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The early medieval period, from about the fifth century to the thirteenth, saw a decline in the role of Śrāuta sacrifice in the religious ceremonies undertaken by Indian rulers. But it was not that kings turned aside from the brahmanical tradition in a fundamental sense. They continued to uphold the brahmanical social order of the castes and disciplines (varṇāśramadharmaḥ) and they were commonly commended in inscriptions from the fifth to the eighth centuries for having rigorously imposed it on their subjects. We see this in the case of the Maukhari Harivarman in the fifth century, the Mahārājādhirāja Gopacandra of Vanga and the Parivrājaka Mahārāja Sāmkṣobha of Daḥbālārājya in the sixth, the Puṣyabhūti Prabhākara-vardhana of Kanyakubja, Bhāskaravarmman of Prāg-jyotisa, the Maitraka Kharagraha II Dharmāditya of Valabhi, the Gūrjara Dadda III of Bharukaccha in the seventh, and the Licchavi Śivadeva of Nepal at the turn of the seventh and eighth.¹ The same claim is seen in the account of the

¹ CII 3, p. 220, ll. 1–2: varṇāśramavyavasthāpanapravṛttacakraḥ ‘Harivarman, who set in motion the establishing of the distinctions between the caste-classes and disciplines’; RAJAGURU 1962, ll. 6–9: varṇāśramavyavasthāhetuḥ *sāksād (corr. RAJAGURU: sāksad Ep.) dharma *ivopātajanma (corr.: ivopātajanmā RAJAGURU) ...paramamāheśvaro mahārājādhirājaśrigopacandra- ‘Mahārājādhirāja Gopacandra, entirely devoted to Śiva, who caused the distinctions between the caste-classes and disciplines to be established, as though he were Dharma incarnate’; EI 8:28, ll. 11–12: varṇāśramadharmaḥpanābhārata (Sāmkṣobha); EI 4:29, l. 3: varṇāśramavyavasthāpanapravṛttacakraḥ (Prabhākara-vardhana); EI 12:13, ll. 34–35: bhagavatā kamalasambhavenāvākārnavānāśramadharmapravi-bhāgāya nirmito bhuvanapatir ‘King [Bhāskaravarmman], created by Brahmā himself to separate the caste-classes and disciplines that had abandoned their duties’; CII 3, pp. 173ff., ll. 43–44: sāksād dharma iva samāgyavasthāpitavarnāśramācāraḥ ‘Kharagraha II Dharmāditya, who established the observances of the caste-classes and disciplines, as though he were Dharma in visible form’; CII 4i:21, ll. 7–9: mahāmunsinmanupraṇīta-pravacanādhigamavivekasvadharma-nuṣṭhāna*pravino (em. MIRASHI: pravani Ep.) varṇāśramavyavasthonmūlitasakalamakalikālāvalepa<h> ‘Dadda III’, who uprooted all the taints of this [degenerate] age of Kali by establishing the separation of the caste-classes and disciplines, well-versed in the execution of his duty [as the king] through discriminat-
history of Kashmir before the advent of the Kārkoṭa dynasty in the seventh century given in the twelfth by the Kashmirian historian Kalhaṇa. His chronology for this early phase of his country’s history is confused, but it is likely that we should assign to the fifth or sixth century the king Gopāditya whom he commends for having restored the first and perfect Age through his regard for the castes and brahmanical disciplines. He also reports a popular belief of his time that in order to promote the orthodox brahmanical social order the Hephthalite Mihirakula, who ruled Kashmir in the early sixth century, had settled natives of Āryaḍēṣa in his kingdom, which was then, we are told, devoid of the true religion (dharmah), being overrun by Dards and Tibetans.

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

Thus the first centuries of this period are presented in our sources as marked not by the decline of brahmanism but rather by its imposition, reinforcement, and expansion. Moreover, there is abundant epigraphical evidence of kings throughout this time bringing Vaidika brahmins into their kingdoms by making them grants of tax-exempt land,\(^5\) thereby extending the penetration of brahmanical culture while facilitating the administration of their territories and promoting agricultural development.\(^6\)

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

---
\(^{5}\) On the duty of the king to donate [tax-free] land and other valuables to learned Vaidika brahmins (vīprāḥ, śrotiyāḥ) see, e.g., Yājñavalkyasṛṃṭi 1.315–320; 1.323: nātah parataro dharmo nṛpāṇāṁ yad raṇājitam | vīprebhya diyate dravyaṃ . . . ‘There is no higher religious obligation for kings than that of bestowing the wealth they acquire through war on learned Vaidika brahmins . . . ’; Viṣṇusṛṃṭi 3.81–82: brāhmaneḥbhyas ca bhuvam pratipādayet . . . ‘He should bestow land on brahmins’. On the king’s duty not to tax learned Vaidikas see Manusṛṃṭi 7.133ab: mṛiyamāṇo ‘py ādātā na rājā śrotiyāḥ karam ‘Even though dying [through poverty] a king may not levy a tax from a learned Vaidika’. The giving of land to learned brahmins is already advocated at length as the king’s religious duty in the Mahābhārata (Anuśāsanaparvan, Adhyāya 61); and that passage includes an injunction that it should be read to the king immediately after his consecration (13.61.36: abhīṣicayai va nṛpatim śrāvayed imam āgамam).

