

HISTORY THROUGH TEXTUAL CRITICISM  
*in the study of Śaivism, the Pāñcarātra and  
the Buddhist Yoginītantras*

ALEXIS SANDERSON

My purpose is to communicate a number of conclusions concerning the histories of Śaivism, the Pāñcarātra and the latest stratum of Esoteric Buddhism reached through the identification and text-critical examination of extensive parallel passages linking the scriptural literatures of these traditions, first those of the various Śaiva traditions with each other and then these with those of the Pāñcarātrika Vaiṣṇavas and the Buddhist Yoginītantras of the Śaṃvara corpus. Text-critical analysis has achieved this end by revealing the direction of redaction, so providing evidence of relative chronology.

Subsumed within this purpose is that of drawing attention to certain aspects of the practice of textual criticism. By establishing that one text has incorporated passages from another we obtain a powerful means of selecting from among the variants transmitted by the manuscripts of the borrower. A redactor will tend to revise the text he is incorporating, especially when he is taking it from the corpus of another religion, since then he must take care to remove all that would betray its origin. But whatever in the transmission still matches the source must be the derived text as it was at the moment of its redaction before the development of variants, except in cases in which the agreement is likely to be the result of random variation or secondary scholarly editing. In a closed recension, in which the readings of the surviving manuscripts of a borrower allow the editor to discern the text of their archetype, the source-text will be a means of evaluating that archetype and may alert the editor to its limitations as the representative of a small, conveniently coherent area of a wider and less straightforward transmission. When a recension is open the source-text will reveal this through the inconstancy of the groupings of the manuscripts in agreement with its readings; and when the contamination that has produced this openness is not so complete that it has obliterated all evidence of vertical structure the source text may be crucial in guiding

the editor to a clearer perception of this concealed order, one that he can extend to the text beyond the boundaries of the parallel.

Source-texts, then, are the most valuable of all testimonia. For unlike others they point directly to the state of the text at its inception. The search for them should therefore be a primary concern of anyone who undertakes the critical study of such literature. As my examples will show, this may require one to extend one's reading beyond the boundaries of the text-group or Śāstra within which one commences one's work. But such breadth is in any case the royal road to success in scholarship. For though the critic may be assisted by excellent testimonia for parts of certain texts he will more commonly find himself confronting problems which only the cultivation of this breadth can equip him to recognize and solve. He will have on occasion to choose between rival readings that are equally well attested; and even where the transmission can be reduced to a single reading he ought still to submit that reading to his judgement, and if he has grounds to suspect that it is spurious he should aspire to undo the corruption through emendation. The extent of his success in these tasks of selection, diagnosis and emendation will depend on the level of his knowledge of the restraints imposed on language, style, and sense by a wide range of contexts. Most importantly, to master texts of this kind, written within a highly complex and multiform world of religious practice and doctrine and written for persons engaged in it, the critic must work towards an ever more thorough understanding of that world; and this will lead him from one area of the Tantric tradition to another and will also require him, like the Tantric scholars before him, to have a grounding in the domains that underly and inform the Tantric, such as those of Vaidika observance and hermeneutics in the case of the Śaiva and Pāñcarātrika systems, and of Abhidharma and Vinaya in the case of Tantric Buddhism. In this way the training of the textual critic is nothing less than the intimate study of the civilization that produced and understood the documents he confronts. Nor can that study proceed without textual criticism, since that is the art of reading the documents which are its richest and most numerous witnesses.

The knowledge of the history of this area that we can obtain by means other than textual criticism is meagre. For the most part we are reduced to cautious generalizations. Concerning the chronology of the early scriptural sources of Tantric Śaivism we can do little more than assert for most of the texts known to us that they predate the citations that appear in the works of the earliest datable commentators, that is to say, in works of the tenth to early eleventh centuries from Kashmir and Mālava,<sup>1</sup> and for a few of them, that they go back at least to the early ninth century since they survive in

<sup>1</sup>These early datable commentators are (for Kashmir) Bhaṭṭa Nārāyaṇakaṇṭha (*Mṛgēndravṛtti*), his son Bhaṭṭa Rāmakaṇṭha (*Kiraṇavṛtti*, *Mataṅgavṛtti*, *Kālotṭara-vṛtti*, *Nareśvaraparīkṣāprakāśa*, *Bhogakārikāvṛtti*, *Mokṣakārikāvṛtti* and *Paramokṣaṇi-*

*rāsakārikāvṛtti*), the latter's pupil Bhaṭṭa Vidyakaṇṭha (*Bhāvacūḍāmaṇi* on *Maya-saṃgraha*), Abhinavagupta (*Tantrāloka*, *Parātriṃśikāvivarṇa* etc.) and his pupil Kṣemarāja (*Svacchandodyota*, *Netroddyota* etc.). The only absolute dates associated with these are those given by Abhinavagupta for the completion of certain of his works: [Saptarṣisaṃvat 40]66 for his *Kramastotra*, [Saptarṣisaṃvat 40]68 for his *Bhāiravastotra*, and [Saptarṣisaṃvat 40]90/Kalisāṃvat 4115 for his *Īśvarapratyabhijñānavṛtīmārsinī*, that is to say, A.D. 990/1, 992/2 and 1014/5. Bhaṭṭa Rāmakaṇṭha predates Abhinavagupta because in *Tantrāloka* 8.428-434b the latter quotes (without attribution) the former's summary of *Mataṅga*, *Vidyāpāda* (hereafter VP), Paṭala 23. But he does not predate him by much because ad *Mṛgendra* 1.11 Bhaṭṭa Rāmakaṇṭha's father Nārāyaṇakaṇṭha quotes the *Īśvarasiddhi* of Utpaladeva, who taught Abhinavagupta's teacher Lakṣmanagupta. From Mālava we have the *Prāyaścittasamuccaya*, a digest of chapters on penance found in the Śaiva canon, by one Hṛdayaśiva. According to metrically inaccurate verses by another found at the end of this text Hṛdayaśiva was a pupil of Īśvaraśiva in the lineage of Lambakaṇṭha, an ascetic of the Raṇipadraka (/Araṇipadraka) Maṭha of the Mattamayūra lineage, who moved to the Gorāṭhikaṃṭha and became the Dikṣāguru of king Siyaka of Dhārā (University Library, Cambridge [hereafter ULC], Add. 2833, f. 128r-v1):

- 1 *mattamayūravamśaje śrīraṇipadra(kāśrame)*  
*lambakaṇṭha iti nāma pṛthivyām prathito muniḥ*
- 2 *nikhilāśaivasiddhāntasrotāḥsaṃskārapāvanaḥ*  
*candrāṅkitajaṭājūṭaḥ kailāstheva śaṅkaraḥ*
- 3 *śrīraṇipadrakāśramād gorāṭhikaṃṭhe (' )gamat*  
*dhārāyām siyakam iti anujagrāha pāṛthivam*
- 4 *āsit tatsantatau muniḥ śrī-īśvaraśiva iti*  
*jagatīpatibhir nṛpaḥ pūjitapādapaṇikajāḥ*
- 5 *tacchiṣyo nikhilāgamārthavimalādarśo muniḥ*  
*śrīhṛdayaśiva iti vidyeśvaratulyakīrtiḥ*
- 6 *yasyocchrito dikṣu tapaḥprabhāva udīryate sādhujanair jagatyām*  
*helād uddhṛtāgamaśāstrasāraḥ sa jhaṭity ākhaṇḍitavādakaṇḍuḥ*

1d *pṛthivyām prathito* conj.: *prathitaḥ pṛthivyām* cod. 2b *srotāḥ*  
em.: *srotra* cod. 3d *pāṛthivam* em.: *pārthivaḥ* cod. 6a *tapaḥprabhāva*  
corr.: *tapaḥprabhāvo* cod.

There were two Siyakas of Dhārā. The first ruled c. A.D. 863-890 and the second, the son of Vairisimha, came to power some time before 949 (the date of the first of two known epigraphs from his reign [*Epigraphia Indica* [hereafter EI] 19, p. 236]) and was still in power in 969 (the date of the second [EI 19 p. 177]); see D. C. Ganguly, *History of the Paramāra Dynasty* (Dacca, 1933), pp. 30 and 37. The first grant of his successor Vākpati II is dated Vikrama 1029 (=A.D. 972/3); see Georg Bühler, 'The Udepur Prasasti of the kings of Mālva' in EI 1, p. 222-238. The Cambridge palm-leaf manuscript of the *Prāyaścittasamuccaya* is dated [Nepāl]saṃvat 278 (=A.D. 1158). There must have been at least two Gurus between Lambakaṇṭha and Hṛdayaśiva's guru Īśvaraśiva. Consequently the outer limits of the date of his work are 1159 and either 949 or 863.

The early Kashmirian authors show that they have direct knowledge of the following Tantras:

1. Saiddhāntika: *Anantavijaya*, *Kacabhārgava*, *Kāmika*, *Sārdhatrisatika Kālotṭara* (/ *Kālañāna*, *Kālapāda*), *Saptaśatika Kālotṭara*, *Trayodaśaśatika Kālotṭara*, *Kiraṇa*, *Devāmata* (*Pratiṣṭhāntara* of the *Niśvāsa*), *Nandikeśvaramata*, *Niśvāsa*, *Niśvāsakārikā*, *Niśvāsakārikā-Dikṣottara*, *Niśvāsottara*, *Parākhya* (/ *Saurabheya*), *Pārameśvara*, *Paṣkarapārameśvara*, *Pratiṣṭhāpārameśvara*, *Bhārgava* (= *Kacabhārgava*?), *Bhārgovottara*, *Mataṅgapārameśvara*, *Mayasaṃgraha* (/ *Maya*), *Mukūṭa* (/ *Mākūṭa* / *Mākoṭa*), *Mukūṭottara*, *Mṛgendra* (/ *Mṛgendrottara*), *Yakṣinipārameśvara*, *Raurava*, *Rauravasū-*

Nepalese manuscripts of that date,<sup>2</sup> are recognizably paraphrased in the

trasaṃgraha, Lalita, Sarvajñānottara (of the Vāthula), [Sūkṣma]svāyambhuva, Svāyambhuvasūtrasaṃgraha, Haṃsapārameśvara.

2. Mantrapīṭha: Svacchanda (/Svatantra), Aghoreśvarīsvacchanda, Lakulasvacchanda.

3. Vidyāpīṭha and Kaula (including Krama): Nisāṭana (/Nisāṣaṃcāra/Nisācāra), Anandagahvara, Ananda, Anandeshvara, Anandabhairava, Uchhuṣṃabhairava, Uthphullakamata, Ūrmikaularāpava, Kālikākrama, Kālikula, Kālimukha, Kulakālīvidhi, Kulagahvara, Kulacūḍāmaṇi, Kulapañcāsikā, Kulayukti, Kulasāra, [Trika]kularatnamālā, Kulārṇava, Kaulottara, Kramarahasya, Kramasadbhāva, Khecarīmata, Gama, Gahvara, Gupta, Guhya, Guhyayoginī, Catuṣkapañcāsikā, Candragarbha, Caryākula, Dāmarā (/Vādyā), Tatvarakṣāvidhi, Tantrarājabhāṭṭāraka (=Jayadrathayāmala), Tantrasadbhāva, Tantrasamuccaya, Timirodghāta, Tilaka, Trikakula, Trika[nta]rāsāra (/Mālinīsāra), Trikaviṃśatika, Trikasadbhāva/Trikahṛdaya, Triśirobhairava, Devīpañcāśatika, Devyāyāmala, Nandīśikhā, Nityātāntrāṇi, Nirmarjāda, Niśākula, Pañcāmṛta, Parātrīpīṣikā (/Parātrīpīṣikā, Anuttarasūtra, Trikasūtra), Picumata (/Brahmayāmala), Bhargavīśikhākula, [Trika]bhairavakula, Bhairavayāmala, Bhogahastaka, Matabhāṭṭāraka, Matatrīpīṣikā, Matsyodarīmata, Mādhavakula, Mālinīvijayottara (/Pūrvaśāstra), Yogasaṃcāra, Yoginīkaula, Yonyarṇava, Lakṣmīkaularāpava, Vājasaneyasaṃhitā, Vijñānabhairava, [Siddha]virāvalī[kulabhairava], Virāvalīhṛdaya, Sarvavira (Sarvācāra), Sarvācārāhṛdaya, Siddhayogeśvarīmata (/Siddhāmata), Siddhāmṛta, Skandayāmala, Haṃsayāmala, Hṛdayabhāṭṭāraka (/Hārdeśa), Haidara.

4. Gāruḍika/Bhautika: Totula, Kriyākālaguṇottara, Caṇḍāsīdhāra.

5. Universal: Piṅgalāmata (/Jayadrathādhikāra), Netra (/Mṛtyujit, Amṛteśa, Sarvasrotasasamgraha), Sarvasrotasasamgrahasāra.

6. Of unknown affiliation: Candrajñāna, Śrīkaṇṭhīya (/Śrīkaṇṭhī), Sarvamaṅgalā (Maṅgalā, Māṅgala), Bharuṇa (?[Tantrāloka 25.14c])

The Saiddhāntika authors rely for the most part on Saiddhāntika Tantras but also quote as authorities the Svacchanda (Mantrapīṭha), the Mālinīvijayottara (Vidyāpīṭha [Trika]) and the Piṅgalāmata, which is based in the Vidyāpīṭha as an affiliate of the Picumata but is concerned with installation rituals in both Saiddhāntika and non-Saiddhāntika systems (Vāma, Dakṣiṇa [← Picumata] and Trika). The non-Saiddhāntika authors (Abhinavagupta and Kṣemarāja) rely on almost all the sources listed, both Saiddhāntika and non-Saiddhāntika.

Hṛdayaśiva of Mālava has brought together the penance chapters of the following:

1. Saiddhāntika: Kāmika, Kīraṇa, Tilakapārameśvara, Devīmata (=vyāmata), Niḥśvāsakārika, Niḥśvāsottara, Pārameśvara, Puṣkarapārameśvara, Pratiṣṭhāpārameśvara, Pārāka, Mataṅgapārameśvara, Mṛgendra, Mohacūrottara, Raurava, Vāthula, Vāmadevīyākriyāsamgraha, Vidyāpurāṇa, Saptavidyādhara, Sarvajñānamahodadhī, Sāhasra, Svāyambhuvasūtrasaṃgraha, Haṃsapārameśvara, Pañcāśatika Haṃsapārameśvara.

2. Mantrapīṭha: Aghoreśvarīsvacchanda (Dvādaśasāhasra-), Svacchanda (Dvādaśasāhasra-), Rasasvacchanda (Śaṭsāhasra-).

3. Vidyāpīṭha: Picumata, Siddhayogeśvarīmata-Bijabheda (Caturviṃśatisāhasra-), Siddhayogeśvarīmata-Cūḍāmaṇītantra-Uttarottara-Jñānādhikāra-Bhairavodyāna (Sārdhatrisāhasrika-), Siddhayogeśvarīmata-Trikasārottara (Caturviṃśatisāhasrika-).

4. Universal: Piṅgalāmata.

Thus he adds the following to the list of Saiddhāntika Tantras known from the works of the early Kashmirians: Tilakapārameśvara, Pārāka, Mohacūrottara, Vāmadevīyākriyāsamgraha, Vidyāpurāṇa, Saptavidyādhara, Sarvajñānamahodadhī, Sāhasra, and a Pañcāśatika Haṃsapārameśvara; and the Rasasvacchanda to that of the Mantrapīṭha.

<sup>2</sup>The following Śaiva Tantric texts are completely or incompletely preserved in Nepalese palm-leaf manuscripts of the ninth and early tenth centuries:

Haravijaya of Ratnākara composed in Kashmir around 830,<sup>3</sup> are listed in

1. Pārameśvara (/Pauṣkarapārameśvara): (a) ULC Add. 1049, dated year 252 [of the era of Mānadeva, alias Aṃśuvarman] (A.D. 827/8), incomplete; (b) a few folios found with, and roughly contemporary with, the Skandapurāṇa of year 234 (A.D. 819/810), National Archives, Kathmandu (hereafter NAK) MS. 2-229. Saiddhāntika.

The colophons of ULC Add. 1049 call the work Pārameśvara. There are no colophons in the NAK 2-229 fragments. Extensive quotations from the Pauṣkarapārameśvara in Hṛdayaśiva's Prāyaścittasamuccaya, Rājānaka Takṣakavarta's Nityādisaṃgraha and shorter quotations in the Kashmirian commentators agree with material in ULC Add. 1049 and NAK 2-229. Palaeographical considerations indicate that the unstated era of the dates of both the Pārameśvara and the Skandapurāṇa ms. can only be that which is found in Nepalese inscriptions that begin during the reign of king Mānadeva, alias Aṃśuvarman, and range in their dates from 30 to 194. The era of these dates was assumed by some to be that of Harṣa (A.D. 606) but Luciano Petech has shown from Tibetan evidence that it is A.D. 576 ('The Chronology of the Early Kings of Nepal', East and West, n.s. 12, 1961, pp. 227-232). That this is the era of the date of the Skandapurāṇa ms. was recognized by M. Witzel (Indo-Iranian Journal [hereafter IJ] 29 [1986], p. 259, n. 9) and accepted by R. Adriaensen, H. T. Bakker and H. Isaacson in 'Towards a Critical Edition of the Skandapurāṇa', IJ 37 (1994), p. 326.

2. Sarvajñānottarottara (col.: pārameśvare mahātāntre pitāputriye sarvajñānottarottare. . .). ULC Add. 1049, incomplete. Saiddhāntika.

3. Bhairavivardhamānaka. ULC Add. 1049, incomplete. Non-Saiddhāntika.

4. Devyādaṇḍaka. ULC Add. 1049, incomplete. A hymn to the Goddess attributed to the Jñānārṇavamahātānta (col.: jñānārṇave mahātāntre . . .). Non-Saiddhāntika.

5. Kālottara/Vāthula. A fragment of an as yet unidentified recension found with the Skandapurāṇa MS of A.D. 810. Saiddhāntika.

6. Sarvajñānottara. NAK 1-1692; incomplete; assignable to the 9th century on palaeographic grounds; see T. Goudriaan in T. Goudriaan and S. Gupta, Hindu Tantric and Śakta Literature (Wiesbaden, 1981) (hereafter Goudriaan 1981), p. 38, n. 27. Saiddhāntika.

7. Niśvāsātattvasaṃhitā. NAK 1-277; complete; c. A.D. 900; see Goudriaan 1981, p. 34, n. 1. Saiddhāntika. An apograph of this manuscript prepared in A.D. 1912 (London, Wellcome Institute Library, Sanskrit MS I.33 [B]) has independent value, since the exemplar had deteriorated further by the time it was photographed in the recent Nepal-German Manuscript Preservation Project (hereafter NGMPP).

It comprises the Niśvāsamukha (ff. 1v-18v6), the Niśvāsamūla/Mūlasūtra (ff. 18v6-23v1), the Niśvāsottara (/Uttarasūtra) (ff. 23v1-29r5), the Niśvāsānaya (/Nayasūtra) (ff. 29r5-42r5), and the Niśvāsaguhya (/Guhyasūtra) (ff. 42r5-114v). In the last verse of the work Śiva invites Devī to ask him to go on to teach the fifth Sūtra, the Niśvāsakārikā (apograph, f. 114v3): catuṛo kathitā sūtrā \*ye mukhādya (conj. : sa + śādyā) varānane / pañcaman tu paraṃ sūtraṃ kārīkā nāma nāmataḥ / sūcitā sūtramātreṇa kārīkā punaḥ prcchatha. That work too, then, which has survived in South-Indian MSS (Institut Français de Pondichéry [hereafter IFP], MS T. 17, T. 150), which include the Dikṣottara as the last part of the text, was in existence at this time.

8. Kīraṇa NAK 5-893; complete; dated [Nepāl]saṃvat 44 (A.D. 923/4). Saiddhāntika.

<sup>3</sup>The Haravijaya (hereafter HaVi) contains two learned hymns, the first addressed by Spring to Śiva (6.5-170), the second by the Siddhas and Sādhya to Caṇḍī (47.2-168). The poet praises these deities in the terms of the principal soteriologies of the day. In keeping with the allusive style favoured by the Sanskrit poets he seldom names the schools whose language he deploys. But many of the stanzas, particularly in the hymn to Śiva, draw on the terms and concepts of the Saiddhāntika Śaivas; and in some of them one can recognize echoes of specific scriptural sources. These are the Svāyambhuvasūtrasaṃgraha (hereafter SvSūS), the Rauravasūtrasaṃgraha (hereafter RauSūS) and the Mataṅgapārameśvara (hereafter MaPā). Svāyambhuvasūtrasaṃgraha,

the text of the *Skandapurāṇa* preserved in a manuscript completed in 810,<sup>4</sup>

the *Matāṅgapārameśvara*, and the *Rauravasūtrasaṃgraha*. (1) HaVi 6.126 ← SvāSūS VP 1.10-11 (ed. Filiozat); (2) HaVi 6.139 ← SvāSūS 3.11-13; (3) HaVi 6.121 ← RauSūS 1.17; (4) with HaVi 6.147cd cf. RauSūS 4.48 (variant cited ad loc. by Alaka) and *Parākhyā*, ed. D. Goodall (forthcoming) 1.5 (but the latter is a less probable source since it shows signs of being the latest of the pre-tenth-century Saiddhāntika scriptures; see Goodall, *op. cit.* xx, xlvii-lv); (5) HaVi 6.84 ← MaPā VP 8.65ab; (6) HaVi 6.127ab ← MaPā VP 11.33; (7) HaVi 6.115 ← MaPā VP 7.70c-71; (8) HaVi 6.162 ← MaPā VP 9.29b-31... 35-35; and (9) HaVi 47.124 ← MaPā VP 7.31ab.

The colophons of the *Haravijaya* describe Ratnākara as a courtier of king Cippaṭa-Jayāpīḍa, alias Bṛhaspati, when the latter was a juvenile (*śrībālabṛhaspatyanuvivino ... mahākave rājānakasīratnākaraśya*). Kalhaṇa tells us (*Rājatarāṅgiṇī*, ed. Stein [hereafter RāT], 4.703 and 687) that he was murdered in Laukika [38]89 (A.D. 813/4) after a reign of twelve years. But this date is too early, because Kalhaṇa describes Ratnākara as an illustrious figure in the court of Avantivarman, who ruled half a century later, from 855/6 to 883) (RāT 5.34), at a time for which Kalhaṇa's dates are more reliable. Seeing this Georg Bühler pointed out (*A Detailed Report of a Tour in Search of Sanskrit Manuscripts in Kāśmīr, Rājaputana, and Central India*, Bombay, 1887, pp. 42-43) that the date given for Cippaṭa-Jayāpīḍa must be corrected by the addition of about twenty-five years to c. 826-838. Chinese evidence adds weight by diverging to the same extent from Kalhaṇa's dates for Candrāpīḍa, an early king of this dynasty. Kalhaṇa assigns the reign to 686-695 (RāT 4.44 + 4.118), but the *Tangshu* records that a king Chentuobili of Kashmir, who can only be this Candrāpīḍa, sent an embassy to the Chinese capital in 713 and was granted the title of king on the imperial rolls in 720. See A. Stein, *Kalhaṇa's Rājatarāṅgiṇī. A Chronicle of the Kings of Kāśmīr*, 1900, ad 4.45 (with bibliography).

We may add the *Kālotṭara* to the list of Saiddhāntika Tantras current in the ninth century if the *Guhyasiddhi* of Padmavajra in the Buddhist Tantric system of the *Guhyasamāja* is from this period, as it may well be. For verses 8.11-16 instruct the initiate to disguise himself as a Śaiva, win the confidence of a family of untouchables, teach them the Siddhānta, give them Śaiva initiation, receive the Dakṣiṇā and then exchange it for one of their unmarried girls, thus obtaining the consort necessary to the practice of his Vidyā-observance (*vidyāvratam*). Padmavajra specifies the Saiddhāntika texts to be used:

12 *darśayec ca tatas teṣāṃ dharmāṃ siddhāntapūrvakam*  
*kālotṭarādisaṃsiddhāṃ no cen niḥvāsasambhavam*

12b *dharmāṃ siddhānta em.: dharmasiddhānta* ed. 12c *saṃsiddhāṃ*  
 conj. : *saṃsuddhāṃ* ed.

