva text follows this with *tasyāgrataḥ sthitāṃ devīm aghorāṃ ghoravikramāṃ | bhairavābhimukhīm kruddhāṃ raudrarūpāṃ 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 sthitāṃ devīm vajravārāhīm sughorāṃ | mahābhairavābhimukhām kṛtvā tu trinetrīm raudrarūpiṇīm* [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 *śrīherukābhimukhām kṛtvā tu*, and this reading is supported by the commentators Bhavabhaṭṭa (*śrīherukābhimukhām 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 *mahābhairavābhimukhām kṛtvā tu* is what we find in the older redaction attested in Jayabhadra’s commentary, and in the text as incorporated in the *Abhidhānottara* (*mahābhairavābhimukhīm*). It is also supported by the commentary on the later form of the *Laghuśaṃvara* by Vīravajra, 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<sup>477</sup> that what we are seeing is a Śaiva source after its redaction by a Buddhist with little concern for metrical accuracy.<sup>478</sup>

Finally, the *Laghuśaṃvara*'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 (*pañcāmṛtam*) and the ash and powdered charcoal of cremation pyres on the ground of the Maṇḍala (2.1–3),<sup>479</sup> the beating of a drum in its worship (3.2–3), and the marking of the

<sup>477</sup> See here p. 190.

<sup>478</sup> See 2.4ab: *samyagjñānatantrajñāḥ śrīherukamantrajñāḥ*; 2.13d: *yajed dākinījālaśaṃvaram*; and 3.7a: *śrīherukādipīṭha darśayet*. The reading *mahābhairavābhīmukhāṃ kṛtvā tu* (2.18a) probably represents a first attempt to differentiate the Buddhist version from its metrical Śaiva prototype by adding *mahā-*.

<sup>479</sup> This substitution of inauspicious and dangerous substances in the preparation of the Maṇḍala is a marked feature of accounts of initiation found in Vidyāpīṭha texts. See, e.g., *Picumata* f. 5v1 (3.12ab), concerning the Aghorīmaṇḍala): *asthicūrṇatadaṅgaraiḥ mantrajño alikhet puram* 'The mantra-master should draw the Maṇḍala with powdered bone and charred bone'; f. 5v6 (3.31ab): *śmaśānoththena sūtreṇa sūtrakāryaṃ tu kārayet* 'He should do the outlining with a cord from the cremation ground'; f. 10r2–3 (3.184–185): *śmaśānothhāni bhāṇḍāni vastrasūtrādikāni tu | vastrai<r> dhvajā tu kartavyā sūtreṇa karaṇī tathā || keśair darbhā<n> yathānyāyam \*acchinnāgrān* (corr. : *acchinnāgrāḥ* Cod.) *prakalpayet | veṣṭayen maṇḍalaṃ tais tu astrajaptaiḥ samantataḥ* 'The vases, 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*, *Ṣaṭka* 4, f. 65v7 (*Rāviṇīyāgapāṭala*, [concerning the Maṇḍala of Rāviṇī in the *Kālikula* section of the *Jayadrathayāmalatantra*], v. 101cd: *śavasūtreṇa samsūtrya asthicūrṇādibhir likhet* 'He should colour [the Maṇḍala] with powdered [human] bone and the like after pitching its lines with a corpse-cord'; *Jayadrathayāmala*, *Ṣaṭka* 3, f. 200r5–6: *sūtrayed rudhirāktena \*śavasūtreṇa* (corr. : *śavasūtreṇa* Cod.) 'He should outline the Maṇḍala with a corpse-cord smeared with blood'. The nature of this cord is indicated by Kṣemarāja on *Svacchandatantra* 13.21b: *mṛtasūtreṇa vakṣyamānacchummakāyuktyā mṛtasnāyunā* '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 *Svacchandatantra* 15.5: *snāyuh sūtram prakīrtitam* 'The word cord means sinew'. This understanding is also seen in Buddhist Tantric literature. In his commentary (*-piṇḍārthaṭīkā*) on the *Hevajratantra* Vajragarbha glosses *śmaśānasūtreṇa* 'cremation ground cord' as *ro'i rgyus pa rnam kyis byas pa'i srang bus* 'a cord made from the sinews of a [human] corpse' (SNELL-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).<sup>480</sup> 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 *abhiṣekaḥ*. 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 *guhyābhiṣekaḥ*, 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.<sup>481</sup> Bhavabhaṭṭa, however, adopts a more bold and imaginative strategy, finding all seven con-

---

from the guts of a corpse'. We also read of the use of the hair of corpses for this purpose: *Jayadrathayāmala*, *Ṣaṭka* 3, f. 181r4: *ālikhen maṇḍalavaram tato raudreṇa bhasmanā | prathamam sūtrayitvā tu śavamūrdhajarajjunā* 'He should draw the excellent Maṇḍala with human ash after first pitching its lines with a cord of corpse-hair'; *Siddhayogeśvarīmata* 8.8: *narakeśasamutthena karpāsādimayena vā | sūtrayen maṇḍalam divyaṃ sarvasiddhiphalodayam* 'He should trace the excellent Maṇḍala, which bestows the reward of all the Siddhis, with [a cord] made from human hair or from fibres such as cotton'. This option is no doubt fixed: cremation-ground substances for ascetics and conventional substances for householders; see, e.g., *Jayadrathayāmala*, *Ṣaṭka* 2 f. 9v2 (*Vāmeśvarīyāgapaṭala*, vv. 48c–49): *vāmāmṛtādibhir lipya tatra maṇḍalam ālikhet || rajobhir \*vīramārgasthaś* (em. : *vīramārgasthaiś* Cod.) *\*cityaṅgārādibhasmabhiḥ* (*cityaṅgārādi* conj. : *cityaṅgārādi* Cod<sup>ac</sup> : *citāṅgārādi* Cod<sup>pc</sup>) | *ratnādisālījātaiś ca gṛhasthas cālikhet tataḥ* 'Having smeared [the ground] with wine and the like he should draw the Maṇḍala upon it with powders such as the charcoal and ash of funeral pyres, if he follows the path of Heroes, and with [ground] precious stones or rice flour [etc.], if he is a householder'.

<sup>480</sup> 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 trijaptena*]) and the commentators Durjayacandra (*mtshal chen lan gsum brzlas pa yis*), Vīravajra (id.), and Indrabhūti (*mtshal chen ni*).

<sup>481</sup> Jayabhadra, *Cakrasaṃvarapañjikā*, p. 114, ll. 9–11: *kulam tasya vinirdiśed* (3.6) *itiparyantaṃ sukaram eva | tadanantaram tantrānantaraprasiddhena vidhinā sarvam abhiṣekaṃ nivartyedānīm guhyābhiṣekavidhipradhānatvāt pūjayen mudrām* (3.7) *ityādinā guhyābhiṣekaṃ sūcayati* 'The text up to 'he should indicate his Family' is easy. He now alludes to the *guhyābhiṣekaḥ* with the words beginning 'he should worship the Mudrā'. He does so because this is the most important [of the consecrations]. [It 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 *guhyābhiṣekaḥ*.

secreations up to and including the *guhyābhiṣekaḥ* in 3.2–3.3a.: *ghaṇṭānādam ālambya puṣpadhūpair alaṃkṛtām | ghaṇṭām vādayet susvarām paṭahikām vāpi sādhaḥ | hāhākāraṃ 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 (*ghaṇṭābhiṣekaḥ*)<sup>482</sup> and, more astonishingly, that the wild laughter enjoined, literally ‘the sound *hā hā*’, is the consecration of [the giving of the initiatory] name (*nāmābhiṣekaḥ*).<sup>483</sup> Having conjured up these two consecrations he then asserts that the three that precede them are therefore implicitly intended, namely the consecration with water (*udakābhiṣekaḥ*), the consecration with the crown (*makuṭābhiṣekaḥ*), and the consecration with the Vajra (*vajrādhipatyabhiṣekaḥ*).<sup>484</sup> He then subjects this same passage to a second reading in order to force it to refer also to the two consecrations that follow these five: the *ācāryābhiṣekaḥ*, which qualifies the initiate to officiate as a Vajrācārya, and the consecration of the secret (*guhyābhiṣekaḥ*). 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.<sup>485</sup>

<sup>482</sup> Bhavabhaṭṭa, *Cakrasaṃvarapañjikā*, p. 37, l. 17: *ghaṇṭānādam ityādinā ghaṇṭābhiṣekaḥ pratipādyate* ‘The passage beginning with *ghaṇṭānādam* teaches the consecration of the bell’.

<sup>483</sup> Bhavabhaṭṭa, *Cakrasaṃvarapañjikā* p. 38, ll. 6–7: *hāhākāraṃ ca kārayet iti | hāhākāro nāmābhiṣekaḥ | taṃ gurubhaṭṭārakenātmanaḥ 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’.

<sup>484</sup> Bhavabhaṭṭa, *Cakrasaṃvarapañjikā*, p. 38, l. 10: *tata udakamaulivajrādhipatyabhiṣekānām grahaṇam tatpūrvakatvāt 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.

<sup>485</sup> Bhavabhaṭṭa, *Cakrasaṃvarapañjikā*, p. 38, ll. 13–14: *ghaṇṭānādah \*svaṅgāvasthitāḥ pañcaviṃśatikābhidhānam* (em. : *svaṅgāvasthitāḥ pañcaviṃśatikābhidhānam* Ed.) | *ghaṇṭā dvādaśābdikā | paṭahikā ṣoḍaśābdikā | ghaṇṭānādo vajrakulam | ghaṇṭā ratnakulam | paṭahikā padmakulam | hāhākāras tathāgatakulam | cakārād anyac ca | \*ghaṇṭānādādīnām anyatamām ācāryaḥ sevayet* (em. : *ghaṇṭādīnām anyatamānōcāsevayet* Ed.) | *ghaṇṭānādam aho sukheti mantram sādhaḥ śiṣyaḥ kārayed uccārayed ity arthaḥ | kuto ’nantaram ity āha | anāmetyādi | anāmāṅguṣṭhavaktrābhyāṃ lehayed yogavit sadā | somapānavad āsvādya siddhim āpnoti sāśvatīm* (1.12c–13a) *iti gātheha yojitavyā | tato ’syā idam arthāntaram | pūrvoktaprajñāsevayā yad bhūtam tad anāmāṅguṣṭhavaktrābhyāṃ ācāryaḥ śiṣyaṃ lehayet | sa ca śiṣyaḥ tataḥ somapānavad āsvādya siddhim āpnotīti guhyābhiṣeko ’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 *guhyābhīṣekaḥ*, he finds the *ācāryābhīṣekaḥ* 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 *guhyābhīṣekaḥ*, because that requires it as its antecedent.<sup>486</sup> He finds a reference to the final consecration that he needed to discover here, that of wisdom (*prajñābhīṣekaḥ*), in the statement in 3.7 that Jayabhadra had taken to allude to the preceding *guhyābhīṣekaḥ*: *tataḥ pūjayen mudrām ācāryaḥ susamāhitaḥ* ‘Then the Ācārya, fully concentrated, should worship the Mudrā’. If, as is highly probable, the consecration understood by Bhavabhaṭṭa here was the *prajñājñānābhīṣekaḥ* 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 to as an officiant only figuratively, because he has all the qualities that are required of an officiant.<sup>487</sup> These readings are, of course,

---

bell is [a women of] the Vajra Family, the bell [one of] the Jewel Family, the drum [one of] the Lotus Family, and the wild laughter [one of] the Tathāgata Family. The word ‘and’ [in ‘and he should laugh wildly’ indicates [one of] the other [Family, that of Action]. The officiant should have intercourse with one or other of these women of whom the first is ‘the resonance of the bell’. The meaning is [also] that the Sādhaka, [that is to say,] the candidate, should make, that is to say, utter, ‘the resonance of the bell’, that is to say, the Mantra AHO SUKHA [‘Oh, Bliss’]. He [also] tells us that after which [he should utter this Mantra] in the passage [of this Tantra] that begins with *anāmā-*. At this point one must read in the following verse (1.12c–13a) ‘The master of Yoga should always lick [it, taking it] with the tips of his ring finger and thumb. Having relished it as though it were a draught of Soma he attains eternal success’. So there is another sense of this [verse], namely that the officiant should make the candidate take into his mouth [lit. ‘lick’] the product of his sexual union with the aforesaid consort with the tips of his ring finger and thumb; and that candidate, having relished it like a draught of Soma attains Siddhi. This, then, is the *guhyābhīṣekaḥ*’.

<sup>486</sup> Bhavabhaṭṭa, *Cakrasaṃvarapañjikā*, p. 38, ll. 23–24: *sa ca śiṣyaḥ tataḥ somapānavad āsvādyā siddhim āpnotīti guhyābhīṣeko ’yam | ata evācāryābhīṣekaḥ siddhaḥ tatpūrvakatvāt tasya* ‘This is the *guhyābhīṣekaḥ*. This itself establishes the presence of the *ācāryābhīṣekaḥ*, because the former is preceded by the latter’.

<sup>487</sup> Bhavabhaṭṭa, *Cakrasaṃvarapañjikā*, p. 39, ll. 21–22: *tata ityādinā prajñābhīṣekaṃ darśayati | tato guhyābhīṣekānantaram | ācārya iti dhairyādiguṇayogāt* ‘In the passage beginning *tataḥ* he reveals the Wisdom Consecration. The word *tataḥ* (‘next’) means directly after the *guhyābhīṣekaḥ*. 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 *Gurupañcāsikā*: *dhīro vinīto matimān kṣamāvān ārjavo ’śaṭhaḥ | . . .*

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 *Laghuśaṃvara* has it). For ease of comparison I give in bold characters those parts of each of the three related texts, the *Picumata*, the *Herukābhyaḍaya*, and the *Laghuśaṃvara*, that partly or completely correspond to passages in one or both of the other two. The *Picumata* passage is as follows:

*mūlasūtrādikānāṃ tu kramaṃ sādhanalakṣaṇam* ||  
**10 durlabham triṣu lokeṣu samayācārapālanam** |  
*yāgaṃ vidhis tathā jñānam cakram yogam ca śobhanam* ||  
 11 *kathayāmi mahādevi yat tvayā coditam \*balam* (?) |  
**madhyamottamacchāgena gandhodasahitena tu** ||  
**12 vaṭikām prāsayet prājñāḥ pūjākāle viśeṣataḥ** |  
*vidhānan tu sadā yojyam carvāhāreṇa suvrate* ||  
 13 *samaye sādhanē caiva dravyālabhanakarmaṇi* |  
**tasyaiva dūtayaḥ siddhāḥ sahajā vīravandite** ||  
 14 *guruṇādivibhāgena sṛṣṭidravyādīsaṃgrāhe* |  
*ṛtuyogaviyogena anulomavilomajā* ||  
 15 *yāgādhordhvagatā devī sarvakāmaṣilakṣaṇā* |  
**kuṇḍagolodbhavenaiva svayambhukusumena ca** ||  
**16 japahomārcanam snānam bukapuṣpasamanvitam** |  
*niyojyam svena mārgēṇa svakāle yāgapūrvakam* ||

f. 319v3–5

**11c** *madhyamottamacchāgena* em. : *adhamottamacchāgena* Cod.<sup>488</sup>

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

<sup>488</sup> 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 (*adhama-*), the second intermediate (*madhyama-*), and the third superior (*uttama-*): *adhamaṃ cchāgam ity uktam madhyamaṃ gobhavam bhavet | puruṣottamaṃ mahādevi tridhā tu caravaḥ 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 *madhyamot-tomaśvāsena* 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 (durlabham triṣu lokeṣu)* |  
*g.yon nas skyes pas byed pa yin* |
- (7) *dam tshig spyod pa’i mtshan nyid dang (samayācāralakṣaṇam)* |  
*sbyor nyid cho ga’i yi ge shes ni (yoga eva vidhijñānam)* |  
*de ni nga yis bshad kyis nyon (tan me nigaditam śṛṇu)* |  
*dbugs dbyung mchog gi bar dag ni (madhyamottamaśvāsena)* |
- (8) *dri yi chu dang bcas pa dang (gandhodakasahitena [tu])* |  
*rtag tu ril bu bza’ par bya (vaṭikāṃ prāśayen nityam)* |  
*mchod pa’i dus kyī bye brag la (pūjākālaviśeṣataḥ)* |  
*pho nyas lhan cig skyes dngos grub pa (dūtayaḥ sahajāḥ siddhā)* |
- (9) *dman pa mchog dang ’bring rnams kyī (adhamottamamadhyamāḥ)* |  
*de yis sbyor bas dngos grub ’gyur (tābhir yogena siddhiḥ syāt)* |  
*’dod pa’i don kun sgrub pa’o (sarvakāmārthasādhakaḥ)* |  
*dpal ldan he ru ka las byung (śrīherukodbhavam)* |
- (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 (ekapuṣpasamanvitam)* |
- Khrag ’thung mngon par ’byung ba D f. 12r6–v2 (Herukābhyudaya 15.6–10)*

TESTIMONIUM— Kumāracandra, *Katipayākṣarā nāma Herukābhyudayapañjikā*, p. 156: *evam mayā nigaditam śṛṇu* | *madhyamottamaśvāsaḥ* pañca pradīpāḥ | *gandhodakam* pañcāmṛtāni | *vaṭikāṃ prāśya* (Cod. [f. 3v6] : *prāpya* Ed.) \**bhāvanāgaṇamaṇḍalāḍau* (*bhāvanāgaṇa* corr. : *bhāvanā gaṇa* Ed.) *dūtīm pūjayet* | *adhamāḥ* mantrajāḥ | *uttamāḥ sahajāḥ* | *madhyamāḥ* kṣetrajaḥ | *tābhiḥ siddhiḥ syāt* tasya yoginaḥ.

The version of the *Laghuśaṃvara* reads:

- 1.4 *sambhavān nādarūpād viniṣkrāntāḥ samayācāragocarāḥ* |  
*durlabham triṣu lokeṣu ādimadhyāntasaṃsthitam* ||  
 5 *manthiyamanthānasaṃyogaṃ yathā tathā mantrajāpadhyānādiyuktaṃ* |  
*yogaś caiva vidhijñānaṃ tantre nigaditam śṛṇu* ||  
 6 *madhyamottamocchvāsena gandhodakasahitena tu* |  
*kulikāṃ pūjayen nityaṃ kālaviśeṣeṇa tu* ||  
 7 *dūtayaḥ sahajāḥ siddhā adhamottamamadhyamāḥ* |
- f. 1v2–5

**6a** *madhyamottamocchvāsena* JAYABHADRA : *madhyamottamaśvāsena* Cod. BHAVABHATṬA

The *Herukābhyudaya*, then, shows a version that is closer than the

*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 *vaṭikāṃ prāśayet prājñāḥ pūjākāle viśeṣataḥ* (84.12ab), reading *rtaḡ 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* (*rtaḡ tu*) and *pūjākālavīśeṣataḥ* where that has *prājñāḥ* and *pūjākāle viśeṣataḥ*. That the Sanskrit read *vaṭikāṃ* is shown by the gloss *vaṭikāṃ prāśya* in the *Herukābhyudayaapañjikā* (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 *bukapuṣpasamanvitam* 'together with the Buka flower' in *Picumata* 84.16, so that the Sanskrit may be restored from the Tibetan with some confidence as *ekapuṣpasamanvitam*. 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' (*bukapuṣpaṃ*) 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: *bukaṃ liṅgamalaṃ smṛtam*), and the *Kubjikāmata* tells us that *bukapuṣpaṃ* has the same meaning (25.226ab: *bukapuṣpa kaṇākhyam ca liṅgapaṅkamalaṃ 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 *ekapuṣpa-* in his *Herukābhyudayaapañjikā* and ventures to explain it as 'the blood of a [woman's] first menstruation': *ekapuṣpaṃ prathamam rajaḥ vajrapadmābhyām sādhyamānaṃ kapālastham* (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' Vidyāpīṭha 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 *kulikāṃ pūjayen nityam* 'let him constantly worship the Kulikā' in place of the reading *vaṭikāṃ prāśayen nityam* seen in the *Herukābhyudaya* and in the Śaiva proto-text. This is evidently the result of a corruption of a redaction which read not

*vaṭikāṃ* but the exact synonym *gulikāṃ*,<sup>489</sup> and this hypothesis is confirmed by the *Abhidhānottara*, which in its own first chapter preserves *gulikāṃ* in a passage modelled on these verses of the *Laghuśaṃvara*, 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 *kulikāṃ* here:

1.7 *nādarūpād viniṣkrāntā samayācāragocaram |*  
*durlabhaṃ triṣu lokeṣu ādimadhyāntanirmalam ||*  
 8 *manthamanthānayogena saṃyogād yatra yat tathā |*  
*prakṛtiprabhāsvaraṃ śuddhaṃ guhyapīṭhodbhavodbhavam ||*  
 9 *nirdoṣaṃ śāsvataṃ śāntaṃ khasamaṃ sṛṣṭikāraḥ |*  
*svabhāvaśuddham svayāmbhūtaṃ yoginīnāṃ sukhapradam ||*  
 10 *jāpadhyānādibhir yuktaṃ yogasyaiva vidhijātā |*  
*tantra nīgaditaṃ tattvaṃ guhyakādhipate śṛṇu ||*  
 11 **madhyamottamaśvāsena gandhodakasahitena tu |**  
***gulikāṃ kārayed dhīmān pūjayet parśamaṇḍalam***<sup>490</sup> **||**  
 12 *kāvelāviśeṣeṇa pūjayet tatra dūtayaḥ |*  
*sahajāḥ siddhidāḥ sarvā adhamottamamadhyamāḥ ||*  
 13 *antargatena manasā kāmasiddhiṃ tu sādhayet |*

*Abhidhānottara* A f. 2r2–6; B f. 2r4–v3

**7ab** *nādarūpād* em. : *nādarūpo* B : *nādarū + A • viniṣkrāntā samayācāragocaram*  
 B : + + + + + *cāragocaram* A **7d** *nirmalam* A : *nirmalaḥ* B **8b** *saṃyogād yatra*  
*tatra yathā* B : *sayogād yatra yat tathā* A : \**yatra tatra yathā tathā* (Tib. *srub dang*  
*bsrub par yang dag sbyor | gang la de la ji ltar bzhin*) **8cd** *prakṛtiprabhāsvaraṃ*  
*śuddhaṃ guhyapīṭhodbhavodbhavam* B : *prakṛtiprabhāsva + + + + +*  
*ṭhodbhavodbhavam* A **9a** *śāsvataṃ* A : *sāsanam* B **9c** *śuddhaṃ svayāmbhūtaṃ*  
 conj. [= Tib. *dag pa rang byung ste*] : *śuddhasambhūtaṃ* B : *śuddham adbhūtaṃ*  
 A **10ab** *dhyānādibhir yuktaṃ yogasyaiva* B : *dhyānādibhir yu + + + + va* A •  
*jātā* A : *jñeyā* B

The otherwise unattested *kulikāṃ* was then construed by force to mean *yoginīṃ* ‘a/the Yoginī’, and the verb *prāśayet* ‘let him swallow’, since it now made no sense, altered to *pūjayet* ‘let him worship’.<sup>491</sup>

<sup>489</sup> For *gulikā* (variant forms: *guṭikā* and *guḍikā*) see here p. 217.

<sup>490</sup> 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 prāśayet prājñāḥ*). This, then, has probably survived from the Śaiva source on which the first Buddhist version drew.

<sup>491</sup> Bhavabhāṭṭa, *Cakrasaṃvarapañjikā*, p. 20: ***kulikā*** *yoginī | tāṃ pūjayed ārādhayet | nityaṃ sarvakālaṃ 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, *Cakrasaṃvarapañjikā*, p. 110: ***kulikāṃ*** *itī tantra samayabhāṣā | vajravārāhisvarūpāṃ bāhyāṅganāṃ 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 were 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 | vaṭikāṃ prāśayet prājñāḥ*, 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’.<sup>492</sup> 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 *Herukābhyudaya*, 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 *madhyamottamaśvāsaḥ* ‘the intermediate and upper breath’ means those meats and that the *gandhodakam* ‘scented water’ with which this ‘breath’ is to be mixed

---

*iti | yathā samtoṣo jāyate tathā karaṇīyam ity arthaḥ* ‘The word *kulikāṃ* 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 Vajravārāhī. He should worship her, which means that he should do whatever is necessary to satisfy her’. In his *Kālacakra*-influenced commentary on the *Laghuśamvara* (*Laghutāntraṭīkā*) Vajrapāṇi interprets *kulikā* more esoterically as referring to Vajravārāhī as the non-conceptual central energy-channel: *kulikāṃ pūjayen nityam iti | iha kulikā madhyamāvadhūtī vajravārāhī nirāvaraṇā grāhyagrāhakavarjītā* (p. 59).

<sup>492</sup> See the footnote on my emendation *madhyamottamacchāgena* on p. 212.

means those nectars.<sup>493</sup>

Jayabhadrā and Bhavabhaṭṭa commenting on the same expression when it occurs in the *Laghuśaṃvara*, where the second part of the sentence has emerged through further confusion as *kulikām pūjayet*, impose quite different but equally arbitrary interpretations, which are based not on the text itself but, in the absence of evident meaning, on their own notions of what the text ought to be saying here. Thus Jayabhadrā, who has the variant *madhyamottamocchvāsena*, makes *madhyama-* mean ‘vagina’, *uttamocchvāsaḥ* ‘the placing of the tongue’, and *gandhodakam* ‘semen’, interpreting the sentence to mean that the adept should worship the Kulikā, that is to say, his female consort identified with Vajravārāhī, by placing his tongue (*uttamocchvāsena*) together with his semen (*gandhodakasahitena*) in her vagina (*madhyama-*).<sup>494</sup>

<sup>493</sup> Kumāracandra, *Herukābhhyudayaapañjikā*, p. 156: *madhyamottamaśvāsah pañca pradīpāḥ | gandhodakam pañcāmṛtāni* ‘The word *madhyamottamaśvāsah* means the five ‘lights’; and *gandhodakam* means the five nectars’. On the five lights and five nectars see, e.g., Vāgīśvarakīrti, *Tattvaratnāvalokavivarāṇa* 18: *pañca-pradīpaśabdena gokudahanalakṣaṇasya amṛtaśabdena vimūmāraśulakṣaṇasya sataṭānuṣṭhānam eva sādhyam manyante* ‘[The learned] hold that the expression *pañcapradīpa-* refers to the accomplished regular practice of the [five meats] of the cow (*go-*), dog (*ku[kkura]-*), horse (*da[mya]-*), elephant (*ha[sti]-*), and man (*na[ra]-*), and the expression *amṛta-* to that of excrement (*vi[t]-*), urine (*mū[tra]-*), flesh (*mā[ṃsa]-*), blood (*ra[kta]-*), and semen (*śu[kra]-*). Cf. Jayabhadrā, *Cakrasaṃvarapañjikā*, p. 108: *ādau tāvan manonukūle sthāne niśadya pañcāmṛtakṛtagulikām mukhe kṛtvā ...* ‘At the beginning [before he begins the Sādhana] he should sit in a place conducive to meditation, place a pellet of the five nectars in his mouth, ...’; Bhavabhaṭṭa, *Cakrasaṃvarapañjikā*, p. 24: *gokudahanānām pañcāmṛtasya ca vaṭikām bhāvanārambhe bhakṣayet* ‘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’; *Sādhnamālā* 251 (Advaya-vajra, *Saptākṣarasādhana*), p. 490: *yogī prātar utthāya samayagulikām mukhe prakṣipyā ...* ‘The meditator, having risen before sunrise and placed a Samaya pellet in his mouth ...’. The term *samaya-* in *samayagulikā* means the five nectars; see Bhavabhaṭṭa, *Cakrasaṃvarapañjikā* p. 18: *samayapālanam samayarakṣaṇam pañcāmṛtabhakṣaṇam* ‘maintaining the *samaya-* means keeping the pledges [and] swallowing the five nectars’; Jayabhadrā, *Cakrasaṃvarapañjikā*, p. 109: *samayo dvididhaḥ rakṣaṇīyo bhakṣaṇīyaś 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]’.

<sup>494</sup> Jayabhadrā, *Cakrasaṃvarapañjikā*, p. 110 : *madhye bhavatīti madhyamaḥ | padma ucyate | tasminn uttamocchvāso jihvāvinyāsaḥ | tena kimbhūtena | gandhodakasahitena tu bodhicittasahitenaivety arthaḥ | kulikām iti tantrē samayabhāṣā | vajravārāhīsvarūpām bāhyāṅganām pūjayet iti | yathā saṃtoṣo jāyate tathā karaṇīyam ity arthaḥ* ‘The word *madhyama-*, meaning ‘that which is in the centre’, refers to the Lotus [i.e. the vagina]. The word *uttamocchvāsaḥ* means ‘the placing of the tongue’ [and *madhyamottamocchvāsena* is a locative Tatpuruṣa compound meaning ‘by the placing of (his) tongue] in that. The words *gandhodakasahitena 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 Bhavabhaṭṭa's commentary we find an entirely different understanding. According to him *madhyamottamaśvāsenā gandhodakasaḥitena tu | kulikāṃ pūjayet* means 'he should worship the Yoginī with the place or time (*-śvāsenā*) of fire (*madhyama-*) and earth (*-uttama-*) together with wind (*gandha-*) and water (*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 Yoginīs 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 (*abhicāraḥ*), re-invigoration (*pauṣṭikam*), expulsion (*uccātanam*), and the averting of danger (*śāntikam*) respectively. That Bhavabhaṭṭa 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' (*madhyama-*) is fire (*vahniḥ*) because it falls in the middle of the list of the four elements (actually in the penultimate position); the 'highest' (*-uttama-*) is that of Mahendra, the presiding deity of the symbol of earth (*pr̥thivī*), because he is the king of the gods; *gandhaḥ* means not 'fragrance', its lexical meaning, but 'that which possesses fragrance', namely the wind (*vāyuh*), since that is the bearer of fragrance; *udaka-* is not *udakam* 'water' but an unattested *udakaḥ* meaning Varuṇa, literally 'he who possesses the waters', since Varuṇa is the presiding deity of the symbol of water (*udakam*); and *śvāsaḥ* 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.<sup>495</sup>

---

[i.e. his semen]. The word *kulikā* is a term specific to the esoteric jargon of this Tantra. It denotes the physical woman [as] identical with Vajravārāhī. By saying that one should 'worship' her the text means that one must do what is necessary to satisfy her'.

<sup>495</sup> Bhavabhadra, *Cakrasaṃvarapañjikā*, p. 20: *madhyama uttamaḥ śvasity asmīn aneneti vā | śvāsaḥ sthānaṃ kālo vā | madhyamo vahniḥ pr̥thivyaptejovāyava iti vacanena madhyodbhavatvāt | †madhyodbhūtatve 'py upāyagrahaṇaṃ yatas tāṃ vakṣyati† | uttamo māhendra devarājatvāt | madhyamottamaḥ śvāsaḥ sthānaṃ kālo vety arthaḥ | tena kulikāṃ pūjayet iti saṃbandhaḥ | kiṃbhūtenety āha gandhetyādi | gandho 'syāstīti gandho gandhavāhatvād vāyuh | udakam asyāstīty udako varuṇaḥ | tayoh sthānena sahito gandhodakasaḥita iti madhyapadalopī samāsaḥ ghr̥tapūrṇo ghaṭo ghr̥taghaṭo yathā* 'The term *śvāsaḥ* is to be understood here to be derived from the root *śvas* 'to breathe' in the meaning 'that in which X breathes', X in this case being *madhyamaḥ* and *uttamaḥ*. The *śvāsaḥ*, then, is the locus of these or their time-period. The *madhyamaḥ* 'intermediate' is 'fire', because it arises in the middle, in accordance with the text 'earth, water, fire, and wind'; and the *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 *madhyamottamaśvāsaḥ* is 'the locus or time of the *madhyamaḥ* and the *uttamaḥ*'. With this he should worship the Kulikā. Such is the core syntax. The compound beginning *gandha-* describes this *śvāsaḥ* further as 'accompanied by *gandha-* and *udaka-*', meaning 'together with the **locus** of these [other] two (*gandhodakasthānasaḥitaḥ*). This is a com-



Since these confused and barely comprehensible verses are found in the opening chapter of the *Laghuśaṃvara* 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*,<sup>496</sup> and the verses (1.7c–13b) that follow it contain awkwardly collocated variants of verses found in that text and the Buddhist *Sarvatathāgatatattvasaṃgraha* and *Guhyasamāja*.<sup>497</sup>

But this attempt to lend the compilation a Buddhist character by embedding the passage from the Śaiva Vidyāpīṭha 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 Jaya-

---

pound of the type in which an intermediate word is dropped, as when one says ‘a pot of ghee’ (*ghrtaḡaṭaḡ*) when what one means is ‘a pot **full** of ghee’. The other two are *gandhaḡ* and *udakaḡ*. The first is a primary derivative of *gandhaḡ* ‘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 *udakaḡ* ‘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 Yoginīs 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 Yoginīs 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. Bhavabhaṭṭa explains there that the three eights that make up the 24 Yoginīs associated with the sacred sites must have the symbols of fire, water, and earth as their thrones (pp. 21–22: *devīnām āsanaḡ vahnīmaṇḡdalam iti dinabhāḡaḡ; devīnām āsanaḡ vāruṇamaṇḡdalam iti rātribhāḡaḡ; devīnām māhendramaṇḡdalam āsanaḡ iti dinabhāḡaḡ*). This, evidently, is what he means by *śvāsaḡ* in the sense of ‘place’. He explains its second meaning as ‘time’ in the following: *agnyādiyogo ’py abhicārādaḡ tathaiva jñeyah | yathābhīcāre cittacakraḡya vahnīkḡṣaṇe śāntike vācakraḡya varuṇakḡṣaṇe pausṡike kāyacakraḡya māhendrakḡṣaṇe uccāṡane śmaśānacakraḡya vāyukḡṣaṇe yoginīnām anyatamā bhāvīyā* ‘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 Yoginīs 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’.

<sup>496</sup> See here p. 154.

<sup>497</sup> See here p. 163, parallels 1, 5, and 6.

bhadra and Bhavyakīrti 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 (*mantroddhārah*) has been adopted in imitation of Śaiva scriptural practice, appearing first, as we have seen, in the *Sarvakalpasamuccaya* that supplements the proto-Yoginītantra *Sarvabuddhasamāyoga*.<sup>498</sup> 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.<sup>499</sup>

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 Śākta 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

<sup>498</sup> See here p. 154.

<sup>499</sup> 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 Jñānadākinī and her retinue are said to have taught it to Tilopā together with the oral transmission (TORRICELLI and NAGA 1995, p. 12): *gsungs nas rtsa rgyud le'u nga gcig pa bshad rgyud dang bcas pa dang snyan rgyud gnang ngo*. The extended Tantra was already current when at least some of the Vyākhyātantras 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 *Samputodbhava*: 50.21–23b and 24ab > *Samputodbhava* 5.1.16–19b; and 50.25 > *Samputodbhava* 5.1.19cd. Verses from the remainder of the longer text, from 51.12c to the end, are found in the *Yoginīsaṃcāra* and the *Samvarodaya*: 51.7ab > *Yoginīsaṃcāra* 17.10ab; 51.13c–16b > *Yoginīsaṃcāra* 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 (*tripuradahana*) given in the *Haracaritacintāmaṇi*, a collection of Śaiva myths for the instruction of the laity compiled in the thirteenth century by the Kashmirian Śākta Śaiva Jayadratha.<sup>500</sup>

According to that account Bṛhaspati, 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.<sup>501</sup>

<sup>500</sup> Jayadratha was the brother of Jayaratha, author of the *Tantrāloka*, 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 (*ḥvālāliṅga*) at Suyam (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: *etad vedakavedyavedanamayaṃ dagdhvā purāṇāṃ trayāṃ pūrṇādvairahutāśānena śamāyan māyāmāyopadravam | ḥvālāliṅgatayā \*sphuraṇā* (A : *sphuraṇ* Ed.) *jagadanugrāhī svayambhūr asau devaḥ samprati bhāsatāṃ mama parāṃ ullāsayan nirvṛtim* '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.

<sup>501</sup> *Haracaritacintāmaṇi* 13.61–83: *ripūṇāṃ bhagavadbhaktir vijaye mūlakāraṇam | sā śaithilyam avāpnoti kena yatnena cintyatām || 62 tatrābhyupāyaḥ prāyeṇa kaścit samcintito mayā | śukrasya saṃnidhāne tu kathaṃkāraṃ pragalbhate || 63 teṣāṃ hitam \*prāpayitum* (conj. : *prārthayitum* Codd. Ed.) *śukra eva dine dine | bhagavadbhaktidārḍhyāya prayatnam adhiṣṭhāti || 64 svayaṃ yady api \*te* (Codd. : *ye* Ed.) *bhaktās tathāpy aiśvaryagarvitāḥ | mitaprajñās ca yojyante helayaiva viparyaye || 65 ity uktavān mahendreṇa \*prcchate* (A<sup>pc</sup>: *prcchate* Ed. A<sup>ac</sup>BC) *sma sa kautukāt | bhagavan brūhi tāṃ yuktīm teṣāṃ liṅgārcanāpahām || 66 śrutveti so 'bravīt paśya prāyaḥ sarve 'pi sarvadā | uttarottaram utkarṣaṃ jñātvā rajyanti jantavaḥ || 67 tad īśvarād ṛte ko 'tra sarveṣāṃ mūrdhani sthītaḥ | svavikalpena tasyāpi kaścīd ūrdhvastha ucyate || 68 evaṃ māyāmāyāṃ teṣāṃ varṇyate svopakalpitam | sāstraṃ ca darśyate kimcil likhitvā nijayā dhīyā ||*

[Bṛhaspati:] “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 (conj.) their welfare. [But] 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.

---

69 *dhyānāni devatānām ca likhyante tāni kaitavāt | yāsām maheśvaro py eṣa nyagbhāvena \*niveśyate* (Codd. : *nyaveśyate* Ed.) || 70 *evam maheśvarād anya utkr̥ṣṭa iti kathyate | teṣām yato bhavel liṅgapūjāsāithilyataḥ \*kṣatiḥ* (Ed. : *kṣitiḥ* A : *matiḥ* BC) || 71 *śukrasya saṃnidhāne tu prathante na kaduktayaḥ | \*sa pratīyopapattyā* (A : *sapratīpopapattyā* Ed. BC) *ca paramārthaviśāradaḥ || 72 ity uktavān āṅgīraso vāsavena sagauravam | abhyarthiyate sma sā yuk-tir akhaṇḍā kathyatām iti || 73 uvāca sa tataḥ \*śakram* (A : *śukram* Ed. BC) *ākalaḥ yā bṛhaspatiḥ | bhavato bhagavallīṅgavaimukhye naucitī kvacit || 74 eṣām upaplāvayitum \*matim* (BC : *bhaktim* A : *satyam* Ed.) *eṣa mama kramah | buddher āgatam ity etad darśanam bauddham ucyate || 75 buddhaḥ prasiddhas tatraikaḥ \*saṃkalpyeta* (Codd. : *saṃkalpeta* Ed.) *\*sureśvaraḥ* (Ed. AC : *sureśvara* B) | *dhyāne yacchatradhartrtve likhyante kāraṇāny api || 76 gaṇapatyādāyo ye ca śaivā atyuttamāḥ sthitāḥ | teṣām mūrdhani likhyante devā bauddhā \*amī iti* (Codd. : *amīti* ca Ed.) || 77 *mithyopakalpitāny evam dhyānāny ālokya dānavāḥ | śivād utkarṣavanto \*mī iti \*muhyanty asaṃśayam* (AB Ed. : *muhyanti saṃśayam* C) *|| 78 evam dhyāneṣu siddheṣu prasiddhiṃ \*lambhiteṣu* (A Ed. : *lambhiteṣu* BC) *ca | śaivatāntrānuvādena mantrān api nīyojaye || 79 uddhṛtya śivaśāstrebhyaḥ khaṇḍān khaṇḍān nīyojaye | mantratantrādikaṃ kṛtyam yat kiṃcic copakalpi-tam || 80 bandhamokṣavyavasthāyām śāstram yac ca viracyate | tatra \*tīvratarah prajñāprakarṣah (tīvratarah Codd. : tīvratarā Ed.) \*pariṣakah* (Codd. : *pari-toṣakah* Ed.) || 81 *liṅgārcanādikas tatra bandhas tāvan nigadyate | muktis tu sūnyataiva syād itikartavyahārīnī || 82 yajñādikā kriyā \*yeyam* (A : *seyam* Ed. BC) *sā tatra pratihanyate | atmā nāstīti saṃcintya dūṣyate paramēśvaraḥ || 83 evamvidham mayā śāstram viracayya purāṃdara | hr̥di \*praveśya* (conj. : *praviśya* Codd. Ed.) *bhagavadbhaktis teṣām vihanayate || 84 \*śukrasyāsaṃnidhānam* (Codd. : *śukrasya saṃnidhānam* Ed.) *tu tatra siddhyai \*pratīkṣyate* (Codd. : *pratīkṣate* Ed.).

[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 Brhaspati 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 śivaśāstreḥbhyaḥ 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”.

Brhaspati’s plan works. The demons’ Śaiva Guru leaves for a year to attend a sacrifice. Brhaspati 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,<sup>502</sup> thus making it possible for Śiva to destroy them.

Evidently the Buddhist Tantric scriptures that Brhaspati is represented here as having concocted are the Yoginītantras as typified by the *Laghuśaṃvara* and its satellites,<sup>503</sup> and the fact that this understanding of the nature of the

<sup>502</sup> *Haracaritacintāmaṇi* 13.127c–128b: *\*tataḥprabhṛti* (A : *tadāprabhṛti* Ed. B) *te daityāḥ śivabhaktiparāṇmukhāḥ | asahanta na liṅgasya nāmāpi kim utārcanam*.

<sup>503</sup> That this is the Buddhism envisaged here is in keeping with another anti-Buddhist myth in this collection (*Haracaritacintāmaṇi*, 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 Vajradākas), and Ādibuddha (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.<sup>504</sup>

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

---

17.4: *māyāsambariko nāmnā herukākhyas ca dāruṇaḥ | ādibuddhābhidhānaś cety asurās traya āsate*; 17.9: *vajraḍākāv iti khyātau tadā herukaśambarau | ādibuddhena sahītau surāṇām cakratur bhayam*. Heruka here is evidently Hevajra, 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 kecin 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, *Tattvaratnāvalī*, pp. 4–8; Sahajavajra, *Sthitisamāsa* ff. 4v1–6r2 (*nirākārayogācārasthitisamāsaḥ*), ff. 6r2–7r1 (*sākārayogācārasthitisamāsaḥ*), ff. 7r1–11r3 (*madhyamāsthitisamāsaḥ*), and ff. 11r3–18v5 (Mantranaya); Vāgīśvarakīrti, *Tattvaratnāvalokavivarāṇa*, pp. 141–142 (*mantranaye ca vijñānavādāmadhyamakamatayor eva pradhānatvāt . . .*); Mokṣākaragupta, *Tarkabhāṣā*, pp. 107–110; and KAJIYAMA 1998, pp. 148–151, 154–158.

<sup>504</sup> Consider Jayadratha’s own statement at the beginning of the work (1.5): *deśe śrīvijayeśasya nivasan preraṇāt tayoh | caritrāṇi trinetrasya sāstradrṣṭāni 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 institution of these two [teachers]’.

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 Śaivas 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*, *Brhannārādīyapurāṇa*, *Brhaddharmapurāṇa*, and *Kālikāpurāṇa*,<sup>505</sup> from non-eastern testimony,<sup>506</sup> from the fact that east-Indian locations are conspicuous in early lists of the Śākta sacred sites,<sup>507</sup> and from the inscriptions and other his-

<sup>505</sup> See CHAKRABARTI 2001 *passim*. The *Devīpurāṇa* (39.143–145) lists places where the Mother goddesses are especially present. In this list are Varendra, Rāḍhā, and Kāmarūpa: *veśyāsu gopabālāsu tuḍahūṇakhaseṣu ca | pīṭhe himavataś \*cālpa (?) \*jālandhare* (corr. : *jālandhara* Ed.) *savaidiṣe || \*mahodare (?) vandre ca rādhāyām kośale pure | bhoṭṭadeśe sakāmākhye \*kiṣkindhe* (corr. : *kiṣkindhye*) *ca nagottame || malaye \*kollanāme* (conj. : *kolunāme* Ed.) *ca kāñcyām ca hastināpure | ujjayinyām ca tā vidyā viśeṣeṇa vyavasthitāḥ* ‘Those Vidyās are especially present among courtesans, cowherd girls, \*Tūḍas (?), Hūṇas, and Khasas, in the sacred site of Himālaya\* . . . (?), in Jālandhara, Vidiśā, \*Mahodara (?), Varendra, Rāḍhā, the capital of Kosala, Tibet, Kāmarūpa, the great mountain of Kiṣkindhā, Malaya, \*Kolla[giri] (conj.), Kāñcī, Hastināpura, and Ujjayinī’.

<sup>506</sup> A verse in a Purāṇic passage on the calendrical festivals of Kashmir cited by Lakṣmīdhara early in the twelfth century in the *Niyatakālakāṇḍa* of his *Kṛtyakalpataru* (p. 410, ll. 4–5) associates the sanguinary cult of Durgā/Bhadrakālī with the peoples of Bengal and Orissa (Aṅga, Vaṅga, and Kaliṅga), the Kinnaras, the Barbaras, and the Śakas: *evaṃ nānāmlecchagaṇaiḥ pūjyate sarvadasyubhiḥ | aṅgavaṅgakaliṅgaiś ca kiṅnarair barbaraiḥ śakaiḥ* ‘She is worshipped in this way by various foreign communities, by all the Dasyus: the people of Aṅga, Vaṅga, and Kaliṅga, the Kinnaras, the Barbaras, and the Śakas’. In this list only the people of Aṅga, Vaṅga, and Kaliṅga 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 (*Brhatsaṃhitā* 14.6ab: *khasamagadhasībiragirimithilasamataḍodrāśvavadanadanturakāḥ*), and the latter in the southwest (14.18c).

<sup>507</sup> 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 Aṭṭahāsa, Caritra, Kolāgiri, Jayantī, Ujjayinī, Prayāga, Varāṇā/Vārāṇasī, and Koṭivarṣa (see here p. 195), or, in a variant, Prayāga, Varāṇā/Vārāṇasī, Kollagiri, Aṭṭahāsa, Jayantī, Caritra, Ekāmra, and Devikoṭa (see, e.g., citation of the *Mādhavakula* in *Tantrāloka* on 29.67; *Kularatnoddyota* f. 13r3–4: *prayāgā varuṇā kollā aṭṭahāsā jayantikā | caritraikāmraḥ caiva \*devikoṭam* [corr. : *devikoṭam* Cod.] *tathāṣṭamam*). Aṭṭahāsa, Koṭivarṣa/Devikoṭa, 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 Jayantīpura in the Ganjam District of Orissa rather than that in Karṇāṭaka (Banavasi). Other east-Indian sites among the twenty-four are Viraja (Jajpur in Orissa), Nagara (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 Vaḍabhī 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,<sup>508</sup> and Madanapāla, the patron of Saṃdhyākaranandin, is described in that poet's *Rāmacarita* as having attained his success in war through the favour of Caṇḍī.<sup>509</sup> Even the Saiddhāntika Praśasti from Bāṅgarh has a Śākta context, its immediate purpose being to report the building by the Rājaguru Mūrtiśiva of a Vaḍabhī temple for Carcikā.<sup>510</sup>

[Mūrtiśiva], being devoted to pious works, has constructed this Vaḍabhī 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 Vaḍabhī surmounted by lions establishes that it is a temple of a goddess.<sup>511</sup> 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:<sup>512</sup>

---

Bihar), and Puṇḍravardhana (in Bengal) among the eight Saṃdohas or Upakṣetras (*Nīśisaṃcāra* f. 15v1 [3.26]; *Kubjikāmata* 22.32–38), and Prṣṭhāpura (Piṣṭāpura in Kaliṅga, in the East Godavari District of Andhra Pradesh), and Rājagṛha (in Bihar) among the eight Upakṣetras or Saṃdohas (*Nīśisaṃcāra* f. 15v3–4 [3.29]; *Kubjikāmata* 39–46). We see the same emphasis on the east of India in the scheme of nine sacred sites (three Pīṭhas, three, Upapīṭhas, and three Saṃdohas) taught in the *Nīśisaṃcāra*. In the version of that text known to Abhinavagupta and his commentator Jayaratha the three Pīṭhas are Kāmarūpa (Assam), Pūrṇagiri (in the Deccan), and Uḍḍiyāna (Swat). The Upapīṭhas and Saṃdohas are Puṇḍravardhana, Vārendra, Ekāmra, Devīkoṭa (all four in eastern India), Ujjayinī, and Kollagiri; see *Tantrāloka* 15.83c–88.