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

**THE DOMINANCE OF ŠAIVISM**

Among these alternatives devotion to Śiva was the most commonly adopted. During this period the epithet *paramamāheśvarah* ‘entirely devoted to Śiva’ is the most frequently encountered in declarations of the religious adherence of rulers;\(^7\) and of the many temples surviving or reported in inscriptions that were established by rulers and other notables from the late sixth century onwards in the subcontinent, the Khmer realm, the Cham kingdoms of Indo-China, and the kingdoms of Java and Bali, those dedicated to the worship of this god are much the most numerous.\(^8\)

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

---

\(^7\) The royal epithet *paramamāheśvarah* first appears in the epigraphical record in the fourth century in Andhra, in an inscription of the Śālankāyana Mahārāja Devavarman of Vengi pura (*EI* 9:7, ll. 1–7), probably the earliest of the Śālankāyanas in our records since this inscription alone is in Prakrit: *sirivijayaveṅgipūrā bhagavato cittarathasāmipādānuñjihātassa bappabhaṭṭārakapādābhattasya paramamāheśarassā sālankāyanassā asamedhayājino mahārājasirīvijayadevavammasa vayanaṇa . . .* ‘From victorious Vengi pura: by the command of the Śālankāyana, who has performed the Aśvamedha sacrifice, the venerable Mahārāja Vijayadevaravarman, favoured by [his kuladevatā, the Śiva] Citrarathasvāmin, loyal to [his] venerable father, entirely devoted to Śiva . . .’. It is mostly found in inscriptions but occasionally appears on coinage. Thus the coins of Krṣṇarāja, the Kalacuri king of Māhismati, who ruled c. 550–575, have on their reverse, (with corrected orthography): *paramamāheśvara mātpitṛpādānuñjihātaya śikṣṛṇārājaya* (*MIRASHI, CII* 4i p. clxxxi). This is the standard term, as is confirmed by its use in literary sources. But we also find the synonym *atyantamāheśvarah* (e.g. *CII* 5:3, l. 8: Vākāṭaka Prthivisena I, late fourth century), and, though very rarely and not to my knowledge in any inscription, *paramasāvah* (*PETECH* 1984, pp. 57 and 61: the twelfth-century Nepalese kings Indradevā and Ānandadevā in the colophons of manuscripts). That the Taddhita *māheśvarah* is to be understood as formed from the name Maheśvara in the meaning ‘devoted to Maheśvara’ (*maheśvarabhaktah*), i.e. ‘devoted to Śiva’, is proved beyond doubt by the occurrence in inscriptions of analytic renderings of parallel terms. Thus where the affiliation is with Viśṇu (/Bhagavat) we see not only *paramabhāgavatāh* but also *param bhagavadbhaktah* and in the case of the Sun-god (Śūrya/Āditya) we see both *paramasaurah* and *paramādityabhaktah*. And there are some cases in which the name of the deity precludes any but the analytic form. Thus where the deity is the Goddess or Mahābhairava we see *param bhagavatibhaktah* and *atyantasvāmimahābhairavabhaktah*. For all these epithets see *MIRASHI CII* 3, pp. 253–254, n. 3.

\(^8\) This can readily be observed by perusing the published volumes of *EITA*. On the pre-eminence of Śaivism among the Khmers up to the fall of Angkor see SANDERSON 2005a, pp. 402–421. For the situation in Karnataka, where Śaiva foundations greatly outnumbered others throughout the perod from the fifth to fourteenth centuries see p. 298. For Kashmir see p. 298, and for Andhra see p. 300.
The Saiva Age

profundely influenced by it. In the first part of this study I shall present this evidence for each religion in turn, but with particular attention to Buddhism. In the second I shall attempt to explain the factors that enabled Saivism to attain this dominant position.