Then he should reveal to them the Siddhāntadharma established in such [scriptures] as the *Kālotṭara*, or that whose source is the *Nisīvāsa*.

<sup>4</sup>NAK 2-229. This *Ur-Skandapurāṇa* lists seven Tantras of the Mother Goddesses (*mātṛtantrāṇi*) in Adhyāya 171. Śiva has declared that henceforth Koṭivarṣa will be a place sacred to the Mothers (171.121), that he will be present there as Hetukeśvara to lead them (171.122), and that whoever drinks the water of the Śūlakunḍa in that place, the site where Bahumāṃsā has just slain the Dānavas with her trident, and offers obeisance to Bahumāṃsā herself, will be protected from all harmful spirits (171.124-125). He continues (171.127-130b, ed. Kṛṣṇaprasāda Bhaṭṭarāi, Kathmandu: Mahendrasaṃskṛtaviśvavidyālaya, 1988):

127 *aham brahmā ca viṣṇuś ca ṛṣayaś ca tapodhanāḥ*  
*mātṛtantrāṇi divyāni mātṛyajñavidhiṃ param*  
 128 *pūnyāni prakariṣyāmo yajanaṃ yair avāpsyatha*

or are mentioned as having been studied or practised during this period in Śaiva inscriptions from Cambodia.<sup>5</sup>

*brāhmaṇ svāyambhuvaṃ caiva kaumāraṃ yāmalaṃ tathā*  
 129 *sārasvataṃ sagāndhāraṃ aiśānaṃ nandiyāmalaṃ*  
*tantrāṇy etāni yuṣmākaṃ athānyāni sahasraśāḥ*  
 130 *bhaviṣyanti narā yaiś tu yuṣmān yakṣyanti bhaktitāḥ*

I propose that *yāmalaṃ* in 128d is to be understood with all (*sarvasaṣṭatayā*), so that the titles indicated are *Brahmayāmala*, *Svāyambhuvayāmala*, *Kumārayāmala* (= *Skandayāmala*), *Sarasvatīyāmala*, *Gāndhārayāmala*, *Īśānayāmala* and *Nandiyāmala*. For of these seven all but the *Svāyambhuvayāmala* and the *Gāndhārayāmala* are found in the scriptural lists of Yāmalatantras known to me, namely (1) in the list of the 64 Bhairavatantras (*sādāśivaṃ cakram*) given in the *Śrīkaṇṭhīya*'s account of the canon Rājānaka Takṣakavarta in *Nityādisaṃgrahapaddhati*, Oxford, Bodleian Library (hereafter Bodl.), MS Stein Or. d. 43 (hereafter *Śrīkaṇṭhīya*), f. 19r3-6: *Brahma*-, *Viṣṇu*-, *Skanda*-, *Umā*-, *Ruru*-, *Ātharvaṇa*-, *Rudra*- and *Vetāla*-; cf. the version of the same quoted by Jayaratha in *Tantrāloka* v. 1 (1) pp. 41-43; (2) in the version of the same list in *Ṣaṭka* 1 of the *Jayadrathayāmala*, NAK 5-4650, f. 184v6-8 (44.5-6): *Brahma*-, *Rudra*-, *Viṣṇu*-, *Skanda*-, *Gautamiya*-, *Ātharva*-, *Vetāla*-, and *Ruru*-; (3) in the *Siddhayaḡogesaṃmatā*, Asiatic Society of Bengal (hereafter ASB), MS 5465 G, f. 69v1-5 (29.16-20): *Rudra*-, *Brahma*-, *Viṣṇu*-, *Skanda*-, *Umā*-; (4) in *Jayadrathayāmala*, *Ṣaṭka* 1, f. 169r7-v6 (36.16-25): *Rudra*-, *Brahma*-, *Viṣṇu*-, (*Skā(n)da*-, *Auma*-/ *Gautamiya*-); (5) *ibid.*, f. 182v8-183r3 (42.1-7): 5 Upayāmala: *Vetāla*- (← *Brahma*-), *Īśāna*- (← *Viṣṇu*-), *Ātharva*- (← *Rudra*-), *Sarasvatī*- (← *Skanda*-), *Soma*- (← *Umā*-); (6) *Picumata*, NAK 1-363, f. 199r2: *Rudra*-, (*Skanda*-, *Brahma*-, *Viṣṇu*-, *Yama*-, *Vāyu*-, *Kubera*-, *Indra*-); (7) in *Jayadrathayāmala*, *Ṣaṭka* 3, NAK 5-1975, f. 170r8 (*Yoginīsaṃcāraprakaraṇa*, *Yoginīsaṃcāraṇipattipaṭala*, v. 37d), listing fifty-eight Tantras in which Śiva has taught *yoginīsaṃcāraḥ*: *Ruru*-, *Rudra*-, *Umā*-, *Gaurī*-, *Skanda*-, *Bhairava*-, *Viṣṇu*-, *Nandī*-, *Śukra*-, *Śakra*-.

Koṭivarṣa is the site also called Devikoṭṭa, Devikoṭa, Śrīpīṭha, Śrīkoṭa, or Ṣonitapura. A Viṣaya of the Puṇḍravardhana Bhukti (EI 14, p. 325) it may be identified with Bāngarh on the bank of the Punarbhavā river in the new Dinajpur District of Bengal; see D. C. Ganguly, 'Yādavaprakāśa on the ancient Geography of India', *Indian Historical Quarterly* 19 (1943), p. 224; J. C. Sengupta, *West Dinajpur*, Calcutta: State Editor West Bengal District Gazetteers, 1965, pp. 186-187, 219-220. It is one of the set of eight Kṣetras, or primary sites of the Goddess, venerated in our earliest sources, the other seven being Prayāga (mod. Allahabad), Varāṇā (mod. Benares), Kollagiri (mod. Kollhapur in Karṇāṭaka), Aṭṭahāsa (in the Bhirbhūm district of Bengal), Jayanti (mod. Jayantipur in the Ganjam District of Orissa?), Caritra (in the Puri District of Orissa) and Ekāmra (Bhubaneswar in the same District) (*Mādhavakula* and *Kālasaṃkaraṣaṇyām-śaktinirdeśa* [both in *Jayadrathayāmala*, *Ṣaṭka* 4], *Guhyasiddhi*, *Nityāhnikatilaka* etc.) or these with Ujjayinī in place of Ekāmra (*Nisīsaṃcāra*, NAK 1-1606, f. 14r [3.5-6]). It is also one of the eight Śmaśāna-sites worshipped in the Maṇḍala of the *Picumata*, Paṭala 3, the others being Prayāga, Vārāṇasī, Virajā (mod. Jaipur in Orissa), Kollagiri, Prabhāsa (mod. Somnāth-Pattana in Surat), Ujjayinī (in Malwa), Bhūteśvara (identity uncertain) and Ekāmra. According to Kṣemarāja it is one of the sites of the eight Śmaśānādhīpatīs listed in *Svacchandatantra* 2.177-180b, the other being Kāmarūpa, Ujjayinī, Kāśmīra, Kāñci, Karavira, Uḍḍiyāna and Hiraṇyapura. Hetuka/Hetukeśvara is named as the Śiva or Kṣetrapāla of this site in *Picumata* Paṭala 3, *Nisīsaṃcāra* Paṭala 4, *Kubjikāmata* Paṭala 22, and the Buddhist *Dākṛṇavatatantra* Paṭala 50, Prakaraṇa 3 (NAK 3-447). An inscription of the Pāla king Nayapāla (EI 39, no. 7) from the middle of the ninth century records (v. 28) the construction of a temple of Hetukeśa at Devikoṭa. The rebuilding of a temple of Hetukaśūlin is mentioned in a copper-plate inscription of the Mleccha king Vanamālavarman of Assam (r. c. 835-860) (EI 29, no. 20, v. 24.)

<sup>5</sup>An inscription of the reign of the Cambodian King Rājendravarman (944-968)

Going back further than this we lose sight of titles and can only establish that Tantric Śaiva texts of certain familiar kinds must have been present and that these or some of these were probably works among those that were current later. Thus I propose that a scriptural corpus of the kind we find later in the Saiddhāntika scriptures must have been in existence by the beginning of the seventh century. There survive inscriptions recording the Saiddhāntika Śaiva initiation of three major kings during the second half of that century,<sup>6</sup> and during its first half the Buddhist philosopher

at Bantāy Kdēi (*Bulletin de l'École Française d'Extrême Orient* [hereafter *BEFEO*] 25:359) says about a certain Śivācārya who died in c.890 and was the Hotar of this king and his predecessors beginning with Isānavarman II (900–928), that he had mastered the 'Sarvajñānottara and all other Śaiva scriptures' (v.38ab: *tasyāsye sañhitās sarvās sarvajñānottarādayah*) and been consecrated as a Śaiva officiant through initiation into the Maṇḍala taught in the *Niśvāsa* (36: *naiśvāsamaṇḍalīn dikṣān naiśthikācāryayātārppaṇīm śivācāryyābhidhādyām yo bhīṣekavidhau dadhau*).

The Sdok Kak Thom inscription of A.D.1052 reports that the *Śīrascheda*, the *Sammoha*, the *Nayottara*, and the *Vināśikha* (= *Vīṇāśikha*), the '[teachings of] the four faces of Tumburu', were transmitted by one Hiranyadāman to Śivakaivalya, the Hotar of king Jayavarman II (A.D.802–850), founder of the kingdom of Angkor, and that this Hiranyadāman performed a ritual following these texts to protect the kingdom and to guarantee its continued independence. These are the principal Tantras of the Vama branch of the Vidyāpīṭha, teaching the cult of Tumburu and his four sisters Jayā, Vijayā, Jayantī/Ajitā and Aparājitā.

Indirect evidence that this cult was already well-established in India at least as early as the beginning of the eighth century is provided by the incorporation of Tumburu and his sisters in the Esoteric Buddhism that reached China in the middle of that century. Chapter 15 of the tantricized *Adhyardhasatikā Prajñāpāramitā*, alias *\*Nayasūtra*, in the Chinese translation completed by Amoghavajra (Taishō 243, of A.D.774), speaks of the four sisters among deities making offerings to the Buddha (tr. Ian Astley-Kristensen, *The Rishukyō*, Tring, 1991, p.159). In his Chinese commentary on this text (Taishō 1003) he identifies them as the sisters of Tumburudeva (ibid., p.160). The five also appear in the Mañjuśrī enclosure of the *\*Garbhadhātumaṇḍala* in the version known as the Genzu brought from China to Japan by Kūkai in A.D.806. There the central Mañjuśrī configuration is flanked by, among others, Dōmoro, Shaya, Hishaya, Ajita and Aharajita; see Adrian Snodgrass, *The Matrix and Diamond World Mandalas in Shingon Buddhism*, Volume 1 (New Delhi, 1988), p.391; and Ulrich Mammitzsch, *Evolution of the Garbhadhātu Maṇḍala* (New Delhi, 1991), pp.150–151, 288–293.

<sup>6</sup>The three kings are the Cālukya Vikramāditya I of Bādāmi, the Eastern Gaṅga Devendravarman, and the Pallava Narasimhavarman of Kāñcī. The earliest of these initiations is that of Vikramāditya I. It was received while he was in the Kollapuram Taluk of the Mahabubnagar District in Andhra and recorded in his Āmudālapāḍu plates announcing a gift to his initiator made on 30th April, 660 (EI 32, no. 21, ed.D.C. Sircar, ll. 25–30):

*viditam astu vo 'smābhiḥ pravarddhamānavijayarājyapañcamasaṃvatsare maṣṭruragrāmādhivāsakaḥ vaṃguravādiviṣaye mātāpitrōr ātmanas ca puṇyayaśovāptaye śivamaṇḍaladikṣyāṃsudarsanācāryāya gurudakṣiṇā-rtham/ vaiśākhapaurṇamāsyām iparumkālāmāgrāmāḥ sarvavaparihāram udakapūrvvo dattāḥ.*

*vo 'smābhiḥ em. Sircar : vāsmābhiḥ ep. grāmādhivāsakaḥ em. Sircar : grāmādhivāsakaḥ ep.*

'Be it known to you that in the fifth year of my prosperous and victorious

reign, while staying in the village Maṣṭrura in the Vamguvādi district I have on the full moon day of Vaiśākha, to attain merit and fame for my parents and myself, donated with [the due pouring of] water the village Iparumkal with all exemptions to Sudarsanācārya as Guru's fee on the occasion of [my] initiation into the Maṇḍala of Śiva.'

For the expression *śivamaṇḍaladikṣā* 'initiation into the Maṇḍala of Śiva' cf. the reference in the Cambodian inscription at Bantāy Kdēi cited above to *naiśvāsamaṇḍalī dikṣā* 'initiation pertaining to the Maṇḍala of [of Śiva] taught in the *Niśvāsa*.'

The initiation of Devendravarman was recorded in a copper-plate grant dated [Gaṅga]saṃvat 184 (EI 26, no. 5, ed. R. K. Ghoshal, ll. 7–10) found during excavations near the Dharmalingeśvara temple in the village Sudaba near Parlākimidi, close to the Orissa-Andhra border, near Mukhalingam, the ancient Gaṅga capital in what was then known as Kalinga. It records that this village was gifted to the Guru Pataṅgasivācārya as his *dakṣiṇā* for performing the king's initiation:

*viditam astu bhavatām yathāsmābhir ayaṃ grāmas sarvavakaraiḥ pariṣṭyācandārkapratīṣṭhaṃmātāpitrōr ātmanas ca puṇyābhivarddhaye ... bhagavatapataṅgasivācāryāya gurave dikṣottarakāle gurupūjāyai dattas ... pravarddhamānavijayarājyasamvatsarasāte caturāṣṭe 100 80 4 utkṛṇṇam ... sarvavacandrena*

Be it known to you that for the increase of the merit of my parents and myself I have gifted this village with exemption from all taxes for as long as the moon and sun shall remain, to His Holiness, the Guru Pataṅgasivācārya, ..., in order that I might make a worshipful offering to him now that [my] initiation has been completed .... Engraved by Sarvacandra in the year 184 of [the dynasty's] prosperous and victorious rule.

The date is A.D.682/3 if we accept 498/9 as the epoch of the Gaṅga era as argued by Mirashi (EI 26, pp. 326–336; EI 27, p.192; EI 28, pp.171–174) and now widely accepted (see Richard Salomon, *Indian Epigraphy*, New York, 1998, pp.187–188.)

The initiation of the third king, Narasimhavarman II of Kāñcī, also called Rājasimha and Atyantakāma, took place at some time between c.680 and c.731, those being the earliest and latest dates that have been assigned to the beginning and end of the much disputed period of his rule. It is indicated by a contemporary inscription in Kāñcī on the king's eponymous Rājasimheśvara shrine (*South Indian Inscriptions* I: 24). Though not stating explicitly that he underwent Śaiva initiation (*śivadikṣā*) it conveys the same by describing him in v.5cd as *śaivasiddhāntamārge śrīmān atyanta-kāma(h) kṣatasakalamalo* ..., 'Atyantakāma, all of whose Impurity has been destroyed by following the path of the Śaivasiddhānta.' For in Saiddhāntika Śaiva doctrine Impurity is what impedes the soul's liberation and it is held that the only way in which a soul can be freed from its effect is to undergo Śaiva initiation. A similar expression occurs in an inscription of the Kalacuri king Yuvarājadeva II (r. c.980–990), referring to the Śaiva initiation received by king Avantivarman in c.825 (EI I, pp.251–270, v.49): *mattamayūranāthaḥ / niṣṣeṣakalmaśaśim apahrtya yena saṅkrāmītam paramo nṛpater avanteh*. '..... [Purandara,] the abbot of Mattamayūra, entirely removed from King Avanti the stain of Impurity and transmitted to him the supreme radiance [of Śivahood].' That the inscription is referring to Śaiva initiation here rather than to simple instruction is proved by an inscription found in the ruins of the Saiddhāntika monastery of Araṇipadra (/Raṇipadra, → mod. Rāṇod, 25°5 N, 77°5 E). For that narrates the same occurrence more directly (EI I: 41, vv.10–13):

*10 tasmāt purandaragurur guruvad garimṇaḥ  
prajñātirekajanitasya babhūva bhūmiḥ  
yasyādhunāpi vibudhair itikṛtyaśaṃsi  
vyāhanyate na vacanaṃ nayamārggavidbhīḥ*

Dharmakīrti (c. 600–660) goes to the trouble of attacking the Tantric Śaiva practice of initiation as the means to liberation.<sup>7</sup> These facts reveal

11 vandyaḥ ko pi cakāsty acintyamahimā tulyaṃ munir bhāvatā  
rājann uttamaśabdapūrvvasikharābhyarṇnam prakīrṇadyutiḥ  
dikṣārthīti vaco nīsamya sukṛti cāroktam urvūpatir  
yasyehānayanāya yatnam akaroc chrīmān avantīḥ purā

12 gatvā tapasyantam upendrapūrvve pure tadā śrīmadavantivarmanā  
bhṛṣaṃ samārādhyā tam ātmabhūmiṃ kathaṃcid ānīya cakāra pūtām

13 athopasadyāpya ca samyag aiśiṃ dikṣāṃ sa dakṣo gurudakṣiṇārtham  
nivedya yasmai nījarājyasāraṃ svajanmasāphalyam avāpa bhūpaḥ

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] are observed even today by scholars learned in the way of discipline; whom the glorious and virtuous king Avantī[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 properly 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 (*gurudakṣiṇā*) and so brought his human birth to fulfillment.

That these initiations were Saiddhāntika Śaiva rather than in the Vāma, Dakṣiṇa or some other Śaiva system of ritual is a strong probability in the light of the respectable and catholic character one would expect of the publicly proclaimed initiation of a king. This, for example, was the tradition followed by the Kalacuris of Cedi, the Paramāras of Mālava, the Colas, the Kākatīyas, the Khmer kings of Cambodia, and others. However, it would not be a certainty without further evidence. In the case of the Pallava king, that his initiation was Saiddhāntika is clearly stated. In the other cases it is not; but it is, I propose, implied by circumstantial details. That the Cālukya's initiation was Saiddhāntika is suggested by its description as an initiation into the Maṇḍala of Śiva (*śivamaṇḍaladikṣā*), and while his Guru Sudarśanācārya appears not to have a Saiddhāntika initiation-name (*dikṣānāma*)—scriptural texts indicate that the taking on of such a name is optional in most cases—we do find such names among those of three of the twenty-seven Brahmins listed in the inscription as indirect recipients of shares (*ācāryeṇāpi brāhmaṇebhyo dattaḥ*): Rudraśivācārya, Gāyatrīśiva and Paramaśiva (ll. 32–34). That Devendravarman's initiation was Saiddhāntika is indicated by the name of the officiant Pataṅgaśivācārya. For a Saiddhāntika abbot with this name see the Gwalior Museum stone inscription of Pataṅgaśambhu published by V. Mirashi in *Journal of the Madhya Pradesh Itihasa Parishad* 64 (1962), pp. 3–12.

<sup>7</sup>See *Pramāṇavārtikakārikā*, ed. Yūshō Miyasaka (1973–75), *Pramāṇasiddhi*, vv. 259c–269c, in which Dharmakīrti attacks those non-Buddhists who claim on the sole authority of their scriptures (*āgamamātreṇa*) that it is initiation (*dikṣā*) that brings about liberation. See his commentator Manorathanandin (ed. R. Saṅktyāyana) ad 259c–260b: *nanūktam īsvareṇāgame 'sty ātmā mokṣaś cāsyā dikṣāvīdhiṇeti* 'Surely Īśvara [Śiva] has said in his [Tantric] scriptures that the soul exists and that it attains liberation through the ritual of initiation' and the rebuttal of Dharmakīrti's criticisms put forward by Kṣemarāja in the 'inquiry into [the theory of] initiation' (*dikṣāvicārah*) with which he concludes his commentary on *Svacchanda*, Paṭala 5 (*Svacchandoddyota* 3[5] 73, 10–84, 9). The fact that he attacks the idea that initiation is the way to liberation does not

that Tantric Śaivism of this relatively public and strongly soteriological variety was not merely present in the seventh century but well established. And this implies the existence of Tantric Śaiva scriptures. For while innovation in religious practice must have preceded its scripturalization, it could not have survived without it, far less reached such prominence. As is exceptionally clear in the case of the Buddhist Yoginītantras, the need to display a scripture as the proof of validity could be greater than the need that such scripture be fully intelligible and coherent.

We also have some evidence from this period of the existence of texts belonging to more esoteric, private and Siddhi-directed forms of Tantric Śaiva practice. In the first quarter of the eighth century Bhavabhūti's picture of Kāpālika observances and doctrine in his drama *Mālatīmādhava* corresponds closely with what is seen in parts of the *Jayadrathayāmala*,<sup>8</sup> the poet Vākpati, his contemporary, knows of the Kaula worshippers of the Goddess;<sup>9</sup> and in the first half of the seventh century Dharmakīrti testifies that among holders of the soul-doctrine there existed Mantrakalpas, 'texts of Mantra ritual', which taught procedures involving the taking of life, theft and sexual congress. He cites the Dākinītantras and Bhaginītantras as examples.<sup>10</sup> His contemporary, the poet Bāṇa, mentions a Mantrakalpa

suffice in itself to show that he has the Śaivas in mind, since the Pāñcarātrikas too had this belief (see, e.g., *Jayākhyasamhitā*, ed. Krishnamacharya, 16.44a, 60; *Sāttvatasamhitā*, ed. Dwivedi, 19.4; *Paṇḍarasamhitā*, ed. Sampatkumāra Rāmānuja, 1.11c–12, 34–41). What narrows the field is that in 261c–262b Dharmakīrti attacks the claim that the efficacy of initiation (and therefore the validity of the scriptures that teach it) is proved by a variety of the ritual called *tulādikṣā* 'scales-initiation', in which the initiate is weighed before and after the performance. Those present, we are asked to believe, see that the person's weight is greater before than after, and are thereby made to understand that the initiation has succeeded in destroying the Impurity (*malah*) that impedes the soul's omniscience and omnipotence, that being of the nature of a material substance (*dravyam*), albeit imperceptible. Now, this variety of initiation is Śaiva. It is cited by the Saiddhāntika Sadyojyoti in *Tattvasaṃgraha* 36: *suddhiṃ vrajati tulāyām dikṣāto brahmahatyato mukhyāt / pratyayato jānīyād bandhanavigamaṃ viśakṣayaṃ*, 'By initiation on the scales he is purified even of such great sins as brahminicide. One may know that his bonds have been destroyed through the evidence [of one's senses], just as [the validity of the Gāruḍatantras is proved] by the cessation of poison [brought about by their Mantras]'. It is the subject of the twentieth chapter of Abhinavagupta's *Tantrāloka*, where he draws on Paṭala 9 of the Trika's *Tantrasadbhāvatāntra*. His commentator Jayaratha on 9.15b quotes the *Tantrarājatantra*. The passage he cites is *Jayadrathayāmala*, Śaṭka 3, Paṭala 20 (*ghoraghoratarācakre catuṣcatvāriṃṣatīdikṣāvīdhiḥ*, variety of initiation no. 21: *ghaṭadikṣā*), f. 153v1–2.

<sup>8</sup>See my 'Purity and power among the Brahmans of Kashmir' in M. Carrithers, S. Collins and S. Lukes (ed.), *The Category of the Person* (1985), p. 213.

<sup>9</sup>*Gauḍavaho*, ed. Shankar Pandurang Pandit, v. 319: *viśasijantamahāpasudamaṣaṇa-saṃbhamaparopparūḍhā / gayane cciya gaṇḍhaūḍiṃ kuṇḍānti kailāṇārio* 'The Kaula women seem to form a shrine in the air as they clamber over of each other in their eagerness to watch a victim of human sacrifice being carved up.'