<sup>508</sup> For Nayapāla's foundations see here pp. 111–114.

<sup>509</sup> Saṃdhyākaranandin, *Rāmacarita* 4.21: *caṇḍīcaranasarojaprasādasampannavigrahasrīkam | na khalu madanaṃ sāṅgeśam īśam agāj jagadvijayaśrīḥ* 'Did not the glory of world-conquest come to King Madana when, with the king of Aṅga, he had achieved success in battle by the favour of the lotus-like feet of Caṇḍī?'

<sup>510</sup> SIRCAR 1983b, v. 25: *teneyaṃ himakāñcanācalamahākautūhalāveśitasvīyārdhārdhavapuṣmatīva vaḍabhī puṇyātmanā nirmitā | yatsimhapratibimvam ambaradhunītoyeṣu manye 'dbhutaṃ drṣṭvā saṃkucadaṅghrir adya na jalāny airāvataḥ \*pāsyati* (em. : *paśyati* Ep.).

<sup>511</sup> See here p. 112.

<sup>512</sup> *om namaś carcikāyai || surāsuraśiraḥśreṇīpaṭavāsasamā jagat | pāntu viśvakṛtā-*



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."<sup>513</sup>

That a Saiddhāntika Guru should have built a temple for a fearsome goddess of this kind is compelling evidence of the strength of Śāktism 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 fourteenth,<sup>514</sup> she figures prominently in the east-Indian Śākta *Devīpurāṇa*;<sup>515</sup> and

---

*bhyarcās carcācaraṇareṇavaḥ || daṃṣṭrāsamdhinilīnam ekakavalam viśvaṃ tad aśnāmi kiṃ saptāmbhodhijalāni hastasuṣire guptāni kim pīyate | ity āhāradaridra-tākulatayā suṣyattanum bibhratī kalpānte nrkapālamaṇḍanavidhiḥ pāyāj jagac carcikā.*

<sup>513</sup> With these verses compare those of the east-Indian poets Bhāsoka and Umāpatidhara in the anthology *Saduktikarṇāmṛta* (vv. 126 and 129), compiled by the east-Indian Śrīdharadāsa in 1205 under Lakṣmaṇasena. Bhāsoka's being east-Indian is evident from his name in -oka; see the many names of this kind in the east-Indian anthologies *Subhāṣitaratnakōṣa*, and *Saduktikarṇāmṛta*, Amṛtoka, Saṅgokā, Ucchoka in the inscriptions of Bengal (N.G. MAJUMDAR 2003, pp. 179, 27, 37, 178), and Dibboka and Rudoka in the commentary on *Rāmacarita* 1.39. Umāpatidhara composed the Deopārā inscription of the Sena king Vijayasena (r. c. 1096–1159) and is reported in Merutuṅga's *Prabandhacintāmaṇi* to have been a minister of the Sena Lakṣmaṇasena (r. c. 1179–1206); see N.G. MAJUMDAR 2003, p. 45.

<sup>514</sup> See Camunda (Cāmuṇḍā) in the *Huntington Archive*. For Orissa see also DONALDSON 1991.

<sup>515</sup> See in particular *Devīpurāṇa*, Patalas 7 and 9 (> *Agnipurāṇa* 135) on Cāmuṇḍā's Padamālāmantra. In that Mantra Cāmuṇḍā is described as having her body clothed with an elephant hide (*gajacarmaprāvṛtaśarīre*). This feature, which was borrowed from the iconography of Śiva not only by Cāmuṇḍā but also, as we have seen, by Cakrasaṃvara and Vajravārāhī, is found in most of her east-Indian images. See *Huntington Archive*, Scans 0058416 (Bangladesh), 0006042 (Itahar, North Dinajpur District, West Bengal), 0013693 (findspot not recorded), 0013697 (findspot not recorded), 0002686 (Harsinghpur, Darbhanga, Bihar), 0000308 (West Bengal),

in early canonical treatments of the Śākta Śaiva sacred sites this goddess is said to preside at Devīkoṭa,<sup>516</sup> Puṇḍravardhana,<sup>517</sup> both in Varendrī, and Ekāmra (Bhubaneswar) in Orissa.<sup>518</sup> In the first she has the name Karṇamoṭī,<sup>519</sup> according to the *Nīśisaṃcāra*, *Picumata*, and *Kubjikāmata*, and Bahumāmsā according to the *Skandapurāṇa-Ambikākāṇḍa*.<sup>520</sup> In the other two she is called Cāmuṇḍā.

0013061 (Dighapatiya, Natore District, Bangladesh), 0002607 (Munger [Monghyr], Bihar), 0013063 (Bangladesh), 0013062 (Mahātore, Dinajpur District), and 0013476 (Vikramapura, Dacca District, Bangladesh); also *AIISPL* Acc. no. 32782 (Advahati, Burdwan, West Bengal). It is not generally seen in images of Cāmuṇḍā from other regions. An exception is a fine sculpture at Khajuraho (*AIISPL* Acc. no. 45199) from the Chandella period (c. 900–1150). It is perhaps to be introduced by emendation into the description of Cāmuṇḍā's icon in *Agnipurāṇa* 50.21c–23b: *cāmuṇḍā koṭarakṣī syān nirmāmsā tu trilocanā || nirmāmsā asthisārā vā ūrdhvaeśī kṛṣodarī | \*dvīpacarmadharā (dvīpa conj. : dvīpi Ed.) vāme kapālaṃ paṭṭīsaṃ kare || śūlaṃ kartrī dakṣiṇe 'syāḥ śāvārūdhāsthībhūṣaṇā*.

<sup>516</sup> See here p. 112.

<sup>517</sup> *Nīśisaṃcāra* f. 18v2–3 (4.35–36): *cāmuṇḍeti ca \*vikhyātā (em. : vikhyā Cod.) devyā vā \*puṇḍravardhane (corr. : puṇḍa Cod.) | mahābalakulotpannā khatvāṅga-karasobhitā || 36 bhuktimuktikarā devyā saṃdohakṣetrasaṃsthitā | kumbhākhyo kṣetrapālas ca tasmin kṣetre vyavasthitāḥ; Kālikulakramārcana f. 21v1: HRĪM ŚRĪM ŚRĪM \*PUNḌRAVARDHANAMAHOPAKṢETRE CĀMUṆḌĀ-AMBĀPĀDA (puṇḍra corr. : puṇḍa Cod.)*.

<sup>518</sup> *Nīśisaṃcāra* f. 31r1–2: *\*ekāmre (em. : ekātye Cod.) \*saṃsthitō (corr. : saṃsthitā Cod.) devī kīrti\*vāseti (corr. : tāseti Cod.) \*kīrtitaḥ (corr. : kīrtitā Cod.) | cā-muṇḍayā (corr. : cāmuṇḍāyā Cod.) samāyu\*ktāḥ (corr. : ktaṃ Cod.) sthāna-balisamanvi\*tam (corr. : taḥ Cod.); Kubjikāmata 15.28–30: *vartamānikakalpe tu ekāmra-kavanāntagāḥ | kapālīśa\*kuleśānacāmuṇḍācakramadhyagāḥ (kuleśāna corr. : kuleśānaṃ Ed.) || 29 śrīkuleśvaradevasyā hr̥tpadme 'ṣṭadale sthitāḥ | iśānakramayogena sṛṣṭimārgāvalambikāḥ || 30 karṇikāyām sthito devas catuṣka-parivāritāḥ | raktākaraḷācaṇḍākṣimāhoczhuṣmāsamanvitāḥ; Kularatnoddyota f. 16r2 (3.140c–142b): ekāmra-kavanāntasthā utpannā<ḥ> parameśvari || 141 kapālīśasamopetās cāmuṇḍā\*cakramadhyagāḥ (corr. : ścakra Cod.) | pīṭhasthānā-śrayodbhūtās catasro 'nyā<ḥ> parāmbike | 142 raktā karālā caṇḍākṣī ucchuṣmeti prakīrtitāḥ*.*

<sup>519</sup> Karṇamoṭī is listed as a synonym of Cāmuṇḍā in *Amarakośa* 1.1.92 (see here p. 231). The name appears for Cāmuṇḍā 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 KṢA in *Siddhayogeśvarīmata* 16.41c–43c: *kavarge saṃsthitā brāhmī cavarge caiva vaiṣṇavī || māheśvarī ṭavargasthā yāmyā pūjyā ta-m-ādinā | kaumārī sarpa-valayā pādyenāitāṃ prapūjayet || yavarge vāsavī tatra karṇamoṭī śa-m-ādinā | krodhe \*jñeyā (conj. : seyā Ed.) parā śaktir aghoreśī* 'Brāhmī is in the gutturals, Vaiṣṇavī in the palatals, Māheśvarī in the retroflexes, and Yāmyā in the dentals. He should worship snake-bangled Kaumārī with the labials. Aindrī is in the semi-vowels and Karṇamoṭī (= Cāmuṇḍā) in the sibilants. Know that the goddess in *kṣa* is the supreme Power Aghoreśvarī'. The origin of the name is unknown, the common interpretation 'Ear-pearl' being implausible since it fails to account for the retroflex *ṭ*.

<sup>520</sup> *Skandapurāṇa-Ambikākāṇḍa* 171.109, 112, 124 This name is probably an epithet that served as this Karṇamoṭī'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 Devikoṭa appears to have been of special importance from early times. The *Mādhvakula* refers to it simply as Śrīpīṭha, that is to say, as *the Seat* [of the Goddess],<sup>521</sup> and the *Skandapurāṇa-Ambikākhaṇḍa* describes it<sup>522</sup> 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,<sup>523</sup> that he will reside here with them as Hetukeśvara,<sup>524</sup> 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 (*mātrtantrāṇi*), which are listed in the narrative, reveal them to be Yāmalatantras, headed by the *Brahmayāmala*.<sup>525</sup>

---

tible appetite for animal sacrifices. The alternative, that it means 'fleshy', that is to say, full-bodied, is highly implausible, since she is described here as the destroyer of the universe and as having a hideous form (171.108c–109: *tato devo 'sṛjad devīm rudrāṇīm mātaram śubhām | vikṛtaṃ rūpam āsthāya dvitīyām api mātaram | nāmnā tu bahumāṃsām tām jagatsaṃhārarūpiṇīm* 'Then the deity [Śiva] emanated the fine Mother goddess Rudrāṇī, and, taking on a hideous form, a second Mother, the [well-known goddess] called Bahumāṃsā, who embodies the destruction of the universe'.

<sup>521</sup> See here p. 192 and *Tantrāloka* 29.60cd.

<sup>522</sup> *Skandapurāṇa-Ambikākhaṇḍa* 171.78–137, referring to Devikoṭa under its name Koṭivarṣa. See here p. 113.

<sup>523</sup> *Skandapurāṇa-Ambikākhaṇḍa* 171.120c–121b [Śiva addresses the Mothers]: *bhavatīnām idaṃ sthānaṃ koṭivarṣam iti śrutam | bhaviṣyati jagatkhyātaṃ sarvapāpaprāmocanam* 'This place known as Koṭivarṣa will be yours, famed throughout the world, with the power to free from any sin'; 171.133cd: *koṭivarṣam idaṃ sthānaṃ mātrīṇāṃ priyam uttamam*.

<sup>524</sup> *Skandapurāṇa-Ambikākhaṇḍa* 171.121c–122b [Śiva addresses the Mothers]: *ahaṃ hetur hi yuṣmākaṃ yasmāt sṛṣṭā mayaiva ca || herukeśvaranāmnāhaṃ sthāsyāmy atra varapradāḥ | yuṣmābhiḥ saha vatsyāmi nāyakatve vyavasthitaḥ || yas tu yuṣmān mayā sārḍhaṃ vidhivat pūjayiṣyati | sarvapāpavimuktātmā sa parāṃ gatim āpsyati* 'Because I am your cause (*hetuḥ*) 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'.

<sup>525</sup> *Skandapurāṇa-Ambikākhaṇḍa* 171.127–132b [Śiva addresses the Mothers]: *ahaṃ brahmā ca viṣṇuś ca ṛṣayaś ca tapodhanāḥ | mātrtantrāṇi divyāni mātriyajñavidhiṃ \*prati (conj. : param Cod.) || 128 punyāni prakariṣyāmo yajanaṃ yair avāpsyatha | brāhmaṇaṃ svāyambhuvaṃ caiva kaumāraṃ yāmalaṃ tathā || 129 sārvasvataṃ ca gāndhāraṃ aiśānaṃ nandiyāmalam | tantrāṇy etāni yuṣmākaṃ tathānyāny sahasraśaḥ || 130 bhaviṣyanti narā yais tu yuṣmān yakṣyanti bhaktitaḥ | narāṇāṃ yajamānānāṃ varān yūyaṃ pradāsyatha || 131 divyasiddhipradā devyo divyayogā bhaviṣyatha | yāś ca nāryaḥ sadā yuṣmān yakṣyante sarahasyataḥ || 132 yogēśvāryo bhaviṣyanti rāmā 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-*

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 Devikoṭa was located, shows the goddess seated beneath a banyan tree,<sup>526</sup> and we see the same in an image from an unrecorded site in West Bengal.<sup>527</sup> 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.<sup>528</sup> Now, in the tradition of the *Picumata* and the *Niśisaṃcāra* each of the major Śākta sites is a cremation ground with its own distinctive sacred tree; and in the case of Koṭivarṣa/Devikoṭa this is in-

---

*mayāmala*, the *Svayambhūyāmala*, the *Skandayāmala*, the *Sārasvatayāmala*, the *Gāndhārayāmala*, the *Īśānayāmala*, and the *Nandiyāmala*: you shall have these Tantras and others in thousands, and with them men will sacrifice to you in devotion. You will grant boons to men who sacrifice to you. Being goddesses of celestial power you will bestow celestial Siddhis. And women who sacrifice to you regularly with the secret [rites] will become Yogeśvarīs, women of celestial might'. On the list of Yāmalatantras in this passage and its relation to lists of such texts in the Vidyāpīṭha see SANDERSON 2001, pp. 6–7, fn. 4. The *Brahmayāmala*, also called *Picumata*, teaches the worship of Bhairava as Hetuka surrounded with the Goddess by eight Vīras and twenty-four Yoginīs in its eightieth chapter (f. 306r2–3; 80.32–33): *hetukaṃ devadeveśaṃ kapālakṛtabhūṣaṇaṃ | vīrāṣṭakayutaṃ madhye devadevaṃ parodayaṃ || kālāgnivāyusaṃyuktam adhordhvakṛtasamgatim | nyaset svarūpabhāsvantaṃ tato yogigaṇaṃ nyaset*. It is striking that this reference to Hetuka, presumably the Bhairava of Devikoṭa, is found in a chapter which is distinguished by being one of the very few passages in the Vidyāpīṭha that departs from the Tantric norm by containing material of the Purāṇic type, the subject which gives it its title being a myth of the origin of the skull-bowl and skull-staff (*kapālakhatvāṅgotpattih*).

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

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

<sup>528</sup> See, e.g., *Kumārasambhava* 5.73cd; *Kathāsaritsāgara* 18.130d; *Rājatarāṅgiṇī* 2.79–84; *Picumata* 3.32d–93, describing the depiction of the cremation ground at Prabhāsa: *tato nimbaṃ samālikhet | saptaḍālaṃ mahābhīmaṃ citibhiḥ prajvalantibhiḥ | ekaikasmim likhet ḍāle nagnaṃ udbaddhakaṃ 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: *kṛṣṇāṣṭamyāṃ caturdaśyāṃ śavaṃ gṛhya tha sādḥakaḥ | udbaddhaṃ śūlaprotaṃ vā akṣatāṅgaṃ tu dāraṅkaṃ; Jayadrathayāmala, Ṣaṭka 3, Yoginīsāṃcāraprakaraṇa* 8.71c–72b, describing the depiction of cremation grounds: *yāmyādyair nairṛtāntais tu diśair vrkṣāṇ samālikhet || udbaddhanarapracchannān;* Vajragarbha on *Hevajra* 1.7.21 (*dhvajam śastrataṃ caiva*) quoted in SNELGROVE 1959, Pt. 1, p. 71, n.: *rgyal mtshan ni rgyal pos rkun po la sogs pa skyes pa 'am bud med 'ga' zhig chad pas bcad de lus mtshon gyis dral nas ro shing la dpyangs pa'o 'a dhvajah 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 (*vatavṛkṣaḥ*).<sup>529</sup> This strongly suggests that the local Carcikā of Devīkoṭa 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 *Niśisaṃcāra* specify this as the weapon distinctive of the Karṇamoṭī of Devīkoṭa, and the *Skandapurāṇa-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 Śūlakuṇḍa ‘the pond of the trident’ and that anyone who drinks its water (*śūlodakam*) after doing obeisance to her will be safe from all harmful beings (171.124–125). The *Picumata* too refers to this Kuṇḍa.<sup>530</sup>

Finally, the pre-eminence of the emaciated goddess in the Śāktism of eastern India during this period is strongly underlined by the fact it is she that the Buddhists of the cult of Cakrasaṃvara chose to represent supine beneath the right foot of Śaṃvara and Vajravārāhī as the female representative of the Śākta 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 Lūyī,<sup>531</sup> and Cāmuṇḍā in a Kalpa of the *Abhidhānottara* and in the anonymous *Trayodaśātmakavajradākinīvajravārāhīsādhana*, which is based upon it;<sup>532</sup> (2) Carcikā is called Kālarātri in a

<sup>529</sup> 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 (*mahāmaṇḍalam*), one at the centre (Prayāga) and eight around the periphery (Vārāṇasī, Virajā [Jajpur in Orissa], Kollagiri [Kolhāpur in Karṇāṭaka], Prabhāsa [in Kathiawar], Ujjayinī [in Malwa], Bhūteśvara [in Mathurā?], Ekāmraka [Bhubaneswar in Orissa], and Koṭivarṣa). It is also clear from the account of Koṭivarṣa given in the *Skandapurāṇa-Ambikākhaṇḍa*, since that prophesies that the site will become a great cremation ground (171.133c–134b): *koṭivarṣam idaṃ sthānaṃ mātṛṇāṃ priyam uttamam || śmaśānaṃ pravaraṃ divyaṃ bhaviṣyati sukhapradam*.

<sup>530</sup> *Picumata* f. 8r3 (3.119c–121b): *īśāne tu diśābhāge koṭivarṣam prakalpayet || 120 vaṭaṃ tatra samālikhya tatra śūlodakam likhet | dikṣu caiva vidikṣu ca śūlaprotā likhet tathā || 121 śūla tasyāgrato likhya kuṇḍasyaiva mahātape*. It appears from this that the pond (*kuṇḍam*) was also known as the Śūlodaka.

<sup>531</sup> *Guhyasamayāsāadhanamālā* f. 11r1–2: *vāmabāhustanamāṇḍalahṛdayasambhava- \*militadakṣiṇāṅghriṃ* (em. : *militā | dakṣiṇāṅghri* Cod.) *carcikā<ṃ> raktā<ṃ> dakṣiṇāśiraḥpatitā<ṃ>*.

<sup>532</sup> *Abhidhānottara*, Paṭala 56, A f. 173v2: *pādatalākṛāntabhairavacāmuṇḍā* ‘treading on Bhairava and Cāmuṇḍā with the soles of her feet’; *Trayodaśātmakavajradākinīvajravārāhīsādhana* in *Guhyasamayāsāadhanamālā*, f. 78r4–5: *pādākṛānta\*krta-śambhucāmuṇḍām* (em. : *kṛtām | sambhuścāmuṇḍām* Cod.). For the full visualiza-

verse by the east-Indian poet Bhāsoka,<sup>533</sup> and (3) the goddess beneath the foot of Śaṃvara/Vajravārāhī is depicted as emaciated, with sunken eyes and withered breasts, holding a skull-bowl and chopping knife in her two hands.<sup>534</sup> The emaciated Carcikās of our surviving images have four, six, eight, or ten arms, but the skull-bowl (*kapālam*) and chopping knife (*kartrikā*) are indeed among their four primary attributes, the other two being the trident and a severed head.<sup>535</sup> 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 Vajravārāhī'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

---

tion text of which this is part see ENGLISH 2002, p. 407, n. 207.

<sup>533</sup> *Saduktikarṇāmṛta* 126. For the east-Indian character of names in -oka see here p. 227.

<sup>534</sup> For this depiction see two stone sculptures from Ratnagiri in Orissa (LINROTHER 1999, figs. 198–202), two bronzes, one from Vikramaśīla and the other from an unrecorded site in eastern India (LINROTHER 1999, figs. 206–208), a Kashmirian bronze (PAL 1975, Plate 64a,b; LINROTHER 1999, fig. 211; *Huntington Archive* Scan 0059531), some early Tibetan bronzes (LINROTHER 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 (RHIE and THURMAN 1991, fig. 92), and a Nepalese painting of the early seventeenth century (KREIJGER 1999, p. 53). In some Tibetan paintings Kālarātri's emaciation is absent (e.g., PAL 2003, fig. 117; KOSSAK and SINGER 1998, fig. 43; RHIE and THURMAN 1991, fig. 69.2); but that this is a secondary development can be inferred from its much more restricted occurrence.

<sup>535</sup> See Camunda (Cāmuṇḍā) in *Huntington Archive*.

the iconography of the humiliation of Carcikā and Bhairava and the extensive learned literature that developed around the kernel of the Yoginītantras 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, Śākta 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,<sup>536</sup> its point of entry, namely initiatory introduction before the Maṇḍala, 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,<sup>537</sup> and in the eight century the *Sarvatathāgata-*

<sup>536</sup> See, for example, the doctrine of the four points of superiority of the Tantric form of the Mahāyāna, the Mantranaya, over the non-Tantric Way of the Perfections (*pāramitānayaḥ*) asserted in the \**Nayatrāyapradīpa* by an author whose name appears in the Tenjur as Tripiṭakamalla, an implausible name, perhaps an error for Tripiṭakamalla (*Tshul gsum gyi sgron ma*, f. 16v3: *de yang pha rol tu phyin pa'i theg pa chen po dang don gcig pa las de'i khyad par gang dag yod pa de brjod par bya'o | don gcig nyid 'ang ma rmongs dang | thabs mang dka' ba med phyir dang | dbang po rnon po'i dbang byas pas | sngags kyi bstan bcos khyad par 'phags* 'Moreover, although there may be no difference in the goal [of the Mantramahāyāna] from that of the Pāramitāmahāyāna the points that distinguish [the former] should be stated[. This has been done done in the following verse]: "Though the goal is one and the same the Mantraśāstra is superior (1) because it is free of delusion [on the path], (2) because it offers many methods [for reaching the goal], (3) because it is free of difficulties, and (4) because only those with the highest capacity are qualified [to undertake it]". The Sanskrit of the verse is preserved through citation (without attribution) in the *Tattvaratnāvalī* of Advayavajra (p. 8) (A), the *Sthitisamāsa* of his disciple Sahajavajra (f. 11v2 [6.5]) (B), and the anonymous *Subhāsitasaṃgraha* (part 2, p. 31) (C): *ekārthatve 'py asaṃmohād \*bahūpāyād* (AB Tib. [*thabs mang*] : *vajropāyād* C) *aduṣkarāt | tikṣṇendriyādhikārāc ca mantraśāstram viśiṣyate*. It has also been cited by Ka ro pa (Kāropā?), wrongly attributing it to a \**Pradīpoddyotanatantra* (*sgron ma gsal ba'i rgyud*), in his commentary on the *Caturmudrānvaya* (MATHES 2008, p. 96). According to the view of some, as reported by Gzhon nu dpal, Ka ro pa was another disciple of Advayavajra (*Blue Annals*, pp. 842–843, 847–849, reported by MATHES [2008, p. 89] as saying that he was a disciple of Advayavajra's disciple Vajrapāṇi).

<sup>537</sup> *rNam par snang mdzad chen po mngon par byang chub pa'i rgyud* (*Mahāvairocanā-*

*tattvasaṃgraha* 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:<sup>538</sup>

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 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].<sup>539</sup> Venerable [Tathāgatas],

*bhisambodhitantra*), f. 162v4–6: *de nas de yi phyi de nyin | slob ma dad cing rigs btsun pa | de bzhin dkon mchog gsum la dad | zab mo yi ni blo dang ldan | spro ba che zhing tshul khirms ldan | bzod dang ldan zhing ser sna med | dpa' la yi dam brtan pa ni | bcu 'am brgyad dam bdun nam lnga | gcig gnyis bzhi 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].’

<sup>538</sup> *Sarvatathāgatasamgraha*, sections 210–213: *athātra vajradhātumahāmaṇḍale vajraśiṣyapraveśādividhivistaro bhavati | tatra prathamam tāvat praveśo bhavaty aśeśānavāśeṣasattvadhātuparitrāṇasarvahitasukhottamasiddhikāryakaraṇatayātra mahāmaṇḍalapraveśe pātrāpātraparikṣā na kāryā | tat kasmād dhetoh | santi bhagavantas tathāgatāḥ kecit sattvā mahāpāpakāriṇaḥ | ta idam vajradhātumahāmaṇḍalam drṣtvā praviṣtvā ca sarvāpāyavigatā bhaviṣyanti | santi ca bhagavantaḥ sattvāḥ sarvārthabhojanapānakāmaguṇagrddhāḥ samayadvīṣtāḥ puraścaraṇādīṣu aśaktāḥ | teṣām apy atra yathākāmakaraṇīyatayā praviṣṭānām sarvāśāparipūrīr bhaviṣyati | santi ca bhagavantaḥ sattvāḥ nṛtagāyahāsyālāsyaḥāravihārapiyatayā sarvatathāgatamahāyānābhisamayadharmatānavabodhatvād anyadevakulamaṇḍalāni praviṣanti | sarvāśāparipūrisamgrahabhūteṣu niruttara-ratiprītiharṣasambhava-kareṣu sarvatathāgatakulamaṇḍaleṣu śikṣāpadabhayaabhītā na praviṣanti | teṣām apāyamaṇḍalapraveśapathāvasthitamukhānām ayam eva vajradhātumahāmaṇḍalapraveśo yujyate sarvaratiprītyuttamasiddhisukhasaumanasyānubhavanārthaṃ sarvāpāyapratipraveśābhimukhapathavinivartanāya ca | santi ca punar bhagavanto dhārmikāḥ sattvāḥ sarvatathāgataśīlasamādhiprajñottamasiddhyupāyair buddhabodhiṃ prārthayanto dhyānavimokṣādibhir bhūmibhir yatantaḥ kliṣyante | teṣām atraiva vajradhātumahāmaṇḍalapraveśamātrenaiva sarvatathāgatatvam api na durlabham kim aṅga punar anyā siddhir iti.*

<sup>539</sup> The doctrine that the mere sight of the Maṇḍala destroys all one’s sins is seen here in section 900: *tato yathāvan mukhabandham muktva mahāmaṇḍalam darśayet | maṇḍale drṣtamātre tu sarvapāpair 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-*



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] (*samayāh*) and incapable of such disciplines as the Preliminary Observance (*puraścaraṇam*).<sup>540</sup> If they enter this [Maṇḍala] they too will have all their

*maṇivipulavimānasupraṭiṣṭhitaguhyaparamarahasyakalpadhāranī*, which may be the earliest Buddhist text teaching consecration in the context of introduction to a Maṇḍala, here with the peculiarity that consecration precedes entry, while in the later tradition entry precedes consecration: f. 53v1–5 (Tib. f. 384v7): *tataḥ anena mantreṇābhīṣiṅcyā praveśayet*: OM MAṆIVIPULASUPRAṬIṢṬHITA\*SIDDHE (Tib. : *siddha* Cod.) ABHIṢIṅCA MĀM \*SARVATATHĀGATĀBHIṢEKAIR (Tib. : SARVATATHĀGATĀBHIṢEKAI Cod.) BHARA BHARA \*SAMBHARA SAMBHARA (Tib. : SAMBHARA Cod.) \*HŪM HŪM (Cod. : HŪM Tib.) | *yathābhīṣiktamātrāś ca sarvapāpāvaraṇāni pūrvajanmasaṃjātāni karmāvaraṇāni viśuddhāni bhavanti sarva\*suddhipariḡrḥito (śuddhi em. : śuddha Cod.) bhavati sarvatathāgatādhiṣṭhitāḥ sarvatathāgatābhīṣiktaḥ* ‘Then he should introduce him into the Maṇḍala after consecrating him with the Mantra OM MAṆIVIPULASUPRAṬIṢṬHITA-SIDDHE ABHIṢIṅCA MĀM SARVATATHĀGATĀBHIṢEKAIR BHARA BHARA SAMBHARA SAMBHARA HŪM HŪM. Merely through this consecration the obscurations of all his sins, the obscurations of his actions committed in previous lives, are eliminated. He possesses all purity. He has been entered-and-empowered by all the Tathāgatas. All the Tathāgatas have consecrated him’. According to the Zhen Yuan Catalogue of A.D. 800 (T. 2157–935a:26) the Chinese translation of this text (T. 1007) was prepared by an unknown translator of the Liang dynasty (503–557). However, I do not yet know if this passage is found in that translation.

<sup>540</sup> This is the practice otherwise known as *pūrvasevā*. It consists of a high number of repetitions of a Mantra along with ascetic restraints by means of which the practitioner qualifies himself to undertake procedures that require its use. See, e.g., *Mañjuśrīyamūlakalpa*, p. 236: *ātau tāvat parvatāgram āruhya viṃśallakṣāṇi japet | pūrvasevā kṛtā bhavati | kṣīrāhāreṇa mauninā nānyatra mantragatacittena trīśaraṇaparigrḥītena utpāditabodhicittena ca pośadhaśīlasamvarasamādāpanābodhisattvasaṃvaraparigrḥītena japtavyam | 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 Pośadha 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 *puraścaraṇam* / *puraścaryā* are standard and synonymous. See, e.g., *Niśvāsaguhyā*, f. 80v3: *japamāna-m eva māsenā pūrvasevā kṛtā bhavati* ‘By repeating the Mantra for a month the Preliminary Service will have been accomplished’; and Kṣemarāja *Svacchandoddyota* ad 7.104cd: *puraścaryā prathamam eva mantragrahaṇapūrvam vratam niyata-japādikaraṇam* ‘The *puraścaryā* 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., *Niśvāsaguhyā* f. 81r4: *daśāhaṃ kṣīrāhāreṇa japtavyaḥ kālamṛtyuṃ jayati*; f. 82vr4: *naktāśi kṣīrāhāro vā maunena tu japet yas tu | sa śivo ’bdena mānavah*; f. 84v6: *anena mantreṇa kṣīrāhāro saṃvatsaram japet*.

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 (*vimokṣaḥ*), 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 *Sarvatathāgatattvasaṃgraha* 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,<sup>541</sup> attempting

<sup>541</sup> 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 *Sarvatathāgataattvasaṃgraha* (his *Sarvavajrodāya*, his commentaries on the *Sarvatathāgatattvasaṃgraha* [Tōh. 2511]), the *Paramādya* (his commentary [Tōh. 2512]), the *Māyājāla* (his commentary [Tōh. 2513]), *Guhyasamāja* (his commentary [Tōh. 1917]), and the *Sarvabuddhasamāyogaḍākinījālaśaṃvara* (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 śrītherukasādhanopayikā* in a codex photographed by Rāhula Sāṅkrītyāyana

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:<sup>542</sup>

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 Viṣṇu 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”.<sup>543</sup>

---

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 Dīpankarabhadra, who was a pupil of Buddhajñāna, a contemporary of king Dharmapāla (r. c. 775–812) (see here p. 93).

<sup>542</sup> *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' zhing yul yongs su mi spong ba rnam ni 'dod chags kyis '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) *gci 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 dga' bar byed pas na | des na sred med bu zhes bya zhes bshad do.*

<sup>543</sup> The unknown author of this verse intends a *nirvacanam* of *nārāyaṇaḥ*. 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 KAHRS 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 *nārāyaṇaḥ* 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 *nārāyaṇaḥ*: *āpo nārā iti proktā āpo vai naraśūnavaḥ*), or as 'men' (*nara-*) by application of *Aṣṭādhyāyī* 6.3.136 (*anyeṣām api drśyate*) 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  $\sqrt{ni-}$  'to lead [to]', arriving by this artifice at 'he who leads men to good fortune, i.e. happiness' (*nārān ayaṃ sukhaṃ nayatīti nārāyaṇaḥ*), the substitution of  $\eta$  for *n* being caused by the preceding *r*. The artificial derivation of *-na* from  $\sqrt{ni-}$  is seen in the semantic analysis of *samānaḥ* for the fourth of the five vital energies implicit in, e.g., *Niśvāsānaya* 4.124ab (*Niśvāsātattvasamhitā* f. 40r3) (> *Svacchandatantra* 7.308d): *samānaḥ samatāṃ nayet*, and *Sārdhatrīsatikālottara*

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 Śāiva Vidyāpīṭha, and of the *Picumata* in particular,<sup>544</sup> 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 Śāiva 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 Śāivas in mind when he referred to “those devoted to the Tantras of Viṣṇu and *other* [gods]”.

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

10.10cd: *samaṃ nayati gātreṣu samāno nāma mārutaḥ*.  
<sup>544</sup> See, e.g., *Picumata* f.280v4: 67.71 **śaktigarte kṣipel liṅgaṃ 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** *mantrī vidyāyāṣṭasataṃ japet | mantrasya vā japed caiva svayāgavidhicoditaṃ || 153 dravyapraśya purā kṛtvā gomāṃsam *kiñcisamyutaṃ | surāṣṭhinā samāyuktaṃ piṣṭaṃ piṇḍikṛtan tathā || 154 kṣobhadravyeṇa samṃardya liṅgākāraṃ tu kārayet | prakṣiped yonimadhye tu nimīṣaṃ cālya pīḍayet || 155 mantram uccārayen mantrī samkhyāyāṣṭasataṃ tathā | karṣayitvā tu taṃ liṅgaṃ guḍikāṃ kārayet tataḥ || 156 japārcanavidhau nityaṃ pūjayet sādhakottamaḥ* ‘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 Sādhakas should always offer [this] when he performs the repetition of the Mantras and the act of worship’; f. 10v5: **gomāṃsam guggulaṃ caiva piṇyākaṃ laśunaṃ tathā || 3.210 siddhyarthaṃ guḍikā hy eta homāyē nityakarmaṇi | maṇḍale tarpaṇaṃ kṛtvā gomāṃsasurayānviṭaṃ*** ‘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 miśraṃ homayīta vicakṣaṇaḥ** ‘The adept should offer into the fire cow-flesh mixed with wine’; f. 39v3 (5.40ab): *saṃpuṭe sthāpayitvā tu mūtraḥomaṃ tu kārayet* ‘He should place urine in a bowl and offer it into the fire’.

*tantrārthāvatārasaṃgraha*, referring to the Yogatantras as the Tantras of Method (Upāyatantras) and to the Yoginītantras as the Tantras of Wisdom (Prajñātantras):<sup>545</sup>

A Method Tantra is one in which the Maṇḍala shows mainly male deities in order to train (*vinī-*) men and insiders (*svayūthya-*), 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.<sup>546</sup> A Method Tantra is one that exhibits deities that purify the outer and inner aggregates of personality (*skandhāḥ*), the elements (*dhātavaḥ*), and the faculties and their objects (*āyatanāni*), 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 Śraddhākaravarman 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

<sup>545</sup> *rNal 'byor bla na med pa'i rgyud kyi don la 'jugs pa bsdus pa*, ff. 103v7–104r3: *gang du skeyes 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 khamdang dang skeye mched kyi rnam par dag pa'i lha ston pa ni thabs kyi rgyud do | gang du phyi nang gi rtsa dang byang chub kyi sems rnam par dag pa'i lha ston pa ni shes rab kyi 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.*

<sup>546</sup> 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 (Dākinīvajrapañjaratantra)*, f. 104v5–6: *skeyes bu rnam ni gdul ba'i phyir | rnal 'byor rgyud ni yang dag bshad | btsun mo rnam ni bsdu ba'i phyir | rnal 'byor ma yi rgyud bshad do* ‘The Yogatantras were taught in order to train (*\*vinayanāya*) men. The Yoginītantras were taught in order to recruit (*\*saṃgrahāya*) women’.

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.<sup>547</sup>

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 Śākta Mantra is ŚRĪM HRĪM KLĪM AIṀ VAJRAVAIROCANĪYE HŪM HŪM PHAṬ SVĀHĀ, and the two companions that flank her are Ḍākinī and Varṇinī.<sup>548</sup> In the Buddhist prototype the flanking goddesses are Vajravarṇanī and Vajravairocanī, and the Mantra for recitation (*jāpamantraḥ*) is OṀ SARVABUDDHADĀKINĪYE OṀ OṀ VAJRAVARṆANĪYE OṀ VAJRAVAIROCANĪYE HŪM HŪM HŪM PHAṬ PHAṬ SVĀHĀ.<sup>549</sup> Moreover, the procedure of her visualization retains features distinctive of her Buddhist Sādhana, 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.<sup>550</sup> The only differences here are that in the Buddhist Sādhana the triangle

<sup>547</sup> *Rgya gar chos 'byung*, p. 168, ll. 14–: *he ru ka'i sku dngul las byas pa chen po zhig dang | sngags kyi glegs bam mang dag cig yod pa si nga gling pa sogs nyan thos se ndha pa 'ga' zhig gis 'di dag ni bdud kyis byas pa'o zhes byas nas | glegs bam rnam kyis bud shing byas | sku gzugs de yang dum bur bgos nas rnyed 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.

<sup>548</sup> *Śāktapramoda*, p. 222 (her Mantra); pp. 221, 224–225 (the visualization of Chinnamastā, Ḍākinī and Varṇinī)

<sup>549</sup> *Abhisamayamañjarī*, pp. 151–152.

<sup>550</sup> *Śāktapramoda*, pp. 224–225, *Puraścaryārṇava*, p. 816, *Karmakāṇḍa*, vol. 4, p. 239d–240a (in the Kashmirian Śāktaśrāddha): *svanābhau nīrajaṃ dhyāyec chuddhaṃ vikasitaṃ sitam | tatpadmakośamadhye tu maṇḍalam caṇḍa-rociṣaḥ | japākusumasamkāsam raktabandhūkasam nibham | rajaḥsattvatamo-rekhāyonimaṇḍalamāṇḍitam | madhye tasya mahādevīm sūryakoṭisamaprabhām | chinnamastām kare vāme dhārayantīm svamastakam | prasāritamukhīm bhīmām lelihānāgrajihvikām | pibantīm raudhirīm dhārām nijakaṇṭhavinirgatām | vikīrnakeśapāsām ca nānāpuṣpasamanvitām | dakṣiṇe ca kare kartrīm muṇḍamālāvibhūṣitām | digambarām mahāghorām pratyālīḍhapade sthitām | asthimālādharām devīm nāgajyānopavitinīm | ratikāmopariṣṭhām ca sadā dhyāyanti mantriṇaḥ* '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 Guṇas] Rajas, Sattva, and Tamas. At its centre Mantra adepts always visualize the Great Goddess Chin-

has the strictly Buddhist name *dharmodayā* and that the goddess is visualized as a transformation out of a yellow HRĪḤ visualized in that triangle.<sup>551</sup>

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 *Mahācīnakramatārāsādhana* 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.<sup>552</sup> The earliest mention of the text in sources known to me is in 2.15 of the *Sarvollāsatantra* of Sarvānandanātha, in a list of a canon of sixty-four Tantras cited from the *Toḍalatantra* but not appearing in the published text of that work. It is probable that Sarvānandanātha, who wrote his work in Senhati in what is now Bangladesh, was born around the beginning of the fifteenth century.<sup>553</sup> It is tempting to assume that the *Phetkārīṇī* was written at a time closer to Śāśvatavajra's than to Sarvānandanātha's, that is to

---

namastā shining like ten million suns, holding her own [severed] head in her left hand, fearsome, with the mouth [of her severed head] open wide, with the tip of her tongue licking greedily, drinking the stream of blood that gushes from her neck, her hair loosened, adorned with various flowers, holding a chopping-knife in her right hand, adorned with a garland of heads, naked, most terrible, standing in the Pratyālīḍha posture, with a necklace of bones and a snake as her sacred thread, standing on Kāma and Rati'.

<sup>551</sup> *Abhisamayamañjarī*, p. 151: *svanābhisthaśuklakamalasūryasthitasindūraruṇadharmodayāmadhye pitahrīḥkārājā svayam eva kartitasvamastakaṃ vāmahastasthitaṃ dhārayantī* ... 'Arising by transformation of a yellow syllable HRĪḤ 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 ...'.

<sup>552</sup> The take-over of Śāśvatavajra's *Sādhana* of Ugratārā (= *Sāadhanamālā* 101) by the *Phetkārīṇītantra* and its subsequent influence have been demonstrated by BÜHNEMANN (1996). Śāśvatavajra flourished around the last decades the tenth century and the first decades of the eleventh. His *Bāhyapūjāvidhi* (= *Sāadhanamālā* 252), *Hastapūjāvidhi* (= *Sāadhanamālā* 253), and *Cakrasaṃvarabalividhi* 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 *Sādhana* of Ugratārā is found in the \**Sādhanaśataka* (a facsimile of an undated Sanskrit palm-leaf manuscript from Tibet has been published in BÜHNEMANN 1994 = Tōh. 3306 ff.) and was translated into Tibetan by the Indian Paṇḍita \*Amoghavajra 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 sgröl ma'i sgrub thabs slob dpon rtag pa'i rdo rjes mdzad brjogs so | pa ṇi ta don yod rdo rje dang khams 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 *Laghuśaṃvara*, translated by Bu ston Rin chen grub (Tōh. 1410), survives in the Potala Palace in Lhasa, where it awaits study.

<sup>553</sup> 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 *Kālacakra* 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),<sup>554</sup> who collaborated with him in a translation of the *\*Trayodaśātmaśrīcakrasaṃvara-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;<sup>555</sup> and we have a manuscript of the Mahāyāna classic *Bodhicaryāvatāra* copied by a lay Buddhist in Bengali characters at Veṅugrāma in 1436.<sup>556</sup>

After her incorporation from the Mantranaya Tārā became with Dakṣiṇakālī 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 *Jñānadvīpa* in the *Sarvollāśatantra* (3.1–29) the ten Mahāvidyās are said to be [Dakṣiṇa]kālī (Śyāmā), Tārā, and Tripurasundarī (Ṣoḍaśī), with the third dividing into eight: herself and the seven others that make up the total of ten, namely Bhuvaneśvarī, Bhairavī, Chinnamastā, Dhūmāvatī, Bagalāmukhī, Mātāṅgī, and Kamalā. The centrality of these three goddesses is reflected in the corpus of east-Indian Śākta scriptures. The *Toḍalatantra* teaches the rites of these three alone, and the *Bṛhannīlatantra* follows the same model but adds Kāmākhyā, 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 *Āṅgirasakalpa* corpus it was principally the rites of Dakṣiṇakālī and Tārā that they adopted.<sup>557</sup>

The importance of Tārā in late east-Indian Śāktism is independently

<sup>554</sup> *Blue Annals*, pp. 797–805. On the career of Vanaratna see ERHARD 2004.

<sup>555</sup> HAHN 1996, p. 37: *samāptam idam [vanaratnastotrasaptakam | kṛtir magadha-deśīyādityānām iti*; p. 40: *dpal ldan bla ma nags kyi rin chen bstod pa bdun pa 'di ni rdzogs so | yul ma ga dhā nas byung ba'i bsnyen dam pa nyi ma pa zhes bya bas mdzad pa'o (\*samāptam idam śrīguruvanaratnastotrasaptakam | kṛtir magadha-deśīyaparamopāsakādityānām).*

<sup>556</sup> SHASTRI 1917, p. 21: ASB MS 8067. The scribe identifies himself as Sadbauddhakarāṇakāyasthaṭhakkura Amitābha.

<sup>557</sup> SANDERSON 2007b, pp. 235–236, fn. 88.



confirmed by the existence of substantial texts devoted exclusively to her worship, notably the *Tārārahasyavṛtti* of Gauḍīya Śāṅkara composed in 1630, the *Tārābhaktisudhārṇava*, a work in some 11,000 verses composed by Nṛsiṃha Ṭhakkura c. 1688, the *Tārābhaktitarāṅgiṇi* of Kāśīnātha, composed in 1682 at the request of Kṛṣṇacandra, 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 MANTRASĀSTRA

Jainism too enjoyed royal support during this period, notably in western India under the Caulukyās and in Karṇāṭaka among the Gaṅgas of Talakād, the Rāṣṭrakūṭas, and Hoysaḷas,<sup>558</sup> and it too developed a Tantric ritual culture along Śaiva lines for the propitiation (*ārāḍhanā*) of Mantra-goddesses for mundane benefits using Mudrās, Japa, and offerings into fire (*homaḥ*). 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,<sup>559</sup> and, most important, in the lower world the Yakṣī attendants of the Tīrthan̄karas, associated with major Jaina pilgrimage sites, notably Ambikā (/Kūṣmāṇḍinī), the attendant of Neminātha at Gīrnār, Cakreśvarī, the attendant of Rṣabha at Śatruñjaya, Padmāvati, the attendant of Pārśvanātha at Śravaṇa Beḷgoḷa, and Jvālāmālinī, the attendant of Candraprabha.<sup>560</sup>

That these deities were developed on the basis of the Śaiva tradition is more transparently obvious here than in Buddhism. Thus the *Bhairava-padmāvatiḥkalpa*, the Digambara Malliṣeṇa's Paddhati on the propitiation of Padmāvati, written in 1057 equates her with Totalā, Tvaritā, Nityā, Tripurā, and Tripurabhairavī, all well-known Mantra-goddesses of the Śākta Śaivas.<sup>561</sup>

<sup>558</sup> See STEIN 1998, especially pp. 147–152.

<sup>559</sup> In the classical listing these are the following eighteen: Rohiṇī, Prajñaptī, Vajraśṛṅkhalā, Vajrāṅkuṣā, Apraticakrā, Puruṣadattā, Kālī, Mahākālī, Gaurī, Gāndhārī, Sarvāstramahājvālā, Mānavī, Vairoṭyā, Acchuptā, Mānasī, and Mahāmānasī.

<sup>560</sup> For images of Ambikā, Cakreśvarī, Padmāvati, and Jvālāmālinī see, e.g., *AIISPL*, Accession numbers 45246, 10029, 58659, and 19995. On the cult of Padmāvati see JHAVERY 1944. On the cult of Jvālāmālinī see SETTAR 1969.