THE INCORPORATION OF ŚĀKTISM

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

---

11 For the use of the term pīṭham in this context in the meaning ‘corpus’ or ‘collection’ see Tantrāloka 37.18c–19c1, quoting or paraphrasing the lost Anandaśāstra: śrīmadanandaśāstraśtradau proktam bhagavatā kila || samāhaḥ pīṭham etac ca dvidhā dakṣināvatamātaḥ || mantra vidyeti The Lord has taught in such scriptures as the Ananda that pīṭham [here means] the corpus [of the non-Saiddhāntika Śaiva scriptures]. It is divided into two, to the right and left [respectively], namely the
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headed by (1) the *Jayadrathayāmala*, also known as the *Śīrāścheda*, consisting of four parts called hexads (*saṭkam*) because each is approximately six thousand verses in length, which teaches the cult of Kālasamkarṣaṇī or Kāli in the first and those of numerous goddesses worshipped as her esoteric embodiments in the remaining three parts, evidently added at a later date—closely related to parts of this huge corpus are the scriptures of the Kālikula, *Kālikukrama-sadbhāva*, *Kālikulapaṇeśaṣataka* and others, that were the scriptural basis of the Kālikula Kālī cult known as the Krama, Mahānaya, or Mahārtha—, (2) the *Siddhayogeśvarimata*, which teaches the cult of the goddesses Parā, Parāparā, and Aparā, to which the *Mālinivijayottara* is related, the scripture taken as the foundation of the Trika variant of Śaiva Śaivism expounded in the *Tantraloka* of the great Kashmirian Śaiva Abhinavagupta (*fl. c. 975–1025*), (3) the *Picumata* or *Brahmayāmala*, which teaches the cult of the goddess Cāṇḍā Kāpālinī and numerous related Kalpas, and (4) the texts of the *vāmasrotaḥ*, of which only the *Viṇāśikha* has come down to us intact, which teach the cult of the four goddesses Jayā, Vijayā, Jayantī/Ajītā, and Aparājītā, the sisters of the god Tumburu, venerated as an aspect of Śiva.12

---

Mantra[pīṭha] and the Vidyāpīṭha. The terms ‘right’ and ‘left’ assigned to the two Pīṭhas follow the common notion that these are the relative positions of the male/masculine and female/feminine, Mantras being masculine and the deities they embody male and Vidyās being feminine and their deities female.

12 The distinction in terms of left and right between the two Pīṭhas in the passage of the *Ānanda* cited in the preceding footnote must not be confused with that between the right current (*dakṣināsrotaḥ*) and the left current (*vāmasrotaḥ*) of the Śaiva scriptures, which derives from the fact that these are thought to have emerged from the right and left faces of the five-faced composite Sādāśiva, those of Aghora (Bhairava) and the feminine Vāmadeva respectively. For of the texts of the two Pīṭhas only those of the cult of the four sisters are assigned to the latter. The *Siddhayogeśvarimata* and the *Picumata* are both assigned to the former, while according to itself the first S. at.ka of the *Jayadrathayāmala* is a hybrid of both (*ubhayātmakam*); see SANDERSON 2002, pp. 1–2. Of the other three faces the front and rear, the faces of Tatpuruṣa and Sadyojāta, are seen as the source of the Gāruḍatantras and Bhūtatantras, texts concerned respectively with procedures for the curing of the effects of poisons and demonic possession, while the upper face, that of Īśāna, is seen as the source of the scriptures of the Siddhānta, revealing that this, unlike the distinction between the two Pīṭhas, is a Siddhānta-centric system of classification. It is adapted by the non-Saiddhāntika Abhinavagupta as the basis of his esoteric account of the nature of the Śaiva canon in the *Mālinivijayavārtika* but only by adding a sixth, upper-upper current (*ūrdhvordhvasrotaḥ*) above the Siddhānta as the source of the non-dualistic Kaula (Śaṅkā) revelation that he takes to be the ultimate ground of the entire canon. *Mālinivijayavārtika* 1.160–163b: *prakṛtam brūmahē devīvisṛṣṭāś citrasamvidāh* | *yāvat tāvat tad ūrdhvordhvaṃ sroto yad bhedavārjītam* || 161 saurabhargasikhādīni tataḥ sāstrāṇi tenire | uktam bhargasikhāyām ca devena parameṣṭhīnā || 162 ūrdhvordhvotthavāṃ jīānām idaṃ tat paramaṃ priye | paramadhvānordhvothhasaṃvidrūpābhidhāyinā ||
To these we may add the scriptures of two later Śākta cults, those of the goddesses Kubjikā and Tripurasundarī. The scriptures of the former, the *Kubjikāmata* and related texts such as the *Śaṃsāhasra*, do not claim to be part of the Vidyāpīṭha. But they are closely related to, and draw heavily on, the sub-corpus of texts within the Vidyāpīṭha that is headed by the *Siddhayogēśvarīmata* and is associated with the Śākta system that would be developed under the name of the Trika: the *Siddhayogēśvarīmata* itself, the *Trikaṭukāratanamālā*, the *Tantrasadbhāva*, the *Devyāyāmala*, and the *Triśırohhairava*. Also allied in character is the *Nityāsodaśīkārīnava* or *Vāmakesvarīmata*, the fundamental scripture of the cult of the goddess Tripurasundarī. This, which became the most widely established of India’s Śākta cults, has no direct antecedents in the Vidyāpīṭha literature, but is rather an independent development out of an earlier Śākta tradition of the propitiation of goddesses known as the Nityās in which rites for success in love predominated. ¹³ This early cult was eclipsed by its