<sup>10</sup>Dharmakīrti, *Pramāṇavārtikasavavṛtti*, ed. R. Gnoli, p. 163, ll. 3–5: *na, dharmaviruddhānām api kravyasṭeyamaithunahinakarmādibahulānām dākinībhaḡinītantrādiṣu darśanāt* 'No. [It is not the case that Mantras are effective only if they involve virtue];

for there is the evidence that there are also sinful [but nonetheless effective observances (*vrataṃ*) which are] full of violence, theft, sexual congress, base acts and the like in the *Ḍākinītantras*, *Bhagīnītantras* and others'.

Our attention has previously been drawn to this passage by R. M. Davidson ('The Litany of Names of Mañjuśrī. Text and Translation of the Mañjuśrīnāmasaṃgiti', in M. Strickmann (ed.), *Tantric and Taoist Studies in Honour of R.A. Stein, Vol 1*, Bruxelles, 1981, p. 8). He took Dharmakīrti to be referring to Buddhist Tantras here and wondered whether these might not be the same as the *Yogīnītantras* known from later evidence. But it is certain that he is mistaken and that Dharmakīrti refers to Tantras of the Śaivas. To be convinced of this it should be sufficient to read the passage in the light of the following remark earlier in the same discourse (ed. Gnoli, p. 123, ll. 22–24: *bauddhetarayo mantrakalpayor hiṃsāmaithunātmadarśanādāya 'nabhyudāyāhetavo 'nyathā ca varpyante*. 'Violence, sexual congress and belief in the Self are taught to be cause of suffering and bliss in texts of Mantra ritual that are Buddhist and non-Buddhist [respectively].')

Kaṇṇakagomin's commentary on the later passage associates the *Ḍākinītantras* with the taking of life, the *Kambukīnītantras* with theft, and sexual congress with the *Bhagīnītantras*, which he identifies as the *Caturbhagīnītantras* 'the Tantras of the Four Sisters'. See p. 578, ll. 7–9 (ed. R. Saṃkṛtyāyana): *ḍākinībhagīnītantrādiṣu darśanāt. ḍākinītantrē caturbhagīnītantrē, ādiśabdāc cauryahetuṣu kambukīnītantrādiṣu darśanāt*, "For there is the evidence in the *Ḍākinītantras*, *Bhagīnītantras* and others.", i.e. because there is evidence in the *Ḍākinītantras*, in the *Caturbhagīnītantras* and, considering the words "and others", in such as the *Kambukīnītantras* that instigate robbery'; and *ibid.*, ll. 14–17: *ḍākinītantrē samayavyavasthā, yadā prāṇināṃ hatvā khādati tadā mantrasiddhim āśādayati, tathā kambukīnītantrē steyācārāṇāt siddhir ukta, tathā maithunācārāṇāt siddhipradā kācīc devateti bhagīnītantrāntare kvacīc samayaḥ*, 'In the *Ḍākinītantras* the rule of postinitiatory discipline is that one attains the power of the Mantra if one kills and devours a living creature. In the *Kambukīnītantras* one's attainment is said come about through the practice of robbery. And somewhere in the *Bhagīnītantras* the postinitiatory rule is that a certain goddess bestows the attainment on one if one practises sexual intercourse'. I have seen no other reference to the *Kambukīnītantras* ('Tantras of the Robber Wives'). No *Ḍākinītantra* survives, to my knowledge; but they are referred to elsewhere, and in terms that exactly support Kaṇṇakagomin's claim. See Kṣemarāja, *Netroddyota* ad 20.39, referring to methods by which Yoginīs kill their victims (*tattadḍākinītantrōktānām ācārāṇām*); Somadeva, *Kathāsaritsāgara* 20.102–114 (/Kṣemendra, *Bṛhatkathāmañjarī* 3.368–374); and Bhāsarvajña, *Nyāyabhūṣaṇa*, p. 395, ll. 18–21 (ed. Svāmī Yogīndrananda): *yathābhīcārakarṣaṇādīkarmānuṣṭhāyinām ḍākinītantrādiṣu krauryasteyamaithunādyatinindita-karmopetavratānuṣṭhāyinām dhaneśvarādeṣena tacchatratṃ brāhmaṇādīkam api viśvāsyā ghātayatām cauryādīkarmakārīṇām ceti*. Note also that Muslim accounts of Indian religion going back to the report of an eighth-century Abbāsīd envoy refer to practitioners of human sacrifice whom the manuscripts call *Tahkīniyya*, *Dahkīniyya*, etc. W. Halbfass (*Tradition and Reflection*, 1991, p. 105, n. 85) wonders whether these have anything to do with *thakaśāstra*/Thuggee. I judge it more probable, though by no means certain, that they are referring to practitioners of the *Ḍākinītantras* (\**ḍākinīyāḥ*). For these accounts see B. B. Lawrence, *Shahastānī on the Indian Religions*, 1976, pp. 54 and 226–237.

As for the *Bhagīnītantras*, if Kaṇṇakagomin is right that Dharmakīrti is referring to the Tantras of the Four Sisters, then the four, since no other set of four sisters appears in Śaivism, are *Jayā*, *Vijayā*, *Ajitā*/*Jayantī* and *Aparājītā*, the sisters of Tumburu, whose cult is the signature of the Tantras of the Vāma Stream (*vāmasrotāḥ*). One may support this identification by pointing out that the *Śrīkaṇṭhīya* (see above, n. 4) has among its twenty-four Vāma tantras an *Ajitātantra* and a *Vijayātantra*: (f. 17v4–6) *udaksrotasi vāmākhyam caturvīṃśatibhedataḥ / teṣāṃ madhye mahātāntram nayasūtram nayottaram / mahāsaṃmohanam cānyad vīṇatantram śikhottaram / ajitam vijayam hy anyac*.

manuscript for the propitiation of the *Mahākālāhrdayamantra*, in his description of a fictitious Tantric *Sādhaka*.<sup>11</sup> The terms *Mantrakalpa* and *Kalpa* are used in exactly this sense in Tantric literature, to denote the manuscript of a text setting out the procedure for the propitiation of a Mantra.<sup>12</sup> Finally, the jurist Bhāruci, who may also belong to the first half of the seventh century, refers to the *Bhūtatantras* in his commentary

The forms *ajitam* and *vijayam* here are evidently *bhīmat* contractions of *ajitātantram* and *vijayātantram*. The same source also lists a *Catuṣka*, which is said to comprise four Tantras, one *Catuṣka* for each of the sisters: (f. 18r14–v1) *catuṣkaṃ tu tato vakṣye tac caturdhā prakṛtitam / jayācatuṣkaṃ prathamam vijayākhyam tathāiva ca / jayantyākhyam tṛtīyam tu tathā caivāparājitam*. In the list of the Vāmātantras given in the account of the Śaiva canon prefixed without notice to the *Jñānapāñcāśikā* at the beginning of NAK 5-4632 (*Kālotaratantra*) are a *Jayātantra*, a *Vijayātantra*, an *Ajitātantra* and an *Aparājītātantra*: (vv. 22–23b [f. 2r6]) *nayam nayottaram mūkam saṃmohanam mohanāmṛtam / karapūjāvidhānam tu vīṇatantram taduttaram / jayam ca vijayam caiva ajitam cāparājitam*. The first *Ṣaṭka* of the *Jayadrathayāmala* lists a *bhāgīneyam tantram*, i.e. a Tantra of the Sisters in the Vāma division as one of the Tantras of the cycle of the *Mahāsaṃmohanatantra* (f. 178r7–40.111c–112): *\*bhāgīneyam* (em.: *bhōgīneyam* cod.) *viśālam ca bhrātṛtantrādikāni tu / mahāsaṃmohajāladhes tantraratnāni koṭīṣaḥ / nīrgatāni mahādevi bhūktimuktikarāṇi ca*.

<sup>11</sup> *Harṣacarita*, ed. Führer, p. 161, ll. 11–14 (the words of Bhairavācārya): *bhagavato mahākālāhrdayānamno mahāmantrasya kṛṣṇasragambārānulepanenākalpena kalpa-kathitena mahāśmaśāne japakoṭyā kṛtapūrvasevo 'smi tasya ca vetāśādhānāvāsānā siddhiḥ*, 'I have completed the preliminary service (*pūrvaseva*) of the great Mantra called the Heart of Mahākāla by muttering it ten million times in a great cremation ground while wearing a garland of black flowers, a black robe and black unguent, with all the adornments prescribed in the Kalpa.' Neither the Mantra nor its Kalpa can be identified now but the details of procedure given by Bāṇa tally closely with what is laid down in Tantric Śaiva sources. With this account of a *pūrvaseva*, also called *puraścaryā* or *vidyāvrataṃ*, i.e. the initial period of ascetic *japaḥ* etc. to be undertaken after one has received a Mantra, whereby one becomes able to accomplish feats (*karmāṇi*) with that Mantra (see, e.g. *Niśvāsaguhya*, f. 80v3: *japamāna-m eva māśena pūrvasevā kṛtā bhavati*), we may compare, e.g., *Picumata* 21.84–87 (f. 100v3–4): *caturthan tu pravakṣyāmi kṛṣṇabhinnāñjanaprabham / duścaram ghorarūpaṃ ca citrāścaryādīdipitam / mahāsiddhikaram nāma mahocchuṣmaṃ prakṛtitam / kṛṣṇāmbāradharo mantri kṛṣṇasragdāmbabhūṣitaḥ / valayābharaṇan divyaṃ pādaṃ nūpurabhūṣitau / keyūrakatīṣūtram ca pādaṃ laktakarañjītau / karṇālāṅkāramakuṭam valikābharaṇan tathā / kapālam sūlakhaṭvāṅgan dhanur nārācasamṃyutam ....* A Kalpa of Mahākāla (worshipped with the eight Mothers Brāhmī etc. as his retinue) is given in Paṭala 52 (*mudrāpīṭhādīkāro nāma*) of the *Picumata*.

<sup>12</sup> *Svacchanda* 4.498abc: *mantrakalpākṣasūtram ca khaṭikāṃ chattrapāduke / uṣṇīśa-rahitaṃ dattvā ...* 'Having given [the newly consecrated *Sādhaka*] the *Mantrakalpa*, the rosary, the chalk, the umbrella and sandals, but not the turban[, which is given to the Guru alone]....'; *Svacchandodyota* ad loc.: *kalpaḥ sādhyaṃmantrapustikā* 'The Kalpa is a book whose subject is [the procedure for propitiating] the Mantra he is to propitiate'; *Svāyambhuvasūtrasaṃgraha*, Mysore ed., 19.33cd: *kalpoktaṃ tu japaṃ kṛtvā devāya vinivedayet* 'When he has completed the Mantra-recitation laid down in the Kalpa he should offer it to the deity'. The term is transferred to the book from its subject; see *Svacchanda* 9.11a ... 12a: *asya mantraḥ purākyāto ... tasya kalpaṃ pravakṣyāmi* 'I have taught the Mantra of this [deity *Niṣkalasvacchanda*] already ... I shall now teach its Kalpa. Kṣemarāja comments ad loc.: *kalpyata ārādhya* 'neneti kalpo vidhānam' 'Kalpa means the ritual procedure, [literally,] the means of propitiating [the Mantra], from the verb *√kṛp* in that sense.



on Manu as sources teaching rites for the mastering of Vetālas.<sup>13</sup>

So much for the scanty evidence of the limits before which Tantric Śaiva literature can be seen to have existed. For evidence of what it postdates, we must look to the texts themselves. Since they have been composed as scripture, that is to say, as transmissions of a timeless revelation, they are less than generous in this respect. Their redactors seem to have been careful to avoid references to historical persons and events that would undermine faith by implying a *terminus post quem*; and the device

<sup>13</sup>Bhāruci ad Manu, ed. D. Derrett, 9.290 (prohibiting sorcery). For Bhāruci's date see the edition's introduction. Canonical lists of twenty exorcistic Bhūtantras, the Tantras of the *paścimasrotaḥ* 'Western Stream' of Śiva's revelation, are found in the accounts of the canon given in the *Śrikanṭhīya* and the text prefixed to the *Jñānapāñcāśikā*. But I have seen no evidence of any surviving manuscript of any of these titles, not even of the *Caṇḍāsīdhāra*, mentioned by the *Mṛgendra* (CP 1.36ab) as the exemplary scripture of this class. The only early scriptural work of this kind that I have encountered is the *Kriyākālaguṇottara*, which is quoted by Kṣemarāja (ad *Netratantra* 19.62c–64b, 69, 172–178b, 178cd, 179a, 179c–180b, 180cd and 182) and survives in Nepalese manuscripts, the earliest (NAK 3-392) dated Nepāladēśiyasamvat 304 (A.D. 1184/5). This covers both exorcism (the domain of the Bhūtantras) and the curing of snake-bites and the like (the domain of the Gāruḍatantras). That its exorcistic sections are related to what has been lost is suggested by the fact that it teaches the worship of such Śiva-forms as Khaḍgarāvaṇa and Caṇḍāsīdhāra. Tantras bearing their names are in the canonical Bhūtantra lists:

<i>Śrikanṭhīya</i> , f. 12v5–9	Text before <i>Jñānapāñcāśikā</i> , NAK 5-4632, f. 2r8–v1 (vv. 26–28)
1. *Helā (em. : holā cod.)	[1] Hālāhala
2. Hayagrīva	[2] Hayagrīva
3. Karaṅka/Kaṭaṅka	[3] Karakoṭa
4. Kaṭaka	[4] Kaṭaṅkaṭa
5. Karoṭī	[5] Karoṭa
6. Muṇḍamālā	[6] Muṇḍamālā
7. Karkoṭa/Karkoṭa	[7] Karkoṭa
8. Khaḍgarāvaṇa	[8] Khaḍgarāva(va em. : ma cod.)ṇa
9. Caṇḍa	
10. Caṇḍāsīdhāra	[9] Caṇḍāsīdhāra
	[10] Huṃkāra
	[11] Hāhākāra
	[17] Vimala
	[18] Vikaṭa
11. Vikaṭa	
12. [Amaran]ṭaka-maṇḍala	
13. Bhūtatrasa	[16] Duṣṭatrasaka
14. Śikhārāva	[12] Śikhārāva
15. Gharghara	[15] Gurghura
16. Siphakoṭara	
17. Ghorāṭṭahāsa	[13] Ghorāṭṭahāsa
18. Ucchiṣṭa	[14] Ucchiṣṭa
18 bis. Ucchiṣṭa	
19. Yamaghaṇṭa	[20] Yamaghaṇṭa
20. Ghaṭotkaca	[19] Mahotkaca

of prophecy, which would have allowed reference to the past without this consequence, is rare in this predominantly prescriptive literature.<sup>14</sup> So one is reduced to trying to get the better of the redactors by identifying elements in their texts which they probably considered timeless facts but whose introduction can nonetheless be dated, if only approximately. Thus there are elements of Greek astrology and chronometry in some of the early Śaiva scriptures, elements such as the signs of the zodiac (*rāśayaḥ*), their subdivisions into *horāḥ* (ωραι) and *drekkāṇāḥ* (δεκανοι), and the listing of the Grahas in the order of their lordship of the weekdays. Texts with

<sup>14</sup>The few passages known to me in the Śaiva Tantras which refer to events in the future tense of prophecy concern the history of the transmission of the text in which they are contained and lack references to datable persons or events. Examples are the *Kularatnoddyota*'s Paṭalas 8 (*parāparasantānanirṇayaḥ*), 9 (*caturvidhasṛṣṭyavatā-rasrīmūlamanḍalapūjāvīdhānam*) and 10 (*bhaviṣyapūrvāmnāyavatārasūcanam*) and the first Paṭala of the *Picumata*. The last is exceptional in that the Gurus and disciples to whom it refers seem to be historical rather than mythical, since it gives not only their names but also the places and castes of their birth, their Vedic Śākhā in the case of brahmins, and in some cases the names of their parents. However, it appears that nothing in this interesting account is datable. It is more common for accounts of the transmission or descent of a revelation to be given in the past tense, but then they generally attribute the events to mythical, prehistorical time, such as the beginning of the Kaliyuga. I know of one exception. The *Yonigahvara* (ASB 1000 G), a text-bricolage in the tradition of the Krama, claims to have been revealed on earth by *Jñānanetranātha* (f. 1v3): *yonigahvaram uddhṛtya mantrasadbhāvam uttamam / śrī-jñānanetranāthena bhūtale samprakāśitam*, who probably flourished towards the beginning of the tenth century since he is reported to have been at three removes from Cakrabhānu, the Guru of the Bhūtīrāja who was one of the teachers of Abhinavagupta (fl. c. 975–1025); see Arṇasimha, *Mahānayaṇaparakāśa*, NAK 5-358, f. 119v1–5 (vv. 154–157): *tataḥ śrīmacchivānandanāthaguruvaram sadā / lokottaramahājñānacakṣuṣaṃ-praṇamāmy aham / śrīmatkeyūravatyakhyā pīṭhajajñānapāragā / khacakraṭācārīnī ye-yaṃ tām ahaṃ naumi bhaktitāḥ / mahāvīravaro yo 'sau śrīmadvāmanasamājñakāḥ / devīdhānni sadārūḍhas taṃ vande kramabhāskaram / tataḥ śrīmacakraḥbhānur deva-tānayaḍeśikāḥ / mahāvratadharo yas taṃ vande 'haṃ paradhāmagam; and Jayaratha, *Tantrālokaṭīkā* ad 4.173ab, p. 193, 13–16. Elsewhere in the *Yonigahvara* a passage in barbarous Sanskrit appears to report composition by Oghānanda, the disciple of Rūpānandā, who had received the Krama (Mahānaya) from Virāsimhasvāmīnī; see vv. 493–495 (ff. 34v4–35r2): *devī śrīvirāsimhākhyā svāmīnī prasphuṭā bhuvī / tadpāda-padmayugalāt prāptam caivam mahānayaṃ / śrīrūpānandābhīdhā devī dattam tasya prasādāt / tayā dattam svasṛṣṭyasya oghānandābhīdhānāt / dattam parāṃrtara-saṃ mahāśāsanam uttamam / tenedaṃ racitam sarvaṃ yathā prāptam guror mukhāt / sampradāyaṃ susambaddhaṃ sarahasyaṃ mukhāgamam / racitam guruvākyena sva-santānahitāya ca*. This Virāsimhasvāmīnī is the Yogīnī otherwise called Maṅgalā, whom the followers of the Krama claimed to be the source of their tradition as the teacher of the Siddha Jñānanetranātha; see *Mahānayaṇaparakāśa* (Trivandrum Sansk. Ser. 130) 7.85: *vīrasimhāsanastheyam devī paramamaṅgalā*; Arṇasimha, *Mahānayaṇaparakāśa*, f. 117v2–3 (v. 135abc): *idam śrīvirāsimhākhyasvāmīnyā samprakāśitam / śrījñānanetranāthasya*; cf. ibid. f. 119r5–v1 (v. 152): *udgīthapīṭha\*ṛjā* (em.: yā cod.) *śrīmanmaṅgalānanda-nirbhārā / sadasadbhāsanāveśavarjitā tām ahaṃ śraye*; Sītikanṭha, Old Kashmiri *Mahānayaṇaparakāśa* 9.5ab: *haraśīru jina gaṅgi avatāraṇa tā jānu maṅgalā pīṭhadiśāna* 'As the Ganges descends to earth from the head of Śiva, so from Maṅgalā the lineages of the Pīṭha [Uḍḍiyāna]'.*



these elements can hardly be earlier than the fourth century A.D., though they may be three or more centuries later.<sup>15</sup>

As for hard evidence of dependence on datable literary sources, I have as yet little to offer. The *Matanigapārameśvara* paraphrases the *Sāṃkhyakārikā* of Īśvarakṛṣṇa (c. A.D. 350–400),<sup>16</sup> and echoes the definition of sense-perception formulated in the *Pramāṇasamuccaya* of the Buddhist Dignāga (c. A.D. 480–540) and elaborated in the *Nyāyabindu* of Dharmakīrti (c. A.D. 600–660).<sup>17</sup> The *Jayadrathayāmala* echoes the *Āgamaśāstra* of Gauḍapāda

<sup>15</sup>See D. Pingree, 'Representation of the Planets in Indian Astrology', *III* 8 (1964–5), pp. 249–267; *The Yavanajātaka of Sphujidhvaja* (1978), vol. 2, pp. 197–98. Though Greek astrology entered India through Yavaneśvara's Sanskrit translation of an unknown Greek work in A.D. 149/50 subsequently rendered into verse by Sphujidhvaja in his *Yavanajātaka* of A.D. 269/70, it was not established outside this Hellenic-Indian corpus before the Gupta period (A.D. 320+). We see these elements of Greek astronomy in the *Niśvāsakārikā*, the *Kālottara*, the *Bṛhatkālottara*, and major works outside the Saiddhāntika corpus: the *Svacchanda*, the *Picumata*, the *Piṅgalāmata* and the *Jayadrathayāmala*; see, e.g., *Niśvāsakārikā-Dikṣottara*, Paṭala 17 (*kālacakraprakaraṇam*); *Sārdhatrisatikālottara* 11.6a (*saṃkrāntiḥ*, in the same context); *Bṛhatkālottara*, *grahayāgaṭālaḥ* (34th Paṭala); *Svacchanda* 7.26c–208 (in the same context); *Picumata* f. 313v4 (in the same context: *rāsayaḥ saṃthavarjitāḥ*, 'the [twelve] vowels minus the infertile [ṚṚLL] equal the signs of the zodiac); *Piṅgalāmata*, *Pratimādhikāra*, 438–451c (NAK 5-1929, f. 16r6–11). The last details the iconography of the Grahas. However, when the planets are worshipped in a circle (*grahacakraṃ*) their distribution around the circle is not usually in the order of the week with Rāhu and Ketu at the end. We see the Greek order in the *Bṛhatkālottara*; but in *Niśvāsakārikā-Dikṣottara* 17.19c–22 (IFP MS T. 150, p. 160) and *Kirāṇa*, Paṭala 30 (*grahayāgaḥ*) it is Sun (centre [Sunday]), Moon (E [Monday]), Mars (SE [Tuesday]), Mercury (S [Wednesday]), Saturn (SW [Saturday]), Jupiter (W [Thursday]), Rāhu (NW), Venus (N [Friday]) and Ketu (NE). Worship in the order of the weekdays is seen in the *grahayāgaṭālaḥ* of the *Bṛhatkālottara*.

A somewhat later limit is probable for the *Bṛhatkālottara*, the *Kālottara* in three hundred verses (*Trayodaśasatika*-) and the *Svacchanda* because they have integrated the duodecimal and sexagesimal cycles of one and five Jovian Great Years into their Yoga. The second of these cycles is unlikely to have entered our literature before A.D. 500. See *Trayodaśasatikakālottara* quoted at *Sārdhatrisatikālottaravṛtti*, p. 102: *saṣṭiṣaṃvatsarāḥ proktā ahorātreṇa yoginām*; *Bṛhatkālottara*, NAK 1-89, f. 178r4 (*Kālañānapaṭālaḥ*, v. 10cd: *tenāhorātramāsās ca dvādaśaṣṭiṣvatsarāḥ*; *Svacchanda* 7.130c–138, *Tantrāloka* 6.126–127. The duodecimal system first appears in the late fifth century A.D. in inscriptions of the Parivrajaka feudatories of the Guptas. The sexagesimal *bṛhaspatiacakraṃ* was in use in 530; but it may go back further, since some south Indian astronomical tables have it commence in 427; see Renou et al., *L'Inde Classique* (1985), vol. 2, pp. 725–26. Its earliest attested use in epigraphy is in a Mahākūṭa inscription dated in the 53rd year of the cycle, which probably = A.D. 602; see Salomon, *Indian Epigraphy* (1998), p. 198.