<sup>561</sup> On the worship of goddesses in Jainism and their division between the three worlds (*ūrdhvalokaḥ*, *tiryaglokaḥ*, and *adhholokaḥ*) 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 *mantrasāstra*'s partial linkage to an ultimately Śaiva-inspired style of religiosity” (p. 36), of the *Jñānārṇava* of the Digambara Śubhacandra, probably in the tenth century, that it “blends much of the “software” of Śaiva *mantrasāstra* 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 (*māntrikāḥ*) 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;<sup>562</sup> the Jaina Guru of king Ajayapāla undertakes a two-month propitiation of Ambikā on the Raivataka mountain at Girnār 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 Gujarat.<sup>563</sup> Hemacandra, Devendrasūri, and Malayagirisūri go to the same mountain at night to undertake the propitiation of the Siddhacakramantra, after first performing preliminary rites to summon the presiding goddess Ambikā into their presence;<sup>564</sup> and Hemacandra propitiates the spell-goddess Tribhuvanasvāminī in Aṇahillapattana, the Caulukya capital, in order to ask her about the previous birth of his pupil Kumārapāla.<sup>565</sup>

As in the non-Jaina tradition the goddesses were put to work to serve the interests of rulers. The *Prabandhacintāmaṇi* of Merutuṅgācārya, written at Vardhamāna (Vadhvān) in eastern Kāthiāvāḍ in 1304, claims that Padmāvati was propitiated by means of a fire-sacrifice by a Digambara monk in order to protect Vārāṇasī, the capital of king Jayacandra (in the late twelfth century), from attack by a Muslim army;<sup>566</sup> bards in Karṇāṭaka at the court of Yaśodhara

---

teriological concerns” (p. 35), and of the *Bhairavapadmāvatikalpa* that it “contains an account of the well-known six magical arts (*ṣaṭkarmāṇi*), not greatly dissimilar from their Hindu equivalents” (p. 33).

<sup>562</sup> Merutuṅga, *Prabandhacintāmaṇi*, p. 169: *ṣoḍaśe dine ākasmike devācāryasya kaṇṭhāvagrahe māntrikaiḥ śrīyaśobhadrasūribhir atulyakurukullādevīprasādalabdharais tatkaṇṭhapīṭhāt kṣaṇāt kṣapaṇakakṛtakārmaṇānubhāvāt keśakaṇḍukaḥ pātayāṃ cakre.*

<sup>563</sup> *Kumārapāladevaprabandha* §54: *cintitaṃ devatārādhanam vinā manorathānām siddhir na | ato raivatake gatvā devīm ambāṃ paritoṣya hemācāryasamo bhaviṣyāmi | upavāsatrāyaṃ tad anu talahaṭṭikāyāṃ pāraṇam | ekaḥ paricaryākaraḥ | evaṃ māsa 2 tapaḥprānte devy ambā pratyakṣā jātā kāryaṃ vada | tenoktaṃ yādṛśaḥ kumārapāladevas tādrśam ajayapāladevaṃ yādṛśo hemācāryas tādrśam māṃ vidhehīti.*

<sup>564</sup> *Kumārapālprabodhaprabandha* §61. On the worship of the Siddhacakra see JHAVERY 1944, pp. 167–169.

<sup>565</sup> *Kumārapāladevaprabandha* §21.

<sup>566</sup> *Prabandhacintāmaṇi*, pp. 294–295.

are said to have invoked Aparājitā to secure the king victory in battle;<sup>567</sup> and these powers are fully confirmed by the manuals for these rites. According to the unpublished *Jvālāmālinīkalpa*, composed by the Digambara Indranandin in Karṇāṭaka in 939, the benefits that can be attained by propitiating Jvālāmālinī include the splitting open of the gates of enemy forts; and the *Bhairava-padmāvātikalpa* teaches a spell (*vidyā*) for making one's enemies fall asleep and magical receipts both for causing dissension among them (*vidveṣaṇam*) and causing their death (*māraṇam*). Moreover, Padmāvati was the lineage goddess (*kuladevī*) of a number of Jaina ruling houses in Karṇāṭaka<sup>568</sup> 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 Padmāvati of Śāśakapura (Sosavūru) in a Jaina myth of the origin of the name of the Hoysaḷa (/Poysaḷa) dynasty related in an inscription of 1133.<sup>569</sup> When a Jaina ascetic Yogin was trying to subjugate this goddess with a Mantra and a tiger sprang out to break its power the ascetic commanded king Saḷa, saying “Strike [it], O Saḷa” (*poṃ saḷa*).<sup>570</sup> 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 Śākta 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.<sup>571</sup> Thus the Osvāl

<sup>567</sup> CORT 1987, p. 248.

<sup>568</sup> Notably the Śilāhāras, Rāṭṭas, and Śāntaras; see CORT 1987, p. 243.

<sup>569</sup> EC 5:124.

<sup>570</sup> Cf. EI 6:10, l. 6: *sa hoy saḷeti prāpat taṃ kila vinihatya hoysaḷākhyām*.

<sup>571</sup> In the Buddhist case, however, animal sacrifice, though unusual, does occur. We see it in the *mahābali* sacrifice performed by the Buddhist Newars at Lagāṅkhel on the occasion of the chariot festival of Bugmalokeśvara (Karunāmaya); see SINCLAIR 2008. Nor is this a recent innovation. See *Catuṣpīṭhatantra* ff. 30r2–32r3. The Mantra for the Bali there (f. 31v2–) is derived from a Śaiva prototype seen in the Vidyāpīṭha's *Nīśisaṃcāra* (14.56–63; ff. 47v5–48v2: *ekavṛkṣe śmaśāne 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 *Catuṣpīṭha* but have been added from the *Catuṣpīṭhamāṇḍalopāyikā* of Caryāvratipāda (19.30–33 [f. 20r]). On that work, its author, and the incorporation of material from it in this MS of the *Catuṣpīṭha* see SZÁNTÓ 2008a. He has also drawn my attention to references to sanguinary offerings elsewhere in the *Catuṣpīṭha* itself, in the Sādhana of Dākinī (2.4.63–66) and in that of Cūṣiṇī (2.4.75),

Jainas of Rajasthan and Saurashtra hold that their lineage deity Saccikā or Sacci-yā adopted her present non-violence only when she and they were converted to Jainism by the monk Ratnaprabhasūri, probably in the twelfth century,<sup>572</sup> 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 before their conversion they had been Rajput warriors—a claim also found among other Jain castes—<sup>573</sup> and she a fierce Cāmuṇḍā whom they propitiated with the Tantric rites of the Vāmamārga. Her pre-Jaina past is still visible in her temple at Osiān near Jodhpur, the Osvāls' original home. For the outer wall of her innermost shrine shows images of Cāmuṇḍā, Maḥiṣāsūramardīnī, Śītalā, and a naked Bhairava.<sup>574</sup>

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 Caulukyās, and the other goddesses associated with her had always been placated during the nine days of the annual

---

and to a reference to the attracting of animal and human victims (*paśuḥ*) at the end of the ninth chapter of the *Vajradāka*. That passage is derived from *Laghuśaṃvara* 32.1–2 and 31.2–3b. See also here p. 182, on human sacrifice.

<sup>572</sup> See DUNDAS 2002, p. 149.

<sup>573</sup> On the claims of Rajput *kṣatriya* ancestry among the Jain castes of the Osvāls, Khaṇḍelvāls, Agravāls, and Śrīmāls see BABB 1993, pp. 7–8.

<sup>574</sup> AGRAWALA 1954 and 1956; CORT 1987, pp. 243–244; and BABB 1993, pp. 9–10, following accounts in BHŪṬORIYĀ 1988. For photographs of the Cāmuṇḍā and Maḥiṣāsūramardīnī see *AIISPL*, Accession numbers 59386 and 59388. An account of the conversion of Saccikā is found in a chronicle, the *Upakeśagacchapattāvalī*, of the monastic community followed by the Osvāl laity, which ends with the installation 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 translation, 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 resemble such offerings.

Navarātra festival by the sacrifice of thousands of goats and buffaloes.<sup>575</sup> But this stops when Kumārapāla, now a convert to Jainism, declares a fourteen-year ban on the taking of life. Kaṅṭheśvarī 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.<sup>576</sup> She reports a vassal king in Saurāṣṭra for secretly butchering goats in his home: Kumārapāla sends his minister Udayana at the head of an army to punish him.<sup>577</sup> 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).<sup>578</sup>

<sup>575</sup> 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 (Mahānavamī). See Somatilakasūri, *Kumārapāladevacarita* vv. 387–389: *śuddhasamyaktvapūtātmā mahānavamīparvaṇi | kumārapālābhūpāla āmīgādibhir ākhayata || 388 devī \*kaṅṭheśvarī* (corr.: *kaṅṭheśvarī* Ed.) *gotradevī svam bhāvyaṃ ihate | ekaṃ chāgaśataṃ caiko mahiṣaḥ pratipaddine || 389 etāvad eva dviguṇaṃ dvitīye divase punaḥ | tṛtīye triguṇaṃ yāvan navame \*navasaṃguṇaṃ* (corr.: *nava saṃguṇaṃ* Ed.); and *Kumārapālāprabodhaprabandha* §75: *athāmāriṃ pravartayati rājani āsvinaśuklapakṣo 'gāt | tatra \*kaṅṭheśvaryādidevatānām (kaṅṭheśvaryādi corr.: kaṅṭheśvaryādi Ed.) arcakair vijñaptam deva saptamyām sapta śatāni paśavaḥ sapta mahiṣās ca devatānām puro dīyante rājñā | evam aṣṭamyām aṣtau śatāni navamyām nava śatānīti*. In the editions of the *Kumārapāladevacarita* and the *Kumārapālāprabodhaprabandha* the goddess' name appears in the form Kaṅṭheśvarī. I have corrected this to Kaṅṭheśvarī on the dubious strength of a passage in the *Prabandhacintāmaṇi* of Merutuṅga in which the author implies that she owes her name to the fact that in the eighth century Vanarāja, the founder of the Cāpotkaṭa dynasty that preceded the Caulukyās at Aṇahillapattana, had a shrine built for her in the *kaṅṭhaḥ* ('narrow entrance?') of his palace (p. 35: *tathā ca tena dhavalagr̥hakaṅṭhe kaṅṭheśvarīprāsādaś ca kāritah*).

<sup>576</sup> *Kumārapāladevacarita*, vv. 387–396 and *Kumārapālāprabodhaprabandha* §75.

<sup>577</sup> *Kumārapālāprabodhaprabandha* §85.

<sup>578</sup> *Kumārapāladevacarita*, vv. 404–406; cf. *Kumārapālāprabodhaprabandha* §77. The same sources relate another occasion on which the Jaina Mantravāda was used to curb a sanguinary goddess. Hemacandra and Yaśāścandra 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*).<sup>579</sup> 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

---

air from Aṇahillapattana to Bhṛgupura (Bhṛgukaccha, Bharukaccha, modern Bharuch/Broach) and attempt to tame the Tantric goddess Saindhavā, who had possessed the minister Āmbaḍa. She shows her contempt for Hemacandra by sticking out her tongue. Yaśāscandra punishes her by pounding some grains of rice in a mortar. The first blow causes her temple to quake, and the second and third cause her image to shudder and then be dislodged. She falls at Hemacandra's feet begging for his protection. See Somatilakasūri's *Kumārapāladevacarita*, vv. 76–85 and *Kumārapālaprabodhaprabandha* §87. Saindhavā is no doubt the Sindhavāī Mā whose temple is located outside the walls of Broach to the north, not far from the temple of Nilakaṇṭha. She was receiving goat sacrifices on Mahānavamī up to the 1940s (DESAI 1993, p. 48). According to Somatilakasūri, she was the principal of the non-Jaina deities of the city. Sindhavāī Mā also has temples in Ahmedabad, near Bilimora, and Kayavarohana, Vadodara.

<sup>579</sup> *Kumārapālaprabodhaprabandha* §61: *te ca trayāḥ kṛtapūrvakṛtyāḥ śrī-ambikā-kṛtasānnidhyāḥ śubhadhyānadhīradhiyāḥ śrīraivatādevatādṛṣṭau triyāminyām āhvānāvaguṇṭhanamudrākaraṇamantranyāsavisarjanādibhir upacārair gurūktavidhinā samīpsthapadminīstrikr̥tōttarasādhakakriyāḥ śrīsiddhacakramantram \*asādhayan* (em.: *asādhayat* Ed.). 'And those three, after performing the preliminary service (*pūrvasevā*) 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 Sādhana 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., *Pañcasāyakamañjarī* 1.6: *sampūrnendumukhī kuraṅganayanā pīnastanī dakṣiṇā mṛdvaṅgī vikacāravindasurabhiḥ śyāmātha gauradyutiḥ | alpāhāraratā vilāsakuśalā haṃsasvanā sadgatir lajjātur gurudevapūjanaparā syān nāyikā padminī*; and in Tantric literature *Hevajratantra* 2.7.2–5 and *Samvarodayatantra* 31.3–5b.

repeated the Mantra for three days on the Padminī's vulva (*tasyā yonau*).<sup>580</sup> 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 dharmah*). This perception is much emphasised in their literature,<sup>581</sup> and it is expressed through the

<sup>580</sup> *Kumārapāladevaprabandha* §21: *atha śrīhemācāryais tribhuvanasvāminīm vidyām ārādhayitukāmā bhāṇḍāgārikam kapardinam prāhur yan mehatāgrāme trihuṇasiṃhaḥ kauṭumbikaḥ | tasya putrās catvāraḥ | laghor vadhūḥ padminī | yadi sāyāti tadā \*tasyā avācyapradeśe (corr.: tasyāvācyapradeśe Ed.) dinatrayaṃ jāpe datte devī prasīdati | etad atiduṣkaram | kapardinoktam | cintā na vidheyā | bhāṇḍāgārikas tatra gataḥ kauṭumbikagrhe | tena satkṛtaḥ | prayojanaṃ prṣṭaḥ | bhāṇḍāgārikenoktam laghuputravadhūṃ mamārpaya | tenoktam kim idam ādisasi | evam eva | vicāro 'pi na kartavyaḥ | tenoktam yadi bhavatām \*vicāre samāyātam idam (?) tadaivam astu | sukhāsane 'dhiropya pattane samāgataḥ | śrīhemasūribhiḥ paramānnāhāraparair avikṛtacittais tasyā yonau dinatrayaṃ jāpaḥ kṛtaḥ | devī tuṣṭā* "Then Hemācārya, desiring to propitiate the spell-deity Tribhuvanasvāminī said to his treasurer Kapardin: "There is a farmer called Trihuṇasiṃha in Mehatā village. He has four sons. The wife of the youngest is a Padminī. 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 *paramānnam*, with his mind undisturbed [by lust]. The goddess was pleased'. The food *paramānnam* 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.

<sup>581</sup> It is encapsulated in the often cited words of their scripture *Bhārgavottara: iti varṇāśramācārān manasāpi na laṅghayet | yo yasminn āsrame tiṣṭhan dikṣitaḥ śivaśāsane | sa tasminn eva saṃtiṣṭhec 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 *paramabrahmaṇyaḥ* that is sometimes found with the titles of our kings in inscriptions.<sup>582</sup>

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 Purāṇic texts such as the *Uttarabhāga* of the *Līṅgapurāṇa*,<sup>583</sup> the *Kālikāpurāṇa*, the *Devīpurāṇa*, and the *Agnipurāṇa*,<sup>584</sup> the boundary between the Smārta 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.<sup>585</sup>

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 Koṅkaṇa 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

---

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 SANDERSON 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*.

<sup>582</sup> We see this combination in the case of the Pāṇḍuvaṃśins/Pāṇḍavas of Mekalā in the fifth century (SHASTRI 1995, nos. II: I–II), the Śailodbhava Mādhavarāja of Koṅgoḍa in the seventh (*EI* 6:14), the Pallavas Parameśvaravarman I (c. 669–690) and Narasiṃhavarman II (c. 690–728/9) (MAHALINGAM 1988, nos. 45, 53) around the turn of the seventh and eighth, the Bhañja Neṭṭabhañja of Orissa in the eighth (*EI* 28:41, ll. 16–17), the descendants of King Nimbara of Kārtikeyapura in Himachal Pradesh in the ninth and tenth (*EI* 31:38), and the Eastern Cālukyas in the eleventh (*EI* 6:35; *EI* 6:36).

<sup>583</sup> On the presence of the Śaiva Mantramārga in its Saiddhāntika, Dakṣiṇa (Bhairava), and Śākta forms in the *Uttarabhāga* of the *Līṅgapurāṇa* see SANDERSON 2005b, pp. 235–236.

<sup>584</sup> On the *Agnipurāṇa*'s incorporation of the Saiddhāntika Śaiva Paddhati of Somaśambhu see p.65 above.

<sup>585</sup> In vv. 55–67 of the introduction to his *Dānasāgara* Ballālasena rejects on these and allied grounds the *Garuḍapurāṇa*, the *Brahmapurāṇa*, the *Agnipurāṇa*, the *Vaiṣṇavapurāṇa* in twenty-three thousand verses, the *Līṅgapurāṇa* in six thousand, the *Devīpurāṇa*, and parts of the *Bhaviṣyapurāṇa*. That he did not include the *Kālikāpurāṇa* 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 (*dīkṣā*) which those scriptures require.<sup>586</sup> 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.<sup>587</sup>

<sup>586</sup> 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 (*dharmamūlam*), namely Śruti, Smṛti, and observation of the practice of exemplary brahmins, supplemented by personal judgement and preference where the other sources of knowledge leave scope for them. Aparāditya considers at length and rejects the proposition that the scriptures of the Pāsupatas, Śaivas, Pāñcarātrikas, and others not rooted in the Veda (*vedamūla-*) should be added to the list (vol. 1, p. 10, l. 6 ff.). He concludes: *tataś ca devapūjādau narasiṃhapurāṇādiprasiddhāivetikartavyā grāhyā nānyā | evaṃ dīkṣāyām apy avagantavyam | na hi purāṇaprasiddhāyāṃ dīkṣāyām jātiśodhanam asti* (vol. 1, p. 14, ll. 17–19) ... *evaṃ pratiṣṭhāyām api purāṇādyuktaivetikartavyatā grāhyā nānyā teṣām eva vyāmiśradharmapramāṇatvena bhaviṣyatpurāṇe pariñātavāt* (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 *Narasimha-*, and no other. The same should be understood to apply in the case of initiation. For in the initiation established in the Purāṇas 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 *Bhaviṣyatpurāṇa* acknowledges none but these as sources of valid knowledge of hybrid religious duty’. By ‘hybrid’ (*vyāmiśra-*) Aparāditya 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.

<sup>587</sup> This source is the Saiddhāntika scripture *Devyāmata*. It devotes several verses to distinguishing types of Sthāpaka 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 (*samayācāraḥ*), without any inclination towards the scriptures of the uninitiated (*paśuśāstram*), taking no pleasure in the mundane religion, but delighting in the religion of Śiva alone: (2.16cd, 17ab, 19ab, 20ab): *ācāryaḥ śivaśāstrajñāḥ pratiṣṭhātantrapāragāḥ || ... 17 śivaśāstrārthasamtuṣṭāḥ samayācārapālakaḥ | ... 19ab śivaśāstraikacittātmā paśuśāstraparāṇmukhaḥ | ... 20 virakto laukike dharme śivadharmaṇurañjitaḥ*. 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 Smārta domain can be aduced from most regions and periods;<sup>588</sup> but perhaps the most striking because it was so widely disseminated and accepted by those who considered themselves to be on the Smārta side of the divide is represented by the *Prapañcasāra* attributed to Śaṅkarācārya and the closely related *Śāradātilaka* of Lakṣmaṇadeśika. These two texts, which, I have argued, were composed in Orissa or on the basis of Orissan tradition, most probably in the twelfth century,<sup>589</sup> present a system of ritual that differs from the properly Tantric only in its catholic character—in Smārta fashion it includes rituals of propitiation for all the main deities—in its avoidance of all the elements of ‘impure’ practice that the Smārtas 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 systems 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 invisible 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 considering evidence of changes over time within the Śaivas’ prescriptive literature, I

---

*pratiṣṭhātāntrakiñcijñāḥ paśuśāstrānurañjitaḥ | tattvopadeśahīnāś ca nācāryo na ca sādhaḥ || 8 tena saṁsthāpitaṁ liṅgaṁ siddhidaṁ na kadā cana | ... 13 padavākyapramāṇajño brāhmaṇo vedapāragah | pratiṣṭhātāntrakiñcijñāḥ sthāpako na praśasyate || 2.14 pratiṣṭhātāntratattvajñāḥ śivaśāstraviśāradaḥ | so 'pi na sthāpakair iṣṭaḥ paśuśāstrānurañjitaḥ.*

<sup>588</sup> One of these, the assimilation of Śākta Śaiva propitiation rites by the Atharvavedic tradition of the Paippalādins of Orissa, has been demonstrated at length in SANDERSON 2007b.

<sup>589</sup> SANDERSON 2007b, pp. 230–233.

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.<sup>590</sup>

At the same time it took steps to integrate itself with the brahmanical sub-

---

<sup>590</sup> 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), Brajadulal 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 Sanskrit 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.

### ŚAIVISM AND MONARCHY

Śaivism'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 Śaiva 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 Śaiva 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 Śaivas 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 Śaivas, 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.<sup>591</sup> 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 Śiva taught in the texts of the *Śivadharma* 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 Śaiva modification of the brahmanical royal consecration ceremony (*rājyābhīṣekaḥ*), 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

<sup>591</sup> 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 *Niśvāsa* texts found in the *Niśvāsatattvasaṃhitā* 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 *Kiraṇa*, the *Pārameśvara*, and the *Svacchanda*, and, following the latter, in the Paddhatis. The textual evidence is given in SANDERSON forthcoming *a*.

throne (*yuvarājābhīṣekah*).<sup>592</sup>

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 Sādhaka (*sādhakābhīṣekah*), a specialist in Mantra-rituals for supernatural effects (*siddhiḥ*), and that through which a retiring Guru (*ācāryaḥ*) consecrated his chosen successor (*ācāryābhīṣekah*), passing on to him his duties. In this way the monarch was incorporated as a third kind of Śaiva initiate, who differed from the Sādhaka 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” (*varṇāśramaguruḥ*),<sup>593</sup> the role already assigned to him by brahmanical prescription.<sup>594</sup>

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

<sup>592</sup> 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.

<sup>593</sup> *Naimittikakarmānusamdhāna* f.74v1: [4.118] *varṇānām āśramāṇām ca gurubhāvāya bhūpateḥ | yo ’bhīṣekavidhiḥ so ’pi procyate dīkṣitātmanaḥ* ‘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’.

<sup>594</sup> *Manusmṛti* 7.35cd: *varṇānām āśramāṇām ca rājā sṛṣṭo ’bhirakṣitā* ‘The king has been created as the guardian of the castes and disciplines’; *Bṛhaspatismṛti* 1.9ab: *tasmād varṇāśramāṇām tu netāsau nirmitaḥ purā* ‘he was created of old as the leader of the castes and disciplines’; *Viṣṇusmṛti* 3.1–3: *atha rājadharmāḥ. prajāparipālanam | varṇāśramāṇām sve sve dharme vyavasthāpanam* ‘Next the duties of the king: protection of his subjects [and] ensuring that the castes and [followers of the] disciplines keep to their respective duties’; *Viṣṇudharmottara* 2.65.55: *varṇāśramavyavasthā tu tathā kāryā viśeṣataḥ | svadharmapracyutān rājā svadharme viniyojayet* ‘And his special duty is to establish the castes and disciplines. The king must force those who have fallen away from their duties [as members and followers of these] to practice them’. The characterization of the king in accordance with these injunctions as the Guru of the castes and disciplines (*varṇāśramaguruḥ*) is a commonplace in our period. See, for example, *Sātvatasamhitā* 24.16–17 (> *Īśvarasamhitā* 17.14–15); Somadeva, *Kathāsaritsāgara* 12.6.85; Candraprabhasūri, *Prabhāvakaarita* v.284ab; Kṣemendra, *Avadānakalpalatā* 2.60c and 27.22b. See also the cognate expressions *sarvāśramaguruḥ* and *āśramiṇām guruḥ* in *Netratantra* 19.87 and 20.55b, *varṇāśramadharmamaryādācāryaḥ* and *akhilāśramaguruḥ* in *Āgamadambara*, Act 2, prose after 20 and Act 3, v. 4, and *varṇaguruḥ* in *Rājatarāṅgiṇī* 3.85ab.

banners, weapons, and armour in the objects of worship,<sup>595</sup> the seating of the king on a platform covered with the skins of a fighting bull and a cat,<sup>596</sup> the

<sup>595</sup> *Naimittikakarmānusamdhāna*, f. 75r4–v1 (4.129c–132): *ghaṭeṣu abhyarṇya lokeśān sāstrān indrapura<h>sarān* || 130 *śivam agniṅ ca hetīś ca ketuṃ* (conj.: *ketuś* Cod.) *ceśādivediṣu* [Marginal glosses: *khadgādi* on *hetīś* and *dhvajacihnaṃ* on *ketuś*] | *saṃnidhīkr̥tya saṃtarpya pūjayec cakravartinah* || 131 *udagvedīsira<h>stheṣu kalaśeṣūktalakṣmasu* | *anantādiśikhāṇḍy\*antān* (corr.: *antā* Cod.) *digvidikṣu yathākramam* || 132 *tasyās tadvad adha<h>stheṣu rudramātrgaṅārthadān* | *grahāsurapalās\*ākhyān* (conj.: *ākhyā* 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 Vidyeśvaras], beginning with Ananta and ending with Śikhāṇḍin, in the vases whose required characteristics have been stated above, set on the northern altar, and likewise, below that [altar], the Rudras, the Mātr̥s, Kubera, the Grahas, the Asuras, the flesh-eating [Rākṣasas], and the Nāga lords’; f. 76r2–4 (4.141–142): *śivāgnihetiketūnām kārītābhyām athārcanam* | *pañcagavyam caruṃ tābhyām dattvā ca dvijaśodhanam* || *svāpayitvā tu tau tatra sarakṣau vedikādvaye* | *pr̥tha<k>prākśirasau mahyām saṃyatau kṣaumaśayayoh* ‘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 *sarakṣān svāpayen niśi*) and *Mṛgendra*, *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 at this point in Śaiva initiation ritual candidates are to sleep with their heads to the east if they seek benefits other than liberation; see *Mṛgendra*, *Kriyāpāda* 7.99ab: *bubhokṣoḥ śayanam kuryād guruḥ prācīnamastakam*.

<sup>596</sup> *Naimittikakarmānusamdhāna* f. 76v4–5 (4.150–152b): *hetīn astreṇa ketuṃś ca varmaṇā kaṅkaṭāny api* [Marginal gloss on *kaṅkaṭāni*: *saṃnahyāni*] | *sugandhapuṣpadhūpādyair naivedyāntaiḥ prapūjya ca* || *anantādīṃś ca \*vidyeśān udagvedyām* (conj.: *ved+ + + + vedyās* Cod.) *ca pūrvavat* | *rudrādīṃś ca ghaṭeṣu iṣṭvā vedyor ūrdhvam athāstaret* || *brhadukṣṇo ’tisūrasya vṛśadamśasasya 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 \*Vidyeśvaras on the northern altar (conj.) as before and after worshipping the Rudras[, the Mātr̥s, 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 *Brhatsamhitā* 47.75–76, on the royal *puṣyasnānam*: *gatvā dvitīyavedīṃ samupaviśec carmaṇām upari rājā* | *deyāni caiva carmaṇy upary upary evam etāni* || *vṛśasya vṛśadamśasasya ruśoś ca pr̥śatasya ca* | *teṣām upari siṃhasya vyāghrasya ca tataḥ param*; and *Viṣṇudharmottara* 2.21.35 on the brahmanical royal consecration (*rājyābhīṣekah*): *vṛśasya* (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,<sup>597</sup> 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.<sup>598</sup>

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.<sup>599</sup>

---

*vṛsadaṃśasya dvīpinaś ca bhṛgūttama | teṣāṃ upari siṃhasya vyāghrasya ca tataḥ param.*

<sup>597</sup> *Naimittikakarmānusamdhāna* ff. 78r1–79r1 (interrupted by the loss of a folio), beginning (4.168–169): *loke vede prasiddhā<ṃ>ś ca viprān etarhi pāthayet | abhiṣekāśiṣaḥ* (corr.: *abhiṣekāsikhaḥ* Cod.) *ślokān ṛsiproktā<ṃ>ś ca tad yathā || surās tvām abhiṣiñcantu ye ca siddhā<ḥ> purātanaḥ | brahmā viṣṇus ca śambhuś ca śakrādyaś ca marudgaṇāḥ || ...* These verses are prescribed for this purpose by Varāhamihira in the first half of the sixth century in *Bṛhatsamhitā* 47.55–70.

<sup>598</sup> *Naimittikakarmānusamdhāna* f. 84r2–5: *ārūḍho bhadramātaṅgam athavā vājinaṃ sitam || ātapatreṇa śubhreṇa hemadaṇḍena \*cāruṇā* (conj.: *cā + +* Cod.) | *\*nigrhītātapaḥ* (conj.: *+ + hītātapaḥ* Cod.) *śvetair vijyamānaś ca \*cāmaraiḥ* (em.: *cāparaiḥ* Cod.) || *cāturaṅgabalopetaḥ purataḥ ketumālayā || astaviḅhno \*nukūlena dhūtayā + + \*vāyunā* (diag. conj.: *+ + +* Cod.) | *saudhāgravedikāsthābhiḥ kulapatnībhir ādarāt || prayuktaṃ lājavarṣaṃ ca manyamāno \*bahupriyam* (conj.: *vahapriyam* Cod.) | *praviṣet svapuram \*pauraiḥ* (conj.: *pau +* Cod.) *+ + + vikāśibhiḥ.*

<sup>599</sup> *Mohacūḍottara* f. 21v–22r (4.276–281): *śrutismṛtipurāṇāni āgamā dharmadeśakāḥ | etair yo vartate rājā sa rājyaṃ bhuñjate ciram || 277 purāṇaṃ bādhyate vedair āgamaiś ca taduktayaḥ | sāmānyaṃ ca viśeṣaṃ ca śaivam vaiśeṣikaṃ vacaḥ || 278 bādhyabādhakabhāvena no vikalpyam vicakṣanaḥ | yad yathāvasthitam vastu sarvajñas tat tad āvadet || 279 āgamānāṃ bahutve tu yatra vākyadvayaṃ bhavet | kiṃ pramāṇam tadā grāhyaṃ pramāṇam śāṅkaraṃ vacaḥ || 280 \*granthād granthāntaram ṭikā (?) sāpekṣanirapekṣayoḥ | samādhānaṃ tayoh kāryam arthāpattiyādisādhanaiḥ || 281 evaṃ jñātvā surādhyakṣa nirvṛtiṃ paramāṃ vraja | evaṃ dharmānvite rājñi svarāṣṭre sarvadā śivam* [The sources] that teach religious duty are the Vedas, the Dharmasāstras, 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.<sup>600</sup> Similarly, an inscription of the twelfth or thirteenth century from Hariyāṇa tells us that the effect of the initiation of King Sūrapāla was to give him power beyond that of all his rivals.<sup>601</sup> It adds that if his Guru Mūrtigaṇa 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.<sup>602</sup> 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.<sup>603</sup> The same notion is apparent in the great Mebon inscription of A.D. 953 of the Khmer monarch Rājendravarman.

---

[one non-Śaiva and the other Śaiva] and the question of which is valid arises one must privilege the teaching of Śiva. The two should be reconciled, as respectively dependent and independent [in their validity], by means of implication and other exegetical tools, \*[on the evidence of] the texts [themselves in which those statements occur], related texts, and commentary (?). Having understood this, Indra, achieve the highest bliss. Provided that the king adheres to religion in this manner, his kingdom will always prosper’.

<sup>600</sup> Rājānaka Śitikaṇṭha, *Rājānakavamaśaprasāmsā*, v.5ab: *tasmād yodhagurur babhūva bhagavān saṃprāpya dikṣaṃ yataḥ | prājyaṃ rājyaṃ apāstavairinikarāś cakruś ciraṃ bhūbhujah* ‘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.

<sup>601</sup> *EI* I, pp.61-66, ll.12–13.: *tadbhaktimān mūrtigaṇo guṇīndro* (corr.: *guṇīndro* Ep.) *babhūva bhūpālahṛdabjasūryaḥ | saddikṣayā yasya sa sūrapāladevo babhūvāpratimaprabhāvaḥ* ‘Then there was his devotee Mūrtigaṇa, 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’.

<sup>602</sup> *Ibid.* ll.13–14 (continuous with the passage cited in the preceding note): *... vipraṃ bhūmipatiṃ tadīyam athavāmātyaṃ sa yaṃ dikṣayet | taṃ taṃ bodhanidhiṃ samastapṛthivīnāthaṃ pradhānaṃ nṛṇāṃ sthānuṃ patriṇaṃ ātanot tarum iva śrīyājñavalkyo munīḥ* ‘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.

<sup>603</sup> PANTULU 1930, v. 22: *śrīviśveśvaradeśikendrasīvahastodbhāsīdorvikramas*.



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.<sup>604</sup>

Nor was it only the theory that was adjusted to suit their patrons. According to the *Bṛhatkālottara* the Śaiva Guru was to close the initiation ceremony by giving *abhiṣekaḥ* 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”.<sup>605</sup> The Śaivas also created a double of their ritual of post-initiatory consecration (*abhiṣekaḥ*) to be performed for the king before he entered the fray.<sup>606</sup> A much elaborated form of this ‘consecration for victory’ (*jayābhiṣekaḥ*), 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 *Liṅgapurāṇa*.

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

<sup>604</sup> The Mebon inscription (in FINOT 1925 [=K. 582], pp. 309–352), vv. 39–40: *itas ta-to vidyud ivādyutac chris tāvan nṛpānām pracalā prakṛtyā | ramyā śarat prādur abhūn na yāvad yadiyayātrāsamayo nirabhrā || 40 tīvrāstranīrājanarājitaśrīr dīpto mahāmaṇḍaladīkṣayā yaḥ | vidyāṅgamantrais ca kṛtātmaguptiḥ asā[dhaya]t siddhim udārabhūtim* ‘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.’

<sup>605</sup> *Bṛhatkālottara* A, f. 45v2–3 (22.24c–25b): *hastyaśvaratha\*yodhānām* (em.: *yodhyānā* Cod.) *secanam astravāriṇā | kartavyam vighnaśamanam saṃgrāme jayakāraṇam* ‘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]’.

<sup>606</sup> *Kiraṇa* f. 52v (27.23c–25b): *prokto ’yam abhiṣeka<ḥ> syā<d> vijayārtham nṛpasya ca | 27.24 saubhāgyajananaṃ mukhyaṃ grahapīdānivartakam | sarvasampat\*pradaṃ śrīdaṃ* (corr. : *pradā śrīdā* Cod.) *yaśokīrtivivardhanam || 27.25 śāntipuṣṭikaraḥ proktaḥ seko ’yam vighnanāśakaḥ* ‘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. *Siddhāntasārapaddhati*: *evam anenaiva vidhinā rājyakāmasya bhraṣṭarājyasya putrakāmāyāḥ 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.<sup>607</sup> 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 Kāñcīpuram<sup>608</sup> 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’ (*śivadrohī*) had indeed been defeated. The Badāun inscription of Lakhaṇapāla praises the Rājaguru Mūrtigaṇa for his expertise in “the great rites of subjection and attraction” (l. 13: *vaśyākṛṣṭimahāvīdhānanipuṇaḥ*); and Hrasvanātha, a Kashmirian Guru of the Kālīkula 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.<sup>609</sup>

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,<sup>610</sup> so at the time of a Guru’s consecration he received from his predecessor the non-martial symbols of sovereignty (*rājāṅgāni, rājacihnāni*), such as the turban, crown, parasol, sandals, fly-whisk, elephant, horse, and palanquin.<sup>611</sup> To these we may add the throne supported by sculpted lions

<sup>607</sup> For some examples see SANDERSON 2007a, p. 281, fn. 166.

<sup>608</sup> ARE 20 of 1899, SII 4:456; ARE 1899, §§23–38 (partial translation in §34).

<sup>609</sup> See SANDERSON 2007a, pp. 280–291; 2007b, pp. 295–296.

<sup>610</sup> *Viṣṇudharmottara* 2.4.18c–20b: *tato ’bhīṣekasambhārāms tasya kuryāt sa daivavit | kuñjaraṃ turagaṃ kuryāt tasya rājñāḥ parīkṣitau | bhadrāsanaṃ ca chattraṃ ca vālavayanam eva ca | khaḍgaratnaṃ tathā cāpaṃ ratnāni vīvidhāni ca.*

<sup>611</sup> Bhojadeva, *Siddhāntasārapaddhati* f. 41v (< *Svacchandatantra* 4.470): *uṣṇīṣa-makuṭacchatrapādukaśāmarahastyāśvaśībīkādirājāṅgāni ... dattvā. Svacchandatantra* 4.70b has a throne or seat (*chattraṃ 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: *uṣṇīṣamakuṭādyāṃś ca cchatrapādukaśāmarah | hastyāśvaśībīkādyāṃś ca rājāṅgāni aśeṣataḥ*; and IFI T. 1032, p. 96: *uṣṇīṣamakuṭādyāṃś ca chatracāmarapādukāḥ | hastyāśvaśībīkādyāṃś ca rājāṅgāni aśeṣataḥ. In*

(*siṃhāsanam*) so intimately associated with kingship in the Indian tradition.<sup>612</sup> For a manual for royal initiation, the *Amṛteśadikṣāvidhi*, 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,<sup>613</sup> 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 Kākatīya king Gaṇapati of Warangal (r. 1199–1261),<sup>614</sup> 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”.<sup>615</sup>

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.<sup>616</sup> That Gurus should have needed the

---

*Liṅgapurāna, Uttarabhāga*, 27.259–261 the attributes of kings (*nṛpacihnāni*) are “the conch, the fly-whisk, the drum etc., a moon-white parasol, a palanquin, and the war-banner” (*śaṅkhacāmarabheryādyaṃ chattraṃ candrasamaprabham | śibikāṃ vaijayantīṃ ca sādhayen nṛpateḥ śubhām | rājyābhīṣekayuktāya kṣatriyāyeśvarāya vā | nṛpacihnāni nānyeśāṃ kṣatriyāṇāṃ vidhīyate*).

<sup>612</sup> For an image of such a throne see, e.g., the eighth-century metal Tārā from Sirpur (Śrīpura) in HUNTINGTON 1985, plate 30. The notion that the throne is the very embodiment of sovereignty and imparts its power to the enthroned is already found in the Vedic literature, in the *Śatapathabrāhmaṇa* (12.8.3.4) (GONDA 1966: 45–46): *āsandyām abhiṣīcati | āsandi sad vai sāmṛājyaṃ sāmṛājyenainainam sāmṛājyaṃ gamayati* ‘He consecrates him by affusion on the throne. The throne is indeed true sovereignty. Through [this] sovereignty he causes him to achieve sovereignty’.

<sup>613</sup> *Amṛteśadikṣāvidhi* f. 16v2–3: 37 *paścād gurur dakṣaṇīyaḥ svarṇabhāraiḥ \*su-vistaraiḥ* (em. : *suviṣṭaraiḥ* Cod.) | *māṇikyamuktākacitair alaṅkāraiś ca adbhutaiḥ* | 38 *navaratnamayair dāntais tathā vai ratnapāduke | haimaṃ siṃhāsanam chattraṃ dattvā vai cāmāre śubhe* | 39 *maṇimuktāśvanāgendra-uṣtra-meṣagavādibhiḥ | kṣetragrāmādiviṣayair maṇḍalaiś ca śubhair varaiḥ* ‘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.’

<sup>614</sup> PANTULU 1930, v. 38d: *tasmin gaṇapatyadhīśagurutāsiṃhāsanādhyāsini śrīviśveśvaradeśike* ‘While the Guru Viśveśvara[śiva], occupies the lion-throne of his office as Guru of King Gaṇapati’. Note also the reading *chatrapādūkam āsanam* ‘parasol, sandals, and throne’ in the Kashmirian text of *Svacchandatantra* 4.470.

<sup>615</sup> PANTULU 1930, v. 39: *tvāṅgatpiṅgajātākīrīṭam udayasmerāravindānanam muktā-kunḍalatādītāṃsaśikharam hāir manohāriṇam | vidyāmaṇḍapavartinam gaṇapatikṣmāpālādīkṣāgurum śrīviśveśvaraśambhum iṅṣitavatām te cakṣuṣī cakṣuṣī*.

<sup>616</sup> *Mayaṃgraha* 5.182ab: *dhanuḥkhaḍgaśarādīni vidadhīyāt tu gṛhākṣate*;

means of warfare may surprise. But a fragmentary inscription of the late tenth century from Kadwāhā 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 Dharmasīva, abbot of the Araṇipadra monastery, went into battle and routed the enemy through his skill as an archer, at the cost of his own life.<sup>617</sup> Nor is this an isolated instance. From the Jubbulpore stone inscription of Vimalasīva, Rājaguru of the Kalacuri kings Jayasimha (r. c. 1163–1188) and Vijayasimha (r. c. 1188–1210), we learn that the activities of his predecessor Kīrtisīva, 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.<sup>618</sup>

*Piṅgalāmata* f. 71r1–2 (10.28c–31): *grhakṣate grhaṃ caiva śastrasamsthāpanāya tu | khaḍgabānadhānuś caiva kuṭhāro mudgaras tathā | cchurikā kuntadaṃtās ca citradaṇḍas tathaiiva ca | lakuṭaṃ śakti pāsās ca kaṇayaḥ śūlapatrakaḥ | cakrāsi gadavajras ca aṅkuśās ca kupaṭṭisāḥ | evamādyāni cāstrāṇi pharāṇi vividhāni ca | sthāpitavyāni deveṣu grhe grhakṣatasya tu*. The term *grhakṣataḥ* 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 *sphara-* 'shield' from Iranian (Old Persian *spara-barai* 'shield-bearer'; Persian *ispar* 'shield').

<sup>617</sup> *EI* 37:20, ll. 10–16. The inscription is fragmentary, but this much of its meaning is clear: while the ascetic Dharmasīva was in the monastery at Araṇipada (elsewhere called Araṇipadra) performing austerities (*tenāraṇipadam nāma kṛtaṃ padam aniditaṃ . . . dattvāraṇipade . . . tasya dharmasīva ity abhavaj jītātmā śiṣyaḥ . . . tasyā-śrame vardhayatas tapāṃsi* [ll. 10–12]) a ruler called Gobhaṭa came there with a force of elephants (*tatrājagāmonmadasinthurānām balena bhūpaḥ kila gobhaṭa-khyaḥ* [l. 12]). Someone, perhaps the local ruler, was killed by this king (*[nr̥]peṇa parāgatāsuh sahasā papāta* [ll. 12–13]); and he, evidently Dharmasīva, wept with compassion for a while when he heard the news (*tasyāvagamya sa kathāṃ karuṇā-vimuktābāṣpaḥ kṣaṇam* [l. 13]), then, flying into a rage (*tad anu kopavipāṭa[lākṣaḥ]* [l. 13]), went into battle, a veritable Śiva on earth, armed with a bow \*that had come [down to him] from Prabhāva[śiva?] (?) (*atha prabhāvāgatakārmukeṇa bāṇaiś ca dīptaḥ sa dharāvṛṣāṅkaḥ* [l. 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 (*ātta[sva]llīlas tripurāntakasya . . . sakalam api sa jītvā sātravaṃ śarvakalpaḥ | surapatiramaṇī-nām puṣpavṛṣṭyāvākīrṇaḥ puram anupam[am] . . .* [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. 1358–1361.

<sup>618</sup> *EI* 25:33 (A.D. 1174), vv. 23–24: *na syandanam vasumatī na ca candrasūryau cakre na sārathir abhūt sa ca viśyayoniḥ | neśur hariḥ parapurāṇi tathāpi bhasma cakre yataḥ sa iti kīrtisīvaḥ sphuṭaṃ saḥ || yaśobhir induviśadais tathaiivārivikarṣitaiḥ | apūpurat sa sarvāsā vivekakusumair iva* 'He was manifestly [worthy of the name] Kīrtisīva [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

Kings rewarded their Gurus with the donation or construction of monasteries (*maṭhaḥ*) 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 Araṇipadra, using the funds he had received from king Avantivarman as the *dakṣiṇā* 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”.<sup>619</sup> Similarly, when the Kalacuri Yuvarājadeva

foes, just as he did with the [white] blossoms of his *Vivekas*'. My translation finds a reference to [lost] works by Kīrtiśiva entitled *Viveka*, presumably commentaries on Śaiva texts. It is possible that the poet refers not to works but to Kīrtiśiva's spiritual insights (*vivekāḥ*).

<sup>619</sup> Ranod inscription, *EI* 1:41, vv. 10–15: *tasmāt purandaragurur guruvad garimṇaḥ praññātrekajanitasya babhūva bhūmiḥ | yasyādhunāpi vibudhair itikṛtyaśaṃsi vyāhanyate na vacanaṃ nayamārgavidbhīḥ || 11 vandyah ko 'pi cakāsty acintya-mahimā tulyaṃ munir bhāsvatā rājann uttamaśabdapūrvasikharābhyarṇam prakīrṇadyutiḥ | dīkṣārthīti vaco nīsamya sukr̥tī cāroktam urvīpatir yasyehānayanāya yatnam akaroc chrīmān avantīḥ purā || 12 gatvā tapasyantam upendrapūrve pure tadā śrīmadavantivarmā | bhr̥saṃ samārādhyā tam ātmabhūmiḥ kathamcid ānīya cakāra pūtām || 13 athopasadyāpya ca samyag aiśīṃ dīkṣāṃ sa dakṣo gurudakṣiṇārtham | nivedya yasmai nījarājyasāraṃ svajanmasāphalyam avāpa bhūpaḥ || 14 sa kārayām āsa samṛddhibhājam munir maṭhaṃ sanmuniratnabhūmim | prasi-ddham āvāridhi merukalpaṃ śrīmatpure mattamayūranāmnī || 15 punar dvitīyaṃ svayam advitīyo guṇair munīndro 'raṇipadrasamjñam | tapovanaṃ śreṣṭhamāthaṃ vidhāya preṣṭhaḥ pratiṣṭhāṃ paramāṃ nināya* ‘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 Avanti[varman] made efforts to bring to this land because he desired to receive [Śaiva] initiation and had heard from one of his agents that there was a certain holy ascetic in the vicinity of Uttamaśikhara shining in unimaginable glory, shedding his radiance like the sun. Avantivarman then went to [Purandara], who was practising austerities in Upendrapura, and having striven to win his favour succeeded in bringing him back to sanctify his kingdom. Then, having served him with devotion he duly received Śaiva initiation [from him]. The wise king then presented him with the best part of the wealth of his kingdom as Guru's fee and so brought his human birth to fulfilment. In the splendid town of Mattamayūra the sage then caused a richly endowed Meru-like monastery to be built, a treasury of jewel-like ascetics, the fame of which has reached [throughout the continent] to the oceans. This foremost of sages, himself unmatched in his virtues, built and richly endowed a second and most splendid monastery, [this] hermitage of Araṇipadra'. 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: *upendrapuramaṇḍale*), which must have been within his kingdom, that is to say, in Mālava. It is probable that this town and

I *alias* Keyūravarṣa (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,<sup>620</sup> granting him by royal charter numerous villages and a whole well-populated town, which, since it is not named, was probably Golagī itself,<sup>621</sup> or, according to the account

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*.

<sup>620</sup> In all secondary sources, including SANDERSON 2007a (p. 274), the name of this monastery (*maṭhaḥ*) 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 *Kriyākāṇḍakramāvalī* and the Bāṅgarh Praśasti of the time of Nayapāla (r. c. 1027–1043) (SIRCAR 1983b, v. 6: *golagyās sa mahāmaṭhaḥ*). The name appears as Golaggī in the Chandrehe inscription (*carāṇapūtagolaggīkaḥ*). I identify Golagī with modern Gurgi (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 Narmadā river, close to the Kalacuri capital Tripurī, must be set out elsewhere.