---

¹³ The distinctness of this tradition is expressed in the *Kumārikhaṇḍa* of the *Manṭhānabhāirava* in an account of the hierarchy of the various soteriologies. It places those who follow the scripture(s) of the Nityās above those of the Atimārgic traditions (Mausula, Vaimala, Lākula) and below those of the Bhairava corpus comprising the scriptures of the left and right currents. Above this it places six Śākta Tantras (*parāsātkam*): three of the Trika (*Ṣādardha [=Mālinīvijayottara], Bhairavaj[kula], and Virāvali, then the *Kālikula* texts) of the Krama, and finally itself, in two scriptural levels. It is significant that it does not put the Nityā cult on the level of its Śākta Tantras or even on that of the Bhairavatantras below them; see f. 213r3–7 (*Muktisamgrahaśūtra*, vv.108–114c): *musulāyudhahastānām* (em.: *mausulāyudhahastānāṃ* Cod.) *māyātattvam param padam | śuddhajānāmāyā vidyā vaimānām param padam || 109 aṣṭapramāṇavedajānā lākūlārthavīṣāradāḥ | vrate pāśupate caiva āśīvaram paramam padam || 110 *navanītyāgamajānānām* śivatattvam param padam | tasyordhve *kāraṇān* (em.: *kāraṇāḥ* Cod.) paṅca tyaktvā ūrdhvaṃ tu bhairava-ḥ> || 111 *sūṣṭanatratrāntrikānām* (?) nityānandam param padam | samanāntakalāttitaṃ vāmadakṣīnasamsthitam || 112 paṅktikramena mokṣ ‘sti satyaṃ nāsti atra samśayaḥ | tasya ūrdhe parāṣṭakam upary upari samsthitam || 113 śaḍārthaṃ prathamāṃ bhedaṃ bhairavākhyāṃ dvitīyakam | vīrāvali trīṭiyāṃ tu caturtham kālikākulaṃ || 114 tatas tu ādyāyatāram tu tasya ūrdhventaṃ anāhataṃ | śrīmatkulalākāhhyam *The final destination of the [Mausula Pāśupatas,] those who carry a club in their hands, is Māyātattva*. That of the Vaimala[pāśupatas] is Śuddhavidyā[tattva]. For those who are versed in the Lākula[pāśupata] doctrine,
much more successful successor. But nonetheless evidence of it has survived, attesting two forms. One is taught in the Nityākaula, of which a single, incomplete manuscript has come down to us in Nepal. Here the goddess Tripurā is surrounded by a circle of twelve deities comprising eleven Nityā goddesses and Kāmadeva, the Indian Cupid.\textsuperscript{14} The other has been preserved in the eclectic Manthānabhairava, whose Siddhakhaṇḍa contains detailed manual-like instructions for a Śākta cult of Tripurā and nine Nityās with Kāmadeva as her consort.\textsuperscript{15} The earlier prominence of the Nityā cult is indicated by the fact that a syncretistic text of the cult of Kubjikā, the \textit{*Ciṅcinatārasamuccaya}, contains a section drawn from the Nityākaula, or from some lost text closely related to it, in which it sets out this cult as the ‘teaching of the southern or-

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{14} The eleven Nityās of this text are Hṛlekhā, Kledini, Nandā, Kṣobhanī, Madanātūra, Niraṅjanā, Rāgavatī, Madanāvatī, Khekalā, Drāvaṇī and Vegavatī; see Nityākauṇa, f. 2r7–2v1.
\textsuperscript{15} Manthānabhairava, Siddhakhaṇḍa, ff. 186v–231r1. The nine Nityās are Kulavidyā, Vajresvāri, Tvaritā, Kurukullā, Lalitā, Bherunā, Nilapatasā, Mangalā and Vymavāyāpiṇī. The section on Tripurā continues to f. 252v and includes the text of the Nityāsodasikārvana. The folio numbers are those of a palm-leaf manuscript in private hands, to which I have had access through digital images kindly provided by my former pupil and present colleague Dr. Somdev Vasudeva.
\end{flushright}
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der’ (dakṣiṇagarāmnāyaḥ), grouping it with the cult of Kubjikā, the cult of Kāli (Kālikula) in a form attested in the Jayadrathayāmala and the related corpus of the scriptures of the Krama or Mahānāya, and a form of Śaktta worship agreeing closely with that found in the Trika, calling these the teachings of the western, northern, and eastern orders respectively (Paścimagharāmnāya, Uttaragharāmnāya, and Pūrvagharāmnāya).