<sup>16</sup>*Matanāga* VP 6.63c–64b (on the Sāṃkhyas' view of bondage): *pradhānasyeṣyate sargaḥ sa ca sarvatra saṃsthitāḥ / na kaścid badhyate loke na ca kaścid vimucyate*. Cf. *Sāṃkhyakārikā* 62 (as quoted ad loc. by Bhaṭṭa Rāmakaṇṭha): *tasmān na badhyate nāpi mucyate naiva saṃsarati kaścid / saṃsarati badhyate sa vimucyate ca nānāśrayā prakṛtiḥ*.

<sup>17</sup>*Matanāga*, *Yogapāda* 4.15c–16a<sup>1</sup>: *anirdeśyam asaṃdigdham kalpanāpoḍhagocaram / pratyakṣam*, 'Sense-knowledge is inexpressible, certain and free of imagination.' This, specifically the term *kalpanāpoḍha*-, is derived from the definition *pratyakṣam*

(c. A.D. 550–700).<sup>18</sup> And the *Bṛhatkālottara*, a rather late, eclectic text influenced by non-dualism, echoes the *Spandakārikā* of Bhaṭṭa Kallaṭa,<sup>19</sup>

*kalpanāpoḍham* given by Dignāga in the *pratyakṣaparicchedah* of his *Pramāṇasamuccaya* (Masaaki Hattori, *Dignāga, On Perception*, 1968, pp. 25, 82, note 1.25). For Dignāga's date see Erich Frauwallner 'Landmarks in the History of Indian Logic,' *Weiner Zeitschrift für die Kunde Süd- und Ostasiens* 5 (1961), pp. 134–137. Cf. Dharmakīrti, *Nyāyabindu* 1.4: *pratyakṣam kalpanāpoḍham abhīrāntam*, 'Sense-knowledge is free of imagination and non-erroneous'. For Dharmakīrti's date see Frauwallner *op. cit.*, pp. 137–9. The *Matanāga* also knows the Mahāyānist doctrine of consciousness-only (*vijñānamātratā*); see VP 6.19c–20.

<sup>18</sup>This influence is apparent in the nondualistic 'Teachings on the Waveless' (*nistarāṅgapadesaḥ*) found in the third *ṣaṭkam* of that work. (1) *Jayadrathayāmala*, *Ṣaṭka* 3 (NAK 5-1975, ff. 107v1–118r3), Paṭala 15 (*kuṇḍalesarivividhiḥ*). (NU), v. 136ab: *kalpayāmy ātmanātmānam svatantrapaiva hetunā*; cf. *Āgamaśāstra*, ed. Christian Bouy (2000) (ĀŚ), 2.12ab: *kalpayaty ātmanātmānam ātmā devaḥ svamāyayā*; (2) NU 137c–138b: *cijjyotirūpam ātmānam tad ahaṃ sarvadrk sadā / amātro 'nantamātrākhyo mātrābhāvāntare sthitah*; cf. ĀŚ 1.12d and 1.29a: *turiyaḥ sarvadrk sadā ... amātro 'nantamātrāś ca*; (3) NU 178cd: *advayaḥ sarvabhūtānām svayaṃ viraḥ svayaṃ prabhuh*; cf. ĀŚ 1.10cd: *advaitaḥ sarvabhāvānām devas turyo vibhuḥ smṛtaḥ*; (4) NU 182c: *ajena tu ajaṃ \*buddhvā* (em.: *buddhyā* cod.); cf. ĀŚ 3.33d and 3.47cd: *ajenājam vibudhyate and ajam ajena jñeyena sarvajñam paricakṣate*; (5) NU 184a: *nivṛttiḥ sarvaduḥkḥānām*; cf. ĀŚ 1.10a: *nivṛtteḥ sarvaduḥkḥānām*; (6) NU 196c: *\*ajam* (em.: *ajoy* cod.) *anidram asvapnam*; cf. ĀŚ 4.81ab: *ajam anidram asvapnam*; (7) NU 238: *sarvārambhavinīḥkrāntam cittam yasmin suniśalam / \*aniṅgamam* (em.: *aliṅgamam* cod.) *anābhāsaṃ brahmaiva paramārthataḥ*; cf. ĀŚ 3.46: *yadā na kīyate cittam na ca vikṣipyate punaḥ / aniṅgamam anabhāsaṃ niṣpannam brahma tat tadā*.

As for the date of the *Āgamaśāstra*, it is quoted by Maṇḍanamīśra, Śaṅkara, and Śureśvara, which provides a somewhat uncertain posterior limit of c. A.D. 700. A more certain limit is provided by his being known to Śāntarakṣita, c. 725–788, for whose dates see Helmut Krasser, 'On the relationship between Dharmottara, Śāntarakṣita and Kamalaśīla', in *Tibetan Studies*, Proceedings of the 5th Seminar of the International Association for Tibetan Studies, Narita, Vol. 1, 1989, p. 151. A prior limit of c. 550 is established if, as seems probable but is not certain, the source of *Āgamaśāstra* 4.24 is Bhavya (c. 490–570); see Ch. Lindtner, 'Remarks on the Gauḍapādiya-Kārikās (GK)', *III* 28 (1985), pp. 275–279. For a judicious review of the evidence see Bouy, *op. cit.*, pp. 17–21.

<sup>19</sup>See *\*Bṛhatkālottara*, *Dikṣāpaṭala*, NAK 1-89 (B), f. 41r6: *iti yojanikā kāryā citspaṇḍānandamandire*; *Yogapāṭala*, B f. 268v3, NAK 5-778 (A), f. 303v3–4: *asatyam satyam ābhāti tāvat sarvaṃ carācaram \*yāvat* (conj.: *yāvatsu* B: *yāvaṃta* A) *spandarūpaṃ tu na drṣṭam guruvakrataḥ / drṣṭe tasmin pare tattve \*asad* (A: *susad* B) *rūpam carācaram*; *Mantrārpaṇapāṭala*, A f. 314r2–3, B f. 179v2: *\*cit* (B: *vi* A) *spandamandire sthitvā hānādānavivartite / bhāvābhāvavinirmukte dhyā \*nadhyyeyavi* (em.: *nādheyavi* B: *nāc* ca *pari* A) *varjite / etat tat paramam jñānam rahasyam te prakāśitam*. Cf. also *Bṛhatkālottara*, *Antaryāgaṭāla*, A f. 217r3–5, B f. 190v4–5 (B) [I] with *Spandakārikā* 1.23–2.1 [II]:

I

mānasasya paḍaṃ prāpya  
brahmādinām agocaram

II

1.23 yām avasthām samālambya  
yad ayaṃ mama vakṣyati  
tad avasyaṃ kariṣye 'ham  
iti saṃkalpya tiṣṭhati  
24 tām āśṛityordhva mārgēna  
candrasūryāv ubhāv api  
sauṣumne 'dhvany astamito

who according to Kalhaṇa flourished in Kashmir during the reign of Avantivarman (A.D. 855/6–883).<sup>20</sup>

So by the beginning of the seventh century at the latest there existed a Tantric Śaivism of the kind known from the early surviving literature, by which I mean a Śaivism comprising both of the two kinds of system whose scriptures the Śaivas distinguished as the ordinary (*sāmānya*-) and the extraordinary (*vaiśeṣika*-), that is to say both Saiddhāntika Śaivism and non-Saiddhāntika Śaivism of some sort. Inscriptions indicate the existence of the first and Dharmakīrti and Bāṇa that of the second. It is quite possible that by the seventh century most of the literature available to Śaiva scholars in the tenth was already in existence. But it is not until the beginning of the ninth that we have firm evidence of specific texts. Our few witnesses from that time show us the principal among the Saiddhāntika scriptures known later, and also texts of most of the major divisions of the non-Saiddhāntika tradition: the Vāma, the Yāmala and, probably, the Trika.<sup>21</sup> For our earliest evidence of certain divisions, notably the

37 *prāṇodayaṃ samāśrītya*  
*trimuṣṭiyantaṃ kramād vrajet*  
*somasūryalayaṃ yatra*  
*tatra sthītvā yathāsukhaṃ*  
38 *tato bhrūdvāram āśrītya*  
*mantravīryaṃ samākramet*  
*tad ākramya balaṃ mantri*  
*sarvavaiśvaryaṃ padam labhet*

*hitvā brahmāṇḍagocaram*  
25 *tadā tasmin mahāvīryam*  
*pralīnaśaśibhāskare*  
*saṃsuptapadāvan mūḍhaḥ*  
*prabuddhaḥ syād anāvṛtaḥ*

2.1 *tad ākramya balaṃ mantrāḥ*  
*sarvajñabalaśālināḥ*

36c *mānasasya* em.: *māna-*  
*masya* AB 37b *kramād B*  
*kramā A* 37c *somasūrya*  
B : *somasūryaṃ A* 38a *bhrū-*  
*dvāram B* : *bhūdāram A*

<sup>20</sup> *Rājatarāṅgiṇī* 5.66.

<sup>21</sup> I am not aware of direct evidence of the existence of specific Tantras of the Trika at this date. But, as I have pointed out elsewhere ('Maṇḍala and Āgamic Identity in the Trika of Kashmir' in *Mantras et Diagrammes Rituelles dans l'Hindouisme*, Paris: CNRS, 1986, p. 169, n. 1), Ratnākara shows technical knowledge of the Trika in *Hara-vijaya* 47.99:

*cakrāśritatrisīkhakoṭigatāravindasatkarṇikāsanagatām iha kaulikas tvām*  
*dhyātuvāiti śaktipatitām sthīrabhairavāṅkavṛttim parāparabhedavatīm jano*  
*'yam*

By meditating on you here, visualizing you enthroned on the beautiful centre of the lotus above the cusps of the trident that is within [your] Maṇḍala, we Kaulas become Lords of the Powers, attaining the continuous state of existence in Bhairava that embraces both the transcendent and the immanent aspects [of his nature].

To this I add 47.96, 47.97 and 47.112. I propose that in the first two of these verses Ratnākara is giving us encrypted descriptions of the syllables HSAUḥ and SAUḥ, two forms of the seed-syllable of Parā, the principal goddess of the Trika. In the third he refers to those who hold that reality has three aspects, namely *naraḥ*, *śaktiḥ* and *śivaḥ*

Mantrapīṭha and the Krama, and of the majority of titles known to us in all categories, we have to wait until the second half of the tenth century. But, of course, we cannot make the absence of earlier evidence of these divisions and texts the basis for an inference that they were not yet in existence. In other words, while we have established the approximate limits of the development of the Tantric Śaiva literature, we have not succeeded in demonstrating, except in the case of the *Bṛhatkālottara*, that any text or division is earlier or later than any other. The task before us now is to apply text-critical methods to obtain evidence of such relative chronology.

The Tantric Śaiva scriptural literature is divided in Śaiva sources in three ways: (1) into Saiddhāntika Tantras on the one hand and the Mantrapīṭha and Vidyāpīṭha divisions of the Bhairava Stream (*bhairavasrotah*) on the other, (2) into Tantras of the Saiddhāntika (Ūrdhva), Vāma and Dakṣiṇa Streams, and (3) into Saiddhāntika Tantras and Bhairavatantras.<sup>22</sup> In the first classification the Mantrapīṭha is principally the *Svacchanda* and such lost ancillary texts as the *Aghoreśvarīsvacchanda* and the *Rasasvacchanda*, and the Vidyāpīṭha comprises the Vāmatantras, the Yāmalatantras and the Śaktitantras, the last of these containing texts pertaining to both the Trika and the Krama. In the second classification, the Vāmatantras are put in a class of their own as the Tantras of the Northern Stream (*vāmasrotah*, *uttarasrotah*), revealed from the effeminate and gentle Vāmadeva face of Śiva, while the Dakṣiṇatantras, the Tantras of the Southern Stream (*dakṣiṇasrotah*), revealed from his ferocious Aghora/Bhairava face, cover the territory of the Mantrapīṭha and that of the Trika-related and Yāmala divisions of the Vidyāpīṭha. In the third classification, the Bhairavatantras, conventionally sixty-four in number, comprise Tantras

(*tattvaṃ bhavāni naraśaktiśivātmaṃ yad etat tridhā sthitam uśanti parāvarajñāḥ*). On the level of doctrine it is this that distinguishes the Trika from the other Śiva systems. Abhinavagupta, when teaching that the seed-syllable of Parā may be HSAUḥ reports that this (and S-HAUḥ) are the forms prescribed in the *Triśirobhairavatantra* (*Tantrāloka* 30.28d and Jayaratha ad loc.). It is at least probable, then, that Ratnākara was aware of this scripture of the Trika.

Furthermore, the *Bhairavivardhamānaka*, the hymn to the Goddess of which some folios are preserved with the *Pārameśvara* codex of A.D. 827/8, seems to know the Trika's defining triad, the goddesses Parā, Parāparā and Aparā. The text is corrupt at this point but the view that the passage refers to these goddesses gains in plausibility from the fact that the goddess is identified immediately after it with the signature goddesses of another Tantric system, the four Sisters of Tumburu (f. [51]r3: *ṣparāparā śakti tua yāparā. parāparātatva jayāparāḥ. jayā vijayā ajitāparājītā*). The hymn also knows a *Brahmayāmala*, *Viṣṇuyāmala* and *Rudrayāmala*, since it refers to the Goddess as the embodiment of these (f. 53r): *tvam brahmayāmālā tvam viṣṇuyāmālā tvam rudrayāmālā*.

<sup>22</sup> Here I exclude from consideration only the peripheral and purely instrumental traditions represented by the iatro-magical (Gāruḍa-) and exorcistic (Bhūta-, Bhautika-) Tantras. They are accommodated in the second classification as the revelations of the Eastern and Western Streams respectively: Gāruḍa E (Tatpuruṣa), Bhautika W (Sadyojāta), Vāma N (Vāmadeva), Dakṣiṇa S (Aghora), and the Siddhāntatantras above (Iśāna).

that according to the other classifications are (1) revelations of the Mantrapīṭha, (2) Yāmālatantras, (3) the Trika-related Vidyāpīṭha and (4) the Vāma Stream.<sup>23</sup>

In all these classifications the special standing of the *Svacchanda* on the non-Saiddhāntika side of Śaivism is clear. For both the classifications which do not mark out the *Svacchanda*-dominated territory of the Mantrapīṭha as a distinct entity but subsume it within the larger categories of the Dakṣiṇa- and Bhairavatantras, nonetheless place the *Svacchanda* at their head.<sup>24</sup> The importance of this text is also indicated by the existence of a number of extensive ancillary *Svacchanda* scriptures;<sup>25</sup> by the attention it received from the learned in Kashmir in the tenth to eleventh centuries; by the fact that it was the basis of standard Śaiva practice in that region and has remained so down to modern times; by the existence

<sup>23</sup>The reason that texts related to the Krama are absent from the second and third classifications is probably that they predate it. The only surviving Vidyāpīṭha text that is Krama-related is the *Jayadrathayāmala* and this character belongs only to the last three of its four sections of six thousand verses (*ṣaṭkaṁ*). The first Ṣaṭka, to which we owe our only full exposition of the classification into Mantrapīṭha and Vidyāpīṭha, is a text of the cult of Kālasaṃkarṣaṇī with no clear Krama superstructure. The five-stream classification seen in the *Śrīkaṇṭhīya*'s account of the canon includes a number of works with titles resonant of the Krama in a list of subdivisions of the last of its Bhūtantras, the *Ghaṭotkaca*, e.g. *Mahākālīkrama*, *Kramabheda*, *Ṣṣṭikrama*, *Rājāvātāra*, *Mantrāvātāra*, *Kālikrama*, *Kālasaṃkarṣaṇīkrama*, *Samhārakrama*, and *Bhāvasaṃhārakrama*. This is probably a secondary attempt to accommodate the new tradition while at the same time expressing the view that the Krama is a soteriological development from within the exorcistic division of Śaivism. There is much to be said in favour of this view.

<sup>24</sup>A canon of thirty-two Tantras of the Southern Stream (which become sixty-four since each is supposed to have an *-uttaratantra*) is given vv. 17 ff. of the text prefixed to the *Jñānapañcāśikā*: *svacchandabhairavaṃ caṇḍa(m) krodham unmattabhairavam* .... These first four of the list comprise the four primary Sūtras of the Mantrapīṭha in the first classification, which we know from the *Jayadrathayāmala* and, in identical words, from the *Sarvavīra* as quoted by Kṣemarāja ad *Svacchanda* 1.4c-7: *svacchandabhairavaś caṇḍaś krodha unmattabhairavaś / granthāntarāṇi catvāri mantrapīṭhaṃ varāṇane*. Another list is found in the *Śrīkaṇṭhīya*, according to which there are twenty-four Dakṣiṇatantras. The first is the *Mahāghora*. This is not exactly a synonym of the *Svacchanda*, though Aghora = *Svacchanda*, but rather a class-name for a series of 24 Tantras among which *Svacchanda* texts figure conspicuously. They are the *Lākula* (i.e. *Lakulasvacchanda*; cf. Kṣemarāja ad *Svacchanda* 10.1131c), *Aghoreśvarīsvacchanda*, *Vidyāsvacchanda*, *Svacchandāsāra*, *Rasasvacchanda*, *Rājaputrasvacchanda*, *Bindusvacchanda*, and *Nādasvacchanda*. The third classification, that of the sixty-four Bhairavatantras, is available to us in two versions, the first in the *Śrīkaṇṭhīya* and the second in the *Jayadrathayāmala*. Though they differ from each to some extent, they both have the *Svacchandabhairava* as the first text, beginning with the verse already cited, in which this text is followed by the *Caṇḍa*, the *Krodha* and the *Unmattabhairava*. The *Svacchanda* also heads the list of Dakṣiṇatantras in the *Picumata* (f. 200r, 39.34c-36c): *svacchandabhairavaṃ devī krodhabhairavam eva ca / unmattabhairavaṃ devī tathā caivograbhairavaś / kapālibhairavaṃ caiva tathā jhaṃkārabhairavaś / sekharāṇi ca tathā caiva vijayabhairavam eva ca / rudrayāmalaṃ anyāṇi* ....

<sup>25</sup>See notes 24 and 27.

of transmissions of the text in Nepal and South India, especially since these can be shown to be independent of the Kashmirian; and by the presence of *Svacchandabhairava* worship to this day among the Newars of the Kathmandu Valley.<sup>26</sup> It is therefore of particular interest to determine its

<sup>26</sup>See my 'Maṇḍala and Āgamic Identity in the Trika of Kashmir', p. 182, n. 68. *Svacchandabhairava* is the Āgamic identity of the Pacalibhairav in the south of Kathmandu, as is evident from unpublished inscriptions at the site. One of 924 (A.D. 1804) in a pilgrim shelter (New. *phalcā*) facing the front of the shrine refers to the place as the seat of *Svacchandamahābhairava*: (ll. 1-2): *om śubham. samvat 924 māgha sudi 10 śrīśrīśrī* (2) *svacchāṃdamahābhairavasthāne*. Another, in a shelter facing the lateral entrance, begins with obeisance to this deity (l. 1: *om namo bhagavate svacchāṃdamahābhairavāya*) and then refers to the place in the declaration of pious intent (*saṃkalpaḥ*) as the seat of *Svacchandabhairavabhāṭṭāraka* (ll. 5-6: *śrīmatkāṃtī(6)nagare śrī 3 svacchāṃdabhairavabhāṭṭārakasthāne ihaiva puṇyabhūmau*). A folio at the end of a Nepalese ms. of the *Svacchandabhairavatāntra* completed in A.D. 1068/9 (NAK 1-224) records the installation of a *Svacchandabhairava* as Lord of the South in A.D. 1184/5, probably referring to Pacalibhairav, who is the guardian of the southern district of Kathmandu (f. 163r: *samvat 316 ... dakṣiṇesvarasvacchāṃdamahādevapratīṣṭhā*). Of two inscriptions of A.D. 1819 and 1847 recording the dedication of pilgrim shelters in Kupu, about two miles SE of Pharping, the first begins with a verse of devotion to *Svacchanda*, and in the second, the donor refers to the same as his personal deity (ll. 2-3: *sveṣṭadevatāsvacchandabhairavapratīṣṭhā* ...) (see Hemanta Rāṇa and Dhanavajra Vajrācārya, *Ṭiṣṭuṅga-Cīṭalāṇa bhekako aithāsika sāmāgrī* (Kirtipur: CNAS, VS 2029, pp. 30-32, 34). Kamalaprakāśa Malla reports that these shelters in Kupu are at the temple of *Svacchandabhairava* (*Pūrvaja Lumākā*, 1980, p. 7). A *pūjā* and goat sacrifice to *Svacchandabhairava* are offered in Pharping by the Karmācāryas of Kocchutvāh during three chariot processions (*rathayātrā*) in the course of the annual Navarātra (see Kulacandra Koṛālā, 'Dakṣiṇakālīka [Pharpiṇ]', *Prācīna Nepālā* 119 [August-September 1990], p. 30b). There is further evidence of the worship of *Svacchandabhairava* in Nepal until modern times in connection with the shrine of Paśupati, the national deity: a document records a gift of land in A.D. 1701 to Keśavabhaṭṭa, priest of the Paśupati temple, to provide for the *pūjā* and *paśubaliḥ* of *Svacchandabhairava* (text in Axel Michaels, *Die Reisen der Gotter. Der nepalische Paśupatinātha-Tempel und sein rituelles Umfeld* [1994], pp. 331-2); in A.D. 1854/55 Jang Bahadur issues a letter fixing the rent of the tenants of the land of a *Svacchandabhairava* of Nuvākot to the NW of Kathmandu (see Dhanavajra Vajrācārya and Tekbahādur Śreṣṭha, *Nuvākotko Aitihāsik Rūparekhā* [Kirtipur: CNAS, VS 2032], p. 107); a copper-plate inscription A.D. 1801/2 (text in Govind Taṇḍan, *Paśupatiḥṣetrako Sāṃskṛtika Adhyayana*, vol. 2, inscr. no. 126, p. 338), recording provisions for the annual *mahāpūjā* of Paśupati, includes the requirements for the *pūjā* of *Svacchandabhairava* and other ancillary deities of the site; a document of A.D. 1915/6 provides for the annual sacrifice of a goat each to Guhyeśvarī and *Svacchandabhairava* on the new-moon day of Phālguna (Taṇḍan, *op. cit.*, vol. 1, p. 286).

There are numerous Nepalese mss. of the *Svacchandatantra*: NAK 1-11, 1-43, 1-114, 1-224, 1-225, 1-177, 5-691, 5-4974, 5-6165, etc. South-Indian mss.: IFP T. 507, 1032, 1077. Nepalese Paddhatis for the *pūjā* and *homaḥ* of *Svacchandabhairava* following the *Svacchanda*: *Svacchandadevārcanavidhi* (NAK 5.744, 1.386) and *Svacchandadevalakṣahomayāga* (NAK 5.744).

[2001:] Other evidence of the strength of this tradition is that of its influence on the Saiddhāntikas. Since writing this essay in 1997 I have examined mss. of the unpublished *Siddhāntasārapaddhati* or *Bhojadevapaddhati*, the Saiddhāntika ritual manual attributed to Mahārājadhīrāja Bhojadeva (NAK 1-1363 [A.D. 1077/8], NAK 5-743 [A.D. 1111/2]), probably the Paramāra scholar-king Bhojadeva, who ruled c. A.D. 1018-1060, and have concluded from evidence that must be presented elsewhere that this work drew on

position in relation to the other parts of the Śaiva corpus: to Saiddhāntika literature on the one hand and to texts of the Vidyāpīṭha on the other.

An intimate relation with the former has emerged through comparison with the unpublished *Niśvāsa*. This work, which is much the largest of the Saiddhāntika scriptures,<sup>27</sup> seems to have been of little importance when viewed with the perspective of the Kashmirian commentators and their successors, since they seldom refer to it. But there are reasons to suppose that in earlier times it was in the forefront of the tradition. In Cambodia, where later Indian developments do not appear to have penetrated, it was the principal authority of the Śaivas;<sup>28</sup> the *Varāhapurāṇa* speaks of the

the *Svacchanda* extensively and deeply. The influence was passed on into subsequent Saiddhāntika practice through the principal manuals of the late 11th to mid-12th centuries, the Paddhatis of Somaśambhu, Jñānaśiva (*Jñānaratnāvalī* [IFP MS T. 231]), and Aghoraśiva, all of which relied on Bhojadeva's, a fact evident from extensive unsignalled paraphrases in the first and, in the other two works, openly acknowledged.