<sup>621</sup> Chandrehe inscription, *CII* 4i:44, v. 5: *tato madhumatīpateḥ kṛtamahātapaḥ-saṃcayaḥ prabhāvaśiva ity abhūt sakalaśaivacūḍāmaṇiḥ | anekāṅṛpavanditaḥ sa yuvarājadevena yas tapodhanapatīḥ kṛtās carāṇapūta\*golaggīkaḥ* (my reading : *golagnīkaḥ* MIRASHI, BANERJI [*EI* 21:23]) ‘Then after the abbot of Madhumatī 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 Golaggī [=Golagī] with his feet after being appointed by Yuvarājadeva as overlord of the ascetics [of the monastery at that place]’; and the Gurgi inscription, *EI* 22:21, vv. 6–7: *tasyākhilakṣitipatipraṇatottamāṅgacūḍāmaṇidyuticayārcitapāda-pīṭhaḥ | śiṣyo babhūva bhuvanatrayakīrtanīyaḥ śrīmatprabhāvaśivanāmamunir manīṣī || ānīya yaṃ saḥajavāsanayā nayajñāḥ śrīmugdhatuṅgatanayo yuvarājadevaḥ | sattvopakārabhavaduttamakīrtihetor agrāhayan maṭham anantadhana-pratiṣṭham* ‘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 Mugdhatuṅga, 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 kīrtanī[yaṃ] puṇyānvītāya munaye svayam arcitāya | - - nam ullikhita[śāsana - - - keyū]avarṣanṛpatiḥ [svayam ājahāra] || 36 pakk + + . - [tam?] tathā sārasaḍollakam | vakkadollakarajyauddheko + +[nā]sapuṇḍikā || 37 + + + + . - + + + puram khaṭollikā | . nakalābhīrapallī + + + + sarasvatī || 38 [eteṣāṃ] dvādaśakaṇ ca kavacakṣetram eva ca | sāmāntapāṭakaś caiva vaṭa + + . - + || 39 + + + yā[tallapaṭi] śāsanaṃ [sa]tram ity api | sa + + bhadhaci[ūr]ā [kusu?]mvā ca ku[kku]ḍiyā || 40 rajogrāmānvitā[n etān śā]sanatvena dat-*

of the Malkāpuram inscription, gave him a vast reward which that ascetic, after he had himself founded the monastery, transferred to it as its endowment.<sup>622</sup> In the next generation the Kalacuri Lakṣmaṇarāja II (r. c. 945–970) brought in Hṛdayaśiva and gave him the monasteries attached to the temples of Vaidyanātha and Nohaleśvara, the second of which Hṛdayaśiva passed on to his disciple Aghoraśiva,<sup>623</sup> and the Bāngarh Praśasti reports, as we have seen, that

*tavā[n] | + + + + . [siddhā]ntapāragāya gariyase || puram paurajanākīrṇam + + + + samastakam | bhaktyā samarpayām āsa śāsanatve[na bhū]patih.*

<sup>622</sup> PANTULU 1930, vv. 25c–26: *tasmā niḥsprhacetase galacurikṣmāpālacūḍāmaṇir grāmānām yuvarājadevanṛpatir bhikṣām trilakṣim dadau || 26 kṛtvā sa śaivamunir adbhutaśilamūrthi śrīgolakīmaṭham udāram udāttacittaḥ | [ta]syākarasya nṛpadeśikamauktikānām vṛttiṃ cakāra sakalām api tām trilakṣim* ‘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 Rājagurus’. MIRASHI (*CII* 4i, p. clviii) interprets the words *grāmānām bhikṣām trilakṣim* ‘a 300,000 endowment of villages’ to mean that 300,000 villages were given to Prabhāvaśiva 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 Ḍāhala, 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 Malkāpuram 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 Malkāpuram 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 Maṭha 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 *trisāhasriko grāmaḥ* (*EI* 37:13, l. 13: *deṅguttanāmā trisāhasriko grāmo nirṣṭo*), 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”.

<sup>623</sup> Bilhāri inscription, *EI* 1:31, vv. 56–58: *56 kiṃ stūyate ’sau munipuṅgavo ’thavā śrīcedicandro nṛpatih kṛtādarah | sadvṛttadūtāprahitair upāyanaiḥ pradarsya bhaktiṃ vidhinānināya yam || 57 śrīmallakṣmaṇarājo ’pi tasmā sutapase svayam | maṭham śrīvaidyanāthasya bhaktiyuktaḥ samārpayat || 58 svīkṛtyāpi munir bhūyo maṭham śrīnauhaleśvaram | aghoraśivaśiṣyasya sādhuṇṛttasya 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 Aghoraśiva’.

the Pāla emperor Mahīpāla I (r. c. 977–1027) bestowed a lofty gilded monastery on the Guru Indraśiva at Śivavāṭī near Koṭivarṣa.<sup>624</sup>

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 meditation<sup>625</sup> and a hermitage on the banks of the Ganges at Benares.<sup>626</sup> His disciple, the Rājaguru Prabodhaśiva, also built a monastery at Chandrehe;<sup>627</sup>

<sup>624</sup> Bāngarh inscription, SIRCAR 1983b, v.9: *śrīmān indraśivah sphuṭam hariharapṛāyām śivendrākṛtim bibhrad vaṃśavibhūṣaṇam samabhavac chiṣyo 'sya puṇyātmanah | yasmai kāñcanapuñjamañjuracitaprāsādamerusphuratkailāsābhamaṭham dadāu iha mahīpālo nṛpas tattvavit* '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 [=Upendra, 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'.

<sup>625</sup> Chandrehe inscription, *CII* 4i:44, vv. 6a, 7: *praśāntaśivacandramās tad anu tasya śiṣyo 'bhavat ... 7 sa śoṇanadasaṃgame bhramaraśailamūle 'tulam priyālavanasamkule phalamṛṇālakandāśanaḥ | cakāra viditam janair munisakhaḥ praśāntāśramam svapādapadapaṅktibhiḥ pavitabhūtaḥ yaḥ kṛtī* '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 Praśāntāśrama] 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, vv. 8 and 13: *tasyāmalena tapasā ca vivardhamānavidyābalena ca samastajagatpratitah | śiṣyaḥ prakāmakamanīyaguṇaikadhāma śrīmatpraśāntaśivanāmamunir babhūva || ... 13 dāhottīrṇasuvārṇadānaśamitadravyārthisārthasprḥaḥ siddhasthānam acikarat tad aparāṃ yaḥ śoṇatīropari | yasmin yogajuṣaḥ praviśya niyamadhvastāntarāyādhayāḥ śāntāḥ siddhasamādhayo 'cchamatayo 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'.

<sup>626</sup> Gurgi inscription, *EI* 22:21, v. 14: *tīrthasnananiṣevanodyatadhiyām atyan-taviśrāntaye yas tat kāritavān muniḥ surasarittire tapaḥsthānakam | yat saṃsevya maheśvarārcanaratā vārṇasivāsino manyante bhavasāgaram gurum api kṣṭṇam yathā [goṣpa]dam* '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'.

<sup>627</sup> Chandrehe inscription, *CII* 4i:44, v. 16ab: *gurukṛtasurāgārād ārād amuṃ maṭham*



Pataṅgaśiva, a spiritual descendant of Purandara through another line, built a monastery in Gwalior at a site now unknown;<sup>628</sup> and the Rājaguru Viśveśvaraśiva, after receiving a village in Andhra from the Kākatīya Queen Rudradevī, 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 (*golakīvaṃśyakṛtābhīṣekaḥ*), should be allowed to preside over his foundation.<sup>629</sup> According to the same source he also established monasteries in Kālīśvarapura, Mandrakūṭanagara (v. 82), and Iśvarapura (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. Viśveśvaraśiva while holding office as the Rājaguru of the Kākatīya Gaṇapati is said also to have been the Guru of the Kalacuri king, the Cola king, and the king of Mālava,<sup>630</sup> and praise of Śaiva

---

*unnataṃ svakam iva yaśaḥ śubhrābhrābhaṃ viśālam acikarat* ‘Near the temple built by his teacher he built this broad and lofty monastery that resembles a white cloud, as though it were his own fame’.

<sup>628</sup> Gwalior Museum inscription, MIRASHI 1962, v. 40: *maṭhaṃ devakulaṃ kūpāś tadāgānāṃ ca pañcakam | prā[kā]ro vātikā . . .* ‘A monastery, a temple, wells, five reservoirs, a circumvallation, \*an orchard (?) . . .’

<sup>629</sup> Malkāpuram inscription, PANTULU 1930, vv. 42–45 and v. 70: 69c–72: *devasya satrasya maṭhasya tasya grāmasya sarvasya ca so ’dhikārī || 70 yo golakīvaṃśyakṛtābhīṣekaḥ sāntaḥ śuciḥ śaivarahasyavedī | śaivāgamānām api pāragamī samtānapālaḥ samaloṣṭahemā || 71 sarvāṇi bhūtāny anukampamānaḥ samastavidyāsu kṛtāvagāhaḥ | mahīsuraḥ śilavatāṃ purogo bhavettarāṃ naiṣṭhikadeśikendraḥ | 72 viśveśvaraśivācāryo dhīmān rājaguruḥ svayam evam ājñāpayad dhīraḥ śaivācāryasatair vṛtaḥ* ‘Surrounded by hundreds of Śaivācāryas the learned and noble Viśveśvaśivācārya 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 Golaḡī, 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’.

<sup>630</sup> Malkāpuram inscription, PANTULU 1930, v. 38: *śricoleśvaramālavakṣitipatī rājanyacūḍāmaṇī yacchiṣyau kim ataḥ paraṃ gaṇapatikṣoṇīpatir yatsutaḥ | na syāt kasya mude sa deśikavaraḥ śaivāgamāmbhonidhiḥ śrīviśveśvaradeśikaḥ kalacuriksmāpāladiḥśāguruḥ* ‘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.<sup>631</sup>

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”,<sup>632</sup> the Malkāpuram inscription says concerning the Rājaguru Viśveśvaraśiva, a native of Gauḍa in eastern India: “Who can count the Gauḍa [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]?”,<sup>633</sup> and the Bāngarh Praśasti relates that Sarvaśiva, the Rājaguru of the Pāla Nayapāla, gave [to brahmins] all the Great Gifts (*mahādānāni*) of the Purāṇic tradition, including the *tulāpuruṣadānam* 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 millenium.<sup>634</sup> His brother Mūrtiśiva, to

<sup>631</sup> See, for example, in the colophonic verses of the *Prāyaścittasamuccaya* of Hr̥dayaśiva, concerning his Guru Īśvaraśiva (see SANDERSON 2001, p. 3): *āsīt tatsaṃtatau munih śrī-īśvaraśiva iti | jagatīpatibhir nṛpaiḥ pūjītapādapaṅkajah;* Chandrehe inscription (*CII* 4i:44), v. 4b, concerning Purandara: *yatra purandarah kṛtatapā jajñe gurur bhūbhujām;* v. 5c, concerning Prabhāvaśiva: *anekaṅṛpavanditah;* Bilhāri inscription (*CII* 4i:45), v. 50b, concerning Dharmāśiva: *bhūpā-lamaulimaṇikāntibhir arcitāṅghriḥ;* v. 51bed, concerning Sadāśiva: *nṛpaiḥ | yat-pādadvayaṃ vandyam arcitaṃ śekharāṃśubhiḥ;* v. 54cd, concerning Hr̥dayaśiva: *nṛpamukuṭaniviṣṭair yasya māṇikyacakrair akṛta caraṇamūlaṃ kāntam ekāntavandyaṃ;* Gurgi inscription (*CII* 4i:46), v. 6, concerning Prabhāvaśiva: *tasyākhilakṣitipatipraṇatottamāṅgacūḍāmaṇidyuticayārcitapādapiṭṭhaḥ | śiṣyo babhūva bhuvana-trayakīrtanīyah śrīmatprabhāvaśivanāmamunir maṇiṣi;* and v. 17cd, concerning Īśanaśiva: *śrīśānaśambhur akhilāvanipālamaulimālāmaṇidyutipīśaṅgitapādapa-dmah.*

<sup>632</sup> Badāun inscription, *EI* 1:10, l. 15: *svaśiṣyavarabhūpālabhakti-labdhenā bhūriṇā | bhūmidānena yo viprān pūjayām āsa bhūriṇā.*

<sup>633</sup> PANTULU 1930, v. 39ab: *gauḍāḥ pūrṇamanorathāḥ kati kati prāptaśriyas tāpasāḥ saṃtuṣṭāḥ kavipuṅgavāḥ kati kati pradhvastapāsā nṛpāḥ.*

<sup>634</sup> SIRCAR 1983b, v. 11. The inscription lists *ṛthivīdānam, merudānam, viśvacakra-dānam, [sapta]sāgaradānam, brahmāṅḍadānam, kalpavṛkṣadānam, [hiraṇya]kā-madhenudānam, bhavanadānam, grāmadānam, godānam, parvatānāṃ dānam* (the ten *parvatadānāni* of the *Matsyapurāṇa*, with Meru in the centre), *sakalpa-drumabhadraghaṭadānam, hiraṇyāśva[ratha]dānam, hiraṇyahasti[ratha]dānam, hiraṇyagarbhadānam, aśvadānam, tulāpuruṣadānam,* and *śrīnandīśvaradānam.* For an exhaustive presentation of the prescriptions of the Purāṇic and other sources on the “Great Gifts” see especially the fifth *Adhyāya* of the *Dānakhaṇḍa* of the *Caturvargacintāmaṇi* of Hemādri, written while he was a minister of Mahādeva, the Yādava king of Devagiri (r. c. 1260–1270). The *śrīnandīśvaradānam* mentioned in this inscription is, I presume, the gift of a golden image of Nandikeśvara that is to accompany the gift of a thousand cows (*Caturvargacintāmaṇi*, vol. 1, p. 253). On

whom he handed over his office as Rājaguru is likewise praised in that inscription for his abundant donations to brahmins.<sup>635</sup> Sarvaśiva's disciple Rūpaśiva is also praised there for his generosity to supplicants,<sup>636</sup> as is Īśānaśiva, the disciple of Praśāntaśiva, in the Gurgi inscription.<sup>637</sup> 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.<sup>638</sup> In the Bāṅgarh Praśasti Vidyāśiva and Dharmāśiva are

---

the drift away during our period from the sponsoring of Vedic (Śrauta) sacrifices to the bestowing of the Great Gifts such as the *tulāpuruṣadānam* see DIRKS 1976.

<sup>635</sup> SIRCAR 1983b, v. 15cd: *bhrātā mūrṭiśivaḥ sa mānyamahimo dānāmbusekair jagat pūtam yaḥ krtavān* ... 'His brother Mūrṭiśiva, 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 (*Caturvargacintāmaṇi*, 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.

<sup>636</sup> SIRCAR 1983b, v. 28: *śiṣyaḥ sarvaśivasya dīptatapasah sarvārthincintāmaṇir* ... | *śrīmān rūpaśivo babhūva* 'The disciple who succeeded Sarvaśiva, [that Guru] of blazing ascetic power, was the illustrious Rūpaśiva, who was a wishing-granting jewel for all supplicants'.

<sup>637</sup> *EI* 22:21, v. 18ab: ... [*sarvārthi*]nām yena śrīr gamitopabhogapadavim daurgatyaduḥkhaḥchidā 'He caused [his] wealth to be enjoyed by all supplicants, thus ending the torment of their poverty'.

<sup>638</sup> *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) *vāstraśivābhīdhānaḥ* where the editor, MIRASHI, reads ... (l. 6) *vāstuśivābhīdhānaḥ*: Astraśiva is a Saiddhāntika initiation name but \*Vāstuśiva 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 > Puruṣaśiva, Guru of Yaśaḥkarṇa (r. 1073–1123) > Śaktiśiva, Guru of Yaśaḥkarṇa's successor Gayakarṇa (r. 1123–1153) Kīrtiśiva, Guru of Gayakarṇa's successor Narasiṃha (r. A.D. 1153–1163) > Vimalaśiva, Guru of Narasiṃha's successors Jayasiṃha (r. 1153–1188) and, on the evidence of *EI* 40:46, Vijayasiṃha (r. 1188–1210). Of N-śiva we are told (v. 11): + *śivaḥ śiṣyaḥ puruṣārthāya sampadam | guṇānām ca dhanānām ca paropakṛtaye 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) *prītiḥ pātre ratis tīrthe sthitiḥ pathi mate satām | bhaktis bhavate bhavate 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: [*yacchālyām vibudhagaṇo dhigamyā dhatte vaidhuryam na khalu [mahotsa]vodayeṣu* 'Enter-

praised for building temples,<sup>639</sup> and the Rājaguru Mūrtiśiva for building many<sup>640</sup> and excavating numerous reservoirs.<sup>641</sup> 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;<sup>642</sup> 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.<sup>643</sup> The Gwalior Mu-

---

ing the shade [provided by the parasol] of this [patron] a multitude of brahmins was freed from the distress [of penury] on the splendid occasions of major festivals'; in v. 38: *yasyārthidvijarājadarśanavaśād dānāmbu[bhīr vardhate] śraddhā [rātridivam] vareṇa vidhinā dharmasya \*tantrīr (?) iva | yo darśeṣv api sādaraṃ dvijapatīn akṣīṇaśobhābharān dakṣo yojayate suvarṇavikasatsadrohiṇīnām śataih* '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 brahmins, their rich adornments never diminished, hundreds of fine ruddy cows shining with gold [adorning their horns]'; v. 41bc: *[dattaṃ] na yan nāsti tat | pātraṃ tan na yad arcitaṃ* 'there is no gift that he did not give, no worthy recipient whom he did not honour'; and v. 43: *udyānasarasī[sattra]prāsādadvijaveśmabhiḥ | bhūmiḥ paribhavaty aśya na kair bhūṣābharair divam* 'With what rich adornments [created by him], with gardens, reservoirs, charitable feeding-houses, temples, and houses for brahmins, did [this] land not surpass heaven?'

<sup>639</sup> SIRCAR 1983b, v. 8ab: *śiṣyo dharmasīvas taponidhir abhūt tasya vyadhād yo 'dbhutaṃ prāsādam bhagavattrilocanaguror vārānasībhūṣaṇam* 'His disciple, the ascetic Dharmasīva, built a marvellous temple of the blessed three-eyed teacher [of the world] that beautified Benares'; SIRCAR 1983b, v. 7cd: *śrīvidyāśiva ity asīmacaritas satkīrtiśākhāśataprāgbhārasthagītāmbaro munir abhūt tasmād yathārthānvayaḥ* 'After him came Vidyāśiva, an ascetic of boundless virtuous conduct, in whom the lineage fulfilled its purpose, who concealed the sky with the mass of the countless branches of his fine temples'; vv. 16–19.

<sup>640</sup> SIRCAR 1983b, v. 19: *mahīyasīyaṃ na tathā mahī yathā tapasvīnas tasya mahān ihāśayaḥ | tathā hi bhūmiḥ kila kīrtibhir bhṛtā gato na tasyāśaya eṣa vismayaḥ* 'This land though vast was not large enough for the ambition of this ascetic. The wonder is that it did not cease even when the earth was filled to capacity by his temples'.

<sup>641</sup> SIRCAR 1983b, v. 17ab: . . . *nirmitās citraṃ dikṣu vidikṣu yena pṛthivīhāra\*śrīyo* (conj. *śrīyā* Ep.) *dīrghikāḥ* 'Wondrously he created reservoirs in all directions as a beautiful garland to adorn the land'.

<sup>642</sup> Gurgi inscription, *EI* 22:21, v. 11: *yena śrīyuvārājākāritasatkailāśaśṛṅgopama-prāsādottarataḥ sumeruśikharasparidhi prasiddha[m] bhū[vi] | sadma sthāpitam īśvarasya \*sakalatrailokyavismāpakaṃ (trailokya corr. MIRASHI: trailākya Ep.) yat svargaṃ vrajatas tadīyayaśasaḥ sopānamārgāyate* 'To the north of the temple built by Yuvarāja that resembled the shining peak of Mt. Meru he built his famous temple of Śiva. That [too] rivals the peak of Meru, causing wonder throughout the three worlds, a flight of steps, as it were, for his fame as it ascends to heaven'. The repetition of the comparison with Mt. Kailāsa seems lame, but its probable point is that the Guru's temple was no less impressive than the king's.

<sup>643</sup> Chandrehe inscription, *CII* 4i:44, v. 16cd: *anugīram atho sindhuprakhyam tadāgam acīkhanat pracurasalilaṃ kūpaṃ cātra prabodhaśivaḥ śamī* 'Then here [after building the monastery] the ascetic Prabodhaśiva excavated an ocean-like reservoir

seum inscription records that Pataṅgaśiva built a great temple of Śiva<sup>644</sup> and excavated four huge reservoirs.<sup>645</sup> The Jubbulpore inscription records that the Rājaguru Vimalaśiva built a temple of Śiva Kīrtiśvara in honour of his preceptor and predecessor, the Rājaguru Kīrtiśiva.<sup>646</sup> A Kannaḍa 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 Noḷambavāḍi he built fifty temples and two large water reservoirs;<sup>647</sup> and the Malkāpuram inscription records that the Rājaguru Viśveśvara founded temples to house Śivas bearing his own name in Viśveśvaragolakī, Mandrakūṭanagara, Candravallinagara, Viśveśvaranagara, Kommūrgrāma, and Uttarasomaśilā, and also that he founded a town with his own name (Viśveśvarapura) at Ānanda.<sup>648</sup>

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 Tripurī 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 cam-

---

near the [Bhramara] hill and a well with abundant water’.

<sup>644</sup> MIRASHI 1962, v. 29: *tenedaṃ haramandiraṃ suśikharaṃ yat sarvataḥ sundaram bhaktyā kāritam indudhāmadhavalam kailāsāsāilopamam | ākalpaṃ sthiram astu tad bhuvī satām ānandadaṃ darśanād asyaivāmalam āgamat pariṇatim prāsadamūrtyā 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’.

<sup>645</sup> MIRASHI 1962, vv. (30–)38: *sutaṭam catuṣṭayam idaṃ ruciraṃ cirabhūṣaṇam mahīvadhvāḥ | vikaṭatarataḍāgānām acīkarac chrīpataṅgeśaḥ* ‘Pataṅgaśiva made these four lovely and immense reservoirs with beautiful banks as an enduring ornament for the woman that is the earth’.

<sup>646</sup> *EI* 25:33, vv. 45–46: *[a]cīkarac candramauler mandiraṃ ādarāt | guror kīrtiśivasyaitat kīrtaye sukr̥tāya ca || devāya kīrtiśvarasaṃjñitāya prādād amuṣmai jayasimhadevaḥ | bibhrad bhava bhaktibharam gurau ca grāmān raveḥ parvaṇi n + dāyān* ‘He built out of reverence this temple of Śiva for the fame and religious merit of the Guru Kīrtiśiva. The god [installed in it] was named Kīrtiśvara; 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]’.

<sup>647</sup> *EC* 10, Mb:65: *svasti śrīmad-āvanyada sthānamam nālvattu-varṣaman āḷd ayvattu-dēgulaṃ māḍi piriya-eradu-kereya katti śaka-varṣam eṇṭu-nūr-embatta-mūr ādand utkrānti geydu śrītribhuvanakartara-devaṃ 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’.

<sup>648</sup> PANTULU 1930, vv. 82–84, 88.

paign of world conquest. Beginning with the inscriptions of his son and successor Karṇa (r. 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 *paramabhaṭṭārakamahārājādhirājaparameśvaraparamamāheśvaraśrī-*. A variant of these titles, *samadhigatapañcamahāśabdaparamabhaṭṭārakamahārājādhirājaparameśvara-*, is found in Nolambavāḍi records attached to the names of two other Saiddhāntika Gurus, namely Brahmaśiva in an inscription of c. 870 and Varuṇaśiva in one of 936. Similarly, but more modestly, an inscription of 1331 on a step-well in the vicinity of the Acalesvara 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*-Tejaḥsiṃha of Candrāvati.<sup>649</sup>

<sup>649</sup> For these imperial and royal titles attached to the names of Śaiva Gurus see D.C. SIRCAR 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 Śaṅkaragaṇa, 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. SIRCAR 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 SIRCAR. His view has the great strength that it accords (1) with the testimony of the Malkāpuram inscription of 1261/2, which, referring to Vāmaśambhu as the third Guru in succession after Sadbhāvaśambhu, the first pontiff of the Maṭha at Golagī, reports that the Kalacuri kings were being praised (*praśaṃsyante*) [in their Praśastis] up to the present as worshippers of his feet (PANTULU 1930, v. 28: *atha nṛpaśekharamālālītapādo 'tra vāmaśambhur abhūt | adyāpi kalacurīśā yaccaraṇārādhakāḥ praśaṃsyante*)—in the inscriptions of the Kalacuris of Tripurī 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 (*sāhasikas tapasvine vāmadevanāmne nījarājalakṣmīm gurudakṣiṇāyai dattvā sarvām bhūmim jetum prasthitavān*). SIRCAR convincingly identifies the Kalacuri king here called Sāhasika as Gāṅgeyadeva on the grounds that the latter was both an illustrious conqueror and known as Sāhasāṅka 'he who has the cognomen Sāhasa'. This source, cited by SIRCAR (*EI* 30:10, p. 50), is a paraphrase in Jonarāja's commentary on the *Prṭhivīrājavijaya* of Jayānaka of a verse of that work now lost in a lacuna.

The inscription referring to Brahmaśiva is *EC* 10, Śrīnivāsapura taluk, no. 27 (p. 346). SIRCAR (*EI* 30:10, p. 49) wrongly gives the name as Bhramaraśiva and the page reference as 376. The relevant part of the inscription is: *svasti samadhigatapañcamahāśabda pallavānvaya śrīprṭhivīvallava pallavānvayakulatilakam śrīmat-nolambādhirājar prṭhivīrāja*

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 Mahānavamī, 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.<sup>650</sup>

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.

---

*gēye svasti samadhiḡatapañcamahāśabda paramabhaṭṭā[ra]ka mahārājādhirāja parameśvara ātaniya mata . . . pana . . . . .*  
*. . . . . nvita śivaśāstratapovanānurāga śrīpādhivāḡagrāmavirṅgata bhagavatpādaikaśaraṇa śrīmat-brahmaśivācāryyan.* The inscription referring to Varuṇaśiva (Varuṇaśivabhaṭṭāra) is *SII* 9, 1:24 (*ARE* 759 of 1916) from Gūnimorabagalu in the Anantapur District. It speaks of him as the pontiff of the Noṅambeśvarara temple, as the ruler of Paḡivālubālu, and as the Mahāsāmāntādhipati, that is to say, as a feudatory of the highest rank, of king Bīraṅolamba Aṅṅayyadeva of the Noḡamba-Pallava dynasty (= Aṅṅiga, r. c. 932–940). The Noṅambeśvarara is probably the imposing temple at Hemāvati now known as Doḡḡeśvara (COHEN 1989, p. 50, and p. 63, note 36). He is also mentioned in an inscription on the Maṅḡapa of the Doḡḡeśvara temple, which gives the information that he was the disciple of Rudraśivācāryya. On Varuṇaśiva see COHEN 1998, pp. 24, 35, and 41–42, who plausibly concludes that he was Aṅṅiga's Rājaguru. The initiation-names Brahmaśiva, Varuṇaśiva, and Rudraśiva reveal that these Gurus were Saiddhāntikas. The relevant portion of the inscription from Mt. Abu has been published by SIRCAR within this discussion (*EI* 30:10, p. 48).

<sup>650</sup> The purpose, date, and provenance of the *Netratantra* are the subject of SANDERSON 2005b.

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 (*svanāmnā*), 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 Liṅga].

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 Pratiṣṭhāntras, devoted exclusively to this domain, setting out the rituals of installation (*pratiṣṭhā*) and defining the norms for the form of the Liṅga, the iconography of ancillary images, and the architectural design of the various temple types.<sup>651</sup> 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 Pañcarātra.<sup>652</sup> This

<sup>651</sup> 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 *Mayasaṃgraha*, not to be confused with the published *Mayamata*, a later south-Indian work, the *Piṅgalāmata*, the *Mohacūḍottara*, and the *Devyāmata*, which declares itself the *pratiṣṭhāntram* of the *Niśvāsa*. Four other works of this type, not known to have survived, are cited by the Kashmirian Vidyākāṇṭha around the beginning of the eleventh century in his commentary on the *Mayasaṃgraha*: the *Pratiṣṭhāpārameśvara*, the *Nandikeśvaramata*, 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.

<sup>652</sup> See, e.g., *Bṛhatkālottara*, B f. 108v4: *bauddhavaiṣṇavapañcārthe saurakālamukhādīṣu | śaivaḥ sarvādhikārī syān na śaive 'mī kathaṃcana* ‘The Śaiva [Guru] has competence that extends into all [religious systems], the Buddhist, Vaiṣṇava, Pañcārtha[-Pāśupata], Saura, Kālamukha, and others; but [Gurus of] those have absolutely no competence to act in the Śaiva [system]’; *Kāmika*, *Pūrvabhāga* 1.121c–126, on the authority of the Śivabrāhmaṇas, the married Śaiva brahmins who alone were competent to officiate for others: *śaivaḥ sarvādhikārī syāt svākīye ca paratra ca || 122 śaivāḥ sarveṣu kurvanti ye gr̥hasthā dvijottamāḥ | yāmale māṛtantra ca kāpāle pañcarātrake || 123 bauddhe cārhamate caiva lākule vaidike 'pi ca | anyeṣu api ca mārgeṣu tattacchāstraiḥ svaśāstrataḥ || 124 śaivāḥ kurvanti dīkṣādyaṃ talliṅgasthāpanādikam | mukhyatvād iha śaivasya mukhamāhātmyato 'pi ca || 125 adhikāro 'sty sarvatra nānyeṣāṃ śivadarsāne | tasmāt parārtham ātmārtham sthāpanam yajanam tathā || 126 śivavipreṇa kartavyam anyeṣāṃ svārtham eva hi | parārtham api kuryāc cel \*lobhena* (em. : *lopena* Ed.) *nṛpates tathā | tadrāṣṭrasya ca nāsaḥ syād acireṇa na saṃsayaḥ* ‘The Śaiva is competent in



universalization of their authority, which is backed by learned theory of the relation of the Śaiva with the other bodies of scriptural injunction, seems not have been merely theoretical. For the Śaiva Paddhati literature contains instructions for the consecration of Viṣṇus, as we have seen in the case of the Paddhati of Somaśambhu,<sup>653</sup> and Vaiṣṇava sources protest at this encroachment, insisting that images of Viṣṇu installed by Śaivas should be reconsecrated.<sup>654</sup>

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 Jaina, the Lākula, the Vaidika, and yet others, using the scriptures of these systems in accordance with their own. [Such] Śaiva[brahmin]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 *Puruṣasūkta* as the part of his body from which the brahmins, as the highest caste-class, were created]. [The Śivabrāhmaṇa] is competent to act in all [systems], but not others in the teaching of Śiva. Therefore the Śivabrāhmaṇa [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 Śivabrāhmaṇa] performs rituals for the benefit of others[, thus usurping the exclusive right of the Śivabrāhmaṇas], then without doubt both the king and his kingdom will swiftly be destroyed’.

<sup>653</sup> See *Somaśambhupaddhati* vol. 4, pp. 294–311 (*viṣṇusthāpanavidhiḥ*).

<sup>654</sup> In his *Pañcarātrarakṣā* (pp. 26–27) Vedāntadeśika, the influential Śrīvaiṣṇava of the fourteenth century (*EI* 13, p. 222), quotes a passage from the Śaiva *Kāraṇatantra* 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 Pāñcarātrika *Pādmasaṃhitā* (*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 Pāñcarātra and purified by bathing with a thousand vases. See also *Viṣvaksenaśaṃhitā* 39.283–285: *sthāpīte raudramārgena pūjyamāne dine dine | hitvā raudraavidhānaṃ tu sarveṣāṃ hitakāmyayā || grāmaṃ rddhikaraṃ puṇyaṃ rājabhūsuravardhanam | tasmāt sarvaprayatnena hitvā raudraṃ tu tatkṣaṇāt || sthāpayet sāttvatenātha vidhinā pūjayed dharim | tasmāt sarvaprayatnena na kuryāt tantrasaṃkaram* ‘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 brahmins to prosper. Therefore one should abandon the Śaiva rites immediately and scrupulously re-install the Viṣṇu with the Pāñcarātrika ritual and 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: *jātiśaṃkaraṇenaiva jagac caṇḍālatāṃ vrajat | tantrasaṃkaraṇenaiva rājarāṣṭraṃ vinaśyati || rāṣṭraṃ śarīraṃ rājñas tu rājā jīvaḥ sa ucyate | rāṣṭrakṣaye kṣayo rājñāḥ tasmād rakṣyaṃ dvayaṃ 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 Pāñcarātrika 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 Parameśvaravarman I (r.c. 655–960) that a certain Anantaśivācārya, whose name makes it very probable that he was an initiated Saiddhāntika officiant,<sup>655</sup> was appointed as the priest with hereditary rights to perform the ritual of worship (*devakarma*) in the temple of Śiva Vidyāvinītapallavaparamēśvara established with his name by the Pallava king Parameśvaravarman I *alias* Vidyāvinīta.<sup>656</sup>

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

---

in keeping with the mildly disparaging south-Indian Vaiṣṇava practice of referring to Śiva as Rudra. Cf. the expression *rudrakālyupajīvakaḥ* cited here, p. 278 and the rule of the *Śāṇḍilyasmṛti* quoted by Vedāntadeśika in his *Pañcarātrarakṣā* (p. 62) that Vaiṣṇavas should keep far away from temples of Buddha, Rudra, and the like (*buddharudrādivasatiṃ śmaśānaṃ śavam eva ca | aṭaviṃ rājadhānīṃ ca dūrataḥ parivarjayet*).

<sup>655</sup> Saiddhāntika Śaiva initiated brahmins have initiation-names (*dikṣānāma*) that end in -śiva (with -śambhu or, less commonly, -īśvara/-īśa or -śaṅkara as synonyms) as the second of their two components, and those of these who have been consecrated to officiate by receiving the *ācāryābhiṣekaḥ* are referred to as N-śivācārya, a practice that has continued into modern times. Other Anantaśivācāryas are the author of the *Siddhāntasārāvalīvyākhyā*, one of the Śivācāryas, probably 95 in all, among 108 12th-century labelled images at Dārāśuram in Tamilnāḍu (SRINIVASAN 1987, vol. 1:17, no. 60), and one mentioned in an inscription of 1571 at the Vaṭaraṇyeśvara temple at Tiruvālaṅgāḍu (*ARE* 497 of 1906 [Appendix B: stone inscriptions copied in 1905]) as a disciple of Ponnambala Dharmāśivācārya and Guru of Immaḍi Dharmāśivācārya.

<sup>656</sup> The Kūram plates of Parameśvaravarman 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.<sup>657</sup> He is described as an *upabrāhmaṇaḥ* ‘a sub-brahmin’ or, even more disparagingly, as a *brāhmaṇacaṇḍālaḥ* ‘a brahmin untouchable’;<sup>658</sup> and this loss of status is confirmed in modern times in the way that the Smārtha brahmins, the dominant community in Tamilāḍu have viewed the Ādiśaiva community that provides the priests who after undergoing Saiddhāntika Śaiva initiation (*dīkṣā*) and consecration as Ācāryas (*ācāryābhīṣekaḥ*) perform the worship in the Śiva temples of the region. They were forbidden to live in brahmin streets and the Smārthas would not intermarry or interdine with them.<sup>659</sup> The Ādiśaivas, as one might expect, resisted this condemnation, arguing in their scriptural productions and in learned exegesis that it applies only to brahmins 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 brahmins who work as temple-priests will forfeit their status after only six months.<sup>660</sup> As modern practice

<sup>657</sup> Yāmuna, *Āgamaprāmāṇya*, pp. 15–16: *tathā ca devalaḥ “devakośopaḥṇvī yaḥ sa devalaka ucyate” iti | tathā “vṛṭtyarthaṃ pūjayed devaṃ trīṇi varṣāṇi yo dvijaḥ | sa vai devalako nāma sarvakarmasu garhitāḥ” 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.

<sup>658</sup> Atri cited in *Āgamaprāmāṇya*, p.16: *tathā ca viśadataram amīṣām evopabrāhmaṇyaṃ varṇayaty atriḥ: “āhvāyakā devalakāḥ kalpadevalakā gaṇabhogadevalakā bhāgavatavṛttir iti caturthaḥ. eta upabrāhmaṇāḥ” iti* ‘And Atri makes it absolutely clear that it is those that are sub-brahmins, when he says: “Couriers, Devalakas, Kalpadevalakas, Gaṇabhogadevalakas, and fourth, he who lives by being a Bhāgavata: these are sub-brahmins”’; and *Mahābhārata* 12.77.8: *āhvāyakā devalakā nakṣatragrāmayājakāḥ ete brāhmaṇacaṇḍālā mahāpathikapāñcamāḥ* ‘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’.

<sup>659</sup> See THURSTON 1909, p.51, and FULLER 1984, pp.49–71. The Dikshitar, the priests of Śiva at Cidambaram, rank above the Ādiśaivas, probably because they are the trustees of their temple; but they are still considered inferior to non-priestly brahmins; see FULLER 1984, p. 192, n. 3.

<sup>660</sup> Vedajñāna II, *Ātmārthapūjāpaddhati* A, p. 123 and B, p. 99, quoting the *Vīratāntra* and the *Samtānāntra*: *vīratāntre “bhṛtyarthaṃ sarvadākālam ādiśaivaḥ śivaṃ yajet | tac ca svadharmānuṣṭhānaṃ na doṣāya prakalpate || adīkṣitāḥ caturvedī śivaliṅgaṃ na saṃsprśet | dīkṣitāḥ cāpi yo vipro bhṛtyarthaṃ tu na pūjayet || ātmārthapūjāṃ kuryāt \*parārthaṃ naiva (A: parārthaṃ caiva B) pūjayet” | samtāne “adīkṣito ’pi yo vipraḥ ṣaṇmāsaṃ tu śivaṃ sprśet | so ’pi devalakaḥ proktaḥ sa nārho devapūjane | dīkṣitāḥ cāpi yo vipro \*bhṛtyarthaṃ (em.: pratyarthaṃ A: bhṛtyāñced B) vatsaratrayāt | pūjayed yadi deveṣaṃ so ’pi devalako bhaved” iti* ‘Vīratāntra: An Ādiśaiva may worship Śiva for a living permanently; and that, since it is his reli-

reveals, this counterargument had no effect on the Smārtha 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.<sup>661</sup> 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

---

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]. *Samtāna*: 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'; and Kacchapeśvaraśivācārya, *Kriyākramadyotikāvyaḥkhyā*, p. 80, ll. 4–7, quoting the *Vīratāntra*: *adikṣitaś caturvedī na sprśen nāpi cārcayet | bhṛtyarthaṃ paramēśānaṃ dīkṣāviraḥitā janāḥ | \*ṣaṇmāsād yānti* (em. : *ṣaṇmāsāvānti* Cod.) *pātityaṃ te ca devalakāḥ smṛtāḥ || trīni varṣāni bhṛtyarthaṃ sthiraḥliṅge \*hi dīkṣitaḥ* (em. : *hy adikṣitaḥ* Cod.) | *pūjayed yadi \*vipras* (corr. : *vipras* 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'. In the older, north-Indian literature the *Prāyaścittapaṭala* of the *Dvādaśasāhasra Svachchanda*, quoted by Hrdayaśiva in his *Prāyaścittasamuccaya*, 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: *somabrahmaraviṣkandaviṣṇudevyāś ca mātaraḥ | upajīvanti ye devi pūjayitvā tu bhojakāḥ | te vai devalakāś teṣāṃ prāyaścittaṃ 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 Pāñcarātrika 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 Kālī by serving as their priests that become Devalakas (*bhaved devalako yo vai rudrakālyupajīvakāḥ*): Vaiṣṇava temple-priests do not become Devalakas, because they have been consecrated for their work by initiation. See Yāmuna, *Āgamaprāmānya*, pp. 15–17 (the accusation), and pp. 156–157 (the rebuttal).

<sup>661</sup> See, for example, the *Kāmika* cited here p. 274, the *Vīra* and *Raurava* cited in BRUNNER 1964, p. 468, n. 11, and the *Yogaja*, *Cintya*, *Vīra*, *Samtāna*, and other Āgamas cited by Vedajñānaguru II in his *Ātmārthapūjāpaddhati* A, pp. 121–123 and B, pp. 97–99.

of the sixteenth century.<sup>662</sup> But some others are already being cited in the thirteenth, and one in the twelfth.<sup>663</sup>

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 (*rājarakṣā*),<sup>664</sup> 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.<sup>665</sup> 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.<sup>666</sup>

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

<sup>662</sup> These scriptures that first appear in the works of Vedajñānaguru are the *Aṃsumat*, the *Ajita*, the *Kāśmīratāntra*, the *Cintyaviśva / Cintyaviśvasādākhya*, the *Dīpta*, the *Devikālottara*, the *Bhīma*, the *Makuṭa*, the *Mukhabimba*, the *Yogaja*, the *Raurava*, the *Vijaya (Vijayottara)*, the *Vidveṣaṇa*, the *Vīra*, the *Samtāna*, the *Sahasra*, the *Siddha*, the *Sūkṣma*, and the *Skandakālottara*. The works of Vedajñānaguru in which they are cited are the *Ātmārthapūjāpaddhati*, *Dikṣādarśa*, and *Śaivāgama-paribhāṣamāñjarī*. For his date see DAGENS 1979, pp. 6–7.

<sup>663</sup> 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 *Jñānarātnāvalī* of Jñānaśiva, a teacher of Trilocanaśiva and therefore a near contemporary of Aghoraśiva, who completed his *Kriyākramadyotikā* in 1157. The next earliest known work in which there are citations from such scriptures is the *Śivapūjāstavavyākhyā* 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 *Suprabhedā*, the south-Indian *Pauṣkara*, and the *Vātulaśuddhākhya*. I derive this information concerning the citations in the *Śivapūjāstavavyākhyā* 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 *Kriyākramadyotikā* 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 *Śivapūjāstavavyākhyā* and Vedajñānaguru II.

<sup>664</sup> Chapters devoted to this protective temple ritual for the king are found in such south-Indian Śaiva texts as the *Sūkṣmāgama* (pp. 290–297: *rājarakṣāvīdhiḥ*), and the *Dīptāgama* (pp. 211–215: *rājarakṣāvīdhipāṭalaḥ*).

<sup>665</sup> See DAVIS and ORR 2007, p. 91, for epigraphical evidence of such arrangements.

<sup>666</sup> See, for example, the passage of the *Kāmika* cited above, p. 274.

to light.<sup>667</sup>

### 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 *Mayasaṃgraha*, *Mohacūḍottara*, and *Piṅgalāmata*,

<sup>667</sup> Against the view that the Ādiśaiva caste is peculiar to Tamil Nadu one might cite the fact that the Ādiśaivas are mentioned the *Somaśambhupaddhati*, a work composed in the eleventh century far to the north (at the end of the *Pavitrā-rohaṇavidhi*): *pañcayojanasamsthe 'pi pavitraṃ gurusamnidhau | kurvīta vidhinānena labhate vāñchitaṃ phalam | sarvaṃ vai tv ādiśaivānām dīkṣitānām śivoditam | paropakāraśīlena śrīmatā somaśambhunā | kriyākāṇḍakramāvalyāṃ pavitrakavidhiḥ kṛtaḥ*. However, the line is not in the edition based on Kashmirian manuscripts (see *Karmakāṇḍakramāvalī* vv.494c–496b: *pañcayojanasamsthe 'pi pavitraṃ gurusamnidhau || kurvīta vidhinānena labhate vāñchitaṃ phalam | adhītaśivaśāstreṇa kṛto 'yaṃ somaśambhunā || karmakāṇḍakramāvalyāṃ pavitrakavidhiḥ sphuṭaḥ*) nor in the Nepalese transmission (see *Kriyākāṇḍakramāvalī* f.22v4–5: *pañcayojanasamstho 'pi pavitraṃ gurusamnidhau | kurvīta vidhinānena labhate vāñchitaṃ phalam | paropakāraśīlena śrīmatā somaśambhunā | kriyākāṇḍakramāvalyāṃ pavitrakavidhiḥ kṛtaḥ*). It is found only in BRUNNER's edition and the Devakottai 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 *śivabrāhmaṇaḥ* or *śivadviḥaḥ*. 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 Parameśvara at Tikkālivallam it specifies that 500 kāḍi of paddy are for the Śivabrāhmaṇas who offer worship and services in the sanctum (*ār[ā]di[t]t-upāsarikkum [śiva]brāhmaṇarkku*) (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 Śivabrāhmaṇas are named their Gotras are sometimes given and these are those of the Ādiśaivas as attested both by their prescriptive texts and among their modern descendants, namely Kausīka, Kāśyapa, Bhāradvāja, Gautama, Ātreya, Āgastya, and Pārāśara. See, e.g., *SII* 3:41 (Kāśyapa), 55 (Kausīka), 58 (Kausīka), 209 (Kausīka, Kāśyapa, Kausīka); *SII* 12:197 (Āgastya); *SII* 17:152 (Bhāradvāja), 157 (Bhāradvāja), 160 and 161 (Gautama), 162 and 163 (Bhāradvāja), 165 (Gautama, Pārāśara), 203 (Ātreya, Bhāradvāja), and 730 (Kāśyapa); *EC* 3, Sr:44 (Gautama); *EC* 10, Kl:106a (Kausīka), 106d (Gautama), 107 (Kausīka), 187 (Kausīka, Kāśyapa); *EC* 10, Bp:29, 32, 35a, and 37a (all Gautama, Bhāradvāja). Six of the seven, minus Āgastya, are listed in the *Samtāna* as cited in the *Ātmārthapūjāpaddhati* A, p. 125. Five of them, lacking Ātreya and Pārāśara, are listed in *Svāyambhuva*, p. 14 (*Ācāryalakṣaṇapaṭala* 94c–95b). This evidence accords with contemporary testimony. According to the data collected by FULLER (1984, p. 28) the Ādiśaiva priests of the Mīnākṣisundareśvara temple in Madurai belong to the Kāśyapa, Kausīka, Bhāradvāja, 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;<sup>668</sup> and in the first two works the design prescribed includes a section of the palace reserved for teachers of the Śaiva Mantramārga (*mantriṇaḥ*, *mantramārgopadeśinaḥ*).<sup>669</sup> But the layout of the palace taught in these Pratiṣṭhātantras 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.<sup>670</sup> The founding of such royal towns is not explicitly enjoined in the Śaivas' ritual manuals. That is to say that no ritual of *nagarapraṭiṣṭhā* was envisaged. The Sthāpaka was engaged, it seems, only for the choice and consecration of the site (*vāstupūjā*) 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.<sup>671</sup>

One of the early Pratiṣṭhātantras, the *Devyāmata*, devotes its 66th chapter

<sup>668</sup> The layout of the royal palace is prescribed in *Mayasaṃgraha* ff. 33v–34r (5.188–199), *Mohacūḍottara* ff. 20v–22r (4.245c–281), and *Piṅgalāmata* ff. 74r–75v (10.126–180).

<sup>669</sup> *Mayasaṃgraha* ff. 33v–34r (5.191–193b): *vitathe mantriṇām dhāma sarvāstrāṇi gr̥haksate | antaḥpuram yamapade gandharve gāṭṛsaṃśrayam || bhṛṅge senāpatisthānam mṛganābhyādikaṃ mṛge | paitre śaucagr̥ham cātra tāmbūlādivyapāśrayam || avarodhavadhūsthānam sugrīve tu tato nyaset;* *Mohacūḍottara* 4.257c–258b: *vitathe mantriṇām sthānam mantramārgopadeśinām || śastram antaḥpuram gāṭṛ kastūri śaucaveśma ca | tāmbūlasaṃgrahaḥ strīṇām \*pālakān (em.: pācakān Cod.) strīṇiyamakān.*

<sup>670</sup> *Mayasaṃgraha* ff. 34v–35r (5.209–216); *Mohacūḍottara* f.21v1–6 (4.270–275b); *Piṅgalāmata* ff. 75v–76r (10.181–194).