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

16 On the anti-Kāpālika stance of the mature Trika see SANDERSON 2005c, pp. 118–119, fn. 74.
17 For the Kāpālika/Mahāvratin asceticism of practitioners of the Uttarāmnāya, that is to say of the Kālikula and Krama/Mahānāya, see SANDERSON 2007a, pp. 293–294 (Cakrabhānu, Īśānī, and Jayyaka), 323 (Cakrapāṇinātha, author of the Bhāvopahārastotra). Concerning the date of Cakrapāṇinātha I was able to say in 2007a (p. 417) only that he was earlier than his commentator Ramyadeva, who was later than Kṣemarāja, which is to say, next to nothing. However, since then I have read a Nepalese manuscript, NGMPP C114/22, which contains his Bhāvopahārastotra under the title Bhāvopahārapūjā, and this enables us to include him among relatively early authors, since the manuscript is dated in 1158/9. To the Kashmirian exponents of the Krama identified as followers of the Kāpālika observance in 2007a I now propose to add one more. According to a manuscript of the Chummāsaṅketa-prakāśa that I had not seen at that time, which contains the final verses of the work that are lacking in the one manuscript that I had seen then, the redactor of this text attributed to Niskriyānanda was one Anantaśakti. He is described there as mudrādharāḥ (A, f. 11r7–9): saṃsārasaṃbhramacyapravibhāgabandhasambandhasamāksaya*gaṇit (em.: gater Cod.) avikalpamūrtiḥ | saṃsād anābhilāhyā laghuvākramenā

mudrādharaḥ tu vidadhe tad anantasaktiḥ. This expression I take to have the same meaning as pañcamudrādharaḥ ‘wearer of the five sect marks [of the Kāpālika/Mahāvratin]; see, e.g., Svāyambhuvasūrasaṅgrahā, Paṭala 14 (saṃcayabhādhaḥ), one of the chapters that is not part of the original work of this name, vv. 19–20: caturdāsapramāṇena yuktam kāpālam ucyate | kāpāle ca vratam mukhyam sarvapāpanikṛtaṃ | tasmin vratam cared yaś tu saṃmāsān mu-khim āpnumyāt | pañcamudrādharaḥ sāntaḥ samayācārapalakah; and Kubjikāmata
In general we may say that these non-Saiddhāntika texts with their strongly Śākta orientation emerged after the Siddhānta or at least after the emergence of its earliest scriptures. Thus, for example, it is clear in my view that the Svacchandatantra was redacted after the formation of the Saiddhāntika Niśvāsa corpus, the Tantrasadbhāva after the Svacchanda, the Kubjikāmata after the Tantrasadbhāva, the first hexad of the Jayadrathayāmala after the Kubjikāmata, and the remaining three hexads after the first. However, I see no reason to conclude that all that is found in the non-Saiddhāntika corpus is post-Saiddhāntika and some grounds for thinking that some elements may be as old or older. This may be the case with the cult of the four sisters of Tumburu. For that is known to the Buddhist Dharmakīrti (fl. c. 550–650), and the first two folios of a post-scriptural text on this cult, the *Devītantrasadbhavasāra, written in learned style in the Āryā metre, have survived among the Buddhist manuscripts uncovered in Gilgit in 1931. They may be assigned on palaeographical grounds to around the middle of the sixth century. A second area

25.31cd: pañcamudrādharo vāpi bhasmanīṣtho digambaraḥ. He is probably one with the Anantaśakti who wrote the published commentary on the Krama’s Vātulānāthasūtra but probably not with the Anantaśakti who has left us a commentary (Visamapadasamketa), as yet unpublished, on the Bahurūpagarbhastotra; see SANDERSON 2007a, p. 344.