<sup>27</sup>See n. 2 for its division into two parts namely the *Niśvāsamukha* and the four Sūtras (*Mūla*, *Naya*, *Uttara* and *Guhya*) and the fifth Sūtra, called the *Niśvāsakārikā* (which includes the *Dikṣottara* at its end). At the end of the latter we are told that the whole Tantra in five Sūtras is 12,000 verses long (IFP MS T. 17, p. 1152): *idaṃ pañcasūtrojvalaṃ samudāyena dvādaśasāhasrikam samāptaṃ \*niśvāsākhyam* (em.: *niśvāsakārikākhyam* cod.) *tantram*. As we have it, it is about 1,500 short of this total, the text of the first four Sūtras together with the *Niśvāsamukha* in NAK 1-277 being c. 4,500 verses and that of the fifth c. 6,000. We may not have the whole text, then. But it is possible that 12,000 is an exaggeration, since it seems to have been a conventional number for large-scale Tantras. Thus we have the 12,000-verse *Picumata*, the 12,000-verse *Svacchanda* (cited by Hṛdayaśiva, *Prāyaścittasamuccaya*, ff. 90r4-93r5; Manodadatta, *Kalādikṣāpaddhati*, Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, Pune, Ms. 157 of 1886-92, f. 9r8: *iti śrīlalitasvacchandabhairavasaṃhitāyām dvādaśasāhasryām śrībahurūpagarbhastavarājāḥ*), the 12,000-verse *Aghoreśvarisvacchanda* (cited by Hṛdayaśiva, *Prāyaścittasamuccaya*, ff. 84r2-90r2), and the 12,000-verse *Ānandeśvara* (*Tantrāloka* v. 15.139; cf. 'Tantric Collectanea', Bodl., MS Chandra Shum Shere c. 264, ff. 1[=64]v1-13[=64]v1-13[=74]v4, ending: *iti dvādaśasāhasre \*ānandeśvare* (em.: *ānandeśvara* cod.) *saptamaṣṭakāle varṇadhyānam samāptam*). In any case it is much bigger than any other surviving early Saiddhāntika Tantra. The only text of this class that approaches it in length is the late *Bṛhatkālotara*, which has about 5,000 verses. After that comes the *Mataṅga* with about 3,500.

<sup>28</sup>The *Niśvāsa*'s importance in Cambodia is seen in the tenth-century Bantāy Kdei inscription cited in n. 5. Moreover, the *Guhya* that is mentioned in Cambodian inscriptions in contexts that indicate that it is a Saiddhāntika work is, I propose, the [*Niśvāsa*]/*guhya*/[*Guhya*]/*sūtra* that is the major part of the *Niśvāsa*. Thus in the Old Khmer section of the Sdok Kak Thom inscription we are told concerning King Udayādityavarman II (r. 1050-1066) (4.64-67):

vrah pāda kamrateñ añ thve vrah dikṣā daṃnepra gi bhuvañādhva vrah  
vrahmayajña thve mahotsava pūjā toy vrah guhya

Following the venerable *Guhya* His Majesty undertook the venerable Dikṣā of the Order of the Worlds (Skt. *bhuvañādhvadikṣā*), the Brahmayajña, and the Mahotsavapūjā.

The *Guhyasūtra* is indeed distinguished by teaching the *bhuvañādhvadikṣā* form of initiation. In fact, it knows no other, unlike later Siddhāntas, for which this most complex of procedures is but one option beside several that are easier, notably the *kalādikṣā*. Likewise, the Phnom Sandak and Prāḥ Vihār inscriptions state that King Sūryavarman

Siddhānta as the teaching of this scripture, as though it knew no other; and the *Guhyasiddhi* of Padmavajra speaks of the teaching of the Siddhānta as following either 'the *Kālottara* etc.' or this text.<sup>29</sup> That the text should have fallen into obscurity in later times is not surprising. For it contains, as we shall see, features that link it closely with the earlier, pre-Tantric Śaivism, too closely, I suspect, for the comfort of the later commentators, who received and further moulded a Siddhānta more starkly differentiated both from that Śaivism and from that of the non-Saiddhāntika Tantric systems of which the *Svacchanda* is exemplary.

In its tenth Paṭala the *Svacchanda* gives an account of the *bhuvañādhvā*,

II (1113-c.1150) learnt all the Siddhāntas beginning with the holy *Guhya* (G. Coedès, *Inscriptions du Cambodge* [1937-66] [hereafter IC] 1, p. 29); and the Prasāt Tor inscription of 1189 or 1195 mentions a commentary composed by a Cambodian brahman (IC 1, p. 231, v. 5cd): *saṃsārasindhuhuvanoddharaṇāya guhyatikāpathā yad akarod yamasadma śūnyam* 'since he emptied the abode of Death by means of a commentary on the *Guhya* [composed] to promote the raising of [souls] from the worlds within the ocean of transmigration'. Finally, in the Prasāt Khnā inscription, probably of 1060 and in any case from the reign of Udayādityavarman II (1050-1066), the author Phalapriya describes himself as *śrīśaṅkarakaveḥ prāptaguhyajñānaḥ* (IC 1, p. 206, v. 108), 'one who has received knowledge of the *Guhya* from Śaṅkarakavi', though it is possible that it means only that he received secret (*guhya*-) knowledge of some kind from him.

The hypothesis that the Saiddhāntikas of Cambodia remained cut off from the mainstream once their tradition had taken root is reinforced by the persistence in Cambodia of the ritual tradition of the *Pārameśvara* (= *Paṣṅkarapārameśvara*), another Siddhānta that had lost ground in India by the end of the first millennium. Its transcription is mentioned in in A.D. 967 at Bantāy Srēi (*BEFEO* 25, pp. 359 and 362, v. 30: *pārameśvarapūrvāṇ ca yo'likhac chivasamhitām* 'who had also transcribed the *Pārameśvarasamhitā*') and an inscription from Angkor Wat (A. Barth and A. Bergaigne, *Inscriptions sanscrites de Campā et du Cambodge* [Paris, 1885-93], pp. 570-571, no. 65) shows that it was till followed in the fourteenth century. Thus v. 30: *tasmīn kuru mahad yāgaṃ yathoktaṃ pārameśvare* 'There make the great Maṇḍala as it has been prescribed in the *Pārameśvara*'; and v. 36: *kṛtvān sa mahad yāgaṃ kālayāgam iti śrutam / sarasvatīyāgayutam lokapālasamāvṛtam* 'He made the great Maṇḍala that the scripture calls the Kālayāga, including the Yāga of Sarasvatī (i.e. Vāgīśvari) and enclosed by the Lokapālas.' I take the term *kālayāgaḥ* to denote a Maṇḍala in which Śiva is worshipped in the form of the year (*saṃvatsarātmā*, *kālatmā*), i.e. as embodied in the VYOMAVYĀPIMANTRA when 360 of its 368 syllables, equal in number to the days in the year of the Indian calendar, are distributed along twelve equidistant spokes representing the months in a wheel representing the year, with the remaining eight occupying its nave. See *Svāyambhūvasūtrasaṃgraha* 6.1-23 and 18.22, reading *kālatmābhyadhikāni* with the Nepalese codex (NAK 1-348). The *Niśvāsaguhya* teaches this Yāga in detail in its ninth Paṭala, calling its ritual the worship (*yāgaḥ*) [of Śiva] as the year (ff. 79v6-80r1): *yāgaividhiḥ proktaḥ saṃvatsarasārīrīṇaḥ*. The surviving fragments of the *Pārameśvara* (see n. 2) show that the Yāga of that early text does indeed utilize the VYOMAVYĀPIMANTRA enclosed by the Lokapālas and incorporates the worship of Sarasvatī, in the form of the fifty elements of the syllabary (*mātrkā*).

<sup>29</sup>See *Varāhapurāṇa*, ed. A. S. Gupta (1981), 70.42-43, 71.52-53, but read *siddhāntasamjñakam pūrvam* rather than *nayasiddhāntasamjñābhīr* in 70.42c and *niśvāsasamhitā yā* rather than *niśvāsasamhitāyām* in 71.53a, following the citation of this passage ad *Yājñavalkyasmṛti* 1.7 in the commentary of Aparārka (r. c. A.D. 1110-1114) (ed. Apte, 1903, vol. 1, p. 12). For the text of the reference to the *Niśvāsa* in the *Guhyasiddhi* see above, n. 3.

the ascending sequence of worlds to be transcended through initiation and Yoga. Its 1,265 verses are based on the 309 in which the *Niśvāsaguhya* sets out its own distinctive treatment of this subject. The expansion is achieved largely through elaboration and the insertion of stereotyped descriptive passages. The essential structure of the *Niśvāsaguhya*'s *bhuvanādhvā* has been preserved intact and the verses which convey it are still visible as the backbone of the *Svacchanda*'s text. The redactor has done his job with exceptional diligence. But it is still possible to detect his hand and therefore the direction of transmission. One example must suffice.

The *Niśvāsaguhya*'s *bhuvanādhvā* culminates in the world of the goddess Suṣumṇā. Above that it has only Niṣkala Śiva in formless transcendence.<sup>30</sup> But for the redactor of the *Svacchanda* this arrangement was unsatisfactory. In the style of competitive extension that characterizes other new developments in the Śaiva systems he has inserted verses giving three additional strata of worlds between Suṣumṇā and Śiva. Suṣumṇā is provided with a consort Suṣumṇeśa (10.1230–31b) and above her in ascending order are sited the worlds (1) Brahmabila, (2) Śaktitattva, and (3) Śivatattva. Then comes Samanā, the ultimate power, in whom the universe and its cycles of time come to rest. In making this change the redactor has revealed his hand in two ways. Firstly the verses providing these levels above Suṣumṇā are inserted into the passage that describes her in the *Niśvāsaguhya*, dividing it into two parts. The first, which merely describes the form in which the goddess may be visualized, now precedes the inserted verses, but the second, which describes her cosmic function as the creative power of the universe and is therefore no longer applicable to Suṣumṇā, is put to work at the end of the insertion in the description of the goddess Samanā who has usurped her role. What is more, the redactor has been careful to change one element in the passage of Suṣumṇā which his revision has made inaccurate. The *Guhya* speaks of her visualization by liberation-seekers: *mokṣakāmais tu dhyātavyā* (7.305a). This was appropriate when she was at the summit of the universe. But now that she has been demoted meditation on her must be for Siddhi rather than liberation. The *Svacchanda* appears to have revised the text to take account of this: *dhyātavyā sādhaḥkāḍibhiḥ* (10.1233d).

*Niśvāsaguhya* 7, ff. 68v5–69r1:

[301] *tatra madhye sthitā devī  
suṣumṇā nāma nāmataḥ*

*Svacchanda* 10 (Ed.'s numeration):

1229d *tataḥ suṣumṇābhuvanam  
suṣumṇā tatra samsthitā*

<sup>30</sup>Cf. *Niśvāsakārikā* 43.85ab (IFP MS.T.17, p.410) / *Niśvāsakārikā-Dikṣottara* 19.54ab (ibid., p.1151): *ataḥ suṣumṇā vijñeyā sarvādhvānasamāptaye*, 'Know that Suṣumṇā follows, to terminate the entire *bhuvanādhvā*.' This eliminates the possibility that the lack of a passage in the *Guhyasūtra* between the treatment of Suṣumṇā and Śiva is due to textual corruption.

*padmasūtrākṛtiś śuklā  
śaktibhir bahubhir vṛtā*  
[302] *padmahastā sitāṅgī tu  
padmābharanabhūṣitā  
śaktir bhuvanapañktibhis  
samantād avabhāsitā*  
[303] *nāḍabrahmabile līnā  
catuḥśaktibhir āvṛtā  
lakṣaṇākṛtirūpeṇa  
catur ++ vyavasthitā*  
[304] *mahāpadmopariṣṭāt sā  
śivakāyād viniḥsṛtā  
sā tu bhūtaguṇais tyaktā  
māyāvayavavarjitā*  
[305] *dhyātavyā mokṣakāmais tu  
tuṣārakaṇadhūsarā*

1232cd *śvetapadmakarā devī  
padmamālair vibhūṣitā*

1235c *nāḍyā brahmabile līnas*

1233d *dhyātavyā sādhaḥkāḍibhiḥ*  
1232b *tuṣārakaṇadhūsarā*

*sr̥ṣṭisamhārakarttīṚṇām  
kartṛbhūtā vyavasthitā*  
[306] *bibharty aṇḍāny anekāni  
phalānīva vanaspatih  
tatordhvan niṣkal[o devo]  
vartula sa + niṣṭhitam*  
[307] *anaupamyam anākāram  
ūhavādavivarjitam  
sarvajñam sarvagam devam  
svayambhūm bhuvanādhipam*

1257cd *sarveṣām kārāṇānām tu  
kartṛbhūtā vyavavasthitā*  
1258ab *bibharty aṇḍāny anekāni  
śivena samadhiṣṭhitā*

303a *nāḍabrahmabile* cod. (= *Niśvāsakārikā*-SIGLA: N<sup>1</sup> = NAK 1-224; N<sup>2</sup> = NAK 1-182; kā 43.85c) : *nāḍyā brahmabile* *Svacchanda* K = Ed.; G = IFP MSS.T.507,1032 and 10.1235c → *Tantrāloka* 8.393a 303b *catuḥ-* 1077. 1232c *karā* N<sup>1</sup>N<sup>2</sup>K : *dharā* G 1232d *śaktibhir āvṛtā* conj. : *catuḥśaktiruddhṛtaḥ padmamālair* N<sup>1</sup>N<sup>2</sup> : *padmamālā* KG 1235c cod. 304a *mahāpadmopariṣṭāt sā* corr. : *nāḍyā brahmabile līna* N<sup>1</sup>N<sup>2</sup>K : *vinābhyābrahmahāpadmopariṣṭāt sā* cod. 304b *viniḥsṛtā* *mabile lagna* G 1257c *kārāṇānām tu* N<sup>1</sup>N<sup>2</sup> : corr. : *viniḥsṛtā* cod. 306b *vanaspatih* corr. : *kārāṇānām ca* KG 1275d *kartṛ* N<sup>1</sup>N<sup>2</sup>K : *vanaspate* cod. 307c *sarvajñam* corr. : *sarv-* cakra G 1258a *bibharty aṇḍāny* K (= *NiśvGu* jñā cod. 307d *svayambhūm* (an Aīśa form) 7.306a) : *vibhaktiranyā* N<sup>1</sup> : *vibhaktiranyānyā* : conj. : *svayambhur* cod. N<sup>2</sup> : *bhavanty aṇḍāny* G

Here the *Svacchanda* has reworked the text of the *Guhya* thoroughly. The following is an example of lighter revision in the same Paṭala:

ata ūrdhva(ṃ)sthitā vidyā  
aṣṭadhā prakṛtir dhruvā  
[237] idā ca candriṇī caiva  
gaurī śāntis tathāparā  
mālā ca maulinī svāhā  
svadhā ceti prakīrtitā(h)  
[238] [athātāḥ sa]mpravakṣyāmi  
vighrahan tu yathāsthitam  
kāryaṇ duḥkhaṇ tathā jñānaṇ  
sādhanaṇ tatvam eva ca  
[239] sādhyāṇ caiva tathaisvaryaṇ  
kāraṇaṇ ca tathāṣṭamaṇ  
ete aṣṭavidhā jñeyā  
nigrahānugrahe sthitā  
[240] niyatikālarāgaṇ ca  
saṃkṣepeṇa bravīme te  
sukhaduḥkhaṇpradā devī  
śubhāśubhanibandhanī  
[241] rāgas tu rañjakaḥ prokto  
viśayānandalakṣaṇaḥ  
yena sa[ṃsā]rito jantur  
narakādiṣu pacyate  
[242] vimalaṇ saṃpravakṣyāmi  
jñānasargam ataḥ paraṇ  
bhavodbhavaḥ sarvo  
vajradehas tṛtīyakaḥ  
[243] prabhur dhātā vidhātā ca  
kramaś ca vikramaś tathā  
prabheśaḥ suprabhaś caiva  
daśaite śaṅkarāḥ smṛtāḥ  
[244] niyatyaṇ saṃsthitā hy ete  
jñātavyā deśikena tu  
śaṅkarāś ca samākhyātāś

śivāś caiva nibodha me

1087 nādyāvidyāṣṭakaṇ devī  
kathayāmi ataḥ paraṇ  
idā ca candriṇī gaurī  
śāntiḥ śāntikari tathā  
1088 mālā ca maulinī caiva  
svāhā svadhā tathā  
atopariṣṭād deveśe  
vighrahāṣṭakam ucyate  
1089 kāryaṇ ca kāraṇaṇ cai-  
va sukhaduḥkhaṇ tathāparaṇ  
jñānaṇ sādhyāṇ ca vikhyā-  
taṇ sādhanāṇ kāraṇaṇ tathā

1106 atordhve niyatir jñeyas  
tasya rudrāṇ nibodha me

vāmadevas tathā sarvas  
tathā caiva bhavodbhavaḥ  
[1107] vajradehaprabhuś caiva

dhātāra kramavikramaḥ  
suprabheśaś ca daśamaḥ

niyatyaṇ śaṅkarāḥ smṛtāḥ

1108 yat tad dhṛdi sthitam  
padmam ātmā tatra vyava-  
sthitāḥ niyatir dalair ahaṃkā-  
raḥ keśarair buddhi karṇāṇike  
[1109] kālatatve śivā jñeyāḥ  
kathayāmi samāsataḥ

[245] su[ddho] buddhaḥ prabuddhaś siddha buddha prabuddhaś ca  
ca  
praśāntaḥ paramākṣaraḥ praśāntaḥ paramākṣaraḥ  
śivāś ca suśivāś caiva [1110] śivāś ca suśivāś caiva  
dhruvaś cākṣara eva ca dhruvam akṣaraśaṃbhurāt  
[246] avyayaś ca samākhyātā  
daśaite nirmitaḥ śivāḥ daśaite śivā jñeyā  
kālatatve varānane

paramākṣarajāpena  
samayī labhate padaṇ  
[247] hemābhāś śaṅkarāḥ proktāḥ [1111] hemābhāḥ saṃkarāḥ pro-  
ktāḥ śivāḥ sphatikasaṇṇibhāḥ  
śivāś sphatikasaṇṇibhāḥ  
ekaikasya vinirdiṣṭam ekaikasya vinirdiṣṭaḥ  
parivāre yaśasvini parivāro yaśasvini  
[248] koṭir ekā samākhyātā [1112] koṭir ekā samākhyātā  
sahasrāṇi tu ṣoḍaśa sahasrāṇi ca ṣoḍaśa  
kūrmākārāṇi sarveṣāṇ kūrmākārāṇi sarveṣāṇ  
proktāni bhuvanāni tu proktāni bhuvanāni tu  
[249] asādhyekapadam ūrdhvan [1113] atordhvaṇ hariharaś cai-  
tato hariharau varau va rāgatatve nibodha me  
tasmād api daśeśānāḥ  
saṃsthitāḥ kāmarūpiṇaḥ  
[250] suhr̥ṣṭas suprah̥ṣṭas ca suhr̥ṣṭaḥ suprah̥ṣṭas ca  
surūpo rūpavardhanaḥ surūpo rūpavardhanaḥ  
manonmanas samākhyātas manonmano mahāvīro  
sumanonmana eva ca  
[251] mahāvīras suvīraś ca vīreśo daśamaḥ smṛtāḥ vīreśaḥ parikīrtitāḥ



233a *kramaś ca conj.* : *kramaśo cod.*  
240d *sumanonmana* apograph : *su + nonmana cod.*

1087a *nāḍyāvidyā* N<sup>1</sup>N<sup>2</sup> : *nāḍividyā K* :  
*nāḍinām a G* : *nānāvidyā* N<sup>6</sup> 1087b  
*ataḥ param* N<sup>1</sup>N<sup>2</sup> : *tv ataḥ param K* :  
*tataḥ param G* 1087c *candrinī* N<sup>2</sup> : *can-*  
*drinī G* : *candriki* N<sup>1</sup> 1088a *maulinī*  
N<sup>2</sup> : *mauninī* N<sup>1</sup> : *mālinī K G*  
1088c *ato* N<sup>1</sup>N<sup>2</sup> : *atho KG* • *deveśe*  
N<sup>1</sup>N<sup>2</sup> : *devesi K* 1089b *sukhaduḥkhaṃ*  
*tathāparam* N<sup>1</sup>N<sup>2</sup> : *sukhaduḥkhakaram*  
*tathā K* : *sukhaṃ duḥkhaṃ tathāiva ca*  
*G* 1106a *atordhve* N<sup>1</sup>N<sup>2</sup> : *athordhve*  
*KG* • *jñeyas* N<sup>1</sup> : *ya* N<sup>2</sup> : *yā K*  
1106b *tasya* N<sup>1</sup>N<sup>2</sup> : *tasyāṃ K G* 1106d  
*bhavodbhavaḥ* N<sup>1</sup>N<sup>2</sup> : *bhavodbhavau KG*  
1107a *dhātāra* N<sup>1</sup>N<sup>2</sup> : *dhātā ca K* :  
*vidhātā G* 1107b *kramavikramaḥ* N<sup>1</sup>N<sup>2</sup> :  
*kramavikramamau KG* 1107c *suprab-*  
*hedas* N<sup>1</sup>N<sup>2</sup>K : *aprabhedas G* 1108c  
*niyatir dalair* N<sup>2</sup> : *niyatir dalā G* :  
*tidalair* N<sup>1</sup> : *tidalam K* • *ahamkāraḥ*  
*kesarair* N<sup>1</sup>N<sup>2</sup> : *ahamkāraḥkesarām KG*  
1108d *karṇṇike* N<sup>1</sup>N<sup>2</sup> : *karṇṇikai*  
N<sup>4</sup> : *karṇṇikam KG* 1109a *śivā jñeyāḥ*  
*KG* : *śivo jñeyāḥ N<sup>1</sup>* : *śivo jñeyā*  
N<sup>2</sup> 1110c *akṣarasambhurāḥ* N<sup>1</sup>N<sup>2</sup>K :  
*akṣara sambhunā G* 1113c *suhṛṣṭaḥ K* :  
*suhṛṣṭa N<sup>1</sup>* : *suhṛṣṭam N<sup>2</sup>* : *aprahṛṣṭaḥ*  
*G* • *suprahṛṣṭas K* : *suprahṛṣṭam N<sup>1</sup>N<sup>2</sup>* :  
*prahṛṣṭas G* 1114b *vīreśāḥ parikīrtitaḥ*  
*KG* : *vīreśo parikīrtitaḥ N<sup>2</sup>* : *vīreśaḥ*  
*parikīrtitaḥ N<sup>1</sup>*

Here too we see a degree of rewriting prompted by doctrinal revision. But there is also wholesale borrowing from the *Niśvāsa* corpus. Thus the second and third paṭalas of the *Niśvāsanaya*, except the five introductory verses at the beginning of the second have been incorporated by the *Svacchanda* without significant changes as 11.316–12.157. The *Svacchanda*'s twelfth Paṭala ends eleven verses after the verses which bring the third Paṭala of the *Niśvāsanaya* to an end and with it the topic of the visualization of the reality-levels. As in the case of the *bhuvanādhvā* the *Svacchanda* has found the *Niśvāsa*'s hierarchy insufficiently extended. The *Niśvāsanaya* ends with the visualization of Bindu. In its final eleven verses the *Svacchanda* has added instructions for meditation on Śakti, Vyāpinī,

Samanā, Unmanā, and Śiva in inactive transcendence (*śivaḥ śāntaḥ*) beyond the universe.