<sup>671</sup> This practice was followed both throughout the subcontinent and in Southeast Asia, as the following examples demonstrate: in Kashmir Pravarasena II's Pravara-pura (Śrīnagar), Durlabhaka-Pratāpāditya II's Pratāpapura, Jayāpīḍa's Jayapura, Lalitāditya's Lalitapura, Avantivarman's Avantipura, Śaṅkaravarman's Śaṅkara-pura, and Diddā's Diddāpura, in eastern India Rāmāvati (Rāmauti) (of Rāmapāla), Vijayapura of Vijayasena, and Lakṣmaṇāvati (Lakhnauti) (of Lakṣmaṇasena), in the south Gaṅgaikoṇḍacolapura, Parakesaripura, Parāntakapura, Rājakesari-pura, Rājarājapura, Rājādityapura, Rājāśrayapura, Rājendracolapura, Vikramacolapura, Vikramapāṇḍyapura, Vikramasiṃhapura, Vīrarājendracolapura, Vīra-rājendrapura, and, among the Khmers Īśānapura, Bhavapura, Yaśodharapura, 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 officiants 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.<sup>672</sup> 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 Bhadrakālī whose installation and cult are their concern.<sup>673</sup>

### 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 (*kūpaḥ*), step-wells (*vāpī*), and reservoirs (*puṣkariṇī*, *taḍāgaḥ*) were already provided by the brahmanical tradition. A Vaidika procedure of the Ṛgḥya type is outlined or touched upon in a number of sources;<sup>674</sup> a more elaborate, Paurāṇika form of the ritual, taking five days and requiring twenty-four priests in addition to the Sthāpaka, is set out at length in the *Matsyapurāna* (58.4–56);<sup>675</sup> and the currency of this form is evident from the fact that it became the basis of further elaboration.<sup>676</sup> There is no trace of irriga-

<sup>672</sup> *Devyāmata* f. 68r4: *dvibhujo rājadhānyāṃ tu pattane tu caturbhujah | tathā cāṣṭa-bhujo bhadre praśastah pattane sthitaḥ.*

<sup>673</sup> Thus in *Brahmayāmala* IFP 40.1–4b: *ataḥ paraṃ pravakṣyāmi pratimālakṣaṇaṃ param | navatālapramāṇena pratimāṃ kārayed budhaḥ || 2 śilāmayam lohamayam mṛṇmayam vāpi kārayet | grāme cāṣṭabhujam vidyān nagare ca caturbhujam || 3 vanāntare dvibhujam vidyāt parvatāgre tu ṣoḍaśa | samudre dvādaśam kuryāt \*jandandya (?) ... ṣaḍbhujam || 4 taṭāke daśabhujam kuryāt catuṣpathe caturbhujam; and *Brahmayāmala* Triv. 3.3–8: *grāme ca nagare caiva pattane rājadhānike | rakṣārtham vāstavasthānam pure vai khetakādiṣu || 4 sarvasādhāraṇam vidyād yathāvibhavavistaram | bahiḥ prakārataḥ kuryān mātṛsthānam tu vāstavam || 5 śreṣṭham pūrvottare bhāge śatadaṇḍānta'nantare | tadardhe vātha tasyārdhe daśadaṇḍāntare 'pi vā || 6 some syād vāstavaṃ brahman mātṛṇām iha coditam | pūrve vā paścime vāpi sthānam asya praśasyate || 7 yo me pūrvottare vāpi nagaragrāmasobhitam | dakṣiṇe keṭakasyoktam anyeṣāṃ prāci paścime || 8 āgneyanairṛtaiś caiva tṛtīyam vāyugocaram | + + [i]ttham praśamsanti yāmale śivabhāṣite.* On these south-Indian Yāmala texts, the cult they teach, and their non-brahmin priests see SANDERSON 2007b, pp. 277–278 with footnotes 140–143.*

<sup>674</sup> See EINO 2002 for the details of these sources.

<sup>675</sup> A procedure of the Paurāṇika type is also taught in *Āśvalāyanīyagr̥hyaparīśiṣṭa* 4.9 and *Hiraṇyakeśigr̥hyaśeṣasūtra* 1.7.1. (EINO 2002, pp. 713–714).

<sup>676</sup> We find procedures based on the prescriptions of the *Matsyapurāna* in the rit-



tion rituals in the early Śaiva scriptures, including the Pratiṣṭhātantras. But in due course Śaiva officiants, seeking to add this important domain to their ritual repertoire, produced their own version. Its first surfaces in our surviving evidence towards the end of the eleventh century, in the Paddhati of Somaśambhu,<sup>677</sup> and from that source entered both later Paddhatis such as the *Siddhāntaśekhara* and the *Ātmārthapūjāpaddhati* and the second wave of Śaiva scriptural literature produced in southern India.<sup>678</sup> In spite of the Śaivized character of these new rituals the underlying model is still recognizably that of the brahmanical tradition. The Śaiva elements are little more than a veneer on what is essentially a brahmanical procedure, marked by such distinctive features as the erecting of a Nāga pole (*nāgayaṣṭiḥ*) 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.<sup>679</sup> Nor is there any attempt to attribute to

---

ual literature of the priests of the Kashmirian brahmins; see \**Vāpyādipratiṣṭhā*, ff. 893r14–905v16 (*Varuṇapratīṣṭhā*); ff. 906r1–907v9 (the *Varuṇapratīṣṭhā* of Jīvana); 910r1–v1 (*Ādityapurāṇe Nālakapratīṣṭhā*); 929v7–931r8 (*Taḍākapratīṣṭhā* and *Nālakapratīṣṭhā*); and 931r9–931v23 (*Chandogapratīṣṭhātaḥ Kūpapratīṣṭhā*). These treatments do not appear to be distinctively Kashmirian. On the subject of the giving of wells and reservoirs and the Smārta/Paurāṇika procedures for consecrating them see also *Caturvargacintāmaṇi*, vol. 1 (*Dānakhaṇḍa*), pp. 1001–1029.

<sup>677</sup> See *Somaśambhupaddhati*, BRUNNER 1998, pp. 392–403 and pp. 406–411. The first passage sets out the ritual for the consecration of a *puṣkariṇī*, but adds at its end that it applies also for the consecration of a *vāpī* or *taṭākāḥ*. The second passage gives the ritual for the consecration of a *kūpaḥ*. A *kūpaḥ* is a simple well, whereas a *vāpī* is a step-well, a well with a flight of steps leading down to it on one of more sides (*kūpo 'dvārako gartaviśeṣaḥ baddhasopānako 'yaṃ vāpīti dvaitanirṇayaḥ*: 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 (Aṇahillapattana), the old Caulukya capital. Both a *puṣkariṇī* and a *taṭākāḥ* (*taḍāgaḥ*) 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 *Jalāśayotsargatattva* that a *puṣkariṇī* is from 100 to 200 cubits in length, and a *taḍāgaḥ* is from 200 to 800, and the view of the *Vasiṣṭhasaṃhitā* as quoted by Raghunandana that a *puṣkariṇī* is up to 400 cubits in length and a *taḍāgaḥ* up to 2000.

<sup>678</sup> See *Siddhāntaśekhara* of Viśvanātha (13th century, Benares), pp. 565–568 (11.1–28b); *Ātmārthapūjāpaddhati* of Vedājñānaguru II (16th century, Cidambaram), A, pp. 621–629, citing from the scripture *Cintyaviśvasādākhya* a passage obviously incorporated from the *Somaśambhupaddhati* (see BRUNNER 1998, p. 392, fn. 1); '*Kriyākramadyotikā*' MS transcript, pp. 344–346 (*Kūpapratīṣṭhā*); *Virāgama*, Paṭala 92. The section of the *Somaśambhupaddhati* on the consecration of reservoirs is also included in the Kashmirian \**Vāpyādipratiṣṭhā* (ff. 907v10–908r9).

<sup>679</sup> See *Somaśambhupaddhati*, BRUNNER 1998, pp. 397–403 (vv. 8–19). Śaiva elements: the officiant recites the Pāsupatāstra 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 Śaiva Vāmadeva, and after preparing a

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, Prabodhaśiva, Pataṅgaśiva, and Tribhuvanakartaradeva.

### 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,<sup>680</sup> including the Śūdras or at least the Sacchūdras or 'Pure Śūdras', those, that is, who had already succumbed to the values of brahmanical society to the extent that they had abjured alcohol,<sup>681</sup> a move that both promoted the penetration of these

---

porridge (*caruḥ*) with the Mantra of either makes the full oblation with the porridge using the Mantra of Śiva.

<sup>680</sup> Vaktraśambhu, *Mṛgendrapaddhativyaḥkhyā*, p.188: *śrīmatpauṣkare 'pi: brāhmaṇāḥ kṣatriyā vaiśyāḥ śūdrāś caiva striyas tathā | \*jaḍāndhabadhirā* (em. : *jalānāndhattako* Cod.) *mūkā dīkṣyāḥ \*śaktipracoditāḥ* (*śakti* em. : *śakttha* Cod.) 'And in the *Pauṣkara*[*pārameśvara*]: Brahmins, Kṣatriyas, Vaiśyas, Śūdras, 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 Rāmakaṇṭha on *Maṅga-pārameśvara*, *Kriyāpāda* 5.93 in support of the view that candidates for initiation should be brought before the Maṅḍala in the order of their castes: *yad uktaṃ śrīmadrauravādaū: brāhmaṇān kṣatriyān vaiśyān śūdrāś caiva striyas tathā* 'As has been taught in such scriptures as the *Raurava*: brahmins, Kṣatriyas, Vaiśyas, Śūdras, and women'.

<sup>681</sup> *Parākhya* cited by Trilocanaśiva in *Prāyaścittasamuccaya*, p.141: *yad uktaṃ śrīmatparākhye: kāryā dīkṣāpi sarveṣāṃ \*tacchaktividhiyoginām* (*tacchakti* corr. : *tacchaktir* Cod.) | *trayānām api varṇānām na tu śūdrāntyajātiṣu | amadyapās tu ye śūdrāḥ śaivācārahriy\*ādarāḥ* (corr. : *ādirāḥ* Cod.) | *śivabhaktāś \*ca* (corr. : *cai* Cod.) *teṣāṃ sā dīkṣā \*kāryānyathā na hīti* (em. : *kāryannyathānuhīti* Cod.) 'As has been taught in the *Parākhya*: '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] Śūdras and the lowest-born [below them]. One may initiate Śūdras, but only those who do not drink alcoholic liquor, who revere the disciplines and rites taught by Śiva, and are devoted to Śiva themselves'.

values and enabled the integration of the landowning agriculturalists, classed as Sacchūdras, 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 Ācāryas, 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, Kṣatriyas, Vaiśyas and Śūdras, a Kṣatriya only for Kṣatriyas, Vaiśyas and Śūdras, a Vaiśya only for Vaiśyas and Śūdras, and a Śūdra only for others of his caste-class.<sup>682</sup> The key groups here appear to have been the first and the last. For there is little evidence of the presence of Vaiśya traders in Śaivism, and though, as we have seen, Kṣatriya rulers were commonly Śaiva 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, Kṣatriyas rulers, and perhaps on occasion members of lower castes, and of Śūdra Gurus initiating both other Śūdras and the powerful in their communities, who though kṣatriya-like in their local authority<sup>683</sup> were nonetheless formally of the same caste-class as their initiators. The Śāstric formulation

<sup>682</sup> *Kiraṇa* f. [60]v2–3 (38.4–5): *caturṇām api varṇānām* (em. : *catuvarṇṇāpivarṇṇānām* Cod.) *ācāryatvam ihoditam | brāhmaṇādicatuskasya dviḥ* 'nugrahakṛd bhavet | *kṣatriyāditrikam yac ca \*kṣatriyo \*dikṣito* (corr. : *dikṣitod* Cod.) *guruḥ | vaiśyādidvitayam vaiśyaḥ śūdraḥ śūdrān tu dikṣayet*. In this [system] the office of Ācārya has been taught for all four caste-classes. A brahmin may initiate persons of the four beginning with his, an initiated Kṣatriya Guru the three beginning with his, and a Vaiśya the two beginning with his. A Śūdra may initiate [only] Śūdras'.

<sup>683</sup> *Parākhyā* quoted in *Dikṣādarśa* A, p. 26; B, p. 42: *\*amadyapāḥ* (em. : *amadyapa* A : *amādyapa* B) *\*kulīnās* (corr. : *kulīnās* A : *kūlinañ* B) *ca nityadharmā\*parāyaṇāḥ* (em. : *parāyaṇaḥ* AB) | *\*śūdrāḥ* (em. : *śūdra* AB) *kṣatriyavaj jñeyās śeṣā nindyā<s> tato bhr̥ṣam* 'Those Śūdras 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. *Pārameśvara* f. 3v2–3: *\*amadyapās* (em. : *amedhyapās* Cod.) *tu ye śūdrā<h> sau[cā]cārasamanvitāḥ | rudrabhaktās tu teṣān tu bhōjyam annam prakīrtitam* 'One is permitted to accept food from those Śūdras who do not drink alcohol, who observe the rules of purity, and are devotees of Śiva'; Trilocanaśiva, *Somaśambhupaddhativyākhyā*, p. 84: *tad uktaṁ brahmaśambhupaddhatau "brahmaṣatriyaviśāṁ bhikṣāṁ \*abhiśastādivarjitām* (em. : *abhiśabdādivarjitām* Cod.) | *amadyapās tu ye śūdrāḥ sau[cā]cārasamanvitāḥ | teṣāṁ eva cared bhikṣā nānyeṣāṁ tu kadācana" iti* 'That has been taught in the *Paddhati* of Brahmaśambhu in the following: "One may gather alms only from brahmins, 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 Śūdras 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.<sup>684</sup> 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.<sup>685</sup>

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 Veḷḷāḷa community such as Meykaṇṭār, and Ṇānacampantar 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 Tiruvāḍuṭurai, in which the presiding ascetics were and have continued to be members of this upwardly mobile Sacchūdra caste.<sup>686</sup>

<sup>684</sup> See, e.g., *Yājñavalkyasmṛti, Ācārādhyāya* 57, 91–95.

<sup>685</sup> *Dikṣādarśa* A, p. 23; B, p. 25: *atrādhikāri\*tvānirūpaṇavidhir* (corr. : *nirūpaṇatavidhir* Codd.) *ucyate* | *viprādīnām daśānām gurutvam uktam* | *tathā cintyaviśve* “*viprādiṣu caturṣv evam anulomādiṣu ṣaṭsu ca* | *eteṣāṃ daśajātīnām ācāryatvaṃ vidhīyate*” | *tathā kāmike* “*catvāro brāhmaṇādyās ca anulomās 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 *Cintyaśiva*: “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 (Pāraśava); (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., *Yājñavalkyasmṛti, Ācārādhyāya* 91–92. The *-ādi-* in *anulomādiṣu ṣaṭsu ca* in the passage cited from the *Cintyaviśva* is redundant and may be corrupt (perhaps for *anulomātmasu*).

<sup>686</sup> *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 Veḷḷāḷas was the cause of the fact that from the thirteenth century onwards independent shrines of the Goddess (*kāmakōṣṭham*) 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 Śāktization in the later south-Indian Śaiva literature. In the south-Indian Saiddhāntika scriptures *Raurava*, *Cintya*, *Makuṭa*, and *Sūkṣma* 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.<sup>687</sup>

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*, Paṭala 59, and N.R. BHATT's introduction to his edition of the *Sārdhatrisatikālottara*, pp. xviii-xix (*Cintya* and *Makuṭa*) and pp. lxviii-lxix (*Cintya*, *Makuṭa*, and *Sūksma*). There is striking evidence of a related development in the Tamil Śaiva literature in the *Tirumantiram* of Tirumūlar. That text has been assigned to the fifth, sixth, and seventh centuries. But it weaves together the Tamil Śaiva Siddhānta, the Vedānta, a Śākta tradition that features *kuṇḍalinīyogaḥ* 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 Jñānaśiva.

<sup>687</sup> *Sarvajñānottara* A f. 35r3-5 (14.35-40), B pp. 99-100 (*Liṅgoddhārādiprakaṛaṇa* vv. 34c-40b): *āpādamastakaṃ yāva bhasmasnānaṃ dvijasya tu | nābher ūrdhvaṃ nṛpasyoktaṃ ārakteṇa tu bhasmanā || 36 vaiśyasya paṭṭikā proktā śūdrasya tu tripuṇḍrakam | bhasmanā brahmapajaptena yathā\*sthānair (A : sthāneṣv B) anukramāt || 37 brāhmaṇasya jaṭā<h> \*sūksmā<h> (A : ślaṣṇā B) kanakāḥ parikīrtitāḥ | sthūlās tadviguṇā jñeyā kṣatriyasya tu vyantarāḥ || 38 vaiśyasyaikā śikhāsthāne tathā śūdrasya kīrtitā | hrasvā ślakṣṇ\*ākṣasamyuktāḥ (ākṣa A : ānu B) samyatasya \*jitendriya (conj. : jitendriyaḥ Codd.) || 39 \*yajñopavītaṃ sautraṃ (A : yajñopavītasūtraṃ B) tu vipre pañcasaram smṛtam | trisaram kṣatriyasyoktaṃ vaiśyasya dvisaram smṛtam || 40 śūdrasyaikasaram jñeyam nityam avyabhicāriṇaḥ | \*arcāgnikāryakāle tu (A : arcāyām agnikārye vā B) samdhyaḥkāle ca nānyathā ‘ A brahmin’s bath with ashes should be from foot to head. A Kṣatriya’s has been taught to be from the navel up and with reddish ash. A Vaiśya may have only a broad band [of ash] on his forehead. A Śūdra may make the Tripuṇḍraka 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 Kṣatriya’s should be twice as thick \*..(?). A Vaiśya 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 Vaiśya, 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’; *Kiraṇa* f. [60]r3-4 (37.10, 12-13): *upavītaṃ \*bhaved (corr. : bhavedd Cod.) evaṃ kṣatriyādītrayasya tu | trisaram dvisaram vāpi kāryam ekasaram kramāt || 12 pūjātanmātrakaṃ kālāṃ nordhvaṃ**

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 (*antyaajāḥ*), 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 dikṣā*). 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 dikṣā*) or in the form of a gaze believed to transmit Śiva's liberating power (*cākṣuṣī dikṣā*), 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.<sup>688</sup>

*teṣāṃ bhaved iha | jaṭānāṃ dhāraṇam \*bhasmalepanam* (corr. : *bhasmamlepanaṇa* Cod.) *\*brāhmaṇe* (corr. : *brahmaṇe* Cod.) *bhavet* || 13 *tripuṇḍraka*<ṃ> *śikhā caikā kṣatriyādītraye 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 Tripuṇḍraka and a single [braid at the] crown'; *Mṛgendra, Caryāpāda* 1.3–4a: *vratino jaṭilā muṇḍās teṣv agryā bhasmapāṇḍarāḥ | tilakaiḥ puṇḍrakaiḥ pattair bhūṣitā bhūmipādayaḥ | jaṭā na sūdro bibhryāt* 'Ascetics [should either] have their hair in braids or be shaven 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 [Tri]puṇḍraka 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.

<sup>688</sup> *Kiraṇa* f. [60]v3–4 (38.6c–7): *yathāsthithena bhāvena \*mantrāḥ* (em. : *mantra* Cod.) *kurvanty anugraham* || *yatas tato \*ntyajasyasyāpi* (conj. : *ntyajasyāsyasya* Cod.) *dikṣā \*kiṃ tv atra* (em. : *kintatra* Cod.) *mānasī | kārūkānāṃ tu saṃsparśā*<n> *\*na tu hautrīm* (em. : *nugrahautrī* 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 *Dikṣādarśa* A, p. 27 and B, p. 43: *antyaajānām na hautrī syāt kiṃ tu dikṣā tu cākṣuṣī* 'Untouchables may not receive initiation through fire-sacrifice. But they can receive ocular initiation'; *Vāyavyasaṃhitā* quoted in the *Dikṣādarśa* A, p. 26 and B, p. 41: *asacchūdrāntyaajātīnām patitānām viśeṣataḥ | tathā saṃkarajātīnām nādhvaśuddhir vidhīyate | te 'py akṛtrimabhāvās cec chive paramakāraṇe | pādodakapradānādyaiḥ kuryāt \*pāśaviśodhanam* (A : *pāduviśodhanam* B) | *atrānulomajātā ye \*yuktā ye* (em. : *yuktaye* AB) *\*vā* (A : *va* B) *dviajātiṣu | teṣāṃ adhvaviśuddhyādi \*kāryam atra* (em. : *kāryamātra* AB) *\*kulocitam* (A : *kulojitam* B) 'The elimination of the paths [of the universe through oblations in the sacrificial fire] is not permitted for Impure Śūdras, untouchables (*antyaajāti-*), and, above all, for outcastes (*patita-*), nor for those of the mixed castes (*saṃkarajāti-*). If[, however,] they have genuine devotion to Śiva, the highest cause,

Orthodox brahmanical practice denied all Śūdras access through Up-  
anayana 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’ (*antyajah*, *antyajātiḥ*). The texts of the Śaivas justified their liber-  
ating inroads into the mass of humanity beyond these brahmanical boundaries  
by boldly declaring that the system of the separation of the castes (*jātibhedah*)  
is a fabrication without basis in reality, a cultural epiphenomenon rather than  
a deep fact of nature,<sup>689</sup> pointing to its absence among human beings outside  
of India.<sup>690</sup> Only mentality matters; and consequently all devotees of Śiva  
form a single community regardless of birth,<sup>691</sup> 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 brahmīns (?) 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 *saṃkarajātiḥ*,  
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 Vaiśya woman) and  
Karaṇa woman (born of a Vaiśya man and Śūdra woman; see, e.g., *Mitākṣarā* on  
*Yājñavalkyasmṛti*, *Ācārādhyāya* 95.

<sup>689</sup> *Paṣkarapārameśvara* quoted in *Nityādisaṃgraha* f. 62v12–13: *manuṣyajātir  
ekaiva* ‘There is only one caste, that of human beings’; f. 63r4–5: *na jātir vihitā  
tatra varṇaṃ vāpi sitādikam | yonilīṅgodbhavāḥ sarve jīva ekaḥ samaḥ sthitāḥ |  
tatra sarvagato devo drśyate jñānacakṣuṣā | ajñāna\*dhvastacittānām* (conj. : *pāpa-  
cittānām* Cod.) *kuśāstra\*vivaśātmanām* (conj. : *vihitātmanām* Cod.) | *vākpralāpaḥ  
sthitāḥ teṣāṃ 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 un-  
derstanding is destroyed by ignorance, who are under the sway of false teachings’;  
*Kulasāra* f. 72r2: *ekabījaprasūtam hi sarvaṃ jagad idaṃ priye | tasmā jātivicāram  
tu bhrāntipūrvam idaṃ 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.

<sup>690</sup> *Cintyaviśva[sādākhya]* quoted in *Dīkṣādarśa* of Vedajñānaguru II, A, p. 24; B, p. 38:  
*navakhaṇḍeṣu sarveṣu bhārateṣu \*mayena ca* (B : *ca yena ca* A) | *jātibhedam idaṃ  
kalpyam anyadeṣeṣu nāsti tat | tasmāt tat kalpanāmātram 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.’

<sup>691</sup> See, for example, *Niśvāsakārikā*, pp. 35–36 (12.161–167): 161 *tattvāni yo vijānāti  
tattvānām \*vyāptim uttamām* (em. : *vyāptir uttamam* Cod.) | *dharmādharmaṃ  
na lipyeta sa sarvānugrahe kṣamaḥ* || 162 *brāhmaṇa-ḥ kṣatriyo \*vaiśyaḥ* (corr.  
: *veśyaḥ* Cod.) *sūdro vā tattvavid yadā | \*vibhaktir* (em. : *vibhaktim* Cod.)  
*naiva vidyeta yathāgnāv agnir eva hi* || 163 *kṣīram kṣīre yathā nyasto toyē toyam  
ivārpitam | vibhāgo naiva vidyeta tattvam īśvara\*bhāṣitam* (conj. : *īśvarabhāvitam*  
Cod.) || 164 *yathā hi saritas sarvās sāgarāśrayasaṃsthitāḥ | \*vivekum* (em. :  
*vivekan* Cod.) *tu na śakyante rasa\*bhāve* (conj. : *bhāvam* Cod.) *prthak prthak*  
|| 165 *tadvad varṇāśramā devī dīkṣito yadi vā paśuḥ | śivabhāvasamā\*yuktās*

hierarchy is that created by the four levels of empowerment through initiation and consecration.<sup>692</sup>

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,<sup>693</sup> the penances (*prāyaścittam*) that they pre-

---

(conj. : *yukto* Cod.) \**tulyā* (conj. : *tulyam* Cod.) *eva na saṃśayaḥ* || 166 *śivatantram samāśritya vibhaktim yaḥ kariṣyati* | \**pacyen naraḥ sa* (conj. : *sa pacyen naro* Cod.) *ghoreṣu dvātriṃśan narakeṣu ca* || 167 *brahmaṇas tu dināḥ pañca dināḥ pañca ca keśave* | *dinatrayaṃ tu rudrasya prāyaścittīyate naraḥ*; Vāladhārin, *Kriyāsaṃgrahapaddhati* f. 49r4–v1, extending this principle to include foreigners (better to initiate a sincere Mleccha than an insincere brahmin): *māyānvito yadā śiṣyo viprajāṭisamudbhavaḥ* | *māyāhīnas tataḥ pātram mlecchaśūdrādisaṃbhavaḥ* || *na vipre dāpayed dīkṣāṃ dāpayen mlecchajanmine* | *nādhikārī yato vipro māyādiguṇasaṃyutaḥ* || *niṣprapañcaguṇair yukto mlecchaś caiva śivāgame* | *dīkṣā vai sarvathā tasya yato māyāvivarjitaḥ*. See the same point made in the lost scripture *Mukuta* cited by Jayaratha on *Tantrāloka* 15.514cd.

<sup>692</sup> *Nityādisaṃgraha* f. 63r11–12: *taṇibaddho yair ātmā brāhmaṇāms tān vidur janāḥ* | *paśupāśavidhānājñāḥ śivajñānānusārīṇaḥ* | *te hi devātidevasya pūjākarmaṇi kīrtitāḥ* | *ity uktam candrahāsākhye mukuṭādyāgameṣu ca samayādiviśeṣeṇa jātir ekaiva kīrtitā* 'People judge as [true] brahmins 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] *Candrahāsa*'; and in such texts as the *Mukuta* we are told that there is only one 'caste' [for Śaivas] with differentiation [by status] only into Samayins[, Putrakas, Sādhakas,] and [Ācāryas]'.  
<sup>693</sup> Somaśambhu, BRUNNER 1961, p. 301 (v. 8cd.): *savarṇair ekayā paṅktyā bhūñjīntarmanāmuniḥ* 'One should eat in silence with concentrate mind in a single line with others of the same caste-class'; Trilocanaśiva, *Prāyaścittasamuccaya*, p. 25: *ekapaṅktiḥ sadā varjyā bhojane bhinnajātibhiḥ* 'When eating one must always avoid sitting in a single line with persons of other castes'. Note the distaste expressed by the brahmin Saṃkarṣaṇa in the *Āgamaḍambara* (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 varṇasaṃkarā api vā sarva evaikasyāṃ paṅktau bhūñjate* 'Persons of all the four caste-classes and even



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,<sup>694</sup> and they assigned compound initiation-names such as Aghora-śiva and Aghora-gaṇa 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.<sup>695</sup>

from the mixed castes are eating together in a single line’.

<sup>694</sup> See Trilocanaśiva, *Prāyaścittasamuccaya* p. 25. Similar differentiation according to caste applies to the penances for eating the leavings of another’s food (*ucchiṣṭabhojanam*), 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 *ucchiṣṭah*, 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 (*jātīśah*). 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.

<sup>695</sup> 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 *Kiraṇa* 37.11–12b: *kṣatriyādītrayasyoktam <m>antranāma gaṇāṅkītam || 12 viprāṇām \*mantrapūrvam* (conj. : *mātupūrvvan* 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

However, the non-Saiddhāntika traditions of the worship of Bhairava and the Goddess in the Mantrapīṭha and Vidyāpīṭha 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.<sup>696</sup> Distinction on the basis of caste is generally

---

it should begin with a Mantra and end with the Gotra name [-śiva, etc.]; *Mrgendra, Kriyāpāda* 8.60c–61: *srajaṃ vimocayen nāma dikṣitānām tadādikam || śivāntakam dvijendrānām itareṣāṃ gaṇāntakam* ‘He should throw the garland. The names of initiated brahmins should begin with [the name of] that [on which it lands] and end in -śiva. For all others it should end in -gaṇa; and *Vidyāpurāna*, a Saiddhāntika scripture in spite of its title, quoted in *Nityādisaṃgraha* f. 63v12– 64r13: *śivo jyotiḥ śikhā caiva sāvitras ceti gocaraḥ | ... etāḥ saṃjñā dvijāgryānām rājādīnām gaṇānkitāḥ | śaktisaṃjñās tu \*vai* (em: *vā*) *striṇām sarvāsām parikīrtitāḥ* ‘The gocaras are Śiva, Jyoti, Śikhā and Sāvitra. ... These names [ending in -śiva, -jyotis etc.] are proper to brahmins. The names of Kṣatriyas[, Vaiśyas] and [Śūdras] are distinguished by the [ending] -gaṇa, while all women are required to have names [ending] in -śakti’; (2) a Kashmirian tradition in which names in -śiva are for the three higher caste-classes, with names in -gaṇa for Śūdras only, and names in -śakti for women; see Bhaṭṭa Nārāyaṇakaṇṭha on *Mrgendra, Kriyāpāda* 8.60c–61 cited above, taking *dvijendrānām* there to mean not brahmins but brahmins, Kṣatriyas, and Vaiśyas; Jayaratha, *Tantrāloka* on 4.265ab (adding names in -śakti for women); Manoda, *Kalādikṣāpaddhati* A ff. 96v16–97r9: *tatpātavasare śivanāmānkitam śiṣyaṃ vidhāya striyaṃ ca śaktināmānkitam vidhāya ... śūdraviṣaye tu ayam amukagaṇa āgataḥ iti prayojyam* ‘When that [flower] falls he should name a male disciple -śiva and a woman -śakti. ... In the case of a Śūdra he should formulate [the Mantra] as follows: ‘This man, N-gaṇa, has come [before you, O Lord]’; (3) names in -śiva for brahmins, and in -gaṇa and -deva for Kṣatriyas and Vaiśyas; see Brahmaśambhu, *Naimittikakarmānusandhāna* f. 38v4–5 (2.180): *tatpātasūcitasthānapūrvam śivapadottaram | nāmāvadhārya viprasya gaṇadevāntam anyayoḥ* ‘Having determined the [initiation] name, whose first part should be the \* ... (?) indicated by the fall of the [flower] and whose second part should be the word -śiva in the case of a brahmin, but which should end in -gaṇa and -deva in the case of the other two [castes]’; *Amṛtesādikṣāvidhi* f. 16r6–7: *śiṣyasya nāmakaraṇam śivāmaragaṇāntakam*; (4) names in -śiva for brahmins, and in -deva, -gaṇa, and -muni for Kṣatriyas, Vaiśyas, and Śūdras; see *Īśānaśivagurudevapaddhati, Kriyāpāda* 146 (16.67–68b): *śivāntam brāhmaṇasya syād devagaṇāntam anyayoḥ | śūdrasya muniśabdāntam nāma kuryād* ‘The name of a brahmin should end in -śiva and those of the next two [castes, Kṣatriya and Vaiśya] in -gaṇa and -deva. He should give a Śūdra a name that ends in -muni’; and (5) names in -śiva for brahmins, -kavaca for Kṣatriyas, -deva for Vaiśyas, and -gaṇa for Śūdras; see *Bṛhatkālottara* A, f. 91v3–4: *śivasamjñā dvijasyaiva kavacākhya nṛpasya ca | vaiśyānām devasamjñā ca śūdrānām ca \*gaṇāntakam* (em. : *gaṇāntikam* Cod.) | *puṣpapātānusāreṇa samjñā \*tatpātato* (conj. : *tatpātrato* Cod.) *hitā* ‘The [initiation] name should be -śiva for a brahmin, -kavaca for a Kṣatriya, -deva for Vaiśyas, and ending in -gaṇa for Śūdras. The [first half of the] name should be in accordance with the throwing of the flower [on to a Maṇḍala], being determined by [segment of] the [Maṇḍala] in which it lands’.

<sup>696</sup> *Tantrāloka* 15.517: *ata evārthasattattvadeśiny asmin na diśyate | rahasyaśāstre jātvyādisamācāro hi śāmbhave* ‘In this esoteric [Śākta/Kaula] Śaiva system, since

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 *Ṣaṭka* 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 (*abhiṣekaḥ*):<sup>697</sup>

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 *Vīṣeṣadīkṣā* [the Ācārya] must do what I shall now explain. Slender-waisted one, he should initiate brahmins 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:<sup>698</sup>

O fair-faced one, all those who have been initiated by this ritual are of equal nature, whether they be brahmins, 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,

---

it teaches the nature of the ultimately real, observance of such [distinctions] as [those of] caste is not taught’.

<sup>697</sup> *Jayadrathayāmala*, *Ṣaṭka*, f. 230v4–6: *yady apy asmin mahātantre jātibhedo na vidyate* || 33 *tathāpi dīkṣāprārambhe bhavaty eva sulocane | dīkṣitānām na jātiḥ syād ekā jātiḥ tu caīśvarī* || 34 *tasmād vīṣeṣadīkṣāyām \*vakṣyamāṇam* (corr. : *vakṣyamāṇam* Cod.) *samācaret | brāhmaṇā<ṇ>ś \*cālipānena* (em. : *cālipātena* Cod.) *\*kṣatriyāmś* (em. : *kṣatriyaś* Cod.) *ca śivāmbunā* || 35 *vaiśyā<ṇ>ś candanapānena śūdrā<n> vai viśvabhasmanā | striyo vīrāṅgasamsparsā<d> dīkṣayeta sumadhyame*.

<sup>698</sup> *Svacchanda* 4.539c–545: *anenaiva vidhānena dīkṣitā ye varānane* || 540 *brāhmaṇāḥ kṣatriyā vaiśyāḥ śūdrāś cānye ’thavā priye | sarve te samadharmāṇaḥ śivadharme niyojitāḥ* || 541 *sarve jaṭādharaḥ proktā bhasmoddhūlitavigrahāḥ | ekapaṅktibhujāḥ sarve samayinas tu varānane* || 542 *putrakāṇām bhaved ekā sādhakānām tathā bhavet | cumbakānām bhaved ekā na prāgjātivibhedataḥ* || 543 *ekaiva sā smṛtā jātir bhairavīyā śivāvīyā | tantram etat samāśrītya prāgjātim na hy udīrayet* || 544 *putrakāṇām sādhakānām tathā samayinām api | prāgjātyudīranād devi prāyaścittī bhaven naraḥ* || 545 *dinatrayam tu rudrasya pañcāham keśavasya ca | pitāmahasya pakṣaikam narake paçyate tu saḥ* || 545 *avivekī bhavet tasmād yadīched uttamām siddhim | avivekena deveśi siddhir muk-tir dhruvam bhavet*. This passage is related to *Nīśvāsakārikā* 12.161–167 cited above, p. 289.

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;<sup>699</sup> and while the Saiddhāntikas were

<sup>699</sup> See, for example, SANDERSON 2007a, pp. 282–287 for a detailed account of the orgiastic *cakrakiṛdā/vīramelāpah* given in the *vīratāṇḍavavidhi-pāṭalaḥ* of the *Jayadrathayāmala*'s fourth *Ṣaṭka* and by Vimalaprabodha in his *Kālikulakramārcana*. 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 (*dhvajinī*), Antyaja, potter (*cakriṇī*), dyer (*chippinī*), butcher (*saunakī*), Mātāṅga, tanner (*carmakārī*), fisherman (*dhīvarī*), prostitute (*veśyā*), washerman (*dhāvakī*), and dancer (*nartakī*). The *Mādhavakula* (*Jayadrathayāmala*, *Ṣaṭka* 4, f. 128r7 [A]; paraphrased in *Tantrāloka* 29.66 and quoted by Jayaratha thereon [B]) lists nine such woman in this context. They are the wives of a Mātāṅga, a Domba, a butcher, a confectioner (*kandukah*) (*kaṃdukī* A : *kārmukī* 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. The use of the former in the meaning 'cremation-ground worker'—see also *Narmamālā* 2.24cd, *Rājatarāṅgiṇī* 7.44ab and 8.995, and *Lokaprakāśa*, p. 6, l. 3 (*kāpālikah* in a list of serving castes)—survives in the Kashmiri derivative *kāwoj<sup>u</sup>/kāwu<sup>ju</sup>* (GRIERSON 1915 and 1932, p. 495b41–46). For *kandukah* in the meaning 'confectioner' see Prakrit *kaṃḍua-* and *kaṃḍaviya-*. Such caste-promiscuous orgiastic rites are also attested by Kashmirian critics of Tantric practice. Kṣemendra attacks them in *Daśāvatāracarita* 10.26 as a symptom of the degeneration of society that will herald the descent of Kalkin, Viṣṇu's tenth Avatāra: *cakrasthitau rajakavāyakacarmakārakāpālikapramukhaśilpibhir ekapātre | pānena muktim avikalparatotsavena vṛttena cotsavavatā guravo vadanti* '[At that time] the Gurus teach that liberation is attained in a Cakra gathering by drinking [wine] from a single vessel with dyers of cloth, weavers, tanners, cremation-ground attendants, and other such persons of the service-castes (*śilpibhiḥ*), and through ecstatic orgies of indiscriminate love-making'; and he gives a vivid description of such a Śākta ritual in *Narmamālā* 3.1–85 (84cd: *nirvibhāgo bhavat teṣāṃ raticakramahotsavaḥ*). A tanner, a butcher, a potter, a fisherman, and a weaver are mentioned among the participants in 3.13–14. The Kashmirian historian Kalhaṇa tells us that king Kalaśa (r. 1063–1089) fell under the corrupting influence of various Tantric teachers, one of whom he describes as a merchant who had become a Guru of dyers and other workers (*Rājatarāṅgiṇī* 7.283: *rajakādīnām śilpinām gurutām agāt*) and was giving initiation to Bhairava-worshipping Śākta brahmins (*bhaṭṭapādāḥ*) (7.283). Evidently the term *śilpī* used in this context by Kṣemendra has a wider sense than that of 'artisan'

in general prepared to descend in the giving of full initiation only as far as members of those communities classed as Sacchūdra, the Śākta 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 Rāmakaṇṭha in his commentary on the Saiddhāntika *Sārdhatrīśatikālottara*, 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 Sacchūdras. Indeed his Śākta 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 Śāktas to shine through even in this dualistic stratum of his revelation:<sup>700</sup>

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:<sup>701</sup>

The [transcendent] Śāntyatītā [Kalā] is the supreme, inactive, eternal void. When [a Guru] has gained knowledge of that, Skanda, he may initiate even untouchables.

Bhaṭṭa Rāmakaṇṭha argues, as one would expect, that it is purely rhetorical in intention, but he introduces into his argument a report that the Śāktas were citing it in support of their practice of actually initiating such persons. Saiddhāntikas, he insists, must not follow their example.<sup>702</sup>

---

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.

<sup>700</sup> *Mālinīvijayavārtika* 1.196c–197b: *ata evāsti saṃhāradṛśāṃ kauliky apīha dṛk || yathoktaṃ kālapādādau dīkṣayec chvapacān iti.*

<sup>701</sup> *Sārdhatrīśatikālottara* 8.7: *śāntyatītā bhaved vyoma tat paraṃ śāntam avyayam | taṃ viditvā mahāsenā śvapacān api dīkṣayet.* In the other recensions of this scripture the same expression appears in the *Trayodaśaśatika-Kālottara* (f. 23r5, *Dīkṣāpātala* v.6: *śāntyatītaṃ paraṃ vyoma sarvagaṃ pāsamocakam | taṃ viditvā mahāsenā śvapacān api dīkṣayet*). But ‘plants’ take the place of ‘untouchables’ in the versions of the *Dviśatika-Kālottara* (f. 2v7, 5.5) (D) and *Saptaśatika-Kālottara* (f. 5v1–2, 8.7c–8b) (S): *\*śāntyatītaṃ* (D: *śāntātītaṃ* S) *paraṃ vyoma tat paraṃ \*śāntam* (D: *param* S) *avyayam | taṃ viditvā mahāsenā \*sthāvarāṇy api* (D: *sthāvarāṇy anu* S) *dīkṣayet.*

<sup>702</sup> *Sārdhatrīśatikālottaravṛtti*, p. 65, ll. 6–10: *śvapacān api dīkṣayed ity atīśayārtho 'piśabdopahitasya bhāvārthasya "api parvataṃ śirasā bhīndyād" ityādāv iva \*paratīśayapratipādanārthatvena* (em. : *pare 'tīśayapratipādanārthatvena* Ed.) *vidhivīśayatvāsambha\*vād iti śirasā parvatabhedavan mlecchaśvapacādidīkṣaṇam atrāpi \*mantavyam* (conj.: *kartavyam* Ed.) *eveṭi yuktaṃ vyākhyātum. 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.<sup>703</sup> The account lacks the artificiality that might

---

*kulācāryair iva balāt kartavyam iti* ‘The words *śvapacān api dīkṣayet* convey the superiority [of such Gurus rhetorically]. For there is no possibility of [this optative’s] being injunctive, because [Pānini’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 dīkṣayet* on *Aṣṭādhyāyī* 3.3.154 (*saṃbhāvane ’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.

<sup>703</sup> The fourteen comprise eight brahmins: four Atharvavedins, of whom three are from Madhyadeśa and one from Sindhu, a Sāmavedin from Kashmir, a Vājasaneyin Yajurvedin from Lampā, a Ṛgvedin of Kāśī, and an Āpastamba-Taittiriya Yajurvedin from Odḍiyāna. The remaining six are two Kṣatriya princes from Sindhu, two Śūdras of Saurāṣṭra, and the two untouchables (Mātāngas), whose place of birth is not recorded. See *Picumata* f. 2v4–6, 3r4–5 (1.1.54–62, 76–81): *oḍradeśe tu jātasya devadattasya saṃjñayā | caraṇā \*bahvṛcasyātha* (em. : *bahvṛjasyātha* Cod.) *ādeśena na saṃśayaḥ* || 55 *asiddhas tv eva deveśi padmabhairavasamjñā\*kaḥ* (corr. : *kāḥ* Cod.) | *caturviṃśatisāhasraṃ granthaṃ dvādaśabhiḥ punaḥ* || 56 *saṃghāraṃ tu sahasrais tu kariṣyati śivechayā | anenaiva tu \*tandreṇa* (conj. : *mantreṇa* Cod.) *tataḥ siddhiṃ praṇāsyā\*ti* (conj. : *si* Cod.) || 57 *etat tantram asiddhasya sakāśāt \*tata* (conj. : *tava* Cod.) *eva hi | śruṇviṣyanti mahābhāge śiṣyāś caiva caturdaśa* (corr. : *caturdaśaṃ* Cod.) || 58 *raktabhairavako nāmnā jvalābhairavako ’paraḥ | helābhairavakaś caiva trayo ’py ete mahāyaśe* || 59 *madhyadeśasamutpannā \*caranātharvaṇās* (conj. [Aiśa = *caranād atharvaṇās*; cf. 1.52c and 1.62c] : *caranātharvaṇaṃ* Cod.) *tathā | vāmbhairavako devi vijayabhairavako ’paraḥ* || 60 *saurāṣṭrāyām \*samutpannau śūdrau jātyā prakīrtitau* (conj. : *samutpanna śūdrā jātyā prakīrtitaḥ* Cod.) | *bībhatsabhairavo devi gajakarṇas tu bhairavaḥ* || 1.61 *caṇḍabhairava\*kaś* (corr. : *kāś* Cod.) *caiva sindhuviśayasambha\*vāḥ* (corr. : *vaḥ* Cod.) | *bībhatsabhairavo devi gajakarṇabhairavo ’pi ca* || 1.62 *kṣatri\*yau* (corr. : *yo* Cod.) *rājaputrau tu caṇḍabhairava\*kaḥ* (corr. : *kā* Cod.) *punaḥ | brāhmaṇo ’tharvaṇo devi caraṇena na saṃśayaḥ* || ... 76 ***karālabhairavo nāma tathā ucchuṣmabhairavaḥ | mātaṅgajāṭisambhū\*tau*** (corr. : *to* Cod.) *padmabhairavaśiṣya\*kau* (corr. : *gau* Cod.) || 77 *yambhairava\*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.<sup>704</sup>

Nor is it the case that all Gurus of the Siddhānta would have agreed with Bhaṭṭa Rāmakaṇṭha that the statement in the *Kālotṭara* is merely rhetorical. This may be inferred from the passage of the *Guhyasiddhi* of Padmavajra cited above.<sup>705</sup> 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.

*cānyāḥ* Cod.) *kāsmīre saṃbhaviṣyati | chandogo brāhmaṇo devi tathā anyo bhaviṣyati* || 78 *viṣṇubhairavanāmāno lampāyām viṣaye tathā | vājimaḍhyaṃdine vipro bhaviṣyati tathāparaḥ* || 79 *dakṣinabhairavaḥ kāśyām utpanno brāhmaṇas tathā | \*bahvrco cāparaḥ śiṣyo bhaviṣyati* (conj.: *bahvayo cāparā śiṣyā bhaviṣyanti* Cod.) *na saṃśayaḥ* || 80 *oḍḍiyāne mahādevi tathā śekharaḥbhairavaḥ | brāhmaṇo taittirīyaka āpastambo bhaviṣyati* || 81 *caturdaśa samākhyatā padmabhairava-śiṣyakāḥ | jñātvā dvādaśasāhasraṃ siddhiṃ prāpsyanti suvrate.*

<sup>704</sup> The names, castes, and birthplaces of these twenty-five Gurus are given in the *Nityāhnikatilaka*, ff. 17v5–24r2. Only twelve are brahmīns. The other thirteen are five Kṣatriyas, three Vaiśyas, four Śūdras, and one untouchable, a maker and seller of alcoholic liquor (*kalyapālah*) from Kundāpura in Oḍḍadeśa. He is venerated as the ninth in the series of the nine Nāthas. See ff. 19v4–20r1: *oḍḍaviṣaye kundāpurapattane janma jātīkalyapālo māhilo nāma | caryānāma śrīkuharākhyadevaḥ | pūjānāma śrīkṛṣṇānandanāthaḥ | śrīkīrtināma gauś chalī-kr̥tā tadā śrīgaucchalīśadevaḥ | khambaḥ khalitaṃ tadā śrīkhambhādīyanāthaḥ | kapīlah prabodhitas tadā śrīkapīlaprabodhānandadevaḥ | asyaiva śaktiḥ śrī-kr̥ṣṇapīṅgalāmbā pā pū* || 9 ||. A variant listing of the nine and sixteen Nāthas is found in the *Ciñcīṅkaulānāṃ gurusamtatiḥ*. There the ninth of the nine is an untouchable (*mātāṅgaḥ*) called Kañjika from Elāpura (modern Ellora): *śrī-elāpure mahāsthāne janma mātāṅgaḥ \*śrīkañjiko* (corr.: *śrīkañjikā* Cod.) *nāma caryāsuprasiddhaḥ śrīvimalaganāthaḥ | pūjyāḥ śrīkṛṣṇānandadevaḥ | gopyāḥ śrīkhagānandadevaḥ | tenāpi kīrtiṃ kṛtvā sālavane \*sālāstambho 'nugrhitāḥ* (corr.: *sālāstambhānugrhitāḥ* Cod.) || 9 ||. Among the sixteen the seventh is Jayadeva, a *karavālah*, probably a liquor-maker (cf. Bihārī, Nepālī *kalwār* 'a maker and seller of liquor' [Skt. *kalyapālah*]), from Vahapura, and the twelfth is a *mātāṅgaḥ* from Śaubhāra called Lo: *śrīvahapure karavālah śrījayadevanāmasuprasiddhaḥ | \*śrīprayāgadevaḥ* (corr.: *śrīprayāśadevaḥ* Cod.) | *pūjya \*bhairavānandadevaḥ* (conj.: *bahyaravānandadevaḥ* Cod.) | *śrīvirānandadevaḥ | gopya śrīmeghānandadevaḥ* || 7 || ... *śrīśaubhāranagare janma mātāṅga lo nāma caryāsu prasiddhaḥ śrīkhaḍgānandadevaḥ | pūjya śrībālānandadevaḥ | ratnānandadevaḥ | tr̥ṣṭīkānandadevaḥ | gopya viraktānandadevaḥ* || 12 ||.