18 See the evidence for this sequence in SANDERSON 2001, pp. 20–35.
22 No title appears in the surviving fragment of this text. The title assigned here is a guess based on the unknown author’s description of his work in verses 3 and 4. There he says that he is extracting the fundamentals (sārāḥ) of the Essence of the Tantras (tantrasadbhāvah) of the [four] Goddesses (devinām) that had been received from Śiva by a sage identified only as the ornament of the lineage of Atri: 3 ātreyavāṇasātālakenoktaṃ śarvād avāpya yat pūrvaṃ | suramuninarāṣurāṇām devinām tantrasadbhāvam || 4 tasmād aham api adhunā vakṣye samhrtya sāram āryābhiḥ | sapṣṭataraṅkṣarāpanktibhir avīśāladihyāṃ *prabodhāya (em. : pravodhāta Cod.) ‘The Essence of the Tantras of the Goddesses was received of old from Śiva by the ornament of the lineage of Atri and taught to the gods, sages, men, and titans. I in turn have summarized its fundamentals and shall now declare them in Āryā verses whose lines of syllables will be completely clear in meaning, for the instruction of those of modest intellect’. The script is the stage of proto-Śāradā that Prof. Lore SANDERSON has called Gilgit/Bamiyan type 2 and also Sonderschrift 1. I stumbled upon the first folio (3221–3222) while searching the facsimiles of the Gilgit manuscripts for proto-Tantric Buddhist materials and communicated this unexpected discovery to Somdev VASUDEV, then my student, who promptly located the second folio (3340–3341) and presented convincing palaeographical arguments for the date of the manuscript proposed here (email of 7.12.2000), pointing to the presence of the archaic tripartite ya ligature, the occurrence of the old style of hr, and the Gupta style ru. The text teaches the Mantras of the four Devīs, who, it says, were made manifest at the beginning of creation so that men could attain supernat-
of the non-Saiddhāntika canon that is likely to be very early in origin is that of the Yāmalatantras assigned to the Vidyāpīṭha, represented in our surviving manuscripts by the 12000-verse Picumata, also called the Brahmayāmala. For the Skandapurāṇa-Ambikākhaṇḍa, whose earliest surviving manuscript was completed in 810, lists seven Yāma texts, beginning with the Brahmayāmala, as Tantras of the Mother Goddesses (mātrānāmā). The date of the text itself is still a matter of debate; but it is unlikely to have been composed later than the end of the seventh century or earlier than the sixth. It is certainly

ural accomplishments and liberation (v. 11cd: prādurbhūtā devaḥ siddhyartham Muktaṁ caiva), their ancillaries (āngamantrāḥ), their retinue of [four] Dūtis and [four] Kīṅkaras (v. 16bc: dūtās saṅkīṅkara-<h>-), Tumburu (v. 17ab: pranavaṁ tumburuṣahitāṃ sārthavāhā +), and the Ankuśa (v. 18bc: sapranaṁ HūM-Phat-viniyuktam ankuṣam etat). The Viṇāśikha, our only complete surviving Tantra of the vāmasrotāḥ, teaches the four Devis (vv. 30c–32b), Tumburu (vv. 29c–30b), and the Ankuśa (v. 41d etc.), but not the Dūtis or Kīṅkaras. For the fuller pantheon see, e.g., Devyāmata, f. 40r1: jayā ca vijaya caiva jayantī cāparaṇātī | dūtībhīḥ kīṅkaraḥ sārdham samuṛtasya “tumburuḥ” (corr: “tumburuḥ” | Netratantra 11.1–27; and Śāradātilaka 19.87–105b and Tantrasārasamgraha 23.37–52 (with the four Dūtis but without the Kīṅkaras). The expression sārthavāhāḥ ‘the [international] trader’ in v. 17b (v. 17ab: pranavaṁ tumburuṣahitāṃ sārthavāhā +) no doubt refers to Tumburu, who is so described in the Buddhist version of this cult taught in the Maṇjuśrīyamālakalpa (47.29b, 52a, 54c, p. 413, l. 12, etc.). According to that source the four sisters and Tumburu are to be depicted sailing in a ship with Tumburu at the helm (47.24: nauyānasamārūdhā-<h>- sahrātrsahapāncamā-<h>-karṇadhāro "tumburuḥ" (em: “tumburuḥ” | Čitrādhikāra, v. 35): jayādyās cakragās tadvat panktisthāḥ vā likhet | kramāt nāvārādhās ca vā likhyās tumburuḥ karṇadhārakāḥ ‘He should depict Jayā, Vijaya, Jayantī, and [Aparājīta] forming a circle or in a line. Alternatively he may depict them on board a ship with Tumburu as the helmsman’. For the early date of this cult see also here p. 129.

23 See SANDERSON 2001, pp. 6–7, fn. 4 and here p. 229 (171.127–130b) and a discussion of the titles it contains. The oldest manuscript is dated in the year 234. For this date and its equivalence to A.D. 810 see ADRIAENSEN, BAKKER and ISAACSON 1994, p. 326. That the era of the date is that of the Licchavi Mānadeva (=Amśuvarman) was first proposed by WITZEL (1986, p. 256, n. 9). The date of the commencement of this unnamed era which is seen in Nepalese inscriptions that begin during the reign of the Nepalese king Mānadeva was determined to fall in A.D. 576 on the basis of Tibetan evidence by Luciano PÊTECH (1961). Previously it had been assumed that the era was that of Harṣa (A.D. 606).

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

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

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

---

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

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

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

28 RAMESH and TEWARI 1990:10, ll. 2–6: bhagavallokodhipāśupatācāryapratishtā-pitakapiṇchikānakagramamātrsthānadevakulasya piṇchikānakam eva grāmam saha bhadradaṭṭavāta-kramavāta-kacchena devāgrāhāramātṛṇā[m] balicaru-sattradhāpaganḍhapusampāmālyapayojyabhogāya....