As the *Svacchanda* had incorporated and extended the world-hierarchy of the *Niśvāsa*, so the *Niśvāsa* itself had built its system of worlds using materials derived from the yet earlier sources of the pre-Tantric system of the Pāsupata Śaivas known variously as Lākulas, Pramāṇa[pāsupata]s, Mahāvratas, Mahāpāsupatas, or Kālamukhas. I cannot demonstrate this by comparison with their scriptures, since their entire canon has disappeared, with the exception of seven verses of the *Pañcārthapramāṇa* quoted by Kṣemarāja ad *Svacchanda* 1.41–43. But it can be seen from within the *Niśvāsa* corpus itself. For the *Niśvāsamukha* comprises accounts of the religious systems that it ranks below the Tantric Śaivism of the Siddhānta, beginning with the mundane Vedic. The highest of these lower systems is the Śaivism of the Atimārga, which it teaches as having two levels, the first the familiar system of Pāsupata observance taught in the *Pāsupatasūtra*, the second that in question. It gives a detailed account of its *bhuvanādhvā*, and by comparing this with that of the *Niśvāsa* itself we can see that the latter is an extension of the former, and that this is a continuity which sets the *Niśvāsa* corpus apart from all other Saiddhāntika Śaiva systems.<sup>31</sup> We see, then, a continuous line of development from the Lākulas to the *Niśvāsa*-Saiddhāntikas and then from them to the *Svacchandabhairava* worshippers of the non-Saiddhāntika Mantrapīṭha. And this continuity with the pre-Tantric Atimārga, so alien to the Siddhānta of the commentators, is echoed by other features in the practices and doctrines of the *Niśvāsa* and *Svacchanda* corpora.<sup>32</sup>

The flow of redaction can be followed further, into the literature of

<sup>31</sup>This post-Atimārgic *bhuvanādhvā* is set out in full detail in *Niśvāsaguhya*, Paṭala 5 and *Niśvāsākūrikā-Dikṣottara* 19 (*praktiyāsūtram*). The demonstration of this continuity is among the subjects covered in three lectures which I delivered recently in the University of Madras (Ramalinga Memorial Endowment Lectures 1996-97) entitled 'The Lākulas: New Evidence of a System Intermediate between Pāncārthika Pāsupatism and Āgamic Śaivism'.

<sup>32</sup>The features of this kind of which I am aware are the following:

1. The *Niśvāsa* is unique among the Siddhāntas in adding the Pāsupata observance after Vaidika *saṃnyāsaḥ* at the end of its elimination in initiation of the various pre-Śaiva religious rites beginning with conception (*garbhādhānam*). See *Niśvāsottara*, Paṭala 3, f. 26r4–5: *garbhapūṣasavasīmantaṃ ja[nma] niṣkramaṇaṃ tathā / prāśanaṃ cūḍakarmaṇaṃ ca ajinaṃ vratamekhalam / vāsasaṃ copaviṣṭaṃ ca* daṇḍam \**saṃdhya-m-upāsanam* (em. [Aīśa hiatus-bridger] : *sadyāmupāsanam cod.*) *japaṃ homaṃ tathā tathā vānyat tryāyusaṃ cābhivādanam / snānam vrataparitṛyāga daṇḍādīnāṃ ca homanam / vivāhaṃ pākayañjās ca haviryajñās ca somakāḥ / ā sahasrāt tu kartavyā vānaprasthāntabhaikṣukam / vratam pāsupataṃ* (em. : *pāsupataṃ cod.*) *ḥ kṛtvā śodhanaṃ prokṣaṇaṃ tathā / \*nyāsaṃ* (em. : *jñāsaṃ cod.*) *śivahastaṃ ca; Niśvāsaguhya*, Paṭala 9, f. 77r4: *garbhādhānādikarmeṣu yāvāt pāsupatāntikam / śatāhutyā viśuddhis tu*.

2. It teaches a unique variant of the Śaiva model of deriving the streams of revelation in pentads from the five faces of Śiva in which Tantric Śaivism emerges from the superior Iśāna face and the four Pāsupata systems from the rest: the Pramāṇa (= Lākula) from

Aghora, the Vaimala from Tatpuruṣa, the Kāruka from Vāmadeva and the Pañcārtha (*lakulīśottham*) from Sadyojāta (12.17c–18):

*iśāne śaivam utpannam vaimalam puruṣa(t) smṛtam*  
 18 *pramāṇam hṛdayaj jā (tam vāmade) [vā]t tu kārūkam*  
*sadyāc cā lakulīśottham pañca bhedaḥ prakīrtitāḥ*

(...) = text now seen in the apograph alone, due to the subsequent physical deterioration of its palm-leaf exemplar.

18d *lakulīśottham* conj. : *lakulīśāntāḥ* cod.

3. The peculiar vocalization 'HUPUN' (*huḍḍunīkārah*), produced by placing the tongue against the soft palate, which is required as part of the Pāsupatas' daily worship, is uniquely preserved in the rituals of the *Svacchanda*; see *Pāsupatasūtra* 1.8: *hasitagītanṛtāhuḍḍunīkāranamaskārajapyopahāreṇopatiṣṭhet*; Kauṇḍinya ad loc.: \**huḍḍunīkāranāma* (corr.: *ḍumḍunīkāranāma* ed.) *ya eṣa jhivāgratālusamīyogān nīspadyate puṇyo vṛṣanā-dasadrśaḥ*; *Svacchanda* 2.182c–3b: *huḍḍunīkāranamaskārān kṛtvā caiva tato vrajat / agnikūṇḍasamīpam tu arghahastāḥ subhāvitaḥ*. Rājānaka Kṣemarāja ad loc.: *bhakti-vaivaśyoniṣṣannādāmārsamayo dhvanir mukhavādyāparaparyāyo huḍḍunīkārah*; Manodadatta, *Kalādikṣāpaddhati*, f. 39v: *huḍḍunīkāranamaskārān kṛtvā tadagrāsane upaviśya*.

4. The account of the supernatural transmission of the *Svacchanda* in the *Jayadrathayāmala* has it taught by *Svacchanda* to eight Bhairavas (Kaṅkāla etc.), and by them to the Vidyēśvara Ananta. The latter then transmits it from the Pure Universe to the Impure by teaching it to Śrīkaṇṭha and Lakulīśvara/Lakulapāṇi. The latter teaches it to various sages and among them to his disciple Musalīndra, who extracted and taught its essence. Śaṭka 1, f. 170r2–7 (36.35–42):

35 *svacchandabhairavam sūtram dviskandham iva āgataṃ*  
*asitāṅgena bhedenā svacchandena ca bhairavi*  
 36 *svacchando yaḥ smṛto bhedaḥ sa vibhedāṣṭakam gataḥ*  
*svacchandabhairavaj jñātam kaṅkālādisitāntikāḥ*  
 37 *aṣṭabhir bhairavaḥ tebhyaḥ tato 'nantena vedītam*  
*śuddhādhrvatas tatas tasmād yogaśaktisamīraṇāt*  
 38 *śrīkaṇṭhalakulīśābhyaṃ dhṛtaṃ yogasamīkṣayā*  
*†sinanirjala†nandīśamahākālāmbikādibhiḥ*  
 39 *nīlarudramukhodgāravijñātam †vipṛṣṭo†matam*  
*gautamādīmunīndrebhyaḥ vedavidbhyaḥ yathāsthītam*  
 40 *vīṣṭṛtaṃ jñānam etad dhi proktaṃ lakulapāṇinā*  
*tanmadhye 'pi svaśiṣyāya musalīndrāya dhimate*  
 41 *saṃhṛīya sārabhūtaṃ tu nījagāda sa eva tu*  
*yad yena saṃśrūtaṃ tantram yac ca yenāvadhāritam*  
 42 *tasya tasya hi nāmnā tat tat tantram parigīyate*

36a *vāj jñātam* em.: *vājñātaḥ* codd. 36b *sītāntikāḥ* conj. : *sītāntikāḥ* codd. 38a *nandīśa* em.: *sandīśa* codd. 38b *mahākāla* em.: *mahākālī* codd. 41a *yad yena* em.: *yad yena* em.: *yad yevaṃ* codd.

According to vv. 40–41 of this passage there should have existed *Svacchanda* texts in the names both of Lakulīśvara and of his pupil Musalīndra (/Musulendra). A *Lakulasvacchanda* is attested, as we have seen. The second would have had the title \**Musulasvacchanda* or the like. No such title appears in the literature. But since Musalīndra is described here as having extracted the essence of the *Svacchanda*, perhaps the work in question is the *Svacchandasaṅgāra* in the list of the *Śrīkaṇṭhīya* (see n. 24). Lakulīśvara is the source of the Lākula tradition, so Musalīndra is the source of the related Mausula Pāsupata system. See Kṣemarāja ad *Svacchanda* 11.71cd: *śrīlakuleśaśiṣyeṇa musulendreṇa*.

the Vidyāpīṭha. For example, the *Svacchanda*'s massive tenth Paṭala on the *bhuvanādhvā* and the first part of its eleventh Paṭala, dealing with the topic of the order of creation from the highest to the lowest reality-levels, appear with few divergences as the tenth and eleventh paṭalas of the *Tantrasadbhāva*, a Vidyāpīṭha scripture of the tradition later known as the Trika.<sup>33</sup> That the direction of redaction was from the *Svacchanda*

5. The third Paṭala of the *Nīśvāsaguhya* teaches various observances (*vratāni*) that may be adopted by the Siddhi-seeker. Among them are the observances of false self-condemnation (*mīthyāvratam*), the cremation ground (*śmaśānavratam*) and the Śivagaṇa (*gaṇavratam*):

29 *gaur mātā ca pitā trātā atithiś caiva brāhmaṇaḥ*  
*hatā me pāpā[kā]reṇa. caren mīthyāvratam vratī*  
 30 [+ + + + kapā]lena khaṭvāṅgi bhasmaguṇṭhitaḥ  
*śmaśāne carate rātrau śmaśānavrata(m) ucyate*  
 31 *nṛtyate gāyate caiva unmatto hasate bruvan*  
*bhasmāṅgi cīravāsas ca gaṇavratam idaṃ smṛtam*

29a *gaur* corr. : *go* cod.

The first, in which a person accuses himself of the murder of a cow, his mother, his father or a Brahman guest, is evidently in the tradition of the provoking of unmerited condemnation through feigning sin and the like that is required of the Pāsupatas (*Pāsupatasūtra* 3.1–18). The second, in which one goes about in a cremation ground at night smeared with ashes, carrying a skull-bowl and a skull-staff, is, apart from the restriction as to time, the *kapālavratam* that characterizes the Lākulas and the Somasiddhāntin Kāpālika. The third, in which one smears oneself with ashes, wears rags, dances, sings, laughs and babbles like a madman, is evidently the *unmattavratam* 'the observance of one [who pretends that he] is mad', which according to Abhinavagupta's commentary on *Bharatanāṭyaśāstra* 12.85 is the practice of Lākulas in the advanced 'Paramayogin' stage of their practice: *yadi vā paramayogyavasthāyām nākuladarsanapratīpannānām unmattavratam apy asti*. In the post-Atimārgic literature the *kapālavratam* and the *unmattavratam* are generally found only in the non-Saiddhāntika systems, particularly in those of the Vidyāpīṭha. The *Nīśvāsa* seems to be exceptional among Saiddhāntika scriptures in not having put them aside.

<sup>33</sup>Three large-scale texts of the Vidyāpīṭha survive. In the Yāmala division we have the 12,000-verse *Picumata* and in the Śaktitantra division the 7,000-verse *Tantrasadbhāva* and the 24,000-verse *Jayadrathayāmala*. The last, from whose first Śaṭka I have drawn this classification, is permeated in its second, third and fourth Śaṭkas by the Krama. The *Tantrasadbhāva*, which survives in early Nepalese manuscripts (NAK 5-445 [A.D. 1097/98], NAK 1-363) and is much cited by the Kashmirian commentators Abhinavagupta and Kṣemarāja, is the only large-scale scripture of that tradition that has survived intact. We have the Trika's *Siddhayaogeśvarīmatā*; and we have the *Mālinīvijayottara*, which claims to be based on it. But we have the first in what is evidently a highly abbreviated redaction, most of which has recently been edited by Judit Torzsok (D.Phil thesis, Oxford University, 1999); and the second, though of great importance as the base-text of Abhinavagupta's *Tantrāloka*, is written in a terse *kārikā*-like style which has left few traces of redactional continuity. A third large-scale Trika scripture, the *Trīśirobbhairava* (*Anāmaka*), survives only in citations. For the Vāma division of the Vidyāpīṭha in the classification of the *Jayadrathayāmala* we have only the *Vīṇāśikha* in about 400 verses (ed. Goudriaan, 1985): the major Vāmatantras, such as the *Nayottara*, the *Samnōhana* and the *Mahāraudra* have not come to light. However, there are numerous Vāma elements in the first Śaṭka of the *Jayadrathayāmala* (alias *Śiraścheda* and *Tantrārāja*), which describes itself in its account of the canon as a Śaktitantra embodying both the Vāma and the Dakṣiṇa streams, as opposed to the Yāmala

to the *Tantrasadbhāva* and not vice versa is indicated by the presence of details in the latter's version that are appropriate only in the system of the former.<sup>34</sup>

The *Tantrasadbhāva* was in turn among the Trika works that were drawn upon in the redacting of the *Kubjikāmata*, the primary text of the Kaula *Paścimāmnāya*, a system which in terms of its contents gives every appearance of a being an eclectic version of the Trika accommodating the cult of a new Mantra goddess and her auxiliaries, including a version of Svachchanda, the principal deity of the neighbouring Mantrapīṭha. I have provided details of the parallels with Trika texts elsewhere.<sup>35</sup> I need add only that at that time I was working from a manuscript of the *Tantrasadbhāva* (NAK 1-363) that breaks off in the course of the tenth

and the other Śaktitantras (of the Trika etc.) which it defines as purely Dakṣiṇa. The Sdok Kak Thom inscription of A.D. 1052 (see n. 5) refers to the *Śīrascheda* as one of the four faces of Tumburu, that is to say, as one of the four principal texts of the Vāma Stream. It is possible that it has the *Jayadrathayāmala* in mind; for that frequently refers to itself as a Vāmatantra. But it is more probable, I think, that the surviving '*Śīrascheda*' is an transformation of the Vāma *Śīrascheda* in a Dakṣiṇa milieu. Note, for example, that its *bhuvanādhvā* locates Tumburu and his pantheon on the level of Īśvara. This presence of Tumburu in the *bhuvanādhvā* is unique in the surviving literature, and it is the clearest of indications of the text's intimate connection with the Vāma Stream over which Tumburu presides. But the fact that he is placed on the Īśvara level, in the Pure Universe but well below its summit, is proof that this is a text which wishes to incorporate and transcend the Vāma branch of the religion.

<sup>34</sup>A striking example of this is the reference to the Vidyārāja in *Tantrasadbhāva* 1.159: *ekāṣṭipadā ye tu vidyārāje vyavasthitāḥ / padā varṇātmikās te 'pi \*varṇāḥ* (em.: *varṇa* cod.) *\*prāṇātmikāḥ* (em.: *prāṇātmikā* cod.) *smṛtāḥ*. This is identical with *Svacchandatantra* 4.252, on which Kṣemarāja comments: *ekasminn api vidyārāje navātmāny ekāṣṭipadāni prāgvibhaktānityā yāni sthitāni tāny apīdānīm eva nirṇītānityā varṇātmakāni varṇāś ca prāṇarūpās tadātmakatvāt padānām*. This is the arrangement for the *padādhvā*, the vertical order of the universe as embodied in the 'Mantra-units' (*padāni*), in the *Svacchandatantra*. The Vidyārāja, which Kṣemarāja rightly identifies as the Navātman, is the last of the eight Bhairavas in the retinue of Svachchanda. The seed-syllable is given as *RKṢMVLVYŪM* in *Svacchanda* 1.84c–86b (*vidyārājāḥ samākhyāto mahāpātakanāśanaḥ*) and a Kalpa of the Mantra is taught in 9.49c and following. It is called Navātman, 'the nine-fold', because the seed-syllable (*bījam*) comprises nine elements H, R, KṢ, M, L, V, Y, Ū, M, though in its application to Adhvanyāsa the nine elements are OM plus the first eight of these elements; see Kṣemarāja ad 4.102–103c and 5.37c–43b. It is clear that the *Tantrasadbhāva* is the borrower here, because the *Tantrasadbhāva* uses the Trika's Parāparā Vidyā for the *padādhvā*, and not the Vidyārāja; see *Tantrasadbhāva*, NAK 5-1985, f. 34v1: *mantrādhvānam tu saṃśodhya vidyayā tu parāparā / padāḥ padādhvavid dikṣā kartavyā mama vidyayā*. Indeed the Vidyārāja is no part of the Mantra system taught by this Tantra. It owes its presence here to nothing but the inattentiveness of the redactor, who while incorporating the verse failed to notice the anomaly.

<sup>35</sup>See the data in the text of the discussion appended to Teun Goudriaan, 'Kubjikā's Samayamantra and its Manipulation in the Kubjikāmata' in *Mantras et Diagrammes Rituelles dans l'Hindouisme* (1986), pp. 163–64. After receiving details of these parallels Goudriaan discussed them with due acknowledgement in the introduction to his and Schoterman's *editio princeps* of the *Kubjikāmata* (pp. xii, 15–24), confirming my conclusion that the direction of the redaction is from the *Tantrasadbhāva* to the *Kubjikāmata*.

of the work's twenty-nine Paṭalas. Since then I have had access to a complete manuscript (NAK 5-445) and now add a further parallel. The entire fifteenth Paṭala of the *Tantrasadbhāva*, which deals with the subject of post-initiatory ascetic observance (*caryāvrata*), animating each of its external elements with esoteric meaning extracted through semantic analysis (*nirvacanam*), appears as vv. 29–171 of Paṭala 25 of the *Kubjikāmata*. These parallels are of great value to the study of the *Kubjikāmata* since they enable the critical reader to determine which of the various readings transmitted in this highly contaminated recension go back to the time of redaction. It is unfortunate that the editors of the *Kubjikāmata*, though accepting that their text was the borrower, did not use this means of improving their edition of the text.<sup>36</sup> Here I shall propose two such improvements to the text where the *Kubjikāmata* has taken in corrupt readings from its source, in order to illustrate the point that when dealing with a scriptural literature of this kind we must abandon the common assumption of the textual critic that the history of a text begins from an original that is free of errors and meaningful throughout. Sometimes a new dependent scripture came close to this ideal, its redactor approaching the standards of original authorship in his concern to make perfect sense of his sources, incorporating unchanged only what seemed to be sound and passing over whatever was puzzling in the exemplar or revising it in an honest attempt to restore coherence. But text-production often proceeded at a much lower standard of scholarship. In these cases we can see redactors who out of incompetence, indifference, or both, used their sources without recognizing or attempting to remedy the manifest defects of the manuscripts through which they had access to them. The result is that the readings established by comparing the borrower with its source may be sound only in the sense that they are the original readings sanctioned by the redactor. In themselves they may be gibberish. The first of my examples is in the following verse (*Kubjikāmata* 25.34 [← *Tantrasadbhāva* 15.6]):

*yad yad ābharaṇaṃ tasya yad vā vadati vācayā  
sā caryā kathitā tasya mantras caiva na saṃśayaḥ*

SIGLA: T = *Tantrasadbhāva*; others as in the *editio princeps* of the *Kubjikāmata*. 6b *yad* em.: *yam* codd., T, ed. • *vā vadati* T, codd. except FHJK, ed.: *vācayati* FHJK • *vācayā* codd. except G, T, ed.: *vāñchayā* G 6c *kathitā tasya* conj. [=codd.], ed.: *kathito mantre* T

<sup>36</sup>This was no doubt through no fault of Goudriaan's but because the information reached him at a time when their edition was already complete and revision a practical impossibility. I speak only of Goudriaan here because by that time his collaborator, our much-lamented colleague Dr. Jan Schoterman, had passed away. [2001:] On the value of the parallels with the *Tantrasadbhāva* see also my 'Remarks on the Text of the Kubjikāmatatantra' forthcoming in the *IIIJ* (in press).

Both transmissions read *ābharaṇam* ('ornament'). This yields no satisfactory sense in the context and is, I propose, a corruption of *ācaraṇam*. The two akṣaras *ca* and *bha* are easily confused in early post-Gupta North Indian scripts<sup>37</sup> and the result of the emendation is that sense replaces nonsense. We now have the meaning:

His observance (*caryā*) and his Mantra are whatever he does (*yad yad ācaraṇam tasya*) and whatever he utters. Of this there is no doubt.

The verse, in keeping with the spirit of the chapter, provides an inner meaning beyond the particularities of ritual for an element of rule-bound observance, in the case of *caryā* through a semantic analysis that reduces *caryā* to the meaning of the verb *car* 'to do' that underlies it.

My second example is *Kubjikāmata* 29.41–43b, whose source, I propose, is *Tantrasadbāva* 15.13–15):

41 *vidyāmārge cared yas tu sāstradṛṣṭena karmaṇā*  
*dhyānam pūjā japo homaḥ samayānām tu pālanam*  
 42 *etaḍ vidyāvratam proktaṁ nānyathā vīranāyike*  
*vidyā jñeyā tu yonisthā carate dvādaśāntagā*  
 43 *vratasthāneṣu sarveṣu tena vidyāvratam priye*

13c *dhyānam pūjā* EGH, T, ed. : *dhyānapūjā* ABCDEFJK 14c *jñeyā*  
 ABEJHK, T, ed. : *jñeyas tu* CDF : *jñayā* G 14c *yonisthā* codd. : *nābhisthā*  
 T 14d *dvādaśāntagā* conj. [= T] : *dvādaśāntago* J, *dvādaśāntage* : *dvādaśāntake*  
 E : *dvādaśāntaro* C : *dvādaśānta* re G : *dvādaśāntagam* ABH, ed. : *dvādaśāntaga*  
 D : *dvādaśātuga* F 15b *priye* codd. : *smṛtam* T

It requires no great perspicacity to see that a line has dropped out between the first and second lines of this passage. The first line, 41ab, is the first half of a sentence that is never completed, a relative clause without the main clause that must have followed it; and the rest of the passage consists of an unbroken sequence of semantically self-contained line-pairs that now appear to have their first half in one verse and their second in the next until the end of the passage. The *Kubjikāmata*'s redactor appears to have tried to remedy this by giving *Kubjikā* a three-line question at the end of the passage, so that when Bhairava begins the next topic in answer to her the text returns to the norm of congruence between sentences and verses. The editors do not conjecture the loss of this line and so, it seems, do not see the redactor's remedy. Coming up to the barrier to the numbering interposed by *Kubjikā*'s question (*śrīkubjikovāca*) they treat the extra line

<sup>37</sup>See, e.g., Lore Sanders' Gilgit/Bamyan-Type 2.

as an anomalous one-line stanza, numbered 155, and then consider the three-line question an anomalous three-line stanza, numbered 156.