<sup>705</sup> See here p. 144.

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 Hoysālas (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.<sup>706</sup> 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.<sup>707</sup> For immediately after the demise of that

<sup>706</sup> 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.

<sup>707</sup> 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 Kalhaṇa's *Rājatarāṅgiṇī*. It is highly unreliable for this period, being wildly inaccurate in its chronology, and, in the case of the Hunnic Hephthalite kings that reigned from the time of Mihirakula to the advent of the Kārkoṭas, that is to



dynasty it burst forth into its golden age.<sup>708</sup> 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 *Kāśmīratīrthasaṃgraha*, 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 Paṇḍits 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 Śaiva. 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 Īśānadevī establishes circles of the Mothers (*mātrcakram*) at the points of access to the valley (1.122). Rāvaṇa worships Vaṭeśvara, builds a Maṭha 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 Kārkoṭas 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 Khinkhila Narendrāditya shrines of Bhūteśvara (1.347). Tuñjīna I, son of Jalaukas (probably this is the Jalauka, founder of Jyeṣṭharudra, whom Kalhaṇa makes the son of Aśoka), establishes a Tuṅgeśvara (2.14) and Sandhimat founds a Sandhīśvara, an Īseśvara with the name of his Śaiva Guru Īś[ān]a, and many other Liṅgas (2.131–134). Tuñjīna Pravarasena I builds the temple of his Śiva Pravareśvara together with a circle of the Mothers (3.97). The short-reigned non-Kashmirian Mātrgupta establishes a Viṣṇu Mātrguptasvāmin (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 Pravareśvara 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. Laḥkhaṇa Narendrāditya, identified by STEIN (1900, vol. 1, p. 106) with the Laḥkhaṇa Ūdayāditya whose name appears on a Kashmirian silver coin, establishes Viṣṇu Narendrasvāmin (3.383). His brother Tuñjīna Raṇāditya prepares to install two Raṇeśvaras in two new temples but Viṣṇu Raṇasvāmin miraculously takes the place of one through the influence of his wife Raṇārambhā (3.439–455). The couple establish a Viṣṇu Raṇārambhasvāmin, a Śiva Raṇārambheśvara, and a Maṭha for Pāsupatas (3.460). The king establishes the Sun-God Raṇapurāsvāmin (3.462), and Amṛtaprabhā, another wife of his, an Amṛteśvara (3.463). His son Vikramāditya establishes a Vikrameśvara (3.474) and his wife Bimbā a Bimbeśvara (3.482). On the later Hephthalites in Kashmir see DANI 1996.

<sup>708</sup> See SANDERSON 2007a, pp. 425–433.

descriptive survey of these sites and their traditions commissioned by Mahārāja Raṅbīr Singh (r. 1868–1885).<sup>709</sup> 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 *Nīlamatapurāṇa*,<sup>710</sup> and in the list of the major shrines of the valley given by Kalhaṇa in the twelfth century in the preamble of his history of the country.<sup>711</sup>

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 Kākatīyas 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 herders, women, and traders.<sup>712</sup> 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 Sacchūdra Vellāḷa caste, the dominant cultivators of the region.<sup>713</sup>

<sup>709</sup> On the Kashmirian Māhātmya literature and the *Kāśmīratīrthasaṃgraha* of Sāhibrām see STEIN 1900, vol. 2, pp. 383–385.

<sup>710</sup> See TOKUNAGA 1994.

<sup>711</sup> *Rājatarāṅginī* 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 “Śaṅkha, Padma, and others”, Pāpasūdana (the Śiva Kapāteśvara), the goddess Saṃdhyā (Saṃdhyābhātṭārikā), Svayambhū (a Śiva), Bheḍādevī, [the Śivas of the] Nandikṣetra (Bhūteśvara and Jyeṣṭheśvara), Śāradādevī, Cakradhara (Viṣṇu), and Vijayeśvara (Śiva).

<sup>712</sup> This evidence is derived from the work of 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.

<sup>713</sup> For Vellāḷas who gave to Śaiva temples, most commonly cattle or cash to provide an income to fund a perpetual lamp, see, e.g., *SII* 3:17 of A.D. 1014; *SII* 3:116 of A.D. 991; *SII* 13:34 (*ARE* 312 of 1906) of A.D. 941; *SII* 13:44 (*ARE* 227 of 1911); *SII* 13:56 (*ARE* 542 of 1920); *SII* 13:62 (*ARE* 618 of 1920); *SII* 13:66 (*ARE* 238 of 1923); *SII* 13:112 (*ARE* 126 of 1914); *SII* 13:189 (*ARE* 332 of 1927); *SII* 13:300 (*ARE* 5 of 1907) of A.D. 871-907; *SII* 13:47 (*ARE* 216 of 1932-1933); *SII* 14:47 (*ARE* 216 of 1932-33); *SII* 14:131 (*ARE* 213 of 1932-33); *SII* 14:135 (*ARE* 416 of 1929-30); *SII*

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 Yoginīs, 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.<sup>714</sup> 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.

#### 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,<sup>715</sup>

---

14:140 (ARE 76 of 1907); *SII* 14:155 (ARE 77 of 1907; *SII* 14:202 (ARE 394 of 1929-30); *SII* 14:246 (ARE 108 of 1908); *SII* 17:197 (ARE 176 of 1904) of A.D. 1018-19; *SII* 17: 204 (ARE 183 of 1904); *SII* 17:238 (ARE 216 of 1904) of A.D. 1006/7 (with a Valaṅgai Vēlaikkāra soldier); *SII* 17:471 (ARE 440 of 1904) of A.D. 990/991; *SII* 2:95 (a merchant [*vyāpārin*]); *SII* 17:315 (ARE 286 of 1904) (a Valaṅgai Vēlaikkāra soldier) of A.D. 1016. See also GHOSE 1996, pp. 277–282 on the predominance of the upper strata of non-brahmin society in temple patronage in recent times.

<sup>714</sup> 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 SINHA 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 SINHA KAPUR 2002, pp. 209–225 on the case of Mewar in Rajasthan.

<sup>715</sup> See, e.g., *Svacchanda* 11.69-74 (Buddhists > Jainas > Vaidikas > Sāṃkhya > Yogasthas > Pāsupatas > Mausulas and Kārukas > Vaimalas and Lākulas > Śaivas); *Sarvajñānottara* A f. 37r1–3, B p. 96 (*Liṅgoddhārādīprakaraṇa* v. 3): *jñānacaryānvi to buddho buddhitattvam avāpnuyāt | tāmasaṃ \*jinabhaktas tu pauraṣaṃ brahmavedinaḥ || 4 kevalārthavidaḥ kālaṃ prāpnuvanti jīvendriyāḥ | vaidyeśvareśvare tattve somasiddhāntavedinaḥ* (A : (A : *jinabhaktānāṃ prāpnuvanti* + + + + B); Āgama quoted by Bhaṭṭa Rāmakaṇṭha in *Nareśvaraparīkṣāprakāśa*, p. 207: *buddhitattve sthitā buddhā guṇeṣu tu ārhatāḥ sthitāḥ | guṇamūrdhni sthitāḥ sāmṅhyā avyakte pāñcarātrikāḥ*; Somaśambhu, BRUNNER 1977, p. 553 (vv. 7–8): *buddhitattve sthitā buddhā jainās tu guṇamastake | vedāntajñās tu tadyonau puruṣe bhagavanmukhāḥ | pāsupatās tu māyāyāṃ vidyāyāṃ tu mahāvratāḥ. buddhādīliṅgināṃ eṣāṃ muktisthānāny anukramāt*; Trilocanaśiva, *Siddhāntasamuccaya*, pp. 73–87; Kṣemarāja, *Pratyabhijñāhṛdaya* on *Sūtra* 8 (*tadbhūmikāḥ sarvadarśanasthitayaḥ* ‘The positions of all doctrines are its stages’); and here p. 47 (*Manthānabhairava*).

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 Śaivas after their initiation as they were before it if they remained in that domain as active members of society. Śaiva ascetics were allowed a degree of choice in this matter, at least in theory, but householders were not.<sup>716</sup> The religion of the Śaivas, 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 Śaiva 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 (*sapiṇḍīkaraṇam*). 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 Śaivas 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.<sup>717</sup> This accommodation of Brah-

<sup>716</sup> 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*.

<sup>717</sup> 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 Pāśupata 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 *Kīraṇa*, whose treatment of the Śrāddha rituals became the basis for that found in the Paddhati of Somaśambhu and the later Paddhatīs 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 Siddhānta, 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.

---

lead. An intermediate stage in this development is probably to be recognized in the *Sarvajñānottara* and the *Svāyambhuvasūtrasaṃgraha*, which teach a cremation ritual for initiates but make no mention of Śrāddha rituals. I say that the Śrāddhas make less sense in strictly Śaiva terms, because some attempt was made to justify cremation. To create their cremation ritual the Śaivas adapted their ritual of initiation. The soul of the deceased is to be drawn back into the corpse before it is burned on the pyre in order to undergo initiation, just as it did in life. Since the function of initiation is to liberate the soul by destroying all that impedes its liberation this re-initiation of the deceased was justified as a means of eliminating any obstacles that might still be present as a result of the initiate's failure to expiate breaches of discipline that had not been expiated during his lifetime.

**ABBREVIATIONS**

*AIISPL* = American Institute of Indian Studies Photograph Library

*ARE* = Annual Reports on Indian Epigraphy

ASB = Asiatic Society of Bengal

ASI = Archaeological Survey of India

*BEFEO* = *Bulletin de l'École française d'Extrême-Orient*

*Blue Annals* = ROERICH 1995.

BORI = Poona, Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute

*CII* 3 = FLEET 1888

*CII* 4 = MIRASHI 1955

*CII* 5 = MIRASHI 1963

DK = Derge Kanjur

DT = Derge Tenjur

*EC* = *Epigraphia Carnatica*

EFEO = École française d'Extrême-Orient

*EI* = *Epigraphia Indica*

*EITA* = MEISTER et. al. 1983–1991

GOS = Gaekwad's Oriental Series

*HBI* = CHIMPA and CHATTOPADHYAYA 1990

*IA* = *Indian Antiquary*

IASWR = Institute for the Advanced Study of World Religions

*IAR* = *Indian Archaeology, A Review*

IFI = Institut français d'Indologie

IFP = Institut français de Pondichéry

*IJJ* = *Indo-Iranian Journal*

*ISCC* = BERGAIGNE 1893

*JA* = *Journal Asiatique*

K = Khmer inscription, numbered as in CÆDÈS 1966

KLK = Kaiser Library, Kathmandu

KSTS = Kashmir Series of Texts and Studies

*LKA* = VAJRĀCĀRYA 1996

NAK = National Archives, Kathmandu

NGMPP = Nepal-German Manuscript Preservation Project, Reel number

BLO = Bodleian Library, University of Oxford

r. = ruled

*SII* = *South Indian Inscriptions*

SORL = Srinagar, Oriental Research Library, Jammu & Kashmir Research and Publication Department

T. = TAKAKUSU and WATANABE 1924–1932

Tōh. = UI et al. 1934

TUL = Tokyo University Library

ULC = University Library, Cambridge

*Xiyu ji* = BEAL 1884

## REFERENCES

### SANSKRIT TEXTS AND AUTHORS

- Agnipurāṇa*, ed. Baladeva Upādhyāya. Kashi Sanskrit Series 174. Varanasi: The Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series Office, 1966.
- Anargharāghava* of Murāri with the commentary of Rucipati, ed. Pandit Durgāprasād and Wāsudev Laxman Shāstrī Pansīkar. *Kāvya-mālā* 5. 3rd edition. Bombay: Nirṇaya-sagar, 1908.
- Anekārthasaṃgraha* of Hemacandra, ed. Th. Zachariae. Sources of Sanskrit Lexicography 1. Vienna: Alfred Hölder; Bombay: Education Society's Press, 1893.
- Abhayapaddhati*, the commentary of Abhayākaragupta on the *Buddhakapāla-tantra*. NAK MS 5-21, NGMPP A48/2: Maithila script.
- Abhidharmakośabhāṣya* of Vasubandhu, ed. P. Pradhan. Patna: K.P. Jayaswal Research Institute, 1967.
- Abhidhānottaratantra*. A = IASWR, Film-strip MBB–1971–100-108: palm-leaf; Bhujimol script; A.D. 1138; B = NGMPP E695/3: paper; Newari script; A.D. 1665. See also *mNgon brjod rgyud bla ma* under Tibetan Texts.
- Abhisamayamañjarī* of Śākyarakṣita, ed. in *Dhīh* 13 (1992), pp. 123–154.
- Abhisamayālaṃkāra-loka* of Haribhadra, ed. Unrai Wogihara. Tokyo: The Toyo Bunko, 1932–1935.
- Amarakośa: Amarakośa with the Unpublished South Indian Commentaries Amarapadavivṛti of Liṅgayasūrin and Amarapadapārijāta of Mallinātha*, ed. A.A. Ramanathan. Adyar Library Series 101. Adyar, Madras: Adyar Library and Research Centre, 1971.

- Amṛteśadīkṣāvidhi* of Viśveśvara. NAK MS 5-4867, NGMPP A231/17: paper; Devanāgarī; incomplete; no date.
- Avadānakalpalatā* of Kṣemendra, ed. P.L. Vaidya. 2 vols. Buddhist Sanskrit Texts 22. Darbhanga: Mithila Institute, 1959.
- Āgamaḍambara* of Jayantabhaṭṭa. See DEZSÓ 2005.
- Āgamaprāmāṇya* of Yāmunācārya, ed. M. Narasimhachary. GOS 160. Baroda: Oriental Institute, 1976.
- Ācāryakriyāsamuccaya* of Mahāmaṇḍalācārya Jagaddarpaṇa: *Kriya-Samuccaya: A Sanskrit Manuscript from Nepal Containing a Collection of Tantric Ritual by Jagaddarpaṇa* reproduced by Lokesh CHANDRA from the collection of Prof. RAGHUVĪRA. Śata-piṭaka 237. New Delhi: Sharada Rani, 1977.
- Ātmārthapūjāpaddhati* of Vedajñānaguru II. A = IFP MS Transcript 1056; B = IFP MS Transcript 282.
- Ādikarmapradīpa*, ed. Hisao Takahashi (Ādikarmapradīpa bonbun kōtei: Tōkyō daigaku shahon ni yoru [A Sanskrit edition of the *Ādikarmapradīpa* on the basis of the manuscript preserved in Tokyo University]). In *Indogaku Mikkyōgaku kenkyū: Miyasaka Yūshō hakase koki kinen ronbunshū* [Studies on Buddhist Tantra on the Occasion of the 70th Birthday of Dr. Yusho Miyasaka], vol. 2. Kyoto: Hōzōkan, 1993. Other witnesses:— T = Tokyo University MS 57 (New) / 349 (Old); P = the edition prepared by Louis de la Vallée Poussin on the basis of a manuscript in the Royal Asiatic Society, London, in *Bouddhisme, études et matériaux*, London, 1898, Pt. 2, pp. 186–204.
- Indrabhūti. See *'Khor lo sdom pa'i rgyud kyi rgyal po bde mchog bsdus pa zhes bya ba'i rnam par bshad* under Tibetan Texts.
- Īśānaśivagurudevapaddhati (Siddhāntasāra)* of Īśānaśiva, ed. T. Gaṇapati Śāstrī. 4 parts. Trivandrum Sanskrit Series 60, 72, 77, and 83.
- Īśvarasaṃhitā*, ed. Prativādi Bhayaṅkara. Śāstramuktāvalī 45. Kāñcī, 1923.
- Ugracaṇḍāprakaraṇa*. ASB MS 11354 ('Tantric Digest of Unknown Name'), ff. 39v9–67r7: paper: Newari script.
- Upakeśagacchapaṭṭāvalī*. See HOERNLE 1890.
- Ūrmikaulārṇava*. NAK MS 5-4207, NGMPP B115/9: paper; Newari script.
- Kathāsaritsāgara* of Somadeva, ed. Paṇḍit Jagadīś Lāl Śāstrī, Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1970.
- Kambalapāda. See *Sādhananidhi*.
- Karmakāṇḍa*, vol. 4 (*paṇḍitakeśavabhaṭṭajyotirvidā saṃskāraśodhanābhyāṃ sampāditaṃ sāṅgopāṅga-viṣṇubali-sāṅga-saivakriyātmakam karmakāṇḍam, caturthapustakam*), ed. Paṇḍita Keśavabhaṭṭa Jyotirvid, Bombay, 1936; reproduced photographically by Lokesh Chandra in pp. 127–247 of volume 7 of *Sanskrit Texts from Kashmir*, Śatapiṭaka Series 333, New Delhi, 1984.



- Karmakāṇḍakramāvalī* of Somaśambhu: *Karmakanda-kramavali* By Sri Somasambhu, ed. Jagaddhar Zadoo. KSTS 73. Srinagar, 1947. See also *Kriyākāṇḍakramāvalī* and *Somaśambhupaddhati*.
- Kalādīkṣāpaddhati* of Manoda, expanded (*vistāritah*) by Śivasvāmin. A = BORI 157 of 1886-92 (*'Kalādīkṣāvidhi'*: paper: Śāradā script; B = BORI MS 440 of 1875-76: paper; Kashmirian Devanāgarī).
- Kāthakagr̥hyasūtra* with extracts from the commentaries of Devapāla, Brāhmaṇabala, and Ādityadarśana, ed. Willem Caland. Śrīmaddayānanda Mahāvīdyālaya Saṃskṛtagranthamālā 1. Lahore: Research Dept., D.A.V. College, 1925.
- Kāmika*. No editor accredited: published by C. Swaminatha Sivacarya. Madras: Dakṣiṇabhāratārcakasaṅgha, 1975.
- Kāraṇḍavyūha*, ed. P.L. Vaidya. Mahāyāna-sūtra-saṃgraha, Part 1, Sūtra 12, pp. 258–308. Buddhist Sanskrit Texts 17. Darbhanga: Mithila Institute, 1961.
- Kālikulakramasadbhāva*. NAK MS 1-76, NGMPP A209/23: paper; Newari script; incomplete (1.1–7.2).
- Kālikulakramārcana* of Vimalaprabodha. NAK MS 3-314, NGMPP A129/9: paper: Newari script; undated.
- Kālottaratantra*. NAK MS 5-4632, NGMPP B118/7: paper; Devanāgarī. The codex contains in sequence the following texts: (1) *Kālottare Jñānapañcāśikā*, ff. 1v1–4v7 (not a *Kālottara* recension; see GOODALL 2007, pp.127–128), (2) *Kālajñāne Śatikam*, ff. 4v7–9r6; (3) *Kālottare Sārdhaśatikam*, ff. 1v1–6v9; (4) *Kālottare Dviśatikam*, ff. 1v1–9v3; (5) *Kālottare 'dhyuṣṭasatam* (*Sārdhatriśatikam*), ff. 1v1–17v3; (6) *Kālottare Saptasatikam*, ff. 1v1–25r3; (7) *Kālottare Trayodaśasatikam*, ff. 1v1–46v7. This appears to be an apograph of NAK MS 1-1114, NGMPP B25/7, an undated Nepalese palm-leaf MS in the Nāgarī script, except that it has added the *Sārdhaśatika* recension from some other source (GOODALL 2007, p. 129).
- Kāśikāvṛtti* of Jayāditya and Vāmana on the *Aṣṭādhyāyī* of Pāṇini, ed. Paṇḍita Śobhitamiśra. Kāśī-saṃskṛta-granthamālā 37. Banaras: Jaya Krishna Das Haridas Gupta, Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series Office, 1952.
- Kāśmīratīrthasaṃgraha*, materials compiled by Sāhibrām for Mahārāja Raṅbīr Singh (r. 1868–1885). BLO MS Stein d. 33 iii: paper; Śāradā script; incomplete.
- Kiraṇa*. NAK MS 5-893, NGMPP A40/3 (= *Kiraṇatantra*, *Kiraṇāgama*): palm-leaf; Licchavi script; incomplete; A.D. 924. For chapters 1–6 with the commentary of Bhaṭṭa Rāmakaṇṭha; see GOODALL 1998.
- Kubjikāmata*. See GOUDRIAAN and SCHOTERMAN 1988.
- Kumārāpālacaritasamgraha*: *bhinnabhinna-vidvatkarṭka paramārhatābi-*

- rudālaṅkṛtagūrjaracaulukyacakravarti-nṛpatikumārapālacaritrasaṃgraha / Kumārapāla Charitrasaṃgraha (A Collection of Works of Various Authors Relating to Life of King Kumarapala of Gujarat)*, ed. Acharya Jina Vijaya Muni. Singhi Jain Series 41. Bombay: Singhi Jain Shastra Shikshapath, Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan, 1956.
- Kumārapāladevacarita* of Somatilakasūri. *Kumārapālacaritrasaṃgraha*, pp. 9–33.
- Kumārapāladevaprabandha* of the *Caturaśītiprabandha*. *Kumārapālacaritrasaṃgraha*, pp. 112i–112xxiv.
- Kumārapālaprabodhaprabandha*, anonymous. *Kumārapālacaritrasaṃgraha*, pp. 35–111.
- Kumārasambhava* of Kālidāsa, Cantos I–8, with the commentary (*-saṃjīvanī*) of Mallinātha, ed. M.R. Kale, Bombay: Gopal Narayen, 1923.
- Kularatnodyota: Kularatnodyotatantra*. NAK MS 1-16, NGMPP A206/10: paper; Newari script; A.D. 1734.
- Kulasāra*. NAK 4-137, NGMPP A40/11: palm-leaf; early Nāgarī.
- Kṛtyakalpataru: Kṛtyakalpataru of Bhaṭṭa Lakṣmīdhara*. Vol. III, *Niyatakalakāṇḍa*, ed K.V. Rangaswami Aiyangar. Baroda: Oriental Institute, 1950.
- Kṛṣṇayamāritantra*, with the commentary (*ratnāvalī nāma pañjikā*) of Kumāracandra, ed. S. Rinpoche and V. Dwivedi. Rare Buddhist Text Series 9. Sarnath, Varanasi: Central Institute of Higher Tibetan Studies, 1992.
- Kriyākāṇḍakramāvalī* of Somaśambhu. ULC MS Add 1406 12: palm-leaf; Newari script; undated (12th century); KLK MS 539, NGMPP C114/22 (*'Kriyākāṇḍapadakramāvalī'*): palm-leaf; Newari script; A.D. 1159. See *Somaśambhupaddhati* and *Karmakāṇḍakramāvalī*.
- 'Kriyākramadyotikā'*. IFP MS Transcript 1076. A Śaiva miscellany.
- Kriyākramadyotikāvyaḅhyā* of Kacchapeśvaraśiva. IFP MS Transcript 109.
- Kriyāsaṃgrahapañjikā* of Kuladatta. See TANEMURA 2004b.
- Kriyāsaṃgrahapaddhati* of Vāladhārin. KLK MS 63; NGMPP C5/3: palm-leaf; Bhujimol script; A.D. 1091/2.
- Gaṇaratnamahodadhi* of Vardhamāna with his own commentary (*-vṛtti*), ed. J. Eggeling. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1963. First published 1879.
- Gilgit Manuscript Facsimiles: Gilgit Buddhist Manuscripts*. Raghu Vira and Lokesh Chandra. Śata-piṭaka, Indo-Asian literatures, v. 10, parts. 1–10. New Delhi: International Academy of Indian Culture, 1959-.
- Gilgit Manuscripts*, ed. Nalinaksha Dutt with the assistance of D.M. Bhattacharya and Shiv Nath Sharma. 4 volumes (volume 3 in 3 parts). Srinagar:

- His Highness' Government, Jammu and Kashmir, 1939–1959.
- Gītābhāṣya* of Śaṅkara with the sub-commentary of Ānandagiri, ed. Kāśīnātha Śāstrī Āgāṣe. Ānandāśrama Sanskrit Series 34. Pune: Ānandāśrama Press, 1931.
- Gurupañcāsikā* of Āryadeva, vv. 1–33, ed. Sylvain Lévi (1929, pp. 259–263); vv. 34–50 reconstructed from the Tibetan translation by J. Pandey in *Dhīḥ* 13 (1992), pp. 16–20.
- Gurupustikā* of Rājānaka Śitikaṅṭha. Banaras Hindu University, Sayaji Rao Gaekwad Central Library, MS CN. 4115: paper: Śāradā script; complete but for the end of the last section.
- Guhyasamayāsādhanaṁālā*. BLO MS Sansk. c.16: palm-leaf; Newari script; 13th century (?).
- Guhyasamāja*. See MATSUNAGA 1978.
- \**Guhyasamājapañjikā* of Ānandagarbha. See *gSang ba 'dus pa'i dka' grel* under Tibetan Texts.
- Guhyasamājamaṇḍalavidhi* of Dīpaṅkarabhadra. Niedersächsische Staats- und Universitätsbibliothek, Göttingen, Cod. MS. Sanscr. 257: palm-leaf; proto-Bengali script; incomplete, lacking the final folio. This codex, which contains several works of which this is the last, was formerly in the Phyag dpe lha khang chen mo of the Sa skya monastery, where it was photographed by Rāhul Sāṅkrtyāyana (ISAACSON 2002, pp. 152–153).
- Guhyasiddhi*. In *Guhyādi-aṣṭasiddhisāṅgraha*, pp. 1–63 (Sanskrit); pp. 1–107 (Tibetan).
- Guhyādi-aṣṭasiddhisāṅgraha / gSang pa grub pa logs pa'i grub pa sde brgyad bzhugs*, ed. Samdhong Rinpoche and Vrajvallabh Dwivedi. Rare Buddhist Texts Series 1. Two parts: Sanskrit text and the Tibetan translation. Sarnath, Varanasi: Central Institute of Higher Tibetan Studies, 1987.
- Gūḍhapadā* of Advayavajra. A commentary on the *Nāmasaṁgīti*. Royal Asiatic Society, London, Hodgson MS 34: palm-leaf; Newari script; undated.
- Gopālarājavaṁśāvalī*. NAK MS 1-1583, NGMPP B18/23: palm-leaf; Newari script. See VAJRĀCĀRYA and MALLA 1985.
- Cakrasaṁvaraṭīkā* of Devagupta. See *'Khor lo sdom pa'i sgrub thabs gnas thams cad rgya cher 'grel* under Tibetan Texts.
- Cakrasaṁvarapañjikā* of Indrabhūti. See *'Khor lo sdom pa'i rgyud kyī rgyal po bde mchog bsdus pa zhes bya ba'i rnam par bshad* under Tibetan Texts.
- Cakrasaṁvarapañjikā* of Kambalapāda. See *Sādhanaṁidhi*.
- Cakrasaṁvarapañjikā* of Jayabhadra. SUGIKI 2001.
- Cakrasaṁvarapañjikā* of Durjayacandra. See *Rin po che'i tshogs zhes bya ba dka' 'grel* under Tibetan Texts.

- Cakrasaṃvarapañjikā* of Bhavabhaṭṭa. IASWR Film-strip MBB-1-33: palm-leaf; Newari script (Bhujimol).
- Cakrasaṃvarapañjikā* of Bhavabhaṭṭa, ed. Janardan Shastri Pandey. Rare Buddhist Texts Series 26. Sarnath, Varanasi: Central Institute of Higher Tibetan Studies, 2002.
- Cakrasaṃvarapañjikā* of Bhavyakīrti. See '*Khor lo sdom pa'i dka' 'grel dpa' bo'i yid du 'ong bzhes bya ba* under Tibetan Texts.
- Cakrasaṃvarapañjikā* of Vīravajra. See *Yon tan ma lus pa'i gnas zhes bya ba'i 'grel pa* under Tibetan Texts.
- Cakrasaṃvaravṛtti* of Śāśvatavajra. See *De kho na nyid mkhas pa* under Tibetan Texts.
- Caṇḍamahāroṣaṇatantra: The Caṇḍamahāroṣaṇa Tantra, Chapters I-VIII. A Critical Edition and English translation* by Christopher S. George. American Oriental Series 56. New Haven: American Oriental Society, 1974.
- Caturyoginīsamputa*. An unpublished transcript prepared by Prof. Harunaga Isaacson from incomplete photographs of a palm-leaf manuscript taken by Giuseppe Tucci in Tibet, preserved in Istituto Italiano per l'Africa e l'Oriente, Rome, in a folder marked Mahakalparaj 42.
- Caturvargacintāmaṇi* of Hemādri, ed. Paṇḍita Bharatacandra Śiromaṇi, Yogeśvara Bhaṭṭācārya, Kāmākhyānātha Tarkaratna, Yajñeśvara Smṛtiratna, and Pramathanātha Tarkabhūṣaṇa. 6 volumes. Bibliotheca Indica 72. Calcutta: ASB, 1873-1911.
- Catuṣpīṭhatantra*. NAK MS 1-1078, NGMPP B26/23 ('*Prakaraṇatantra*'): palm-leaf; Newari script; perhaps 11th century.
- Catuṣpīṭhanibandha* of Bhavabhaṭṭa. KLK MS 134, NGMPP C14/11: palm-leaf; Gomol script; perhaps 13th century.
- Catuṣpīṭhamāṇḍalopāyikā* of Caryāvratipāda. NAK MS 5-89/1, NGMPP A1298/6 and (duplicate) B30/35: palm-leaf; Bhujimol script; second half of the 11th century.
- Caryāmelāpakapradīpa* of Āryadeva, ed. Janardan Shastri Pandey. Rare Buddhist Text Series 22. Sarnath: Central Institute of Higher Tibetan Studies, 2000.
- Ciñciṇīkaulānāṃ gurusamtatiḥ*. NAK MS 4-304 ('*Tvaritāvidhānasūtra*'), NGMPP A59/13: palm-leaf; Devanāgarī; incomplete. Folios 1-5, 7-12, and 14 are at the beginning of the film and ff. 15-23 are at its end, with the *Tvaritāvidhānasūtra* in the middle. Transcript prepared by Dr. Diwakar Acharya.
- Ciñciṇīmatasārasamuccaya*. NAK MS 1-767, NGMPP B157/19: paper; Newari script; A.D. 1754.

*Chummāsaṃketaparakāśa* of Niṣkriyānandanātha, redacted by Anantaśakti. A = Sayaji Gaekwad Central Library, Banaras Hindu University, MS CN. 491, Acc. 328180: paper; Śāradā script; lacking the beginning; B = Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin - Preussischer Kulturbesitz Hs or 11387 (*Triṃśaccarcārahasya*): paper; Śāradā script; lacking the beginning and end.

*Jayadrathayāmala*, *Ṣaṭka* 1. NAK MS 5-4650, NGMPP B122/7: paper; Devanāgarī.

*Jayadrathayāmala*, *Ṣaṭka* 2. NAK MS 5-4650, NGMPP A153/3: paper; Devanāgarī.

*Jayadrathayāmala*, *Ṣaṭka* 3. A = NAK MS 5-722, NGMPPB 26/9; palm-leaf; 'Pāla-Sena' Devanāgarī; probably 12th century; B = Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin, Hs or 8535; paper; Newari script; A.D. 1667; C = Kaiser Library 728, NGMPP C72/1; paper; Newari script; A.D. 1671; D = NAK MS 5-1975, NGMPP A152/9; paper; Newari script; A.D. 1687; E = NAK MS 1-375, NGMPP B121/13; paper; Newari script.

*Jayadrathayāmala*, *Ṣaṭka* 4. NAK MS 1-1468, NGMPP B122/4: paper; Newari script; A.D. 1626/7.

Jayabhadra. See *Cakrasaṃvarapañjikā*.

*Jayākhyasaṃhitā*. NAK MS 1-49 (*Jayākṣarasamhitā*), NGMPP B29/3: palm-leaf; Newari script; incomplete; A.D. 1395.

*Jayākhyasaṃhitā*, ed. Embar Krishnamacharya. GOS 54. Baroda: Oriental Institute, 1931.

*Jayottara*. NAK MS 4/82, NGMPP A1306/24: palm-leaf; Newari script; A.D. 1383. Draft edition prepared by Dr. Diwakar Acharya.

*Jñānaratnāvalī* of Jñānaśivācārya. IFP MS Transcript 231.

*Jñānalakṣmī* of Sādhaka Candradatta, disciple of Ekāyanācārya Nārāyaṇagarbha. NAK MS 1-1633 (*Jayākṣarasamhitā*), NGMPP A44/7: palm-leaf; Newari script; incomplete; A.D. 1187.

*Jñānasiddhi* of Indrabhūti. In *Guhyādi-aṣṭasiddhisāṅgraha*, pp. 89-157 (Sanskrit).

*Jñānasiddhyāgama*. IFP MS Transcript 507, pp. 395-481.

*Jñānodayatāntra*, ed. Samdhong Rinpoche and Vrajavallabh Dwivedi. Rare Buddhist Text Series 3. Sarnath: Central Institute of Higher Tibetan Studies, 1988.

*Dākārṇava*: *Dākārṇavamahāyoginītantra*. NAK MS 3-293, NGMPP A138/9: paper; Newari script; perhaps 13th century; some folios in a later hand; Tibetan annotations in cursive (*dbu med*) script in the upper and/or lower margins of several folios.

*Tattvaratnāvalī* of Advayavajra, ed. H. Ui in UI 1963, pp. 1-52.

- Tattvaratnāvaloka* of Vāgīśvarakīrti with his own commentary *-vivarāṇa*, ed. Janardan Pandey. Sarnath: Central Institute of High Tibetan Studies, 1997.
- Tattvasiddhi* of Śāntarakṣita. A = Baroda Oriental Institute, MS 56, ff. 91v4–108r4: paper: Nepalese Devanāgarī; B = NAK MS 5-45, NGMPP A134/2 (*'Guhyasiddhyādināgārjunapādādi'*), ff. 37v10–44v8: paper: Nepalese Devanāgarī. See *De kho na nyid grub pa* under Tibetan Texts.
- Tantrasadbhāva*. NAK MS 5-445, NGMPP A44/2: palm-leaf; Kuṭila script.
- Tantrasārasaṃgraha* (also known as the *Nārāyaṇīya*): *Tantrasārasaṃgraha* by *Nārāyaṇa with Mantravimarsinī Commentary* by *Svarṇagrāma Vāsudeva*, ed. N.V.P. Unni. 2 vols. Calicut University Sanskrit Series 15–16. Calicut: University of Calicut, 2002.
- Tantrāloka* of Abhinavagupta with the commentary (*-viveka*) of Rājānaka Jayaratha, ed. Mukund Rām Śāstrī. KSTS 23, 28, 30, 35, 29, 41, 47, 59, 52, 57, 58. Bombay and Srinagar, 1918–38.
- Tarkabhāṣā* of Mokṣākaragupta, ed. Embar Krishnamacharya. GOS 94. Baroda: Oriental Institute, 1942.
- Tārābhaktisudhārṇava* of Nṛsiṃha Ṭhakkura, ed. Pañcānana Bhaṭṭācārya. Tantrik Texts 21. Calcutta: Sanskrit Book Depot, 1983.
- Toḍalatantra*, ed. Gopinatha Kaviraja. *Tantrasaṃgraha*, Part 2, pp. 53–94. Yogatantra-granthamala 4. Varanasi: Varanaseya Sanskrit Vishvavidyalaya, 1970.
- Trayodaśaśatika-Kālottara*. See *Kālottaratantra*.
- Daśāvatāracarita* of Kṣemendra, ed. Durgāprasād and Kāśināth Pāṇḍurang Parab. Kāvya-mālā 26. Bombay: Nirnaya-sāgara Press, 1891.
- Dānasāgara* of Ballālasena, ed. Bhabatosh Bhattacharya. Bibliotheca Indica 274 (fasc. 1-4). Calcutta: Asiatic Society, 1953–1956.
- Dīkṣādarśa* of Vedajñānaguru II. IFP MS Transcripts 76 (A) and 153 (B).
- Dīkṣāvidhi*. NGMPP E 1203/3: paper; Newari script; A.D. 1829.
- Dīptāgama*. IFP MS Transcript 15.
- Durgāpūjātattva* of Raghunandana Bhaṭṭācārya, ed. Satīśa Candra Siddhānta-bhūṣaṇa, Calcutta: Saṃskṛta Sāhitya Pariṣad, 1922.
- Durgābhaktitarāṅgiṇī* of Vidyāpati, ed. Īśāna Candra Śarman Calcutta: Saṃskṛta Sāhitya Pariṣad, 1932.
- Durjayacandra. See *Rin po che'i tshogs zhes bya ba dka' 'grel* under Tibetan Texts.
- Devagupta. See *'Khor lo sdom pa'i sgrub thabs gnas thams cad rgya cher 'grel* under Tibetan Texts.
- Devāmṛtapañcarātra*. NAK MS 1/1078, NGMPP B 29/2: palm-leaf; Newari script; probably 12th century. Transcript prepared by Dr. Diwakar Acharya.

- \**Devītantrasadbhāvasāra*, a text on the cult of the Śaiva *vāmasrotah* 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.
- Devīdvyardhasatikā*. NAK MS 1-242, NGMPP A161/12 Paper; Newari script; undated.
- Devīpurāṇa*, ed. Panchanan Tarkaratna and Srijib Nyayaratna. Calcutta: Navabharati, 1977.
- Devyāmata*. NAK MS 1-279, NGMPP A41/15 (*Nīsvāsamahātantrāntargatapratīṣṭhātantra*): palm-leaf; Newari script; A.D. 1060.
- Dviśatika-Kālottara*. See *Kālottaratantra*.
- \**Nayatrayapradīpa*. See *Tshul gsum gyi sgron ma* under Tibetan Texts.
- Nareśvaraparīkṣāprakāśa*, the commentary of Bhaṭṭa Rāmakaṇṭha on the *Nareśvaraparīkṣā* of Sadyojyotis, ed. Madhusudan Kaul Shastri. KSTS 45. Srinagar, 1926.
- Narmamālā* of Kṣemendra: *The Deśopadeśa & Narmamālā of Kshemendra*, ed. Madhusudan Kaul Shāstrī. KSTS 40. Srinagar, 1927. Also BALDISSERA 2005.
- 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.
- Navasāhasāṅkacarita* of Padmagupta *alias* Parimala, ed. Paṇḍit Vāmana Śhāstrī Islāmpurkār. Bombay Sanskrit Series 53. Bombay: Government Central Book Depot, 1995.
- Nāmamantrārthāvalokinī*, the commentary on the *Mañjuśrīnāmasaṃgīti* by Ācārya Vilāsavajra, also called Viśvarūpa, of Ratnavīpa, maternal nephew of Agrabodhi. A = ULC MS Add. 1708: palm-leaf; Newari script; A.D. 1457 (?); B = NGMPP E360/16: paper; Newari and Devanāgarī scripts. For a critical edition of chapters 1–5 see TRIBE 1994.
- Nityākaula*. 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 Paṭala.
- Nityādisaṃgraha* compiled by Rājānaka Takṣakavarta. BORI MS 76 of 1875–76: paper; Śāradā (*Bhṛṅgeśasaṃhitā*); exemplar of BLO MS Stein Or. d. 43 (*Nityādisaṃgrahābhīdhānapaddhati*).
- Nityāhnikatilaka* of Śrīkaṇṭhasūnu. NAK MS 3-384, NGMPP B 41/11: palm-leaf; Newari script; A.D. 1153.
- Nīśisaṃcāra*. NAK MS 1-1606, NGMPP B 26/25: palm-leaf; Nepalese Kuṭīla script; probably before 1100.
- Niruktabhāṣya* of Yāska with the *Niruktavivṛti* of Mukunda Śarmā: *The Niruk-*

- tam of Yāska Muni [in the form of the Nighaṅṭu Bhāṣya of Kaśyapa Prajāpati] with the Niruktavivṛti and Exhaustive Notes*, ed. Mukund Lha Bakshi. Panini Vaidika Granthamala 12. New Delhi: Panini, 1982.
- Niśvāsakārikā*. IFP MS Transcript 17.
- Niśvāsattattvasaṃhitā*. NAK MS 1-277: palm-leaf; Newari script; undated; probably second half of the ninth century.
- Niṣpannayogāvalī* of Abhayākaragupta, ed. B. Bhattacharya. GOS 109. Baroda: Oriental Institute, 1949 (A); *The Niṣpannayogāvalī by Abhayākaragupta. A New Critical Edition of the Sanskrit Text (Revised Edition)*, ed. Yong-hyun Lee. Seoul: Baegun Press, 2004 (B).
- Netratantra* with the commentary (*Netroddyota*) of Rājānaka Kṣemarāja, ed. Madhusūdan Kaul Śāstrī. KSTS 46, 59. Bombay, 1926 and 1939.
- Naimittikakarmānusaṃdhāna* of Brahmaśambhu. Calcutta, ASB, MS G 4767: palm-leaf; Newari script; incomplete; undated but probably eleventh century.
- Pañcakramaṭippaṇī (Yogimanoharā)* of Muniśrībhadrā, ed. Zhongxin Jiang and Toru Tomabechi. Schweizerische Asiengesellschaft/Société Suisse-Asie Monographie Band/Volume 23. Bern: Peter Lang, 1996.
- Pañcasāyākamañjarī* of Jyotirīśvara, ed. Dhuṇḍirāja Śāstrī in *Kāmakūñjalatā (A Collection of Old and Rare Works on Kāma Śāstra)*. Varanasi: Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series Office, 1967.
- Pampāmāhātmya*, ed. as appendix 4 of FILLIOZAT 2001.
- Pāñcarātrarakṣā* of Vedāntadesika, ed. M. Duraisvami Aiyangar and T. Venugopalacharya. Adyar, Madras: Adyar Library and Research Centre, 1996. 3rd edition. First published in 1942
- Pādmasaṃhitā: Padma Samhita*, Vol. 1, ed. Seetha Padmanabhan and R. N. Sampath. Vol. II, ed. Seetha Padmanabhan and V. Varadachari. Pāñcarātra Parīśodhana Parīṣad Series 3 and 4. Madras: Pāñcarātra Parīśodhana Parīṣad, 1974 and 1982.
- Pārameśvara (= Pauṣkarapārameśvara)*. ULC MS Add. 1049 ('Pārameśvaratantra'): palm-leaf; Licchavi script; A.D. 819.
- Pāraskaragṛhyasūtra*, ed. Brahmānanda Tripāthī. Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series 209. Benares: Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series, 1991.
- Piṅgalāmata (Jayadrathādihikāra)*. 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.
- Puraścaryārṇava* of King Pratāpasimhadeva Shāh of Nepal (r. 1775–1777), ed. Muralidhar Jha. Vrajajivan Prachyabharati Granthamala 10. Delhi: Chowkhamba. 1980.



- Paṣkarabhāṣya*: The *Jñānapāda* of the *Paṣkarāgama* with the commentary (-bhāṣya) of Umāpatiśivācārya, ed. Ambalavanāvalajñānasambandhaparāśaktisvāmi. Cidambaram, 1925.
- Paṣkarasaṃhitā*, ed. Sri Yathiraja Sampath Kumara Ramanuja Muni. Madras: A. Srinivasa Aiyangar and M.C. Thirumalachariar, 1924.
- Pratyabhiññāhṛdaya* of Kṣemarāja, ed. Jagadisha Chandra Chatterji. KSTS 3. Srinagar, 1911.
- Prabandhacintāmaṇi* of Merutuṅgācārya, ed. Rāmacandra Śāstrī, Bombay: Śāntisāgarasūri, 1888.
- Prabhāvākacārīta* of Candraprabhasūri, ed. Hīrānanda M. Sharmā. Bombay: Tukārām Jāvajī, 1909.
- Prasannapadā* of Candrakīrti: *Mūlamadhyamakakārikās (Mādhyamikasūtras) de Nāgārjuna avec la Prasannapadā commentaire de Candrakīrti*, ed. Louis de la Vallée Poussin. Bibliotheca Buddhica 4. St.-Petersburg: Académie imperiale des sciences, 1913.
- Prākṛtaprakāśa* of Vararuci with the commentary (-manoramā) of Bhāmaha, ed. E.B. Cowell. Calcutta: Punthi Pustak, 1962. 3rd edition. First published in 1853.
- Prāyaścittasamuccaya* of Hṛdayaśiva. ULC MS Add. 2833: palm-leaf; Newari script; A.D. 1157/8.
- Prāyaścittasamuccaya* of Trilocanaśiva. IFP MS Transcript 284, pp. 127–174.
- Phetkāriṇītantra*, ed. Gopinatha Kaviraja, In *Tantrasaṅgraha*, Part 2, pp. 161–306. Yogatantragranthamālā 4. Varanasi: Vārāṇaseyasamskṛtavīśvavidyālaya, 1970.
- Buddhakapālatantra*. ULC MS Or. 158: palm-leaf; Kuṭila script; fragmentary; A.D. 1162. In the upper left corner of 1r: *om vajrāmṛtatantra || vajrāralitantra || buddhakapālatantra*. Contains parts of the *Buddhakapālatantra* and *Vajrāmṛtatantra*.
- Bṛhatkālottara*. A = NAK MS 1-89, NGMPP B24/59: palm-leaf; Newari script; undated; B = NAK MS 4-131, NGMPP A43/1: palm-leaf; Pāla script; A.D. 1169.
- Bṛhatsaṃhitā* of Varāhamihira, ed. Ed. Avadhavīhārī Tripāṭhī. 2 Parts. Sarasvatī Bhavan Granthamālā 97. Varanasi, 1968.
- Bṛhannīlatantra*, ed. Madhusūdan Kaul. Varajivan Prachya Bharati Granthamala 77. Varanasi: Chaukhamba Sanskrit Pratisthan, 1995.
- Bṛhaspatismṛti* (reconstructed), ed. K.V. Rangaswami Aiyangar. GOS 35. Baroda: Oriental Institute, 1941.
- Brahmayāmala* IFP. IFP MS Transcript 522 (*Brahmayāmālākhyam mātṛpratiṣṭhātantram*). Incomplete: contains Paṭalas 1–51.1–29b.
- Brahmayāmala* Triv. Trivandrum University Library, MS 1982 (*Brahma-*

- yāmalapratīṣṭhātantram*): Devanāgarī transcript; incomplete, contains Adhyāyas 1–5.71b.
- \**Bhagavatyaṁnāyanūsāriṇī*. 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 *Cakrasaṃvarapañjikā*.
- Bhavyakīrti. See *'Khor lo sdom pa'i dka' 'grel dpa' bo'i yid du 'ong bzhes bya ba* under Tibetan Texts.
- Bhrṅgīśasamhitā*, ed. Anantarāma Śāstrī. Delhi: Nag Publishers, 1986.
- Bhaiṣajyavastu* of the *Mūlasarvāstivādavinaya*. *Gilgit Manuscripts*, vol. 3, part 1.
- Mañjuśrīyamūlakalpa*: *Āryamañjuśrīmūlakalpa*, ed. P.L. Vaidya. Buddhist Sanskrit Texts 18. Darbhanga: Mithila Institute, 1964. Essentially a reprint of the *editio princeps* of T. Ganapati Śāstrī, 1920, 1922, 1925 (Trivandrum Sanskrit Series 70, 76 and 84).
- Mañjuśrīnāmasaṃgīti*. See DAVIDSON 1981.
- Maṇḍalopāyikā* of Padmaśrīmitra. TUL MS 280 (New), 499 (Old): palm-leaf; Newari script; undated.
- Mataṅgapārameśvarāgama (Vidyāpāda) avec le commentaire de Bhaṭṭa Rāmakaṇṭha*, ed. N. R. Bhatt. PIFI 56. Pondicherry: IFI, 1977; *Mataṅgapārameśvarāgama (Kriyāpāda, Yogapāda et Caryāpāda) avec le commentaire de Bhaṭṭa Rāmakaṇṭha*, ed. N. R. Bhatt. PIFI 65. Pondicherry: IFI, 1982.
- Matasāra*. NAK MS 3-379, NGMPP B28/16 (*Śrīvidyāpīṭhamatasāra*): palm-leaf; Pāla script; no date
- Manusmṛti* with the commentary (*Manubhāṣya*) of Medhātithi, ed. Gangānātha Jhā. Bibliotheca Indica 256. 3 Vols. Allahabad: ASB, 1932–1939.
- Manusmṛti* with the commentary (*Manvarthamuktāvalī*) of Kullūkabhaṭṭa, ed. J.L. Shastri. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1983.
- 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.
- Mayasaṃgraha*. NAK MS 1-1537, NGMPP A31/18: palm-leaf; Newari script; incomplete.
- Mahānayaprakāśa* of Śitikaṇṭha (Old Kashmiri) with a Sanskrit commentary, ed. Mukunda Rām Śāstrī. KSTS 21. Bombay, 1918.
- 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-

markar, P. L. Vaidya, S. Winternitz, R. Zimmerman, and other scholars and illustrated by Shrimant Balasaheb Pant Pratinidhi. (Since 1943 ed. S. Belvalkar). 19 volumes. Poona: BORI, 1927–1959.