29 EI 14:13, ll. 6, 7, 7–8: param bhagavatībhaktō mahārājaśīrṇagbhaṭadevaṣ.....param bhagavatībhaktō mahārājaśīrṇabhoja-devaṇaḥ.....param bhagavatībhaktō mahārājaśīrṇimahendrapāławdevaṃ....

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

**The Etiolation and Subsumption of the Cult of the Sun-God**

As for the cult of the Sun, kings who have been declared in inscriptions to be devotees of this god (*paramasaurāḥ, paramādityabhaktāḥ*, and the like) are also few and they are mostly confined to the sixth and seventh centuries. We have Dharmarāja of Padmakholī in the Ganjam District of Orissa, Dharapaṭṭa, the Maitraka of Valabhi, Rājyavardhana, Ādityavardhana, and Prabhākaravardhana, the three successive predecessors of King Harṣa of Kanyakubja, in the sixth century, and from c. 570 to c. 665 the Gūrjara feud-
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tories of Bharukaccha (Broach). This is explicitly stated in the case of Dadda I (r. c. 570–595), and Dadda II (r. c. 620–645); and it is probable in the case of Jayabhaṭṭa II (r. c. 645–665), since it is very likely that the temple of the Sun-god Jayāditya at Koṭipura near Kāvī in the Broach District was founded by him with his name (Jaya-). It is also probable in the case of Jayabhaṭṭa I (r. c. 595–620), since this was the religion not only of his predecessor and successor but also of his brother Ranaṅgraha. After Jayabhaṭṭa II the next three kings of this dynasty, Dadda III (c. 665–690), Jayabhaṭṭa III (c. 690–715), and Ahirola (c. 715–720), turned to Śaivism, declaring themselves paramāheśvarah. In the ninth century we have royal devotees of the Sun in Rāmabhadra, the immediate predecessor of the Gūjrara-Pratihāra Bhōjadeva I of Kanyakubja, and Vināyakapāla, the last’s grandson, and, in the late twelfth and early thirteenth centuries, in the Sena kings of Bengal Laksmanasena and Viśvarūpasena, though the former also appears in his inscriptions as a Vaiśṇava (paramavaishnavaḥ) and more specifically, as a devotee of Narasiṃha (paramanārasiṃhaḥ).33

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

33 EI 28:16: sahasraraśnipādabhakto (Dharmarāja); EI 31:39B,L.8: paramādityabhaktah (Dharaṇaṭa); EI 4:29, L.1–3: paramādityabhaktah (the predecessors of Harsa); CII 4i:16, L.4: dinakaracaranaṅkamalapaṇañmāpanītāśesaduritanivaha- (Dadda I); ibid., L.52: dinakaracaranaṅkaranaratasya (Dadda II); CII 4i:18, L.9: dinakarakarpībhyyarcanaratasya (Rānagraha); CII 4i:21, L.13: paramāmāheśvarah (Dadda III); ibid., L.16–17: paramāmāheśvarah (Jayabhata III); CII 4i:24, L.20–11: paramāmāheśvarah (Ahirola); EI 5:24, L.5: paramādityabhakto (Rāmabhadra); EI 14:13, L.6: paramādityabhakto (Vināyakapāla); SIRCAR 1983a:27, L.35–38: paramasaurah (Laksmanasena); paramasaura (Viśvarūpasena); EI 12:3, L.23–25: paramavaishnava- (Laksmanasena); and SIRCAR 1983a:26, L.32–33: -paramanāraśiṁha- (Laksmanasena). For the attribution of the temple of Jayāditya at Koṭipura to Jayabhata II see MIRASHI, CII 4i, p. liv.

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

Thus a Saurasamhīṭā of our period sets out the procedure for the worship of the Sun and no doubt drew on the Saura tradition.35 But it assigns itself to the canon of the Śaiva scripture Vāthula/Kālottara,36 a text on which it silently draws, gives a Śaiva account of the place of the Sun in the birth of the universe, deriving it through emergence from Śiva expressed in a phrase found elsewhere in the Śaiva scriptures,37 and insists that Śiva and the Sun are in essence a single deity.38 Moreover, the worship of the Sun taught in this text was included by the Saiddhāntika Śaivas as a compulsory preliminary (aṅgam) of the regular worship of Śiva himself, appearing first in the sources known to me in the Siddhāntasārapaddhati of Mahārājādhirāja Bhojadeva of Dhārā (r.c. 1018–1060)39 and then soon afterwards, in dependence on that text, in the