I turn now to evidence of text-flow between the texts of Śaivism and those of the Pāñcarātra. The dating of the sources of the latter is far more problematic than that of the Śaiva scriptural corpus, because no body of early commentaries and manuscripts survives. The literature has been transmitted almost entirely within the Śrīvaiṣṇava tradition of southern India and the earliest datable references to many scriptures that have been considered to predate that tradition are likewise in the works of South-Indian Śrīvaiṣṇavas. It is not easy, therefore, to determine which of the texts considered canonical go back to the early times of the Pāñcarātrika tradition and to an origin outside the South. Much reliance has been placed on the *Spandapradīpikā* of the Kashmirian Bhāgavata Utpala, a commentary on a Śaiva text but one that draws on Pāñcarātrika sources.<sup>38</sup> For he has been dated in the tenth century. Certainly he cannot be much earlier than that since the *Spandakārikā* on which he comments is a text of the second half of the ninth. But the evidence proposed for the conclusion that he is not later is merely that Abhinavagupta (*fl.* c. 975–1025) is not among the Śaiva authorities that he cites. This is hardly conclusive.<sup>39</sup>

Among the Pāñcarātrika scriptures that have been considered ancient is the *Ahīrbudhnyasaṃhitā*. Schrader judged it to be "no doubt one of the oldest Saṃhitās extant" and assigned it to the eighth century and Kashmir.<sup>40</sup> I propose that the *Ahīrbudhnyasaṃhitā* and with it the *Lakṣmī-tantra* postdate the *Pratyabhijñāhṛdaya* of the Kashmirian Śaiva scholar Kṣemarāja, who flourished c. 1000–1050. My evidence for this proposal is that the two scriptures, for all their Vaiṣṇava character, are indebted to the doctrines and phraseology of that work. The case is especially clear with the *Lakṣmītantra*. It draws heavily and transparently on the both the Sūtras and the auto-commentary that make up Kṣemarāja's opusculum.<sup>41</sup> Nor are these the only instances of its dependence on the Śaiva literature of, or current in, Kashmir at that time. The author has also drawn on the

<sup>38</sup>Otto Schrader refers to him as Utpalavaiṣṇava (*Introduction to the Pāñcarātra and the Ahīrbudhnyasaṃhitā* [1916], p. 18). I use the form Bhāgavata Utpala on the authority of the colophon of the *Spandapradīpikā* (*ity ācārya \*bhā[corr. bha] ed. [gavato-tpalaviracitā spandapradīpikā samāptā]*) and in conformity with many other names of this kind; see, e.g., *Subhāṣitāvalī* 142, 143, 164, 608, 425, 609, 866, 927, 1029, 1242, 1876, 2276, 3501, and 3514.

<sup>39</sup>That the *Spandapradīpikā* was composed in the first half of the tenth century was proposed by Bühler (*Tour*, 1877, p. 79) and followed by Schrader, *loc. cit.*

<sup>40</sup>*Op. cit.*, p. 19.

<sup>41</sup>*Lakṣmītantra* (LT) 6.34–44 ← *Pratyabhijñāhṛdaya* (PH) 4, 5, 7, and the commentary on 12 (concerning Vāmeśvari etc.); LT 6.39 ← PH 7; LT 7.29–30b incorporates PH 5 while working in PH 1 and the point of PH 4; LT 12.12 ← PH 1; LT 13.21–22b ← PH 1–2; LT 13.23–30b ← PH 4–5, 10–11 and 14; LT 18.18 ← PH 20; LT 43.33–37 ← PH 11–16. Thus only five of PH's twenty Sūtras have not been used, namely 3, 6 and 17–19.

*Īśvarapratyabhijñāṅkārikā* of Utpaladeva,<sup>42</sup> the *Vijñānabhairava*,<sup>43</sup> the *Svacchanda Tantra*,<sup>44</sup> and the account of creation through the syllabary given by Abhinavagupta in his *Parātrīṣṇikāvivarṇa* and *Tantrāloka*, Āhnika 3.<sup>45</sup> He has also drawn, in the domain of the Kashmirian Pañcarātra, on the *Samvitprakāśa* of Vāmanadatta.<sup>46</sup>

There are also numerous indications of dependence on the sources of Kashmirian Śaiva nondualism in the *Ahīrbudhnyasaṃhitā*, though they are generally more attenuated, being perceptible for the most part on the level of distinctive terminology, phraseology and doctrine rather than in substantial text-parallels. This attenuation may be because the elements of Kashmirian Śaiva discourse reached it indirectly.<sup>47</sup>

<sup>42</sup>LT 18.16 ← *Īśvarapratyabhijñāṅkārikā* (ĪPK) 1.64ab; LT 18.17ab ← ĪPK 1.44a; LT 18.17c ← ĪPK 1.45a. LT 7.18–24 incorporates Utpaladeva's distinctive doctrine of the four levels of the self as perceiver of differentiation (*māyāpramātā*), i.e. *sūnyapramātā*, *prāṇapramātā*, *buddhipramātā* and *dehāpramātā*, for which see ĪPK 1.53–57, 3.8, 9, 19, 22–26.

<sup>43</sup>LT 43.79–83 ← *Vijñānabhairava* 69–73.

<sup>44</sup>LT 43.30c–31b ← *Svacchanda* 4.313.

<sup>45</sup>See LT 19.

<sup>46</sup>LT 14.9c–10b ← *Samvitprakāśa* (SP) 1–2; LT 14.11–12 ← SP 3–4; LT 14.13–14 ← SP 9–10; LT 14.15 ← SP 39 and 41; LT 14.19–30 ← SP 43–61; LT 14.32ab ← SP 62ab; LT 14.38–39 ← SP 77–78; LT 4.42, 25a, 26 ← SP 103–104c, 105. A critical editio princeps of the Pañcarātrika Prakaraṇas of Vāmanadatta (*Samvitprakāśa*, *Ātmasaptati*, *Vikalpaviplava*, *Vidyāviveka*, *Varṇavicāra*, *Paramārthaprakāśa*) is being prepared by Prof. Raffaele Torella. This Vāmanadatta tells us that he is the son of Devadatta (son of Rātridatta) and Ratnādevi (*Samvitprakāśa* 153: *rātridattir devadatto ratnādevyāṃ yam ātmajam / lebhe vāmanadattākhyam*) and therefore should not be confused with his Śaiva namesake, the author of the *Bodhaviṭāsa* and the *Svabodhodayamañjarī*, since that Vāmanadatta's father was Harṣadatta; see *Svabodhodayamañjarī* 44 (Benares Hindu University, MS. 3F/32400): *harṣadattasya sūnūnā / kṛtā vāmanadattena svabodhodayamañjarī*.

<sup>47</sup>My evidence that the *Ahīrbudhnyasaṃhitā* (AhSam) postdates Kṣemarāja and other Kashmirian Śaiva sources is as follows.

AhSam 3.8d (*riktā pūrṇā ca sarvādā*, concerning Viṣṇu's Śakti) ← Ūrmikaṇḍa quoted by Kṣemarāja in *Spandanirṇaya* pp. 48–9: (*lelīhānā* [i.e. *riktā*] *sadā devī sadā pūrṇā ca bhāsate*); Kṣemarāja, *Śivasūtravimarsinī* (SŚV) ad 1.6 (*atiriktāriktatadubhayātmata-yāpy abhidhīyamānāpi anetadrūpā anuttarā parā svāntantrīyāśaktiḥ kāpy asti yayā svabhittau mahyullāsāt prabhṛti parāpramātrīśrāntyantantam śrīmatṣṣṭyādisaktikakrasphāraṇātrmā kriḍeyam ādarśitā*). Cf. also AhSam 60.5ab: *niḥśaktāśaktasamātrā pūrṇā riktā rāmbharā*.

AhSam 7.67d: *\*svaccha* (em.: *svaccha* ed.) *svacchandacinmayah*. The expression *svacchasvacchandacid-* occurs so frequently in the works of Kṣemarāja that one may consider it a hallmark. See, e.g., SŚV ad 3.5: *-svacchasvacchandacidātmata*; ibid. ad 3.25: *paripūrṇasvacchasvacchandacidānandaghanena śivena*; PH p. 3: *bhagavatī svacchasvatantirūpā*; *Netratantroddya* vol. 1, p. 1: *cinmayamahāḥ svacchasvatantirūpā*; ibid. pp. 56: *svacchasvatantirūpācidēkaghanatvāt*; ibid. p. 73: *svacchasvacchandamahimnā*; ibid. vol. 2, p. 23: *svacchasvacchandacidānanda*; ibid. p. 186 *svacchasvacchandacidighana*; ibid. p. 272: *svacchasvacchandaprakāśātmasīva*; *Svacchandoddyota* vol. 2, p. 128: *svacchasvacchandacidānandaghanah*; ibid. p. 245: *svacchasvacchandacidānandaghanam*; vol. 3, p. 98: *svacchasvacchandātmakacidghanatāvyaktir eva yan mokṣah*; ibid. p. 99: *svacchasvacchandadhāma*; ibid. p. 139: *svacchasvacchandacidāna-*

*ndasundaratvāt*; etc. Kṣemarāja's source may be the Maṅgalaśloka of Utpaladeva's *Īśvarapratyabhijñāvivṛtti*; see Abhinavagupta, *Īśvarapratyabhijñāvivṛttivimarsinī* vol. 1, p. 3: *svacchāvabhāsītāśeṣalokayātrātmane namaḥ / śivāya śaśvadacchannasvacchasvacchandavṛttaye*. The expression is also common in the *Lakṣmītantra*; see 8.7cd, 12.4b: *svacchasvacchandacinmayā*; 7.2cd, 13.21b: *svacchasvacchandānirbharā*; 13.24b: *svacchasvacchandacinmayā*; and 14.54d: *svacchasvacchandacinmayā*.

AhSam 3.6ab: *svāntantrīyarūpā sā viṣṇoḥ prasphurattā jaganmayī*. Cf. *Īśvarapratyabhijñāṅkārikā* 1.44–45: *svāntantrīyam etan ... sā sphurattā mahāsattā deśakālāviśeṣiṇī*. Cf. also AhSam 49.58d: *sphuraṇākhye* (voc., in a hymn to Lakṣmī). The term *mahāsattā* appears in AhSam 9.29cd: *nirmalānandasamḥbodhamahāsattāmayena ca*; 14.7ab: *yā sā śaktir mahāsattā viṣṇoḥ taddharmadharminī*, and 16.56a: *anākhyeyā mahāsattā*. Cf. 4.72c.73b: *yā sā bhagavataḥ śaktir ahaṃtā sarvabhāvagā / aprthakcārīṇī sattā mahānandamayī parā*.

The Pratyabhijñāśāstra's terminology *vimarśah*/[*praty*] *avamarśah* is reflected in AhSam 1.16cd: *manīṣā jāyate pūṃsām paratattvavimarśinī* and 54.53: *nirupādhyavamarśo 'yaṃ dehaprāṇātyāge sthitaḥ / ahamityāspadam yāti sa jīvo nirupaskṛtaḥ*.

The Pratyabhijñāśāstra's characteristic equation of the Goddess with the *svāntantrīyāśaktiḥ* of God is seen in AhSam 3.6. The equation of the Goddess with the God's *ahaṃtā* (*pūrṇāhaṃtā*), which is one of the most obvious imprints of the Kashmirian Śaiva tradition on the *Lakṣmītantra*, also appears in AhSam: see e.g., 3.43ab: *sarvabhāvātmikā lakṣmīr ahaṃtā paramātmanah*; 4.72cd: *yā sā bhagavataḥ śaktir ahaṃtā sarvabhāvagā*; 6.1: *yo 'sau nārāyaṇo devaḥ paramātmā sanātanaḥ / ahaṃbhāvātmikā śaktis tasya taddharmadharminī*; 18.6: *iyam sā paramā śaktir ahaṃteyam hareḥ parā*; 3.15cd: *parāha(n)tā\*sva* (corr.: *su* ed.) *rūpatvān mantramātā prakīrtitā*.

The distinctive term *nirmāṇasaktiḥ* in AhSam 3.42d echoes *Īśvarapratyabhijñāṅkārikā* 2.8ab: *kiṃ tu nirmāṇasaktiḥ sāpy evaṃviduṣa īśituh*.

Another distinctively Kashmirian usage is that of the pair *unmeṣah* and *nimeṣah* as the expansion and retraction of the powers of God. See *Spandakārikā* 1.1: *yasyonmeṣanimeṣābhyāṃ jagataḥ pralayo dayau*. Cf. AhS 3.6: *svāntantrīyarūpā sā viṣṇoḥ prasphurattā jaganmayī / uditānuditākārā nimeṣonmeṣarūpiṇī*; AhS 60.6: *śaḍadhvaviṣayātītā śaḍadhvaviṣayātītā / nimeṣonmeṣarūpā sā bhāvābhāvalakṣaṇā*.

Note also the use of the term *spandaḥ* / *spandanam* for the creative force of consciousness in AhS 3.39: *so 'yaṃ sudarśanaṃ nāma saṃkalpaḥ spandanātmakah / vibhajya bahudhā rūpaṃ bhāve bhāve 'vatiṣṭhate*; 21.14ab: *saccidānandasamḥdoham aspandaspanadalakṣaṇam*.

The *Ahīrbudhnyasaṃhitā*'s account of the origin of the universe as the unfolding of the letters of the alphabet in Adhyāya 16 and the terminology of that account are derived from Kashmirian Śaiva sources (*Tantrāloka*, Āhnika 3, 66–171b; *Parātrīṣṇikāvivarṇa* and *Parātrīṣṇikālaghuvṛtti* ad vv. 5–8; *Śivasūtravimarsinī* ad 2.7, etc.). Note that in 16.86 AhSam refers to the sounds YA, RA, LA and VA as the *dhāraṇāḥ* and in 16.84 to the sounds ŚA, ŚA, SA, SA, HA and KṢA as the Brahmas. This terminology is peculiar to *Parātrīṣṇikā* 7: *vāyavagnisālilendrāṇām dhāraṇāṇām catuṣṭayam / tadūrdhve sādī vikhyaṭam purastād brahmapaṇcakam*. Other Kashmirian Śaiva features in the AhSam's account are:

(i) its identifying the alphabet-*śaktiḥ* (in the form of the first fourteen vowels [a slight difference here]) with *kuṇḍalinī*; cf. *Tantrāloka* 3.220c–21b (paraphrasing and developing a passage from the *Siddhayaogasevarīmata*, which is given in full in Jayaratha's commentary): *sātra kuṇḍalinī bījaṃ jīvabhūtā cidātmikā / tajjām dhruvecchonmeṣākhyam trikaṃ varṇaṃ tataḥ punah*.

(ii) its equating the fifteenth and sixteenth vowels, *anusvārah* and *visargah*, with *saṃhārah* and *śṛṣṭiḥ*; cf. *Tantrāloka* 3.110–134b (*anusvārah*), 136c–143 (*visargah*), 201c–202b, 5.68ab and commentary.

(iii) its assimilation of the alphabet-emanation to self-awareness (A → HA → M/M) at 16.64–66. This is the central doctrine of Abhinavagupta's treatment of the alphabet; see *Tantrāloka* 3.200c–204b.

It might be thought that this evidence of the influence of Kashmirian Śaiva authors on the two texts indicates that they were written in Kashmir, so that to that extent at least Schrader's assessment of the *Ahīrbudhnyasamhitā* would have been vindicated. But it is extremely improbable that either text was Kashmirian in origin and probable, if not certain, that both were composed in the South, where they are first cited in learned literature.<sup>48</sup> For both give Pāñcarātrika interpretations of Yajurvedic Mantras; and these are Mantras of the Taittirīya rather than the Kāthaka recension. No one preaching to the community of Kashmirian Brahmins at this period would be likely to encode the Yajurveda in other than its Kāthaka recension; and the stronghold of the Taittirīya is, as is equally well known, the Dravidian South.<sup>49</sup>

But the text-flow is not only from Śaivism to the Pāñcarātra.<sup>50</sup> There

AhSām also shows knowledge of the *Vijñānabhairava* and the *Mālinīvijayottara*, both of which are Trika scriptures central to the Kashmirian tradition:

(i) AhSām 54.31c: *mukhaṃ śaktiḥ samuddiṣṭā*. Cf. *Vijñānabhairava* 20d: *śaivi mukhaṃ ihocyate*.

(ii) AhSām 8.29cd: *yā sū śaktir jagaddhātuḥ kathitā samavāyini*. This equals *Mālinīvijayottara* 3.5ab. The line is much quoted in the non-dualistic Śaiva literature of Kashmir; see, e.g., *Tantrāloka* 1 (1) 16; *Śivasūtravivartanī* ad 1.222 and 3.19.

<sup>48</sup>Schrader (1916:18) claimed that the Kashmirian Bhāgavata Utpala ('Utpalavaiṣṇava') knew the AhSām since he quotes a verse of that work in his *Spandapradīpikā*. But Utpala does not attribute the verse to this source; as Schrader himself reports, it is at best a variant of a verse in the AhSām; its content does not tie it to this text; and finally, as Freidhelm Hardy has rightly pointed out (*Virahabakti. The Early History of Kṛṣṇa Devotion in South India* [Delhi, 1983], p. 35, n. 102), a single verse cannot establish a lower limit for the whole work. It is, of course, only too likely that a text as late as the AhSām is incorporating the verse from one of the many early Pāñcarātrika sources now lost to us.

<sup>49</sup>LT 29.18 ff. refers by name to each of the Mantras of *Taittirīyāraṇyaka* 3.1–10. AhSām gives them in full in its chapters 58 and 59.

<sup>50</sup>[2001:] The ritual systems taught in the Śaiva and Pāñcarātrika Samhitās resemble each other so closely in morphology and syntax that they have the appearance of two dialects of a single 'Tantric' language. There is no reason to suppose that they have a common source that is neither Śaiva nor Vaiṣṇava. It is therefore probable that one has fashioned itself in the guise of the other, as, for example, from the tenth century onwards the Tibetan Bon religion produced a canon of scripture and a body of practice on the model of those of mainstream Tibetan Buddhism (see Per Kvaerne, *The Bon Religion of Tibet* [1995], p. 10), and as the Indian Buddhists had produced by the tenth century a Tantrism that was not only heavily dependent on Śaiva models, for that had been the case from at least the seventh century, but, as we shall see in the last part of this essay, included scriptures that had incorporated large expanses of text directly from Śaiva sources. However, when I wrote this essay in 1997 I was not ready to throw light on the question of which was the imitator in the case of the Pāñcarātrika and Tantric Śaiva systems. Since then I have found evidence, which will have to await publication elsewhere, that all three of the early Pāñcarātrika Samhitās known as the 'three jewels' (see *Jayākhyā*, ed. Krishnamacharya, p. 8, *adhikāḥ pāṭhaḥ*, vv. 2–3), namely the *Jayākhyā*, the *Sāttvata* and the *Paṣkara*, were written under the influence of Tantric Śaiva models; that the first two at least were composed following models that belong to a later stage in the development of Saiddhāntika Śaiva ritual; and that neither of these two is likely to have been composed before c. 850, some 300

is also evidence of movement in the other direction, from Pāñcarātrika to Śaiva literature, as in the case of the Saiddhāntika Śaiva *Bṛhatkālottara*, which has acquired its detailed perscriptions governing the cremation of initiates (*antyeṣṭiḥ*) and the Śrāddha ceremonies to be offered thereafter from the Pāñcarātrika *Jayākhyasamhitā*. The 89 verses of its *anteṣṭimṛtod-dhārapaṭalaḥ* and the 64 verses of the *śrāddhapāṭalaḥ* that follows it, are a redaction of the 105 verses of the 24th Paṭala of the *Jayākhyā* and of 72 verses of the 23rd Paṭala, from verse 64 to its end. The Śaiva redactor has attempted to eliminate traces of his material's Vaiṣṇava origin, but he has not been sufficiently diligent. In the *Bṛhatkālottara*, as in the genuine *Kālottara* recensions among which he wished his text to be accepted, the recipient of instruction is Śiva's son Kārtikeya, whereas in the *Jayākhyā* it is the sage Nārada. He has therefore made an effort to replace with suitable metrical equivalents the not infrequent vocatives addressed to that sage. For example *nārada* (24.48, 24.54 etc.) is replaced with *ṣaṇmukha*, *dviyottama* (24.21d) with *sikhidhvaja*, and *dviya* (24.100) with *vatsa*. But one *dviya* has escaped his net (*Bṛhatkālottara*, *Śrāddhapāṭala*, v. 788ab [= *Jayākhyā* 24.97 cd]):

*ānayetī dvīdhā yojyaṃ tatsaṃjñāṃ tad anu dviya*

SIGLA: K = NAK 1-89; J = NAK 5-778; *Jayākhyā* = consensus of ed. and NAK 1-49 (Nepalese palm-leaf ms. of *Jayākhyā*, f. 81v1-2). 78a *ānayetī* em. [= *Jayākhyā*] : *ānayanta* KJ 78b *tatsaṃjñāṃ* em. [= *Jayākhyā*] : *taṣṭhaṃjñāṃ* KJ *dviya* em. [= *Jayākhyā*] : *dviyaḥ* KJ

Kārtikeya, of course, cannot be addressed in this way.

The redactor has also edited out certain elements of the text which went against Śaiva doctrine, sometimes omitting the passage and sometimes rewriting it. Thus *Jayākhyā* 24.9 says that the bier may be carried to the cremation ground by initiates or non-initiates and again in 24.74 that those obliged to perform a person's funeral rites may be initiates or non-initiates. Both statements offended the redactor's convictions and he has changed the texts accordingly. 24.9b's *dikṣitair vāpy adikṣitaiḥ* 'by initiates or non-initiates' has become *dikṣitair na hy adikṣitaiḥ* 'by initiates and not by the uninitiated' (*Anteṣṭimṛtod-dhārapaṭala* 8d) and 24.74b's *kāryaṃ cādikṣiteṣv api* 'it may be performed for the uninitiated also' has become *kāryaṃ nādikṣite kva cit* 'it should never be performed for anyone who has not been initiated' (*Anteṣṭimṛtod-dhārapaṭala* 55b).<sup>51</sup> But on the level of content too he has occasionally been superficial. Thus, speaking of those who may be

years after our earliest evidence of Saiddhāntika Śaivism. Since the Pāñcarātra existed in some form throughout the Christian era, I venture the hypothesis that its surviving scriptures are the result of a late process of tantricization under Śaiva influence. We may think, perhaps, in the case of both Buddhist and Vaiṣṇava Tantrism, of a process of acculturation to Śaiva norms.

<sup>51</sup>The Nepalese ms. of the *Jayākhyā*, NAK 1-49, confirms the edition's reading of



summoned to take the offerings in Śrāddha, *Jayākhyā* 23.91 adds the option *prāguktam yatipūrvam vā vaiṣṇavam tu ekam eva hi* 'Alternatively, [he may summon] a single Vaiṣṇava, [one of] the aforesaid beginning with the Yati'. The Śaiva redactor rewrote this as *prāguktam yatipūrvam vā śivabhaktam athaikakam*. 'Alternatively, [he may summon] a single devotee of Śiva, [one of] the aforesaid beginning with the Yati'. A Śaiva reading this, and no doubt the redactor himself, would have to understand the expression *yatipūrvam* 'beginning with the Yati' to refer to the well-known sequence of the celibate student, the married householder, the hermit and the ascetic (*yatīḥ*), in reverse order. But in fact his source is referring to a series of specifically Vaiṣṇava practitioners that it had expounded at some length in the immediately preceding Paṭala (22.6–64b), a fact indicated by the words *prāguktam* 'aforesaid'. We might have been none the wiser had the redactor not failed to notice the inappropriateness of this detail in its new location, for that lacks any applicable prior enumeration.

Another example of unconvincing revision is seen in the *Anteṣṭimṛtoddhārapaṭala*, v. 77, in a passage on the cremating of a simulacrum when the body of the deceased has been destroyed or cannot be found. The source is *Jayākhyā* 24.95b–96b:

..... tridhā smṛtvā purāmalam  
mahāvibhūtisāḍḡṇyaśarīram paramēśvaram  
96 tadante mūlamantram ca saṃsmaren mūrtisaṃyutam

SIGLUM: N = NAK 1-49, f. 81r7–v1. 95cd mahāvibhūtisāḍḡṇyaśarīram  
paramēśvaram N: mahāvibhūte sādḡṇyaśarīra paramēśvara ed. 96a man-  
trañ ca corr.: mantras tu ed.

He should first thrice contemplate the Supreme Lord as spotless, embodying the Great Glory and the Six Qualities. Thereafter he should meditate on the Mūlamantra in combination with the Mūrtimantra.