*Mahāmaṇivipulavimānasupratīṣṭhitaguhyaparamarahasyakalpadhāraṇī.*

*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 gshal 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* under Tibetan Texts.

*Mahāmāyāṭīkā: Mahāmāyātantra* with the commentary (-ṭīkā) *Guṇavatī* of Ratnākaraśānti, ed. Samdhong Rinpoche and Vajravallabh Dwivedi. Rare Buddhist Text Series 10. Sarnath: Central Institute of Higher Tibetan Studies, 1992.

*Mahāmudrātilaka*. Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin - Preussischer Kulturbesitz, Hs or 8711 (uncatalogued): paper; Newari script; A.D. 1823/4.

*Mahāvairocanābhisambodhitāntra*. See *rNam par snang mdzad chen po mngon par byang chub pa'i rgyud* under Tibetan Texts.

*Mādhavakula*. = *Jayadrathayāmala*, *Ṣaṭka* 4, ff. 117v5–135v2.

*Mālinīvijayavārtika*. HANNEDER 1998.

*Mālinīvijayottara*, ed. Madhusūdana Kaula Śāstrī. KSTS 37. Srinagar, 1922.

*Muktāvalī* of Ratnākaraśānti, a commentary (*pañjikā*) on the *Hevajra*, ed. Ram Shankar Tripathi and Thakur Sain Negi. Bibliotheca Indo-Tibetica Series 48. Sarnath, Varanasi: Central Institute of Higher Buddhist Studies. Cod.: NAK MS 5-98, NGMPP A135/12: paper; Devanāgarī.

*Mūlasarvāstivādinaya*. *Gilgit Manuscripts*, vol. 3, 3 parts.

*Mṛgendra: Mṛgendrāgama (Kriyāpāda et Caryāpāda) avec le commentaire de Bhaṭṭa-Nārāyaṇakaṇṭha*, ed. N.R. Bhatt. Publications de l'IFI 23. Pondicherry: IFI, 1962.

*Mṛgendrapaddhativyākhyā* of Vaktraśambhu. IFP MS Transcript 1021.

*Mṛtasugatiniyojana* 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.

*Mokṣakārikā* of Sadyojyotis with the commentary (-vṛtti) of Bhaṭṭa Rāmakaṇṭha. In *Aṣṭaparakaraṇam*, ed. Vrajavallabha Dwivedi. Yogatantragranthamālā 12. Varanasi: Sampurnananda Sanskrit University, 1988.

*Meghadūta* of Kālidāsa, ed. M.R. Kale. 7th edition. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1969.

*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). *Yājñavalkyasmṛti* with the commentary (-*nibandha*) of the Śīlāhāra king Aparāditya of Koṅkaṇa, ed. Hari Nārāyaṇa Āpte. Ānandaśramasaṃskṛta-granthāvaliḥ 46. Poona: Ānandāśrama, 1903.
- Yājñavalkyasmṛti* with the commentary (*Mitākṣarā*) of Vijñāneśvara, ed. Wāsudev Laxmaṇ Śāstrī Paṇśīkar. Bombay: Pāṇḍurang Jāwajī, 1926.
- \**Yoganiruttaratantrārthāvatārasaṃgraha* of Śraddhākaravarman. See *rNal 'byor bla na med pa'i rgyud kyi don la 'jugs pa bsdus pa* under Tibetan Texts.
- Yogaratanmālā*. Kāṇha's commentary on the *Hevajra*. SNELLGROVE 1959.
- Yoginījāla*. NAK MS 3-667, NGMPP A141/5 (*Yoginījālamahātantrarāja*): paper; Nepalese Devanāgarī.
- Yoginīsaṃcāra* with the commentaries of Tathāgatarakṣita and Alakakalaśa, ed. Janardan Shastri Pandey. Rare Buddhist Text Series 21. Sarnath, Varanasi: Central Institute of Higher Buddhist Studies.
- Yoginīsaṃcāra*: the Śaiva *Yoginīsaṃcāraprakaraṇa* incorporated in the third *Ṣaṭka* of the *Jayadrathayāmala*.
- Ratnāvalī*: *Nāgārjuna's Ratnāvalī*. Vol. 1: *The Basic Texts (Sanskrit, Tibetan, Chinese)*, ed. Michael Hahn, Bonn: Indica et Tibetica Verlag, 1982.
- Rājataranṅinī* of Kalhaṇa, ed. M.A. Stein. Reprint. Delhi: Munshi Ram Manohar Lal, 1960. First published in 1892.
- Rājānakavaṃśaprasaṃsā*. BLO MS Stein Or. e. 17: paper; Śāradā script; A.D. 1894.
- Rāmācarita* of Saṃdhyākarānandin, ed. Hara Prasad Shastri. Memoirs of the ASB 3,1. Calcutta: ASB, 1910.
- Rauravasūtrasaṃgraha*. Published in volume 1 of *Rauravāgama*.
- Rauravāgama*, ed. N. R. Bhatt. 3 Vols. Publications de l'IFI 18.1–3. Pondicherry: IFI, 1961, 1972, 1988.
- Laghutantraṭīkā* of Vajrapāṇi, ed. Claudio Cicuzza. Rome: Istituto Italiano per l'Africa e l'Oriente, 2001.
- Laghuśaṃvaratantra*, also known as *Cakrasaṃvaratantra*, *Laghvabhīdhānatantra*, and *Herukābhīdhānatantra*. Baroda, Maharaja Sayajirao University, Oriental Institute, MS Acc. 13290 (*Herukavidhānatantra*): palm-leaf; Kuṭīla script; incomplete; undated. Also accessible are two paper manuscripts; but these are merely apographs of this, reproducing its lacunae. For commentaries see under *Cakrasaṃvaraṭīkā*, *Cakrasaṃvarapañjikā*, *Cakrasaṃvaravṛtti*, and *Laghutantraṭīkā*.
- Lokaprakāśa*, attributed to Kṣemendra, ed. Jagaddhar Zadoo Shastri. KSTS 75. Srinagar, 1947.
- Vajrajvālodayā nāma śrīherukasādhanopayikā* 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 Sāṅkrtyāyana 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.
- Vajravārāhikalpa*. NAK MS 3-235, NGMPP E138/10: paper; Nepalese Devanāgarī; A.D. 1894.
- Vajrāmṛttatantra*. 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: *oṃ vajrāmṛttatantra* || \**vajrāralitantra* (*vajrārali* corr. : *vajrāraṇi* Cod.) || *buddhakapālatantra*. As it survives the codex contains only parts of the *Vajrāmṛttatantra* and the *Buddhakapālatantra*.
- Vajrārali*. See *rDo rje ā ra li* under Tibetan Texts.
- Vajrāvalī* A: *Vajrāvalī nāma maṇḍalopāyikā* of Mahāpaṇḍita Abhayākaragupta. NAK MS 5-841, NGMPP B31/14: palm-leaf; Māgadhā script; pre-1200; some replacement folios in Newari script and Devanāgarī.
- Vajrāvalī* B: *Vajrāvalī: a Sanskrit Manuscript from Nepal Containing the Ritual and Delineation of Maṇḍalas*, reproduced by Lokesh Chandra. Śata-piṭaka 239. New Delhi: Sharada Rani, 1977.
- Vanaratnastotrasaptaka* of Āditya. HAHN 1996.
- \**Vāpyādipratiṣṭhā*. Folios 893r14–908r9 and 929v7–931v23 of an untitled and undated paper manuscript in the Śāradā script containing the Paddhatis for various mostly non-Śaiva ritual procedures, predominantly Śāntis, Vratas, Pratiṣṭhās, and Dānas. SORL MS 2B15, folios numbered from 785 to 1089.
- Vāmakeśvarīmatavivaraṇa: Vāmakeśvarīmata* with the commentary (*-vivaraṇa*) of Jayaratha, ed. Madhusudan Kaul. KSTS 66. Srinagar, 1945.
- Vāsavadattā*, ed. Fitzedward Hall. Calcutta: Baptist Mission Press, 1859.
- Vāsudevakalpa* of the *Mahālakṣmīsamhitā*. KLK MS 420, NGMPP C44/6: palm-leaf; Newari script; A.D. 1254/5. Final colophon: *iti pañcarātre mahālakṣmīsamhitāyāṃ vāsudevakalpaṃ samāptam*. Draft edition prepared by Dr. Diwakar Acharya.
- Vimalaprabhā: Vimalaprabhāṭikā of Kalkin Śrīpūṇḍarīka on Śrīkālacakratantrarāja* by Śrīmañjuśrīyaśas, ed. Vrajavallabh Dwivedi and S.S. Bahulkar. Rare Buddhist Text Series 13. Sarnath: Central Institute of Higher Tibetan Studies, 1994.
- Viṣṇudharmottara*, ed. Kṣemarāja Kṛṣṇadāsa. Delhi: Nag Publishers, 1985. Reprint of 1912 edition (Bombay: Venkatesvara Steam Press).

- Viṣvaksenasamhitā*, ed. Lakshmi Narasimha Bhatta. Kendriya Sanskrita Vidyapeetha Series 17. Tirupati, 1972.
- Vīṇāśikhatantra*. GOUDRIAAN 1985.
- Vīravajra. See *Yon tan ma lus pa'i gnas zhes bya ba'i 'grel pa* under Tibetan Texts.
- Vīrāgama*. IFP MS Transcript 30.
- Vṛddhasvacchanda: Vṛddhasvacchandasaṃgrahatantram*, ed. Prakash Pandey. Ganganath Jha Kendriya Sanskrit Vidyapitha Text Series 50. Allahabad: Ganganath Jha Kendriya Sanskrit Vidyapitha, [2001?].
- Vṛddhasvacchanda*. SORL MS 1514: paper; Śāradā script. This is the manuscript used by Pandey for his edition of the text.
- Śāktapramoda*, compiled by Rāja Devanandan Singh. Reprint. Bombay: Khe-marāja Śrīkrṣṇadāsa, 1995. First published in 1890.
- Śāṅkhāyanagr̥hyasūtra*, ed. S.R. Seghal. Sri Garib Dass Oriental Series 42. 2nd revised edition. Delhi: Sri Satguru Publications, 1987.
- Śāradātilaka* of Lakṣmaṇadeśika with the commentary (*Padārthādarśa*) of Rāghavabhaṭṭa, ed. Arthur Avalon. Tantrik Text Series 17. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1982. First published in 1933 (Calcutta: Sanskrit Press).
- Śāsvatavajra. See *De kho na nyid mkhas pa* under Tibetan Texts
- Śivapūjāstavavyākhyā*, an anonymous commentary on the *Śivapūjāstava* of Jñānaśambhu, ed. K.M. Subrahmanyaśāstrī. Śivāgamasan̄ghaparakāśita-gran̄thasāṅkhyā 19. Devakōṭṭai: Śivāgamasan̄gha, 1935.
- Śaivaparibhāṣā* of Śivāgrayogīndra-Jñānaśivācārya, ed. H.R. Rangasway Iyengar and R. Ramasastri. Oriental Research Institute Series 90. Mysore: Mysore Oriental Research Institute, 1950.
- Śaivāgamaparibhāṣāmañjarī* of Vedajñānaguru II. DAGENS 1979.
- Sam̄puṭodbhava*. ASB, MS G 4854: palm-leaf; Māgadha script; perhaps 12th century.
- Sam̄varodaya*. TSUDA 1974.
- Sam̄varodayā: Sam̄varodayā nāma maṇḍalopāyikā* of Bhūvācārya of Ratnagiri. TUL MS 450 (New), 296 (Old): palm-leaf; Newari script; A.D. 1056.
- Saduktikarṇāmṛta*, compiled by Śrīdharadāsa, ed. Sures Chandra Banerji. Calcutta: Firma K. L. Mukhopadhyay, 1965.
- Saddharmapūṇḍarikasūtra*, ed. P.L. Vaidya. Buddhist Sanskrit Texts 6. Darbhanga: The Mithila Institute, 1960.
- Saptaśatika-Kālottara*. See *Kālottaratantra*.
- Sarvajñānottara*. A = NAK MS 1–1692, NGMPP A43/12: palm-leaf; Licchavi script; incomplete; B = IFP MS Transcript 334.
- Sarvatathāgatattvasaṃgraha*. HORIUCHI 1997 and 1983.

- Sarvadurgatipariśodhanatantra*. SKORUPSKI 1983.
- Sarvabuddhasamāyoga/Sarvabuddhasamāyogaḍākinījālaśaṃvara*. See *Sangskyas 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.
- Sarvavajrodaya* of Ānandagarbha: Vajradhātumahāmaṇḍalopāyikā-sarvavajrodaya, ed. Mikkyō Seiten Kenkyūkai. *Taishō daigaku sōgō-bukkyō-kenkyūjo kiyō* 8, 1986.
- Sarvollāsatantra* of Sarvānandanātha, ed. Rāsamohana Cakravartin with an introduction by Dinesh Chandra Bhattacharya. Calcutta: Herambacandra Bhaṭṭācārya, 1953.
- Sātvatasamhitā* with the commentary of Alaśiṅga Bhaṭṭa, ed. Vraja Vallabha Dwivedi. Library Rare Texts Publication Series 6. Varanasi: Sampurnanand Sanskrit Vishvavidyalaya, 1982.
- Sāadhananidhi* of Kambalapāda, a commentary (*pañjikā*) on the *Herukābhidhāna* (*Cakrasaṃvaratantra*). NAK MS 4-122, NGMPP B31/20: palm-leaf; Newari script; undated.
- Sāadhanamālā*, ed. Benoytosh Bhattacharya. GOS 41. 2 vols. Baroda: Oriental Institute, 1968.
- Sāmbapañcāśikā* with the commentary of Kṣemarāja, ed. Durgāprasād and Kāśīnāth Pāṇḍurang Parab. *Kāvya-mālā* 13. Bombay: Nirṇayasāgara Press, 1889.
- Sārdhatrisatikālottara* with the commentaty of Bhaṭṭa Rāmakaṇṭha, ed. N. R. Bhatt. Publications de l'IFI 61. Pondicherry: IFP, 1979.
- Siddhayogeśvarīmata*. See TÖRZSÖK 1999.
- Siddhāntapaddhati* of Jñānaśiva. IFP MS Transcript 507, pp. 374–394.
- Siddhāntaśekhara* of Viśvanātha, ed. K. Sītārāma Somayājīn and Śiva Śrī Talakāḍu Āgamika Kṛṣṇadīkṣita. Manonmanīgranthamālā 20. Mysore: K. Sītārāma Somayājīn, 1971.
- Siddhāntasamuccaya* of Trilocanaśiva. IFP MS Transcript 206, pp. 56–111.
- Siddhāntasārapaddhati* 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.
- Siddhāntasārāvalīvyākhyā* of Anantaśambhu. Published in five parts in the *Bulletin of the Government Oriental Manuscripts Library Madras*: Vol. 17.1, pp. 29–68 (ed. A. A. Ramanathan and T. H. Viswanathan); Vols. 17.2, pp. 1–48; 18.1, pp. 1–64 and 19.1, pp. 53–84 (ed. R. K. Parthasarathi and T. H. Viswanathan); Vol. 19.2 pp. 1–48 and Vol. 20.2, pp. 49–71 (ed. T. H. Viswanathan, P. G. Seetharaman and R. Ganesan). Madras, 1965–1968.

- Subhāṣitaratnaśoṣa* compiled by Vidyākara, ed. D.D. Kosambi and V.V. Gokhale. Harvard Oriental Series 42. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1957.
- Subhāṣitasamgraha*: Subhāṣita-Samgraha. 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).
- Sūksmāgama*. IFP MS Transcript 1003.
- Sekanirdeśapañjikā* 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.
- Somaśambhupaddhati* (the *Kriyākāṇḍakramāvalī* of Somaśambhu). BRUNNER 1963, 1968, 1977, 1998.
- Somaśambhupaddhativyākhyā* of Trilocanaśiva. IFP MS Transcripts 457 and 170.
- Saurasamhitā*. Unpublished edition prepared by Dr. Diwakar Acharya.
- Skandapurāṇa-Ambikākhaṇḍa*. NAK MS 2–229, NGMPP B11/4: palm-leaf; Lic-chavi script; A.D. 810.
- Skandapurāṇa-Ambikākhaṇḍa: Skandapurāṇasya Ambikākhaṇḍaḥ*, ed. Kṛṣṇaprasāda Bhaṭṭarāi. Mahendraratnagranthamālā 2. Kathmandu, 1988.
- Skandapurāṇa-Ambikākhaṇḍa*. Adhyāyas 1–25. ADRIAENSEN, BAKKER, and ISAACSON 1998.
- Sthitisamāsa* of Sahajavajra. NAK MS 5-139, NGMPP B24/4 (*‘Kōśakārikā’*): palm-leaf; 14 folios; incomplete, lacking folios 3, 9, 13, 15, and 19; Newari script; perhaps 13th century. Mantranaya section: ff. 11r3–18v5.
- Svacchandatantra* with the commentary (*Svacchandoddyota*) of Rājānaka Kṣemarāja, ed. Madhusūdan Kaul Śāstrī. KSTS 31, 38, 44, 48, 51, 53, 56. Bombay, 1921-35.
- Svacchandalalitabhairavatantra*. NAK MS 1–224, NGMPP B28/18: palm-leaf; Newari script; A.D. 1067/8.
- . IFP MS Transcript 507, pp. 1–356.
- Svāyambhuva*. IFP MS Transcript 133.
- Svāyambhuvapañcarātra*. NAK MS 1-1648 (*‘Pañcarātra[prakīrṇa]’*), NGMPP A54/9: palm-leaf; Newari script; A.D. 1027. Paṭala colophons: *iti pañcarātre mahājñāne . . . , iti pañcarātre*, and *iti pañcarātre svayambhuve . . .*. Unpublished transcript prepared by Dr. Diwakar Acharya.
- Svāyambhuvasūtrasamgraha: śrīśaivāgame svāyambhuvasūtrasaṅgrahaḥ (sva-*



- yambhuvā maharṣibhya uddiṣṭaḥ*), ed. Venkaṭasubrahmaṇyaśāstrī, Mysore, 1937.
- Svāyambhuvasūtrasaṃgraha*. IFP MS Transcript 39. An inflated south-Indian redaction.
- Haracaritacintāmaṇi* of Rājānaka Jayadratha, ed. Paṇḍita Śivadatta and Kāśīnāth Pāṇḍurang Parab. Kāvyaṃālā 61. Bombay, 1897.
- Haracaritacintāmaṇi* of Rājānaka Jayadratha. A = SORL MS 1547: paper: Śāradā script and Devānāgarī; B = SORL MS 1510: paper: Śāradā; C = SORL MS 599: paper: Kashmirian Devanāgarī.
- Hitopadeśa* of Nārāyaṇa, ed. M.R. Kale. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1985. Reprint of 6th edition.
- Herukasādhana* of Kalyāṇagarbha. *Sādhanamālā*, no. 242.
- Herukasādhana* of Hūṃkāravajra. See *He ru ka'i grub pa'i thabs* under Tibetan Texts.
- Herukābhyudaya*. See *Khrag 'thung mngon par 'byung ba* under Tibetan Texts.
- Herukābhyudayapañjikā (Katipayākṣarā)* of Kumāracandra, ed. in *Dhīḥ* 27, pp. 148–170.
- Herukābhyudayapañjikā (Katipayākṣarā)* of Kumāracandra. KLK MS 229, NGMPP C26/2 (*'Herukābhyudayamahāyoginītantra'*): palm-leaf; proto-Bengali script.
- Hevajratantra*. SNELGROVE 1959.
- Hevajratantrapīṇḍārthaṭīkā* of Vajragarbha. KLK MS 128, NGMPP C14/6: palm-leaf; Māgadha script; copied in Vikramaśīlamahāvihāra, therefore before c. 1200.

## JAVANESE TEXTS

- Arjunawijaya* of Mpu Tantular. Old Javanese. SUPOMO 1977.
- Kuñjarakarṇa* of Mpu Ḍusun. Old Javanese. TEEUW and ROBSON 1981.
- Gaṇapatitattwa*. Sanskrit with an Old Javanese commentary. SINGHAL 1958.
- Jñānasiddhānta*. Sanskrit with an Old Javanese commentary. SOEBADIO 1971.
- Deśawarṇana*. = *Nāgarakṛtāgama*.
- Nāgarakṛtāgama* of Mpu Prapañca. Old Javanese. PIGEAUD 1960–1963.
- Mahājñāna*. Sanskrit with an Old Javanese commentary. SINGHAL 1962.
- Wṛhaspatitattwa*. Sanskrit with an Old Javanese commentary. SINGHAL 1957.
- Sutasoma* of Mpu Tantular. Old Javanese. SANTOSO 1975.

TIBETAN TEXTS

- Khrag 'thung mngon par 'byung ba*. DK, Rgyud 'bum, vol. *ga*, ff. 1v–33v. Translation by Advayavajra and Chings yon tan 'bar of the *Herukābhyudayamahā-yoginītantra*.
- 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 Śā kya ye śes ('Broq mi) of the *Ḍākinīvajrapañjaratantra*.
- '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 Dharmasrībhadrā and Rin chen bzang po of Bhavyakīrti's commentary (\**Vīramānoramā*) on the *Laghuśaṃvaratantra*.
- 'Khor lo sdom pa'i rgyud kyi rgyal po bde mchog bsdu pa zhes bya ba'i rnam par bshad*. DT, Rgyud 'grel, vol. *tsa*, ff. 1v–119v. Translation of Indrabhūti's commentary (\**Śaṃvarasamuccayaḥ*) on the *Laghuśaṃvaratantra*. Translators not recorded.
- 'Khor lo sdom pa'i sgrub thabs gnas thams cad rgya cher 'grel*. DT, Rgyud 'grel, vol. *ma*, ff. 69r–156v. Translation of Devagupta's commentary on the *Laghuśaṃvaratantra*. Translators not recorded.
- Grub thob brgyad bcu rtsa bzhi'i lo rgyus*. Peking Tenjur, Rgyud 'grel, vol. *lu*, 1v–68r (A); *Grub thob brgyad bcu rtsa bzhi'i chos 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 rṇa (B : *tsam pa ra A* [Champaran in N-W Bihar]) named Mi 'jigs sbyin pa dpal (Abhayadattaśrī) and then rendered into Tibetan.
- rGya gar chos 'byung* of Tāranātha:, ed. Anton Schiefner [*Tāranāthae de Doctrinae Buddhicae in India Propagatione Narratio. Contextum tibeticum e codicibus petropolitanis edidit Antonius Schiefner*]. St. Petersburg: Academia Scientiarum Petropolitana, 1868.
- rGyud spyi*. LESSING and WAYMAN 1980.
- mNgon brjod rgyud bla ma*. DK, Rgyud 'bum, vol. *ka*, ff. 247r–370r. Translation by Dīpaṅkaraśrījñāna and Rin chen bzang po of the *Abhidhānottaratantra*, revised first by Jñānaśrī and Khyung po chos kyi brtson 'grus and later by Ānanda and Lo chung.
- 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 Alaṅkakadeva and Tshul khriṃs 'byung gnas sbas (early 12th century) of the \**Bhagavatyāmnāyānusāriṇī nāma vyākhyā*, a commentary on the *Aṣṭasāhasrikā*

- 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*).
- Tha ma'i mchod pa'i cho ga* (\**Anteṣṭividhi*). DT, Rgyud 'grel, vol. *phi*, ff. 35r–38r. Translation by Phyogs dbang dga' byed and Prajñākīrti of the *Mṛtasugatinijojana* of Śūnyasamādhivajra.
- De kho na nyid mkhas pa*. DT, Rgyud 'grel, vol. *ma* ff. 253r–352r. Translation by Rin chen grub of the \**Tattvaśāradā*, Śāśvatavajra's commentary (*-vṛtti*) on the *Laghuśaṃvara*. The Skt. title given at the beginning of the translation is *śrītattvaśāradā nāma śrīsamvaravṛtti*.
- 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 Dīpaṅkaraśrījñāna and Rin chen bzang po, revised by Kumārakalaśa and Śākya 'od, of the *Tattvasiddhi* (*Tattvasiddhināma prakaraṇam*) of Śāntaraksita.
- bDe mchog nyung ngu*. DK, Rgyud 'bum, vol. *ka*, ff. 213r–246v. Translation by Padmākara and Rin chen bzang po, revised by Prajñākīrti and Mar pa Chos kyi grags pa, of the *Laghuśaṃvaratantra*.
- rDo rje ā ra li: rDo rje ā 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 *Vajrāralimahātantrarāja*.
- rDo rje mkha' 'gro: rgyud kyi rgyal po chen po dpal rdo rje mkha' 'gro*. DK, Rgyud 'bum, vol. *kha*, ff. 1r–125r. Translation by Gayadhara and 'Gos lhas btsas of the *Vajradākamahātantrarāja*.
- rDo rje snying po rgyan gyi rgyud*. DK, Rgyud 'bum, vol. *cha*, ff. 36r–58v. Translation by Kamalagupta and Lha ye shes rgyal mtshn of the *Vajrahṛdayālamkārantra*.
- 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 Sujanaśrījñāna and Zhi ba 'od of the *Vajramālāmahāyogatantra*.
- 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-vipulavimānasupratīṣṭhitaguhyaparamarahasyakalpadhāraṇī*.
- 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 gyis rlob pa shin tu rgyas pa mdo sde'i dbang po'i rgyal po zhes bya ba'i chos kyi rnam grangs*. DK, Rgyud 'bum, vol. *tha*, ff. 151v–260r. Translation

- by Śilendrabodhi and Dpal brtsegs of the *Mahāvairocanābhisambodhitāntra* (\**Mahāvairocanābhisambodhivikurvītādhiṣṭhānavaipulyasūtrendrarājanāmadharmaparyāya*).
- 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 *Mahāvairocanābhisambodhitāntra*.
- 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 \**Yoganiruttaratāntrārthāvatārasaṃgraha*.
- rNal 'byor ma bzhi'i kha sbyor rgyud*. DK, Rgyud 'bum, vol. *kha*, ff. 44v–52v. Translation by Chings yon tan of the *Caturyoginīsaṃpuṭatantra*.
- Byang chub lam gyi sgron ma'i dka' 'grel* of Dīpaṅkaraśrījñāna. 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 \**Nayatrāyapradīpa* of Tripiṭakamāla (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*.
- Ri gi ā ra li'i rgyud*. DK, Rgyud 'bum, vol. *nga* ff. 176r–180v. Translation by Gayadhara and Shā kya ye shes of the *Rigi-āralitantra*.
- 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*.
- Zhib mo rdo rje*. STEARNS 2001.
- 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 *Sarvabuddhasamāyoga* (*Sarvabuddhasamāyogaḍākinījālaśaṃvaranāmottaratantra*). 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 Vidyākaraśiṃha and Lha rin po che of the *Herukasādhana* of Hum mdzad rdo rje (Hūṃkāravajra).

**SOUTH AND SOUTHEAST ASIAN INSCRIPTIONS**

- ACHARYA, Diwakar. 1977 (Vikramasamvat 2054). Madhyakālmā nepāl āekā yogī śaṅkarācārya hoīnan. *Ṛtambharā* 2,2, pp. 76–96. Cited here for its critical edition of the stone inscription of Ānandadeva, A.D. 1143/4.
- Annual Reports on Epigraphy* (1887–1981). 1986. New Delhi: The Director General, ASI. Reprint.
- BERGAIGNE, Abel. 1893. *Inscriptions sanscrites de Campā et Cambodge*. Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres. Notices et extraits des manuscrits de la Bibliothèque Nationale et autres bibliothèques, vol. 27, no. 2, pp. 181–632. Paris: Imprimerie Nationale.
- BURGESS, J. 1877. Rock-cut Temples at Bādāmī. *IA* 6, pp. 354–366. See FLEET 1881.
- CHOUDHARY, Radha Krishna. 1958. *Select Inscriptions of Bihar*. Madhipura, Bihar: Smt. Shanti Devi.
- CÆDÈS, George. 1937–1966. *Inscriptions du Cambodge*. 8 vols. Paris: EFEO. 1937 (vol. 1), 1942 (vol. 2), 1951 (vol. 3), 1952 (vol. 4), 1953 (vol. 5), 1954 (vol. 6), 1964 (vol. 7), 1966 (vol. 8).
- ḌHAKĀL, Veṇīmādhav. 1990. Paśupatiprāmgaṇābhilekh (sam. 381) ko pariṣkā. *Prācīn Nepāl / Ancient Nepal* 119, August-September 1990, Nepali section, pp. 1–6.
- Epigraphia Carnatica*. 1885–1965. Mysore Archaeological Department, Madras/Bangalore/Mysore.
- Epigraphia Indica*. Archaeological Survey of India. Calcutta/Delhi, 1892–.
- FINOT, L. 1904a. Notes d'épigraphie VII: inscriptions du Quang Nam, *BEFEO* 4, pp. 83–115.
- . 1904b. Notes d'épigraphie XI: Les inscriptions de Mi-son. *BEFEO* 4, pp. 897–977.
- . 1925. Inscriptions d'Angkor. *BEFEO* 25, pp. 297–407.
- FLEET, J.F. 1881. Sanskrit and Old-Canarese Inscriptions. *IA* 10, pp. 57–67. This contains a lithograph of the Sanskrit inscription of the Cālukya king Maṅgalīśvara to accompany his edition published in BURGESS 1877.
- . 1888. *Inscriptions of the Early Gupta Kings and Their Successors*. Corpus Inscriptionum Indicarum, vol. 3. Calcutta: Superintendent of the Government Printing.
- HUBER, Edouard. 1911. Études indochinoises. *BEFEO* 11, pp. 259–311. Cham inscriptions.
- HULTZSCH, E. 1885. The Sārṇāth Inscription of Mahīpāla. *IA* 14, pp. 139–140.
- . 1886. The Bhāgalpur Plate of Nārāyaṇapāla. *IA* 15, pp. 304–310.

- JOHNSTON, E.H. Some Sanskrit Inscriptions of Arakan. *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 11, pp. 357–385.
- KERN, Hendrik. 1885 & 1913. De steen van den berg Pënanngungan (Surabaya), thans in 't Indian Museum te Calcutta. Met Sanskrit-inscriptie en Oudjavaansche inscriptie van 963 Çāka; ter eere van Vorst Er-langga. In KERN 1917, pp. 83–128.
- . 1910. De Sanskrit-inscriptie van het Mahākṣobhyabeeld te Simpang (stad Surabaya; 1211 Çāka). In KERN 1917, pp. 187–197.
- . 1917. *Inscripties van den Indischen Archipel*. Vol. 7 of H. Kern, *Verspreide Geschriften* (15 volumes, The Hague: M. Nijhoff, 1913–28), pp. 1–226.
- KIELHORN, F. 1892. The Mungir Copper-plate Grant of Devapāladeva. *IA* 21, pp. 253–258.
- LASKAR, Ganga Mohan. 1907. Ashrafpur Copper-Plate Grants of Devakhadga. *Memoirs of the ASB* 1, pp. 85–91.
- MAHALINGAM, T.V. 1988. *Inscriptions of the Pallavas*. New Delhi/Delhi: Indian Council of Historical Research/Agam Prakashan.
- MAJUMDAR, Nani Gopal. 2003. *Inscriptions of Bengal, Containing Inscriptions of the Candras, the Varmans and the Senas, and of Īśvaraghoṣa and Dāmodara*. New edition. Calcutta: Sanskrit Pustak Bhandar. First published in 1929 (Rajshahi: Varendra Research Society).
- MATHES, Klaus-Dieter. 2008. The “Succession of the Four Seals” (*Caturmudrānvaya*) Together with Selected Passages from Karopa’s Commentary. *Tantric Studies* 1, pp. 89–130.
- MIRASHI, Vasudev Vishnu. 1955. *Inscriptions of the Kalachuri-Chedi Era*. Corpus Inscriptionum Indicarum, vol. 4. 2 Parts. Ootacamund: Government Epigraphist for India.
- . 1962. Gwalior Museum Stone Inscription of Pataṅgaśambhu. *Journal of the Madhya Pradesh Itihasa Parishad* 64, pp. 3–13.
- . 1963. *Inscriptions of the Vākāṭakas*. Corpus Inscriptionum Indicarum, vol. 5. Ootacamund: Government Epigraphist for India.
- MISRA, Vinayak. 1934. *Orissa under the Bhauma kings*. Calcutta: Vishwamitra Press. An edition and translation of the Bhauma-Kara inscriptions.
- MUKHERJI, Ramaranjan and Sachindra Kumar MAITY. 1967. *Corpus of Bengal Inscriptions Bearing on History and Civilization of Bengal*. Calcutta: Firma K.L. Mukhopadhyay.
- PANTULU, J. Ramayya. 1930. Malkāpuram Stone-pillar Inscription of Kākatiya Rudradeva (Rudrāmbā). *Journal of the Andhra Historical Research Society* 4, pp. 147–162.
- RAJAGURU, Satyanarayan. 1962. Jayarampur Copper-Plate Inscription of the

- Time of Gopachandra. *Orissa Historical Research Journal* 11, pp. 206–233.
- RAMESH, K.V. and S.P. TEWARI. 1990. *A Copper-plate Hoard of the Gupta Period from Bagh, Madhya Pradesh*. New Delhi: Archaeological Survey of India.
- SANKARANARAYANAN, S. 1977. *The Viṣṇukunḍis and Their Times. An Epigraphical Study*. Delhi: Agam Prakashan.
- SHASTRI, H. Prasad. 1916. Seven Copper-plate Records of Land Grants from Dhenkanal. *Journal of the Bihar and Orissa Research Society* 2, pp. 395–427.
- . 1920. Two Copper-plates from the State of Bonai. *Journal of the Bihar and Orissa Research Society* 6, pp. 265–245.
- SIRCAR, D.C. 1979. *Some Epigraphical Records of the Medieval Period from Eastern India*. New Delhi: Abhinav Publications.
- . 1983a. *Select Inscriptions Bearing on Indian History and Civilization*. Volume II. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.
- . 1983b. Mūrtiśiva's Bāṅgarh Praśasti of the Time of Nayapāla. *Journal of Ancient Indian History* 13, Parts 1–2, 1980–82, pp. 34–56.
- South Indian Inscriptions*. 1890–1999. Madras: Superintendent, Government Press / New Delhi: Director-General, ASI.
- SRINIVASAN, P. R. 1987. Dārāśuram through the Inscriptions. In HERNAULT 1987, vol. 1, pp. 15–40.
- TANḌAN, Govinda. 1999. *Paśupatiḥetrako Sāṃskṛtika Adhyayana*, part 2 (Document Volume). Kathmandu: Jharendra Shumsher Jung Rana and Manju Rana.
- THAPLYAL, Kiran Kumar. 1985. *Inscriptions of the Maukharīs, Later Guptas, Puṣpabhūtiś and Yaśovarman of Kanauj*. Delhi: Indian Council of Historical Research / Agam Prakashan.
- TRIPATHY, Narayana. 1930. The Jayapura Copper-plate grant of Dhruvananda Deva. *Journal of the Bihar and Orissa Research Society* 16, pp. 457–472.
- TRIPATHY, Snigdha. 1997. *Inscriptions of Orissa*. 2 vols. Delhi: Indian Council of Historical Research.
- VAJRĀCĀRYA, Dhanavajra. 1996 [Vikramasaṃvat 2053]. *Licchavikālakā Abhilekha*. Kathmandu: Nepāla ra Eśiyālī Anusandhāna Kendra, Tribhuvana Viśvavidyālaya.

#### STUDIES AND TRANSLATIONS

- ADRIAENSEN, R., H. T. BAKKER and H. ISAACSON. 1994. Towards a Critical Edition of the Skandapurāṇa. *IJJ* 37, pp. 325–331.
- . 1998. *The Skandapurāṇa. Volume 1. Adhyāyas 1-25. Critically Edited with*

- Prolegomena and English Synopsis*. Groningen: Egbert Forsten.
- AGRAWALA, R. C. 1954. A Unique Sculpture of the Jaina Goddess Saccikā. *Artibus Asiae* 17, pp. 232–234.
- . 1956. Iconography of the Jain Goddess Saccikā. *Jaina Antiquary* 21, pp. 15–16.
- American Institute of Indian Studies Photograph Library*: <http://dsal.uchicago.edu/images/aiis/>
- BABB, L.A. 1993. Monks and Miracles: Religious Symbols and Images of Origin Among Osvā Jains. *The Journal of Asian Studies* 52, pp. 3–21.
- BAKKER, Hans. 1997. *The Vākātakas. An Essay in Hindu Iconology*. Gonda Indological Studies 5. Groningen: Egbert Fortsten.
- BAKKER, Hans and Harunaga ISAACSON. 2004. *The Skandapurāṇa. Volume IIA. Adhyāyas 26–31.14. The Vārāṇasī Cycle. Critical edition with an Introduction, English Synopsis & Philological and Historical Commentary*. Groningen: Egbert Forsten.
- BALDISSERA, Fabrizia. 2005. *The Narmamālā of Kṣemendra. Critical Edition, Study and Translation*. Beiträge zur Südasiensforschung Südasiens-Institut Universität Heidelberg 197. [Würzburg]: Ergon.
- BANDYOPADHYAYA, Bimal. 2007. *Excavations at Udayagiri-2 (1997–2000)*. Memoirs of the ASI 100. New Delhi: ASI.
- BANERJI, R.D. 1931. *The Haihayas of Tripuri and Their Monuments*. Memoirs of the ASI 23. Calcutta: Government of India Central Publication Branch.
- BEAL, Samuel. 1884. *Si-yu-ki. Buddhist Records of the Western World*. London: Trübner. A translation of the first five chapters of the *Da Tang Xiyu ji* ‘Memoir of the Western Region during the Great Tang’, an account of Xuanzang’s journey to India (629), his long sojourn there (630–644), and his return to China (645), compiled by Xuanzang’s assistants under his supervision in 646.
- . 1914. *The Life of Hiuen-tsiang by the Shaman Hwui Li*. Popular Edition. London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner & Co. First published in 1911. A translation of the *Da Tang Da Ciensi sanzang fashi zhuan* ‘Biography of Tripiṭaka, Master of the Dharma, of the Great Monastery of the Compassionate Benefaction during the Great Tang’, the account of the life and travels of Xuanzang (602–664) completed by his disciple Huili in 649 and covering his life up to his return from India to China. The remaining five chapters (6–10), covering his life in China after his return from India, were completed by Xuanzang’s disciple Yancong in A.D. 688.
- BENDALL, C. 1883. *Catalogue of the Buddhist Sanskrit Manuscripts in the University Library, Cambridge*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- . 1902. *Catalogue of the Sanskrit Manuscripts in the British Museum*. Lon-



- don: Gilbert and Rivington.
- BHŪṬORIYĀ, Māngilāl. 1988. *Osvāl Itihās kī Amar Bel*. Calcutta: Priyadarśī Prakāśan.
- BOLON, Carol Radcliffe. 1979. The Mahākuṭa Pillar and Its Temples. *Artibus Asiae* 41, pp. 253–268.
- BROWN, Robert L. 1978. The Four Stone Façades of Monastery I at Ratnagiri. *Artibus Asiae* 40, pp. 5–28.
- BRUNNER, Hélène. Ed. and transl. 1963, 1968, 1977, 1998. *Somaśambhu-paddhati*. 4 parts. *Première Partie: Le rituel quotidien dans la tradition śivaïte de l'Inde du Sud selon Somaśambhu; Deuxième Partie: Rituels occasionnels dans la tradition śivaïte de l'Inde du Sud selon Somaśambhu I: Pavitrārohaṇa, Damanapūjā et Prāyaścitta; Troisième Partie: Rituels occasionnels dans la tradition śivaïte de l'Inde du Sud selon Somaśambhu II: dikṣā, abhiṣeka, vratoddhāra, antyeṣṭi, śrāddha; Quatrième Partie: rituels optionnels: pratiṣṭhā*. Publications de l'Institut Français d'Indologie 25. Pondicherry: Institut Français d'Indologie.
- . 1964. Les catégories sociales védiques dans le śivaïsme du sud. *JA* 252, pp. 451–72.
- BSOD NAMS RGYA MTSO. 1991. *The Ngor Maṇḍalas of Tibet. Listings of the Maṇḍala Deities*. Revised by Musashi Tachikawa, Shunzo Onoda, Keiya Noguchi, and Kimiaki Tanaka. Bibliotheca Codicum Asiaticorum 4. Tokyo: Centre for East Asian Cultural Studies. First published in 1983 under the title *Tibetan Maṇḍalas: The Ngor Collection* (Tokyo: Kōdansha).
- BÜHNEMANN, Gudrun. 1994. *\*Sādhanasātaka and \*Sādhanasātapañcāśikā. Two Buddhist Sādhana Collections in Sanskrit Manuscript*. Wiener Studien zur Tibetologie und Buddhismuskunde 32. Vienna: Arbeitskreis für tibetische und buddhistische Studien Universität Wien.
- . 1996. The Goddess Mahācīnakramatārā (Ugratārā) in Buddhist and Hindu Tantrism. *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 59, pp. 472–493.
- BÜHNEMANN, Gudrun and Musashi TACHIKAWA. 1991. *Niṣpannayogāvalī. Two Sanskrit Manuscripts from Nepal*. Bibliotheca Codicum Asiaticorum 5. Tokyo: Centre for East Asian Cultural Studies.
- CHADWICK, Henry. 1957. The Shorter Text of Luke XXII, 15–20. *Harvard Theological Review* 50, pp. 249–258.
- CHAKRABARTI, Kunal. *Religious Process. The Purāṇas and the Making of a Regional Tradition*. 2001. New Delhi: Oxford University Press.
- CHAMPAKALAKSHMI, R. 1986. Urbanization in Early Medieval Tamilnadu. In *Situating Indian History*, edited by Sabyasachi Bhattacharya and Romila Tha-

- par (Delhi: Oxford University Press), pp. 34–105. Reprinted as chapter 4 ('Developments Within: Urban Processes in the Early Medieval Period A.D. 600 to c. 1300') of her *Trade, Ideology, and Urbanization. South India 300 BC to A.D. 1300* (Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1996).
- CHATTOPADHYAYA, Brajadulal. 1994. *The Making of Early Medieval India*. Delhi: Oxford University Press.
- CHAULEY, G. C. 2000. Excavated Remains at Lalitagiri, a Buddhist Site in Orissa. In *Archaeology of Orissa*, 2 volumes, edited by Kishor K. Basa and Pradeep Mohanty, Delhi, Pratibha Prakashan, pp. 441–455.
- CHIMPA, Lama and Alaka CHATTOPADHYAYA. 1990. *Tāranātha's History of Buddhism in India translated from the Tibetan*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass. 2nd edition. First published in 1970 (Simla: Indian Institute of Advanced Study). Tibetan title of the original: *rGya gar chos 'byung*.
- COHEN, Andrew L. 1998. *Temple Architecture and Sculpture of the Nalambas (Ninth-Tenth Centuries)*. New Delhi: Manohar.
- COLAS, Gérard. 2003. History of Vaiṣṇava Traditions: An Esquisse. In *The Blackwell Companion to Hinduism*, edited by Gavin Flood (Oxford: Blackwell), pp. 229–270.
- CORT, J. 1987. Medieval Jaina Goddess Traditions. *Numen* 34, pp. 235–255.
- CUNNINGHAM, Sir Alexander. 1885. *Reports of a Tour in Bundelkhand and Rewa in 1883–84 and of a Tour in Rewa, Bundelkhand, Malwa, and Gwalior, in 1884–85*. ASI Reports, Vol. 21, Parts 1 and 2. Calcutta: Superintendent of Government Printing, India.
- DANI, A.H. 1996. Eastern Kushans and Kidarites in Gandhara and Kashmir. In *History of civilizations of Central Asia. Volume III: The crossroads of civilizations: A.D. 250 to 750*, edited by B.A. Litvinsky, Paris: Unesco, pp. 163–176.
- DAGENS, Bruno. 1979. *La florilège de la doctrine śivaïte, Śaivāgamaparibhāṣā-mañjarī de Vedajñāna. Édition critique, traduction et notes*. Publications de l'IFI 60. Pondicherry: IFI.
- . 1984. *Entre Alampur et Śrīśailam. Recherches archéologiques en Andhra Pradesh*. 2 volumes. Publications de l'IFI 67,1–2. Pondicherry: IFI.
- DATTA, Swati. 1989. *Migrant Brāhmaṇas in Northern India. Their Settlement and General Impact c. A.D. 475–1030*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.
- DAVIDSON, Ronald M. 1981. The Litany of Names of Mañjuśrī. Text and Translation of the *Mañjuśrīnāmasaṃgīti*. In *Tantric and Taoist Studies in Honour of R.A. Stein*, Vol. 1, edited by Michel Strickmann (*Mélanges chinois et bouddhiques* 20), pp. 1–69.
- . 2002. *Indian Esoteric Buddhism: A Social History of the Tantric Movement*. New York: Columbia University Press.