This becomes *Anteṣṭimṛtoddhārapaṭala* 75c–76:

..... tridhā smṛtvā purā śivam  
mahāvibhūtibhālam citiśarīram maheśvaram  
tadante mūlamantram tu saṃsmared brahmasaṃyutam

SIGLA: K = NAK 1-89; J = NAK 5-778. 76a bhālam conj.: pālam KJ 76c  
tadante tentative conj.: hṛdante KJ

24.9b. But for 24.74b it has *kāryaṇ cādīkṣitosvapi* (f. 80v4), which I have emended to *kāryaṇ cādīkṣiteṣv api*. The edition has *kāryaṣ cādīkṣitair api*. This too is corrupt, since it voids the passage of its intended collocation of the procedures for the initiated (v. 73a: *dīkṣitānām*) and the uninitiated (v. 74).

He should first thrice contemplate Śiva, Maheśvara, as having the great ash on his forehead, embodied in the pyre. \*Thereafter (?) he should meditate on the Mūlamantra in combination with the Mūrtimantra.

The Śaiva redactor faced a number of difficulties. The terms *mahāvibhūtiḥ* and *sāḍḡṇyam* are Pāñcarātrika. He kept the first, probably intending *vibhūti-* to be taken in the Śaiva sense of the 'ash' with which Śiva (and Śaivas) dust their bodies in general and their foreheads (*bhālam*) in particular. But *sāḍḡṇyaśarīram* was intractable. Hence the substitution of *citiśarīram*, which may mean 'embodied as consciousness' but more probably means 'embodied as the pyre', since that is more appropriate to the context. His solution is obviously a makeshift, since it infringes the rule of caesura between quarters. The awkwardness of his *śivam* for *amalam* and *maheśvaram* for *paramēśvaram*, so that there are now two names of the one deity in apposition, only adds to the impression of incompetence. If any doubt remains it should be removed by observing his handling of the final line. The instruction to meditate on the Mūlamantra combined with the Mūrtimantra makes perfect sense in the *Jayākhyā*; for vv. 61c–69 of Paṭala 6 of that work have explained that the Mūlamantra may be used on its own or, to greater effect, in combination with the Mūrtimantra. The redactor, who would have been well advised to add this section to those too intractable to be included, has substituted an unprecedented combination of the Śaiva Mūlamantra with the five Brahmanmantras.

Seeing the artificiality of this last piece of redaction one is bound to ask oneself whether this part of the new text ever supported a corresponding practice. It seems to me probable that it did not and that such blanks may have been a common feature of our scriptural literatures, a predictable consequence of the method of redaction itself, in which materials are taken over and edited to fit the context of a new revelation. It would have been only too easy to overlook details in one part of the text that had become incongruous as the result of revision in another, and this would have been even more so when the new work was expected, as in this case, to cover not only the areas of innovation that motivated its production but all the main elements of religious practice, and in some detail. Moreover, we may suspect that the need to remove such deficiencies pressed less insistently on the minds of the manufacturers of divine revelation, since they themselves would not be held responsible for their work. Thus it is that while there are some scriptures that are just as coherent as works of good scholarship claimed by authors as their own, there are others that are little better than careless bricolage.

I end with the subject of text-flow from the Śaiva Vidyāpīṭha into the scriptures of the Śaṃvara cycle of the Buddhist Yoginītantras. In the *Laghuśaṃvara* (Tib. *Bde mchog ñuñ ñu*), which the Buddhist tradition

identifies as the root-text (*mūlatantram*) of this corpus, long passages, amounting to some 200 verses, nearly a third of the whole, can be seen to have been redacted from Śaiva originals found in texts of the Vidyāpīṭha division, namely the *Picumata*, the *Siddhayogeśvarīmata*, the *Tantrasadbhāva*, and the *Yoginisamcāraprakaraṇa* of the 3rd Śaṭka of the *Jayadrathayāmala*, or, perhaps, from closely related versions of these text-passages that are no longer accessible. The correspondences I have identified are as tabulated in Table 1.<sup>52</sup>

TABLE I

ABBREVIATIONS: AUT = *Abhidhānottaratantra* [Paṭalas as in MS NGMPP, Reel E 695/3; Tenjur numeration in brackets]; LŚT = *Laghuśaṃvaratantra*; MMT = *Mahāmudrātilakatantra* (from the Hevajra corpus; uncatalogued *codex unicus*, Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin, Hs. or. 8711); VḌ = *Vajradākatantra*; SampT = *Samputodbhāvatatantra*; SUT = *Samvarodayatantra*; HT = *Hevajratatantra*; YS = *Yoginisamcāraprakaraṇa* of the third Śaṭka of the *Jayadrathayāmala*; PM = *Picumata*; SYM = *Siddhayogeśvarīmata*; NS = *Niśisamcāratatantra*; TS = *Tantrasadbhāvatatantra*.

LŚT	Śaiva sources	No. of verses in LŚT Paṭala	No. of parallel verses
Paṭala 15 ( <i>Akṣara-cchomāvidhiḥ</i> ) =AUT 35 [38].2-8; Samp T 7, 1.13-16	YS, <i>Samayācāraceṣṭā</i> <i>vidhānapaṭalaḥ</i> 116-119	8 (verse and prose)	5½ (verse and prose)
Paṭala 16 ( <i>Saptayoginī-lakṣanaparikṣāvidhiḥ</i> ) = AUT 36 [39:1]; 12-18b = SUT 9.7-11	YS, <i>Samayācāraceṣṭā</i> , <i>vidhānapaṭalaḥ</i> , 120-138b	17½	17½

<sup>52</sup>[2001: Since writing this I have encountered other extensive passages that were brought into the text from the same Śaiva sources, covering such topics as initiation (*abhiṣekah*) and the making of offerings into fire to attain supernatural effects (*siddhiḥ*), amounting with those mentioned in Table 1 to about half the whole. There may well be other sources that I have not yet identified or that may never be identified, since we are far from having manuscripts of all the Vidyāpīṭha texts whose existence is attested in those that have survived. As for the rest, much of it follows Śaiva models. For example, the substantial sections in which the Mantras are given sound by sound (*mantroddhārah*) cannot have been lifted directly from a Śaiva source, because however dependent the text was on Śaiva prototypes in other respects, a Buddhist Tantra had to have its own Mantras. But the convention according to which they are given sound by sound in the code of their numerical position in the numbered letter classes (*vargaḥ*), does have its exact Śaiva parallels in this literature, and was no doubt adopted from that source. The Mantras themselves are in the style of those of the Śaiva Vidyāpīṭha.

Paṭala 17, 1-11 ( <i>Sarvayoginī rūpa-parivartanacihnamudrā-paṭalaḥ</i> ) =AUT 37 [39:2]. 5 et sqq.; 3-11= SampT 4, 2.1-9	YS, <i>Samayācāraceṣṭā</i> <i>vidhānapaṭalaḥ</i> , 138c-148	12	10½
Paṭala 18 ( <i>Sarvayoginī-varṇalakṣanacihnavidhiḥ</i> ) 1-4 = AUT 37 [40] (= MMT 15) ( <i>Ḍākinīlakṣaṇam</i> ). 1-4	Related to a passage in TS Adhikāra 16 ( <i>yoginīlakṣaṇam</i> )	19	19
Paṭala 19 ( <i>Sarvayoginyo-mudrānirdeśavidhiḥ</i> ). 1-24b (24 vv. in paṭala) =AUT 38 [41] ( <i>Lāmālakṣaṇam</i> )	SYM Paṭala 29 (unnamed). 22c-33, 35-40, 43-46b, 48-50, 52. CST 19.2-11c=lacunose NS 6.3-13c	24	23½
Paṭala 20 ( <i>Sarvayoginyah-mudrāsamketavidhiḥ</i> ) =AUT 39 [42] (= VḌ 8)	No precise parallels,	13½	13½
Paṭala 21 ( <i>Darśanāṅga-mudrālakṣaṇavidhiḥ</i> ) =AUT 40 [43] (=VḌ 7)	except in the case of isolated verses, for CST Paṭalas 20-24. But	10	10
Paṭala 22 ( <i>Saviśeṣāṅga-mudrālakṣaṇavidhiḥ</i> ) =AUT 41[44] (=MMT 14)		8½	8½
Paṭala 23 ( <i>Ḍākinīvicihna-mudrālakṣaṇavidhiḥ</i> ) =AUT 42:1 [45:1]	closely related passages are found in TS and PM	7	7
Paṭala 24 ( <i>Ḍākinīchommā-lakṣaṇavidhiḥ</i> ) = AUT 42:2 [45:2]		16 (prose)	16 (prose)
Paṭala 26 ( <i>Śiṣyaparikṣā-saṃvaravidhiḥ</i> ), 6-12, 14 (one line), 15 (15 vv. in paṭala) = AUT 43:1	PM Adhikāra 85 ( <i>Samayāḥ</i> ), 4-11 (6-11 = YS, <i>Samayācāraceṣṭā</i> <i>vidhiḥ</i> ), 3-10	9½	8
Paṭala 27 ( <i>Caryāvratapūjabalividhiḥ</i> ), 1, 6-14, 23ab (24vv. in Paṭala) = AUT 43:2	PM Adhikāra 85 ( <i>Samayāḥ</i> ), 12, 14, 16cd, 17cd-23b, 25abc, 26bcd, 31ab	24	10

Paṭala 28 ( <i>Adhyātmahomavarnāikavidhiḥ</i> ), 1 (2 pāda verse), 3, 5–7b, 8–11, 13c–16	PM Adhikāra 85 ( <i>saṁyāh</i> ), 31cd, 32 cdef, 33–35b, 35c–40b, 40c–43b,	16	12
Paṭala 29 ( <i>Dūtīlakṣaṇasaktyavasthāvidhiḥ</i> ), 1ef–3c, 3d–4a, 4bcd (10 vv. in paṭala)	PM Adhikāra 85 ( <i>saṁyāh</i> ), 43c–45c, 46b–46c, 47bcd,	10	4½
Paṭala 41 ( <i>Caturvīṃsatiyoginī-samūhanyāśavidhiḥ</i> )	TS Adhikāra 16 ( <i>Yoginī-lakṣaṇam</i> ), 60–68	14?	9½
Paṭala 49 ( <i>Saptajanmasādhyarūpaparivartanavidhiḥ</i> ), 3c–4b, 4cd, 5ab	TS Adhikāra 7, [5], (HT 1 xi 11cd= [6ab]), 4, 7ab, 8cd	2	

Here more than anywhere in the Tantric literature only religious faith could shield one from the realization that original texts need not to be meaningful throughout, since they may incorporate lacunae of meaning from their source-texts or create them through ignorance or carelessness in the process of redaction. I will provide a single example. As Table I shows, Paṭala 85 of the *Picumata* is the source of Paṭalas 26 to 29 of the *Laghuśaṁvara*. The subject is the rules that bind those who undertake the postiniatory observance (*saṁyācāraḥ*). At the end of the passage incorporated, in *Picumata* 85.41–43, the reader is exhorted to maintain his practice of the *smaraṇam*. This is a technical term for the basic seed-syllable of this Tantra, and the passage begins by giving the form of the root-Mantra (*mūlamantraḥ*) of which it is the first element (NAK 3-370 of A.D. 1052, f. 327v):

*smaraṇena samāyuktam CAṆḌE-tyādīpadānvitam*  
42 KĀPĀLINY-antasamāyuktam SVĀHĀ-pada vibhūṣitam  
*hrdayam sarvaśaktinām bhuktimuktiphalapradāḥ*

The heart of all the Powers, that bestows the rewards of paradise and liberation, equipped with the *smaraṇam*, with the word CAṆḌE first, then KĀPĀLINI following it, adorned by SVĀHĀ

...

This gives the nine-syllabled Vidyā of Caṇḍā Kāpālīnī: HŪM CAṆḌE KĀPĀLINI SVĀHĀ. The redactor of the *Laghuśaṁvara* transformed this into the following unmetrical and ungrammatical puzzle in 29.3:

*smaraṇena samāyuktam dūtyādīpadānvitam*  
*caturvīṃśa varadākinyo bhuktimuktiphalapradāḥ*<sup>53</sup>

<sup>53</sup>The only accessible manuscript of the Sanskrit text (Oriental Institute, M.S. Uni-

The commentators had to do what they could with this. Jayabhadra's *Pañjikā* has:

*smaraṇena samāyuktam pañcāmṛtatattvalakṣaṇena samanvitam iti. dūtyādīpadānvitam iti anavaratayogābhīyāsenā dūti-samāyuktāḥ. ādiśabdo 'tra rakṣaṇīyabhakṣaṇīyasamvarasthito mantri. tatrasthā varāḥ pradhānās caturvīṃsati(r) dākinyāḥ bhuktimuktiphalapradā bhavanti.*

SIGLA: A = NAK 3–365, f. 20r1–2; B = NAK 5–212, ff. 47v4–48r1. *saṁyuktam* A : *saṁyuktāḥ* B • *tatvalakṣaṇena* B : *tvalakṣaṇenā* A • *samanvitam* A : *samanvitām* B • *saṁyuktāḥ* B : *saṁyuktam* A

Equipped with *smaraṇam* means provided with that which is the reality of the five Nectars. As for the compound *dūtyādīpadānvitam* it means conjoined with a female consort (*dūti*) through ceaseless practice. The word *-ādī-* in the compound refers to the Mantra-master (*mantri*) committed to the *saṁvarāḥ*, both those that have to be observed [i.e. the pledges of the initiate] and those that have to be consumed [the 'impure' substances of the cult]. Taking up their abode in that [which brings these three together: the Nectars, the consort, and the observant Mantra-master] the best, i.e. the principal twenty-four Dākinis become bestowers of the rewards of enjoyment and liberation.

Bhavabhāṭa's *Čakrasaṁvarapañjikā* has:

*smaraṇam cintā, anena samāyuktam samanuyogaḥ. kasya cintety āha, dūtyādīpadānvitam iti, ādiśabdāt samayarakṣaṇam. padaṁ mūlam. tenānvitam samaraṇ(en)a samāyuktam. etenatad uktam. samayapareṇa dūtībhāvanā kāryeti, dūtya eva ki-yatya ity āha, caturvīṃśa parā dākinyo bhuktimuktiphalapradā iti, pracaṇḍādayaś caturvīṃsati(r) dākinyo ity upalakṣaṇatvāt dvādaśāpīha jñeyāḥ. kimartha(m) tā bhāvīyā ity āha, bhuktiḥ svargādīḥ. (muktiḥ) kleśabandhanāpagamaḥ. te phale prakarṣeṇa dadatīti tās tathā.*

Manuscript: Institute for the Advanced Study of World Religions, film-strip no. MBB 1971-33, f. 101v4–102r1.

iversity, Baroda, Acc. No. 13290: '*Herukavidhānamātra*') does not contain this verse, since it has a lacuna beginning with 22.3 and extending to the end of Paṭala 29. The Sanskrit is given here as it is preserved in the *Abhidhānottara* (NGMPP Reel E 695/3, f. 182r6–v1), which has incorporated Paṭala 29 in its Paṭala 43. The latter's fidelity is proved by the lemmata in the extant LST commentaries, to be cited below, and by the Tibetan translation (Peking Rgyud Kha 81a4–5): *dran pa dan ni yan dag ldan / pho ŋa mo sogs go 'phañ bcas / mkha' 'gro ma mchog ŋi šu bi / spyod dan grol ba'i 'bras rab ster.*

The word *smaraṇam* means awareness and *smaraṇena samā-yuktaṃ* means possession [of it]. Awareness of what? He explains this with the word *dūtyādīpadānvitam* [which means 'conjoined with the Dūtīs etc. and the *padam*']. The word -*ādi*-['etc.'] here indicates [that there should also be] adherence to the *saṃyāh* (pledges/sacramental substances). The *padam* is the root[-Mantra]. The state of being provided with awareness [of these] includes the Root Mantra. What he means by this is that one should perform one's meditation on the Dūtī only if one remains committed to the *saṃyāh*. He explains how many these Dūtīs are by speaking of the twenty-four supreme Dākinīs who bestow the reward of enjoyment and liberation. This should be understood as indicating not just these twenty-four but others of the same kind. So one should understand that this includes the twelve too. He explains why they should be the object of one's meditation. Enjoyment means heaven and the like. Liberation means the cessation of being bound by the Defilements. They fully (*prakarṣeṇa* [←*pra*-]) bestow these two benefits.

We see these early commentators attempting to make sense of the incoherent by allowing the texts an impossible freedom from the rules of grammar and syntax.<sup>54</sup> As this example shows, they were bound therefore in the free exercise of their imaginations to diverge widely in their

<sup>54</sup>Faced with the chaotic Sanskrit produced by the redactors of the Yoginītantras the commentators were content, for example, to interpret declensional endings in whatever case or number they felt would yield appropriate sense. Thus in his commentary on *Laghuśaṃvara* 1.10 Bhavabhāṭa reads *sidhyate jāpa mantreṇa* as meaning *sidhyati jāpena mantrāḥ* 'the Mantra succeeds through repeated recitation', saying that the ending of the instrumental singular has been elided in the case of the stem-form *jāpa* and that *mantrāḥ*, a nominative singular, is being used as the instrumental singular (*cod. cit.*, f. 24v3-4): *jāpeti tṛtīyālope. sa ca mānaso vyāpāraḥ. tena ... mantrāḥ si-dhyati. mantreṇeti prathamārthe tṛtīyā*; on 17.1ab (*tato durlabhā yoginīnām tu dākinī-nān tathaiva ca*) he reads genitives plural as nominatives plural (f. 72v3-4): *yoginīnām tu dākinīnām ityādi. prathamārthe ṣaṣṭhi*; on 3.16ab (*etair vicareḥ jagat sarvaṃ dāki-nyaiḥ saha sādhaḥ*) 'The Sādhaka may wander the whole world with these Dākinīs', in which a feminine noun has a masculine or neuter ending (*etaiḥ ... dākinīyaiḥ*), he observes (f. 38v1-2): *etair dākinīyair ityādikaṃ varṇāgamavināśaviparyayaavikārair ni-ruktavihitaiḥ sādhyam āśasya tatprādhānyena sādhyatvāt* 'Expressions such as *etair dākinīyaiḥ* should be validated by means of the addition, elision, transposition and and transformation of sounds that are prescribed in the semantic analysis (taught in the Nirukta), because that is the principal method in the exegesis of the language of scrip-ture'. These four with *dhātvarthāṭīśayayogaḥ* 'stretching the meaning of a verbal root' are the five methods of semantic analysis (*pañcavidhaṃ niruktaṃ*) as stated in a verse cited by Durga ad *Nirukta* 1.1.1.1, ed. H. M. Bhadkamkar (1918), p. 32; see Eivind Kahrs, 'Exploring the *Saddanīti*', *Journal of the Pali Text Society* 17 (1992), pp. 22-23, n. 3, whom I thank for bringing this reference to my attention. On 1.5 Bhavabhāṭa tells us that because the text is scripture its metrics, grammar and the like are not open to criticism (f. 18r3-4): *neha chandaḥśabdādi vivecanīyaṃ āṣṭatvāt*. On 8.4 of the

interpretations. One can only sympathize, then, with the plight of those Tibetans of the tenth and eleventh centuries who were given the task of translating the Śaṃvaratantras into their native language in the conviction that this task was fully possible. It is not; for the texts are littered with passages whose meaning is thoroughly obscure, either because they inherit the defects of the exemplars in which they drew upon their sources or because their redactors lacked the determination or ability to produce un-ambiguous results as they worked to assimilate and disguise their sources.

same Tantra Jayabhadra explains that since case-endings are employed *ad libitum* in the Tantra in order to cause general confusion they should be interpreted as the sense requires (ff. 38v6-39r1): *tantra sarvavyāmohārthaṃ yatheṣṭaṃ vibhaktinirdeśaḥ kṛtaḥ. tadarthavaśād unneyaḥ*; and in his *Catūṣpīṭhālokā*, NAK 3-360, f. 1v3, on the equally chaotic Sanskrit of the Buddhist *Catūṣpīṭhatantra* Kalyāṇavarman says *evam bhāṣi-tety ārabhya yāvad abhyanandann itivacanā(n)ta(m) vibhaktiṅgavacanasamāsādayaḥ gurulaghuvyaticchandādayaḥ cārthopadeśavaśād yathāyogaṃ yojanīyāḥ* '[In this whole Tantra] from the words *evam bhāṣita* at the beginning to *abhyanandan* at the end, the suffixes of case, gender and number, [the semantic relations between members of] com-pounds and [other matters of grammar and syntax], as well as such features as length of vowels, caesurae and metre, should be interpreted as each case demands on the basis that they are intended to convey an [apposite] sense.' This emphasis on meaning over grammaticality or Sanskritic elegance of expression is in accordance with the ancient principle invoked in all the Buddhist literatures that the Buddhist should concern him-self with the meaning alone (*arthapratiśaraṇatā*) and not be overly concerned with niceties of language and composition. See in the Tantric literature, e.g., Āryadeva, *Caryāmelāpakapradīpa* (alias *Sūtramelāpaka*), Calcutta, ASB, MS. 4837 G, f. 2r): *ya-thoktaṃ bhagavatā 'arthapratiśaraṇeṇa bhavitavyam. śabdas tu yathā tathā' iti*, 'As the Lord himself has declared, "You should pay attention to the meaning. The form of the words is irrelevant."'

PUBLICATIONS DU DÉPARTEMENT D'INDOLOGIE - 91

# **LES SOURCES ET LE TEMPS**

SOURCES AND TIME

A colloquium

Pondicherry  
11-13 January 1997

*edited by*  
François Grimal

INSTITUT FRANÇAIS DE PONDICHÉRY  
ÉCOLE FRANÇAISE D'EXTRÊME-ORIENT

Comité de lecture

Colette Caillat,  
Membre de l'Institut de France  
François Gros,  
Directeur d'études à l'École pratique des Hautes Études, Paris  
Michael Hahn,  
Professeur à l'Université de Marburg  
Alexis Sanderson,  
Spalding Professor of Eastern Religions and Ethics, All Souls' College, Oxford  
Raffaele Torella,  
Professeur à l'Université de Rome

© Institut français de Pondichéry, 2001 (ISSN 0073-8352)  
© École française d'Extrême-Orient, 2001

Ouvrage composé en "Computer Modern" et Velthuis' Devanāgarī par  
M<sup>me</sup> T.V. Kamalambal, à l'aide des programmes T<sub>E</sub>X, L<sup>A</sup>T<sub>E</sub>X et EDMAC  
(*macros* pour la réalisation d'éditions critiques, créés par John Lavagnino et  
Dominik Wujastyk)

Couverture et impression : Sri Aurobindo Ashram Press, Pondicherry

## PREFACE

It takes a great deal of time to arrive at sources, and the retrieving process takes even longer. It was not expected that any claim would be made to final answers being received to the questions put to the scholars participating in the colloquium on *Sources and time* which took place in Pondicherry under the joint auspices of the French Institute and the local branch of Ecole Française d'Extrême-Orient.

The main preoccupation of the textualists, most of them strangers to India, was obviously, to display and to examine the manner in which texts stand the test of time, how they survive, are preserved and transmitted, and how philologists struggle to restore the best possible version, going on to show how, and with which of the available tools such as commentaries, ancient and modern, oral and written, indigenous or otherwise, that version itself is better understood and, ultimately, to how it is translated bearing in mind that the epoch and metalanguage of the translators is but the latest damaging aspect of time erosion, of course never to be final.

The scholars were however asked which historical and epistemological language would permit both the definition and preservation of that part of cultural patrimony which lies within the traditional transmission of knowledge, operating from external approach, as well as permitting exposure of the inherent metalanguage hidden behind each of the traditional *sāstra* as within each of our day-to-day self-interrogations.

A special feature of the structure of the French research institutes established in Pondicherry is their very close cooperation with Indian scholars having their own methods and hierarchy. The colloquium was therefore a unique opportunity to evaluate such interactions and to develop the interface between western principles and instruments of textual criticism, as tested over a long period in classical western philology, and the more indigenous, and very effective, readings of texts by those who have received formal training in traditional Indian learning, and who often consider a text as a support to an oral transmission (now fragile and, to an inquisitive western mind, sometimes hardly warranted) and tend to see variant