- DAVIS, Richard H. and Leslie C. ORR. 2007. People of the Festival. In *Mélanges tantriques à la mémoire d'Hélène Brunner / Tantric Studies in Memory of Hélène Brunner*, edited by Dominic Goodall and André Padoux, Pondicherry: IFI / EFEO (Collection Indologie 106), pp. 73–97.
- DE CASPARIS, J.G. 1992. Some Notes on Ancient Indian Ritual in Indonesia. In *Ritual, State and History in South Asia. Essays in Honour of J.C. Heesterman*, edited by A.W. van den Hoek, D.H.A. Kolff, and M.S. Oort (Memoirs of the Kern Institute 5), Leiden, New York, and Köln: Brill, pp. 480–492.
- DE CASPARIS, J.G. and I.W. MABBETT. 1992. Religion and Popular Beliefs of Southeast Asia Before c. 1500. Chapter 5 of *The Cambridge History of Southeast Asia. Volume One. From Early Times to c. 1800*, edited by Nicholas Tarling, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 276–339.
- DESAI, Rashmi. 1993. The Religious Geography of an Ancient Town: Bharuch. *South Asia* 16, pp. 61–77.
- DEVAHUTI, D. 1970. *Harsha. A Political Study*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- DEZSŐ, Csaba (ed., tr.). 2005. *Much Ado About Religion by Bhatta Jayānta*. New York University Press and the JJC Foundation.
- DIKSHIT, K.N. 1938. *Excavations at Paharpur, Bengal*. Memoirs of the ASI 55. Delhi: Manager of Publications.
- DIRKS, Nicholas B. 1976. Political Authority and Structural Change in Early South Indian History. *Indian Economic and Social History Review* 13, pp. 127–157.
- DONALDSON, Thomas Eugene 1991. The Śava-Vāhana as Puruṣa in Orissan Images: Cāmuṇḍā to Kālī/Tārā. *Artibus Asiae* 51, pp. 107–141.
- DOTSON, Brandon. 2007. “Emperor” Mu rug btsan and the 'Phang thang ma Catalogue. *Journal of the International Association of Tibetan Studies* 3 (www.jiats.org), pp. 1–25.
- DUNDAS, Paul. 1998. Becoming Gautama: Mantra and History in Śvetāmbara Jainism. In *Open Boundaries: Jain Communities and Cultures in Indian History*, edited by John E. Cort (Albany: State University of New York Press), pp. 31–51 and 228–232.
- . 2002. *The Jains*. London: Routledge. 2nd edition. 1st edition, 1992.
- DUTTA, Saroj. 1995. *Land System in Northern India c. AD 400--c. AD 700*. New Delhi: Munshiram Manoharlal.
- EHRHARD, Franz-Karl. 2000. Spiritual Relationships Between Rulers and Preceptors: The Three Journeys of Vanarāna (1384–1468) to Tibet. In *The Relationship Between Religion and State (chos srid zung 'grel) In Traditional Tibet* (Proceedings of a Seminar Held in Lumbini, Nepal, March 2000. LIRI Semi-

- nar Proceeding Series 1. Bhairahawa, Nepal: Lumbini International Research Institute), edited by Christoph Cüppers, pp. 245–265.
- EINOO, Shingo. 2002. Notes on the Inauguration Ceremony of a Water Reservoir. In *Kimura Kiyotaka Hakase Kanreki Kinen Ronshū (Volume in Honour of Professor Kiyotaka Kimura on his Sixtieth Birthday): East Asian Buddhism: its Genesis and Development*. Tokyo: Shunjūsha, pp. 718[71]–703[86].
- ENGLISH, Elizabeth. 2002. *Vajrayoginī: Her Visualizations, Rituals, and Forms. A Study of the Cult of Vajrayoginī in India*. Boston: Wisdom Publications.
- FILLIOZAT, Vasundhara. 2001. *Kālāmukha and Pāsupata Temples in Dharwar*. Chennai: Kuppaswami Sastri Research Institute.
- FINOT, L. 1934. Manuscrits sanskrits de sādhanā's retrouvés en Chine. *JA* 193, pp. 1–86.
- FORTE, Antonino. 1994. Daishi. *Hōbōgin*, pp. 1019–1034.
- FORTE, Antonino and Hubert DURT 1984. Daiji. *Hōbōgin*, pp. 679–704 (FORTE for China) and pp. 704–711 (DURT for Japan).
- FRAUWALLNER, Erich. 1961. Landmarks in the History of Buddhist Logic. *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde Süd- und Ostasiens* 5, pp. 125–148.
- FULLER, C.J. 1984. *Servants of the Goddess. The Priests of a South Indian Temple*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- GELLNER, David. 1992. *Monk, Householder, and Tantric Priest: Newar Buddhism and its Hierarchy of Ritual*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- GHOSE, Madhuvanti. 2002. *The Origins and Early Development of Anthropomorphic Indian Iconography*. Unpublished Ph.D. thesis, School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London.
- GHOSE, Rajeshwari. 1996. *The Lord of Ārūr: Tyāgarāja Cult in Tamilnāḍu. A Study in Conflict and Accommodation*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.
- GONDA, J. 1966. *Ancient Indian Kingship from the Religious Point of View*. Leiden: Brill. Reprinted from *Numen* III and IV with Addenda and Index.
- GOODALL, Dominic. 1998. *Bhaṭṭa Rāmakaṇṭha's Commentary on the Kiraṇatantra. Volume I: chapters 1–6. Critical edition and annotated translation*. Publications du département d'Indologie 86.1. Pondicherry: IFP/EFEO.
- . 2000. Problems of Name and lineage: relationships between South Indian authors of the Śaiva Siddhānta. *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society, Series 3* 10, pp. 208–211.
- . 2004. *The Parākhyatantra, a Scripture of the Śaiva Siddhānta. A Critical Edition and Annotated Translation*. Collection Indologie 98. Pondicherry: IFP/EFEO.

- . 2007. A first edition of the [Śatika-]Kālottara, the shortest of the non-eclectic recensions of the Kālottara. In *Mélanges tantriques à la mémoire d'Hélène Brunner / Tantric Studies in Memory of Hélène Brunner*, edited by Dominic Goodall and André Padoux, Pondicherry: IFI / EFEO (Collection Indologie 106), pp. 125–166.
- GOODALL, Dominic and Harunaga ISAACSON. 2007. Workshop on the Niśvāsātattvasaṃhitā: The Earliest Surviving Śaiva Tantra? *Newsletter of the NGMCP, Number 3*, pp. 4–6.
- GOUDRIAAN, T. 1973. Tumburu and His Sisters. *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde Südasiens* 17, pp. 49–95.
- . 1985. Ed. and transl. *The Viṇāśikhatantra: A Śaiva Tantra of the Left Current*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.
- GOUDRIAAN, T. and J.A. SCHOTERMAN. Ed. 1988. *The Kubjikāmatatantra. Kulālikāmnāya Version*. Leiden: Brill.
- GRAY, David B. 2007. *The Cakrasamvara Tantra (The Discourse of Śrī Heruka): Study and Annotated Translation*. New York: American Institute of Buddhist Studies (Columbia University Press).
- GRIERSON, Sir George A (with the assistance of Mukundarāma Śāstrī). 1915 and 1932. *A Dictionary of the Kāshmirī Language Compiled Partly from Materials Left by the Late Paṇḍit Īśvara Kaula*. Bibliotheca Indica, New Series 1405. Hertford: ASB.
- GUNAWARDANA, R.A.L.H. 1979. *Robe and Plough: Monasticism and Economic Interest in Early Medieval Sri Lanka*. Tucson: Association for Asian Studies, University of Arizona Press.
- GUTSCHOW, Niels. 1997. *The Nepalese Caitya. 1500 Years of Buddhist Votive Architecture in the Kathmandu Valley*. Lumbini International Research Institute Monograph Series 1. Stuttgart and London: Axel Menges.
- HAHN, Michael. 1996. Das *Vanaratnastotra* des Āditya. In *Suhrllekhāḥ. Festgabe für Helmut Eimer*, edited by Michael Hahn, Jens-Uwe Hartmann, and Roland Steiner (Indica et Tibetica 28), pp. 29–42.
- HALL, Kenneth, R. 1996. Ritual Networks and Royal Power in Majapahit Java. *Archipel* 52, pp. 95–116.
- . 2005. Traditions of Knowledge in Old Javanese Literature, c. 1000–1500. *Journal of Southeast Asian Studies* 36, pp. 1–27.
- HANNEDER, Jürgen. Ed. and trans. 1998. *Abhinavagupta's Philosophy of Revelation. Mālinīśloka-vārttika I, 1–399*. Groningen Oriental Series 14. Groningen: Egbert Forsten.
- HARIMOTO, Kengo. 2006. The Date of Śaṅkara: Between the Cālukyas and the Rāṣṭrakūṭas. *Journal of Indological Studies* 18, pp. 85–111.

- HARLE, J. C. 1994. *The Art and Architecture of the Indian Subcontinent*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press. First published in 1986 by Penguin Books.
- HAZRA, R.C. 1958. *Studies in the Upapurāṇas, vol. 1 (Saura and Vaiṣṇava Upapurāṇas)*. Calcutta: Sanskrit College.
- HEITZMAN, James. 1995. State Formation in South India 850–1280. In *The State in India 1000–1700*, edited by Hermann Kulke (Delhi: Oxford University Press), pp. 162–194.
- HERNAULT, Françoise, avec les collaborations de P. R. SRINIVASAN et de Jacques DUMARÇAY. 1987. *Darasuram. Epigraphical Study, étude architecturale, étude iconographie*. Publications de l'EFEO. Mémoires archéologiques 16. 2 volumes. Paris: EFEO.
- Hōbōgirin. Dictionnaire encyclopédique du bouddhisme d'après les sources chinoises et japonaises*. 1929-. Paris / Tokyo : Maison franco-japonaise / Adrien-Maisonneuve.
- HODGE, Stephen. 2003. *The Mahā-Vairocana-Abhisambodhi Tantra with Buddhaguhya's Commentary*. London: Routledge Curzon. This is a translation both of the Tantra with Buddhaguhya's running commentary and of Buddhaguhya's *Piṇḍārtha*, his summary commentary on the same.
- HOERNLE, F.R. Trans. 1890. The Pattavali or List of the Pontiffs of the Upakesa-Gachchha. *IA* 19, pp. 233–242.
- HOOPYKAAS, C. 1973. *Balinese Baudha Brahmans*. Verhandelingen der Koninklijke Nederlandse Akademie van Wetenschappen, Afd. Letterkunde, nieuwe reeks, d. 80. Amsterdam: North-Holland Pub. Co.
- HORIUCHI, Kanjin. 1983. *Bon-Zō-Kan Shoe-Kongōchōgyō no Kenkyū: Bonpon Kōtei Hen, Jō Kongōkai-bon, Gōzanze-bon*. Koyasan: Mikkyō Bunka Kenkyūjo [Volume 2 of an annotated critical edition of the *Sarvatathāgatattva-saṃgraha*].
- . 1997. *Bon-Zō-Kan Shoe-Kongōchōgyō no Kenkyū: Bonpon Kōtei Hen, Ge Henchōbuku-bon, Gijōju-bon, Kyōri-bun*. Koyasan: Mikkyō Bunka Kenkyūjo [Volume 1 of an annotated critical edition of the *Sarvatathāgatattva-saṃgraha*].
- HOUSMAN, A.E. 1921. The Application of Thought to Textual Criticism. *The Proceedings of the Classical Association* 18, pp. 67–84.
- HUNTER, Thomas M. 2007. The Body of the King: Reappraising Singhasari Period Syncretism. *Journal of Southeast Asian Studies* 38, pp. 27–53.
- HUNTINGTON, Susan L. 1984. *The "Pāla-Sena" Schools of Sculpture*. Leiden: Brill.
- . 1985. *The Art of Ancient India: Buddhist, Hindu, Jain*. New York: Weather-

erhill.

- Huntington Archive: Huntington Archive of Buddhist and Related Art:*  
<http://huntingtonarchive.osu.edu/>
- Indian Archaeology, A Review.* New Delhi: ASI. 1953/54–. The annual report of excavations undertaken by the ASI.
- ISAACSON, Harunaga. 1999. A Collection of Hevajrasādhanas and related works preserved in Sanskrit. Unpublished.
- . 2002. Ratnākaraśānti's *Bhramaharanāma Hevajrasādhana*: Critical Edition (Studies in Ratnākaraśānti's tantric works III). *Journal of the International College for Advanced Buddhist Studies* 5, pp. 151–176.
- JHAVERY, M.B. 1944. *Comparative and Critical Study of Mantraśāstra (With Special Treatment of Jain Mantravāda, Being the Introduction to Sri Bhairava Padmavatikalpa)*. Sri Jain Kala Sahitya Samsodhak Series 1. Ahmedabad: Sarabhai Manilal Nawab.
- KAHRS, Eivind. 1998. *Indian Semantic Analysis. The nirvacana tradition*. University of Cambridge Oriental Publications 55. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- KANE, P.V. 1973–1990. *History of Dharmaśāstra*. Government Oriental Series B6. 2nd ed. (rev. and enl.). 5 vols. in 8. Poona: BORI. First published in 1930–1962.
- KAJIYAMA, Yuichi. 1998. *An Introduction to Buddhist Philosophy. An Annotated Translation of the Tarkabhāṣā of Mokṣākaragupta. Reprint with corrections in the author's hand*. Wiener Studien zur Tibetologie und Buddhismuskunde 42. Vienna: Arbeitskreis für tibetische und buddhistische Studien, Universität Wien.
- KARASHIMA, Noburu. 1984. *South Indian History and Society. Studies from Inscriptions A.D. 850–1800*. Delhi: Oxford University Press. Collected articles (1968–1981).
- KOSAMBI, D.D. and V.V. GOKHALE. Ed. 1957. *The Subhāṣitaratnaḥaṣa Compiled by Vidyākara*. Harvard Oriental Series 42. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.
- KOSSAK, Steven M. and Jane Casey SINGER, 1998. *Sacred Visions. Early Paintings from Central Tibet*. New York: The Metropolitan Museum of Art. Exhibition Catalogue.
- KREIJGER, Hugo E. 1999. *Kathmandu Valley Painting. The Jucker Collection*. London: Serindia Publications.
- KREISEL, Gerd. 1986. *Die Śiva-Bildwerke der Mathurā-Kunst. Ein Beitrag zur Frühhinduistischen Ikonographie*. Monographien zur Indischen Archäologie, Kunst und Philologie 5. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag Wiesbaden GMBH.

- KULKE, Hermann. 1990. The Regional Kingdoms of the Early Middle Ages. Chapter 3 of Hermann Kulke and Dietmar Rothermund, *A History of India* (2nd, revised edition, London: Routledge), pp.109–161. First published in 1986 (London: Croom Helm).
- . 1995a. The Study of the State in Pre-modern India. In *The State in India 1000–1700*, edited by Hermann Kulke (Delhi: Oxford University Press), pp. 1–47.
- . 1995b. The Early and the Imperial Kingdom: a Processural Model of Integrative State Formation in Early Medieval India. In *The State in India 1000–1700*, edited by Hermann Kulke (Delhi: Oxford University Press), pp. 233–262.
- KULKE, Hermann and Dietmar ROTHERMUND. 1990. *A History of India*. London and New York: Routledge.
- KUWAYAMA, Shōshin. 1988. How Xuanzang Learned About Nālandā. In *Tang China and Beyond. Studies on East Asia from the Seventh to the Tenth Century*, edited by Antonino Forte. Italian School of East Asian Studies. Essays: volume 1, Kyoto: Scuola di Studi sull’Asia Orientale, pp. 1–33.
- LALOU, Marcelle. 1953. Les textes bouddhiques au temps du roi Khri-sroñ-lde bcan. *JA* 241 pp. 313–353. The Ldan dkar catalogue, preserved in the Tanjur.
- LESSING F.D. and A. WAYMAN. 1980. *Introduction to the Buddhist Tantric Systems. Translated from Mkhas grub rje’s Rgyud spyiḥi rnam par g’zag pa rgyas brjod With Original Text and Annotation*. New York: Samuel Weiser Inc. 2nd edition. First published in 1968 (The Hague: Brill).
- LÉVI, Sylvain. 1884. Note sur la chronologie du Népal. *JA*, New Series 4, pp. 55–72.
- . 1905a. *Le Népal. Étude historique d’un royaume hindou*. 3 volumes. Annales du Musée Guimet, Bibliothèque d’Études 17. Paris: Ernest Leroux.
- . 1905b. Notes chinoises sur l’Inde. V. Quelques documents sur le bouddhisme indien dans l’Asie centrale (première partie). *BEFEO* 5, pp. 253–305.
- . 1929. Autour d’Aśvagoṣa. *JA* 215, pp. 255–285. Contains an edition of *Gurupañcāśīkā* vv. 1–33.
- LINROTHE, Rob. 1999. *Ruthless Compassion. Wrathful Deities in Early Indo-Tibetan Esoteric Buddhist Art*. London: Serindia Publications.
- LIU, Xinru. 1994. *Ancient India and Ancient China. Trade and Religious Exchanges AD 1–600*. Delhi: Oxford University Press. First published in 1988.
- LOCKE, John K., S.J. 1980. *Karunamaya. The Cult of Avalokiteśvara–Matsyendranātha in the Valley of Nepal*. Kathmandu: Sahayogi Prakashan for Research Centre for Nepal and Asian Studies, Tribhuvan University.
- . 1985. *Buddhist Monasteries of Nepal. A Survey of the Bāhās and Bahīs of the Kathmandu Valley*. Kathmandu: Sahayogi Press.



- MAJUMDAR, R.C. 1971. *History of Ancient Bengal*. Calcutta: G. Bharadwaj.
- MALLEBREIN, Cornelia and Heinrich VON STIETENCRON. 2008. *The Divine Play on Earth: Religious Aesthetics and Ritual in Orissa, India*. Heidelberg: Synchron.
- MATSUNAGA, Yukei. 1978. *The Guhyasamāja Tantra. A New Critical Edition*. Osaka: Tōhō Shuppan. The introduction (pp. vii-xix) is a reprint of 'A History of Tantric Buddhism in India', in *Buddhist Thought and Asian Civilization: Essays in Honor of Herbert V. Guenther on his Sixtieth Birthday*, edited by Leslie S. Kawamura and Keith Scott, Emeryville, CA: Dharma Publishing, 1977.
- . 1985. On the Date of the *Mañjuśrīmūlakalpa*. In *Tantric and Taoist Studies in honour of R.A. Stein*, edited by Michel Strickmann. Brussels: Institut Belge des Hautes Études Chinoises), volume 3 (Mélanges chinois et bouddhiques 22), pp. 882–894.
- MAY, Jacques. 1967. Chingokokka. *Hōbōgin*, pp. 322–327.
- MEISTER, Michael W. et al. Ed. 1983–91. *Encyclopaedia of Indian Temple Architecture*. Delhi: American Institute of Indian Studies, Oxford University Press. Vol. 1, Part 1: *South India, Lower Draviḍadeśa 200 B.C.–A.D. 1324* (1983); Vol. 1, Part 2: *South India, Upper Draviḍadeśa, Early Phase A.D. 550–1075* (1986); Vol. 2, Part 1: *North India, Foundations of North Indian Style, c. 250 B.C.–A.D. 1100* (1988); Vol. 2, Part 2: *North India, Period of Early Maturity, c. A.D. 700–900* (1991).
- MEYER, Sir William STEVENSON, Sir Richard BURN, James Sutherland COTTON, and Sir Herbert Hope RISLEY. 1908–1931 [v. 1, 1909; v. 26, 1931]. *The Imperial Gazetteer of India*. 26 volumes. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- MIAH, Abul Hashem. 1997/8. Jagaddala Vihārer Sāmpratīk Khanan. *Itihas Parishad Patrika* 1404 BS.
- MICHELL, George. 1990. *The Penguin Guide to the Monuments of India. Volume 1: Buddhist, Jain, Hindu*. London: Penguin Books.
- MITRA, Debala. 1971. *Buddhist Monuments*. Calcutta: Sahitya Samsad.
- . 1981. *Ratnagiri (1958–61)*. Memoirs of the ASI 80. New Delhi: Director General, ASI.
- MOOKERJI Radha Kumud. 1951. *Ancient Indian Education (Brahmanical and Buddhist)*. 2nd edition. London: MacMillan and Co. First published in 1947.
- MULLIN, Glenn H. 1996. *Tsongkhapa's Six Yogas of Naropa*. Ithaca, New York: Snow Lion.
- . 1997. *Readings on the Six Yogas of Naropa*. Ithaca, New York: Snow Lion.
- NEWMAN, John R. 1987. Paramādibuddha (The Kālacakra Mūlatantra) and its Relation to the Early Kālacakra Literature. *IJ* 30, pp. 93–102.
- . 1998. The Epoch of the Kālacakra Tantra. *IJ* 41, pp. 319–349.

- NJAMMASCH, Marlene. 2001. *Bauern, Buddhisten und Brahmanen. Das frühe Mittelalter in Gujarat*. Asien- und Afrika-Studien 2 der Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- OBERMILLER, E. 1986. *The History of Buddhism in India and Tibet by Bu-ston*. Bibliotheca Indo-Buddhica 26. Delhi: Sri Satguru Publications. First published in 1932.
- OROFINO, Giacomella. 1996. *Sekoddeśa. A Critical Edition of the Tibetan Translation, with an Appendix by Raniero Gnoli on the Sanskrit Text*. Serie Orientale Roma 52. Rome: Istituto Italiano per il Medio ed Estremo Oriente.
- PAL, Pratapaditya. 1975. *Bronzes of Kashmir*. Graz: Akademische Druck-u. Verlagsanstalt.
- . 2003. *Himalayas. An Aesthetic Adventure*. Chicago: The Art Institute of Chicago in association with the University of California press and Mapin Publishing. Exhibition catalogue.
- . 2007. *The Arts of Kashmir*. With contributions by Frank Ames, Simon Digby, Gerald Larson, and John Siudmak. New York: Asia Society. Exhibition catalogue.
- PETECH, Luciano. 1961. The Chronology of the Early Kings of Nepal. *East and West*, n.s. 12, pp. 227–232.
- . 1984. *Medieval History of Nepal (c. 750–1480)*. 2nd, thoroughly revised edition. Serie Orientale Roma, 10: Materials for the Study of Nepalese History and Culture. Rome: Istituto per il Medio e Estremo Oriente.
- PIGEAUD, Theodore G. Th. 1960–1963. *Java in the 14th Century. A Study in Cultural History. The Nagara-Kĕrtāgama by Rakawi Prapanca of Majapahit, 1365 A.D.*. Volume I: Javanese Texts in Transcription; volume II: Notes on the Texts and Translations; volume III: Translations; volume IV: Commentaries and Recapitulation; volume V: Glossary, General Index. Koninklijk Instituut voor Taal-, Land-, en Volkenkunde Translation Series 4,4. Third edition, revised and enlarged. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff.
- PINGREE, David. 1994. *Census of the Exact Sciences in Sanskrit. Series A, Volume 5*. Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society.
- RASTELLI, Marion. 2007. The “Pañcarātra Passages” in Agnipurāṇa 21–70. In *Mélanges tantriques à la mémoire d’Hélène Brunner / Tantric Studies in Memory of Hélène Brunner*, edited by Dominic Goodall and André Padoux, Pondicherry: IFI / EFEO (Collection Indologie 106), pp. 189–229.
- REEDY, Chandra L. 1997. *Himalayan Bonzes. Technology, Style, and Choices*. Newark and London: University of Delaware Press and Associated University Presses.
- REGMI, D.R. 1965–1966. *Medieval Nepal*. 3 Parts [Part 1, 1965; Parts 2–3:

- 1966]. Calcutta: Firma K.L. Mukhopadhyay.
- RHIE, Marilyn M. and Robert A.F. THURMAN. 1991. *Wisdom and Compassion. The Sacred Art of Tibet*. New York: Asian Art Museum of San Francisco and Tibet House, New York in association with Harry N. Abrams, Inc., Publishers. Exhibition Catalogue.
- ROBINSON, James B. 1979. *Buddha's Lions. The Lives of the Eight-Four Siddhas*. Berkeley, California: Dharma Publishing.
- ROBSON, Stuart. Trans. 1995. *Deśawarṇana (Nāgarakṛtāgama) by Mpu Prapañca*. Leiden: KITLV Press.
- ROERICH, George N. 1995. *The Blue Annals*. Reprint. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass. First published in 1949. An English translation of the *Deb ther snong po* of 'Gos lo tsā ba Gzhon nu dpal (1392–1481).
- SALOMON, Richard. 1998. *Indian Epigraphy: A Guide to the Study of Inscriptions in Sanskrit, Prakrit, and the Other Indo-Aryan Languages*. New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- SANDERSON, Alexis. 1985. Purity and Power among the Brāhmins of Kashmir. In *The Category of the Person: Anthropology, Philosophy, History*, edited by M. Carrithers, S. Collins and S. Lukes. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 190–216.
- . 1986. Maṇḍala and Āgamic Identity in the Trika of Kashmir. In *Mantras et diagrammes rituelles dans l'hindouisme*, edited by André Padoux. Paris: Éditions du Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique, pp. 169–214.
- . 1988. Śaivism and the Tantric Traditions. In *The World's Religions*, edited by S. Sutherland *et al.* (London: Routledge), pp. 660–704. Reprinted in *The World's Religions. The Religions of Asia*, edited by F. Hardy (London: Routledge, 1990), pp. 128–172.
- . 1995a. Meaning in Tantric Ritual. In *Essais sur le Rituel III: Colloque du Centenaire de la Section des Sciences religieuses de l'École Pratique des Hautes Études*, edited by A.-M. Blondeau and K. Schipper (Bibliothèque de l'École des Hautes Études, Sciences Religieuses, Volume CII. Louvain-Paris: Peeters), pp. 15–95.
- . 1995b. Vajrayāna: Origin and Function. In *Buddhism Into the Year 2000. International Conference Proceedings* (Bangkok and Los Angeles: Dhammakaya Foundation), pp. 89–102.
- . 1995c. The Sarvāstivāda and its Critics: Anātmavāda and the Theory of Karma. In *Buddhism Into the Year 2000. International Conference Proceedings* (Bangkok and Los Angeles: Dhammakaya Foundation), pp. 33–48.
- . 2001. History Through Textual Criticism in the Study of Śaivism, the Pañcarātra and the Buddhist Yoginītantras. In *Les sources et le temps*.

- Sources and Time. A Colloquium, Pondicherry, 11–13 January 1997*, edited by François Grimal, pp. 1–47. Publications du département d'Indologie 91. Pondicherry: IFP / EFEO.
- . 2002. Remarks on the text of the Kubjikāmatatantra. *IJJ* 45, pp. 1–24.
- . 2005a. The Śaiva Religion Among the Khmers, Part I. *BEFEO* 90 (2003), pp. 352–464.
- . 2005b. Religion and the State: Śaiva Officiants in the Territory of the Brahmanical Royal Chaplain with an Appendix on the Provenance and Date of the *Netratantra*. *IJJ* 47 (2004), pp. 229–300.
- . 2005c. A Commentary on the Opening Verses of the *Tantrasāra* of Abhinavagupta. In *Sāmarasya. Studies in Indian Arts, Philosophy, and Interreligious Dialogue*, edited by Sadananda Das and Ernst Furlinger, New Delhi: D.K. Printworld, pp. 89–148.
- . 2006. The Lākulas: New Evidence of a System Intermediate Between Pāñcārthika Pāśupatism and Āgamic Śaivism. *Indian Philosophical Annual* 26 (2003–2005), pp. 143–217.
- . 2007a. The Śaiva Exegesis of Kashmir. In *Mélanges tantriques à la mémoire d'Hélène Brunner / Tantric Studies in Memory of Hélène Brunner*, edited by Dominic Goodall and André Padoux, Pondicherry: IFI / EFEO (Collection Indologie 106), pp. 231–442 and (bibliography) pp. 551–582.
- . 2007b. Atharvavedins in Tantric Territory: The *Āṅgirasakalpa* Texts of the Oriya Paippalādins and their Connection with the Trika and the Kālikula, With critical editions of the *Parājapavidhi*, the *Parāmantravidhi*, and the *\*Bhadrakālīmantravidhiprakaraṇa*. In *The Atharvaveda and its Paippalāda Śākhā: Historical and Philological Papers on a Vedic Tradition*, edited by Arlo Griffiths and Annette Schmedchen (Aachen: Shaker Verlag, 2007. Geisteskultur Indiens: Texte und Studien, 11. Indologica Halensis), pp. 195–311.
- . Forthcoming a. *Religion and the State: Initiating the Monarch in Śaivism and the Buddhist Way of Mantras*. Heidelberg Ethno-Indological Series. Harrassowitz.
- . Forthcoming b. *Śaivism and Brahmanism*.
- SANTIKO, Hariani. 1995. Early Research on Sivaitic Hinduism during the Majapahit Era. In *The Legacy of Majapahit*, edited by John N. Micsic and Endang Sri Hardiati Soekatno (Singapore: National Museum of Singapore. Exhibition Catalogue), pp. 55–70.
- SANTOSO, Soewito. 1975. *Sutasoma: A Study in Javanese Wajrayana*. Śatapiṭaka 213. New Delhi: International Academy of Indian Culture.
- SCHOPEN, Gregory. 2004. *Buddhist Monks and Business Matters: Still More Papers on Monastic Buddhism in India*. Studies in the Buddhist Traditions.

- Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.
- SCHMIEDCHEN, Annette. 1993. Einige Besonderheiten der buddhistischen Schenkungsinschriften unter der Maitrakas. *Beiträge des Südasien-Instituts 1 (Sonderheft)*, pp. 83–108.
- . 2007. Epigraphical Evidence for the History of Atharvavedic Brahmins. In *The Atharvaveda and its Paippalāda Śākhā: Historical and Philological Papers on a Vedic Tradition*, edited by Arlo Griffiths and Annette Schmiedchen (Aachen: Shaker Verlag, 2007. Geisteskultur Indiens: Texte und Studien, 11. Indologica Halensis), pp. 195–311.
- SETTAR, S. 1969. The Cult of Jvālāmālinī and the Earliest Images of Jvālā and Śyāma. *Artibus Asiae* 31, pp. 309–320.
- . 1992. *The Hoysala Temples*. Bangalore: Institute of Indian Art History, Karnataka University, Dharwad and Kala Yatra Publications.
- SFERRA, Francesco. 2005. Constructing the Wheel of Time. Strategies for Establishing a Tradition. In *Boundaries, Dynamics and Construction of Traditions in South Asia*, edited by Federico Squarcini, Firenze: Firenze University Press, pp. 253–285.
- SHAHIDULLAH, M. 1928. *Les chants mystiques de Kāṇha et de Saraha. Les Dohā-koṣa (en apabhraṃśa, avec les versions tibétaines) et les Caryā (en vieux-bengali)*. Paris: Adrien-Maisonneuve.
- SHASTRI, H.P. 1917. *A Descriptive Catalogue of Sanscrit Manuscripts in the Government Collection under the Care of the Asiatic Society of Bengal. Vol. I. Buddhist Manuscripts*. Calcutta: ASB.
- SHAW, Julia and Peter SUTCLIFFE. 2003. Water Management, Patronage Networks and Religious Change: New evidence from the Sanchi dam complex and counterparts in Gujarat and Sri Lanka. *South Asian Studies* 19, pp. 73–104.
- SHAW, Miranda. 2006. *Buddhist Goddesses of India*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- SHERBURNE, Richard. 2003. *The Complete Works of Atīśa Śrī Dīpaṃkara Jñāna, Jo-bo-rje, The Lamp for the Path and Commentary, together with the newly translated Twenty-five Key Texts (Tibetan and English Texts)*. New Delhi: Aditya Prakashan.
- SINCLAIR, Iain. 2008. The Problem of Tantric Sacrifice (*Mahābali*) in Newar Buddhism. In *Esoteric Buddhist Studies: Identity in Diversity. Proceedings of the International Conference on Esoteric Buddhist Studies, Koyasan University, 5 Sept.–8 Sept. 2006*, Koyasan: Koyasan University, pp. 261–264.
- SINGH, Upinder. 1994. *Kings, Brāhmaṇas and Temples in Orissa. An Epigraphic Study AD 300–1147*. New Delhi: Munshiram Manoharlal.
- SINGHAL, Sudarshana Devi. 1957. *Wṛhaspati-tattwa, an Old Javanese Philo-*

- sophical Text*. Śataka-piṭaka Series 1, Dvīpāntara Series 1. Nagpur: International Academy of Indian Culture.
- . 1958. *Gaṇapati-tattva, an Old Javanese Philosophic Text*. Śata-Piṭaka 4; Dvīpāntara-Piṭaka 3. New Delhi: International Academy of Indian Culture.
- . 1962. *Tattvajñāna and Mahājñāna (Two Kavi Philosophical Texts)*. Śatapiṭaka Series 23; Dvīpāntara-Piṭaka 6. Delhi: International Academy of Indian Culture.
- SINHA, Surajit. 1962. State Formation and Rajput Myth in Tribal Central India. *Man in India* 42, pp. 35–80. Republished in *The State in India 1000–1700*, edited by Hermann Kulke (Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1995), pp. 233–262.
- . ed. 1987. *Tribal Politics and State Systems in Pre-colonial Eastern and North Eastern India*. Calcutta: K.P. Bagchi.
- SINHA KAPUR, Nandini. 2002. *State Formation in Rajasthan. Mewar during the Seventh-Fifteenth Centuries*. New Delhi: Manohar.
- SIRCAR, D.C. 1953. The Era of the Bhauma-Karas. *Indian Historical Quarterly* 29, pp.148–55.
- . 1966. *Indian Epigraphical Glossary*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.
- . 1975–76. Indological Notes–R. C. Majumdar's Chronology of the Pāla Kings. *Journal of Ancient Indian History* 9, pp. 209–210.
- SIUDMAK, John E.C. 1994. *The Stylistic Development of the Sculpture of Kashmir*. Unpublished D.Phil. thesis, Faculty of Oriental Studies, University of Oxford.
- SKORUPSKI, 1983. *Sarvadurgatipariśodhanatantra, Elimination of All Evil Destinies. Sanskrit and Tibetan texts with introduction, English translation and notes*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.
- SLOUBER, Michael. 2007. The Manuscripts of the Kriyākālaguṇottara. *Newsletter of the NGMCP, Number 5*, pp. 9–16.
- SMITH, Vincent A. 1962. *The Early History of India from 600 B.C. to the Muhammadan Conquest, Including the Invasion of Alexander the Great*. 4th edition, revised by S.M. Edwardes. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- SNELGROVE, David L. 1959. Ed. and transl. *The Hevajra Tantra. A Critical Study*. London Oriental Series 6. London: Oxford University Press. Sanskrit and Tibetan texts of the *Hevajra* with the commentary *Yogaratnamālā* of Kāṇha.
- SOEBADIO, Haryati. 1971. *Jñānasiddhānta*. Bibliotheca Indonesica 7. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff.
- STEARNS, Cyrus. 2001. *Luminous Lives. The Story of the Early Masters of the Lam 'Bras Tradition in Tibet*. Somerville, Massachusetts: Wisdom Publications. This contains an edition and annotated translation of the *Zhib mo rdo*

- rje* of Dmar ston Chos kyi rgyal po.
- STEIN, Burton. 1994. *Peasant State and Society in Medieval South India*. Delhi: Oxford University Press.
- . 1998. All the King's *Mana*: Perspectives on Kingship in Medieval South India. In *Kingship and Authority in South Asia*, edited by J.F. Richards (Delhi: Oxford University Press), pp. 133–188.
- STEIN, M. A. 1900. *Kalhana's Rājatarāṅgiṇī. A Chronicle of the Kings of Kashmir. Translated with an introduction, commentary and appendices*. 2 Volumes. Westminster: A. Constable.
- STÖHR, Waldemar and Piet ZOETMULDER. 1968. *Les religions d'Indonésie*. Paris: Payot. Translated by L. Jospin. Originally published in German in 1965 (*Die Religionen Indonesiens*, Stuttgart: W. Kolhammer).
- STRICKMANN, Michel. 1996. *Mantras et mandarins: le bouddhisme tantrique en Chine*. Paris: Gallimard.
- STUART-FOX, David J. 2002. *Pura Besakih. Temple, religion and society in Bali*. Verhandelingen van der Koninklijk Instituut voor Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde 193. Leiden: KITLV Press.
- SUGIKI, Tsunehiko. 2001. Cakrasaṃvaratantra no seiritsu ni tsuite—oyobi Jayabhadra saku Śrīcakrasaṃvarapañjikā kōtei bonpon— [On the making of Śrīcakrasaṃvaratantra—with a critical Sanskrit text of Jayabhadra's Śrīcakrasaṃvarapañjikā]. *The Chisan Gakuhō / Journal of Chisan Studies* 64, pp. (91)–(141).
- SUPOMO, S. 1972. 'Lord of the Mountains' in the fourteenth century Kakawin. *Bijdragen tot de Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde* 128, pp. 281–297.
- . 1977. Ed. and trans. *Arjunawijaya. A Kakawin of mpu Tantular*. 2 volumes. Bibliotheca Indonesica 14. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff.
- SWAMY B.G.L. 1975. The Gōlaki School of Śaivism in the Tamil Country. *Journal of Indian History* 53, pp./ 167–209.
- SZÁNTÓ, Péter-Dániel. 2008a. Antiquarian Enquiries into the Initiation Manuals of the Catuspīṭha. *Newsletter of the NGMCP, Number 6*, pp. 2–12.
- . 2008b. Review of GRAY 2007. *Tantric Studies* 1, pp. 215–219.
- TAKAKUSU, Junjiro and Kaigyoku WATANABE. 1924–1932 (Taishō 13–Shōwa 7). *Taishō Shinshū Daizōkyō*. 73 volumes. Tōkyō: Taishō Issaikyō Kankōkai.
- TAGARE, Ganesh Vasudev. 1987. *Historical Grammar of Apabhraṃśa*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass. First published in 1948 (Poona: Deccan College Post-graduate and Research Institute).
- TALBOT, Cynthia. 2001. *Precolonial India in Practice: Society, Region, and Identity in Medieval Andhra*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- TAMOT, Kashinath et. al. 2000. *A Dictionary of Classical Newari Compiled*

- from *Manuscript Sources*. Kathmandu: Nepal Bhasa Dictionary Committee.
- TANAKA, Kimiaki. 1996. *Indo Chibetto Mandara no Kenkyū* (A Study of Indian and Tibetan Maṅḍalas). Kyoto: Hōzōkan.
- TANEMURA, Ryugen. 2004a. Indo Mikkyō no Sōgi: Śūnyasamādhivajra saku Mr̥tasugatiniyojana ni tsuite [The Funeral in Esoteric Buddhism: On the Mr̥tasugatiniyojana by Śūnyasamādhivajra]. *Sisehigaku Kenkyū* 2004-nen Akigō, pp. 349(26)–328(47).
- . 2004b. *Kuladatta's Kriyāsaṃgrahapañjikā. A Critical Edition and Annotated Translation of Selected Sections*. Groningen Oriental Studies 19. Groningen: Egbert Forsten.
- . 2007. Mr̥tasugatiniyojana: A Manual of the Indian Buddhist Tantric Funeral. *Newsletter of the NGMCP* 4, pp. 2–6.
- TEEUW, A and S.O. ROBSON. 1981. Ed. and trans. *Kuñjarakarṇa Dharmakathana. Liberation Through the Law of the Buddha. An Old Javanese Poem by Mpu Dusun*. Bibliotheca Indonesica 21. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff.
- THURSTON, Edgar, assisted by K. RANGACHARI. 1909. *Castes and Tribes of Southern India*. 7 vols. Madras: Government Press.
- TOKUNAGA, Muneo. 1994. Description of the temples and *tīrthas* in the Nilamatapurāna. Vss. 989–1356a. In *A Study of the Nilamata. Aspects of Hinduism in Ancient Kashmir*, edited by Yasuke Ikari (Kyoto: Institute for Research in Humanities, Kyoto University), pp. 399–421.
- TOMABECHI, Toru. 2007. The extraction of *mantra* (*mantroddhāra*) in the *Sarvabuddhasamāyogatantra*. In *Pramāṇakīrtiḥ. Essays Dedicated to Ernst Steinkellner on the Occasion of his 70<sup>th</sup> Birthday*, edited by Birgit Kellner, Helmut Krasser, Horst Lasic, Michael Torsten Much and Helmut Tauscher, Vienna: Arbeitskreis für Buddhistische Studien Universität Wien, pp. 903–923.
- . 2008. Vitapāda, Śākyamitra, and Āryadeva: On a Transitional Stage in the History of *Guhyasamāja* Exegesis. In *Esoteric Buddhist Studies: Identity in Diversity. Proceedings of the International Conference on Esoteric Buddhist Studies, Koyasan University, 5 Sept.–8 Sept. 2006*, Koyasan: Koyasan University, pp. 171–177.
- TORRICELLI, Fabrizio and Āchārya Sangye T. NAGA. 1995. *The Life of the Mahāsiddha Tilopa by Mar-pa Chos-kyi bLo-gros*. Dharamsala: Library of Tibetan Works and Archives. Text and translation of a short spiritual biography (*rnam thar*) of Tilopā, ff. 1v–11v of vol. *kha* of the *bDe mchog mkha' 'gro snyan rgyud*, a collection of texts of the Mar pa Kagyu tradition.
- TÖRZSÖK, Judit. 1999. *The Doctrine of Magic Female Spirits. A critical edition of selected chapters of the Siddhayogeśvarīmata(tantra) with annotated trans-*



- lation and analysis*. Unpublished D.Phil. thesis, Faculty of Oriental Studies, University of Oxford. The chapters edited and translated are 1–8, 10–19, 21–22, and 29–32 (the last).
- TRIBE, A.H.F. 1994. *The Names of Wisdom. A Critical Edition and Annotated Translation of Chapters 1–5 of Vilāsavajra’s Commentary on the Nāmasaṃgīti, with Introduction and Textual Notes*. Unpublished D.Phil. thesis, Faculty of Oriental Studies, University of Oxford.
- TSUDA, Shinichi. Ed. and trans. 1974. *The Samvarodaya-Tantra: Selected Chapters*. Tokyo: The Hokuseido Press.
- TSUKAMOTO, Keisho, MATSUNAGA Yukei, and ISODA Hirofumi. Eds. 1989. *Bongo butten no kenkyū 4 [Mikkyō kyōten hen] / A Descriptive Bibliography of the Sanskrit Buddhist Literature Vol. IV: The Buddhist Tantra*. Kyoto: Heirakuji Shoten.
- TUCCI, Giuseppe. 1988. *Rin-chen bzañ-po and the Renaissance of Buddhism in Tibet Around the Millenium*. English version of Indo-Tibetica II, first draft translation by Nancy Kipp Smith under the direction of Thomas J. Pritzker, edited by Lokesh Chandra. Delhi: Aditya Prakashan, 1988. First published in Italian in 1932, Roma: Reale Accademia d’Italia.
- UI, Hakuju. 1963. *Daijōbutten no kenkyū* (A study of Mahāyāna Buddhism). Tokyo: Iwanami shoten.
- UI, Hakuju, Munetada SUZUKI, Yensho KANAKURA, and Tokan TADA. Ed. 1934. *A Complete Catalogue of the Tibetan Buddhist Canon (Bkaḥ-ḥgyur and Bstan-ḥgyur)*. Sendai: Tōhoku Imperial University.
- VAJRĀCĀRYA, Dhanavajra and Kamal P. MALLA. 1985. *Gopālarājavaṃśāvalī. A facsimile edition prepared by the Nepal Research Centre in collaboration with the National Archives, Kathmandu. With an introduction, a transcription, Nepali and English translations, a glossary and indices*. Nepal Research Centre Publications 9. Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner Verlag.
- VAN SCHAIK, Sam. 2008. A Definition of Mahāyoga: Sources from the Dunhuang Manuscripts. *Tantric Studies* 1, pp. 45–88.
- VETTER, Tilmann. 1992. On the Authenticity of the Ratnāvalī. *Asiatische Studien / Études Asiatiques* 46, pp. 492–506.
- VON STIETENCRON, Heinrich. 1966. *Indische Sonnenpriester. Sāmba und die Śākadvīpīya-Brāhmaṇa. eine textkritische und religionsgeschichtliche Studie zum indischen Sonnenkult*. Schriftenreihe des Südasien-Instituts der Universität Heidelberg, Band 3. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz.
- WALLIS, Christopher. 2008. The Descent of Power: Possession, Mysticism and Initiation in the Śaiva Theology of Abhinavagupta. *Journal of Indian Philosophy* 36, pp. 247–295.

- WEST, Martin L. 1973. *Textual Criticism and Editorial Technique Applicable to Greek and Latin Texts*. Stuttgart: Teubner.
- WITZEL, M. 1986. On the Archetype of Patañjali's Mahābhāṣya. *IJ* 29, pp. 249–259.
- YOKOCHI, Yuko. 1999a. The Warrior Goddess in the *Devīmāhātmya*. In *Living with Śakti. Gender, Sexuality and Religion in South Asia*, edited by Masakazu TANAKA and Musashi TACHIKAWA. Senri Ethnological Studies. 50. Osaka: National Museum of Ethnology.
- . 1999b. Mahiṣasuramardinī Myth and Icon: Studies in the *Skandapurāṇa*, II. In *Studies in the History of Indian Thought (Indo-Shisōshi Kenkyū)* 11. Kyoto: Association for the Study of the History of Indian Thought, pp. 65–103
- ZAKARIA, A.K.M. 1994. Jagaddala Mahavihara. *Journal of the Varendra Research Museum* 8.
- ZIMMERMANN, Michael. 2000. A Mahāyānist Criticism of Arthaśāstra: The Chapter on Royal Ethics in the *Bodhisattva-gocaropya-viṣaya-vikurvaṇa-nirdeśa-sūtra*. *Annual Report of the International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhism at Soka University for the Academic Year 1999*, Tokyo: IRIAB, Soka University, pp. 177–211.
- ZOETMULDER, P.J with the collaboration of S.O. Robson. 1982. *Old Javanese-English Dictionary*. 2 parts. Koninklijk Instituut voor Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff.

### CONVENTIONS IN THE FOOTNOTES

Where I have rejected the reading of a text-edition, inscription, or manuscript, I have substituted my proposed reading and marked the point at which it begins with a superscript asterisk. Its end is indicated by the beginning of the parenthesis that follows. In that I first state whether I judge the proposed reading to be a simple correction (corr.), an emendation (em.), a conjecture (conj.), or, in one case, a diagnostic conjecture (diagn. conj.). By the last I mean a conjecture that restores what I take to be the intended meaning of the author while recognizing that an alternative wording is possible. I maintain no clear-cut distinction between corrections, emendations, and conjectures. I intend thereby only to distinguish approximately between three levels of decreasing obviousness. Where the reading adopted is my own proposal no further information is added. Where it has been proposed by another I have given the surname of the proposer after the abbreviation (e.g. em. MIRASHI). These abbreviations, or abbreviations followed by a name, are followed by a single space, a colon, and a single space, after which I have given the reading that I have rejected. That is followed by an

abbreviation that indicates whether the source is the edition of the text (Ed.) or inscription (Ep.) listed in the bibliography, or the manuscript (Cod.) listed in the same. Where more than one manuscript has been cited, they are distinguished by the sigla assigned in the same. When I have given a translation of a passage in which I have rejected a reading or readings I indicate this in the translation only in the case of what I have classified as conjectures, e.g. “\*Vidyēśvaras on the northern altar (conj.)”. Any testimonium is given in square brackets after the reading that it supports. In a few cases in which I have judged a word to have been lost I have inserted it between angle brackets (e.g. <ca>) and where I have judged that insertion to be less than certain I have followed it with a question mark (e.g. <svadharmā?>). In my translations I have marked the corresponding words in the same way. Where I can offer no cure but judge that the intended meaning can be deduced from the context I have given that meaning in my translation enclosed between a superscript asterisk and a question mark in parenthesis. Where I judge a reading to be corrupt but can offer no cure even on the level of meaning alone I have marked the beginning of the reading with a superscript asterisk followed by a question mark in parenthesis, and marked the corresponding place in my translation with a superscript asterisk followed by three dots and a question mark in parentheses. In general I have standardized the Sandhi and orthography of the Sanskrit in all citations, whether from texts or inscriptions. All translations of the text-passages that I have cited are my own.

All Souls College, Oxford