35 A critical edition of this text is being prepared for publication by Dr. Divakar Acharya. I am very grateful to him for sending me drafts of this edition. The text survives in a Nepalese palm-leaf manuscript with a scribal date that falls in A.D. 949 (NAK MS 1/1231, NGMPP A1161/6).
36 Saurasamhitā 1.5: noktā pūrvaṃ tu yā vatsa gopitā saurasamhitā | tāntre tu vāthule sā tu rahasyaṃ na prakāśīta. Final colophon: iti vāthule kriyāpāde saurasamhitāyām...
37 Saurasamhitā 1.10–12: adṛṣṭavigrahāc chāntāc chivāt paramakāraṇāt | kriyāsaktir vinīskrānta paratejasamanvitā || 11 akāśe tu yadā hy ulkā srṣṭhitēr adhomukkhī | tasya tejasamāyogāt utpannam tejārūpinām || 12 ādityamanisamyogād vahnih samjāyate yathā | śaktitejasamāyogād bhānuḥ sambhavitā tathā. 10ab = Pauṣkarapāraṃśvara (as quoted by Bhaṭṭa Rāmaḥaṇḍa at Matangapāraṃśvaravṛtti, Vidyāpāda, p. 19, ll. 5-6) and Śīrakāṇṭhyasamhitā (ed. in HANÀDER 1998, p. 240, v. 1).
38 Saurasamhitā 1.15: ādityaṃ tu śivāṃ vindyāṃ chivām ādityaṃ eva ca | nānātvāṃ yas tu gaccheta yatnenaḥ na sidhyati.
39 Siddhāntasārīpaddhati, MS A, f. 3v5–4v2, MS B, f. 4v6–6r2: Oṃ ṛṇāṃ ṛṇāṃ | saḥ iti sūryamantrenā kṛtaḥsauddhiḥ kṛtaṣakalikaraṇam arghapāṭram kṛtvā puṣpādiṣaṃ samprkṣya raktacandanaṇāṁ sūryāya mūlamāntreṇārgham dattvā sūryaṃ pūjayaḥ | tatra gοṇapatiṣgurupūjanantratam oṃ aṃ prabhūtyāya namah iti pithamadhye, oṃ aṃ vimalāya namah ity āgneyyaṃ, oṃ aṃ sārāya namah iti nairṛtyaṃ, oṃ aṃ ārādhya namah iti vāyavyaṃ, oṃ aṃ paramasukhaḥ namah ity aśānīyaṃ, oṃ aṃ padmāya namah iti pūnar madhye, oṃ ram diptāyā namah pūrvadale, oṃ ram sūkṣmāyai namah aṃgau, oṃ rum jayāyai namah dakoṣē, oṃ rum bhadrāyai namah nāirtte, oṃ rem vibhūtyai namah vārune, oṃ raīm vimalāyai namah vāyavye, oṃ rum amoghaḥyai namah saumye, oṃ rum vidyutāyai namah īśane, oṃ ram sarvatomukhāyai namah karṇikāyai sampaṭhya visphurāṃ mudrāṃ pradarṣai raktavarnavartulatejābimabāṃdhayastham raktavāsasāṃ śvetapadmpari sthitaṃ servābharaṇabhuṣitaṃ ekavakraṃ
Somasambhupaddhati, composed towards the end of the eleventh century.⁴⁰ The Sāmbapurāṇa, which teaches the worship of the Sun-god, is also a product, at least in its later portions, of a Śaiva environment.⁴¹

Traces of some form of the vanished tradition of the Sauras may have survived in the Śākta Śaiva literature. For Kashmirian sources know of a Śākta cult whose deity was the Sun under the name Vīra or Vīreśvara accompanied by the goddess Bhargāsīkhā, citing as its scripture the Kaula Bhargāsīkhā, also called Saurabhargāsīkhā, a work for knowledge of whose content we now have only a few comments in the Kashmirian literature and a few verses quoted in the same, one of which has also been quoted by the east-Indian Buddhist Rāmapāla in his Sekanirdesāpañjikā, a fact that demonstrates that this was not a merely a local, Kashmirian tradition.⁴² The probability that this cult reflects a non-
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Śaiva tradition otherwise lost to us is made somewhat greater by the fact that the names Vireśvara and Bhargaśikhā are applied in Kashmirian sources, both Śaiva and Śākta, to the Sun-god and his consort at Mārtān. d. atīrtha (modern Mārtān). Where King Lalitāditya built his majestic temple of the Sun in the mid-eighth century,43 a site that has been a major pilgrimage site with its own special rites for the dead, the Bhargaśrāddha and Śūryabali, down to modern times.44 However, it is possible that the application of these names merely reflects the pervasive influence of Śākta Śaiva esotericism in the wider Kashmirian community in later times.

There are also strong elements of a solar esotericism in the Kālikula of the Jayadrathayāmala and the Krama.45 It is possible that these too may have been

### Notes

43 Rājatarangini 4.192; Krishna Deva in EITA, vol.2, part 1, pp.363–66; plates 710–721; AIISPL, Accession number 20738–20789 and 60003–60051. The Mārtān Mahāāhāmya, the praise-text of this site, refers to Śūrya here as Vireśvara (Bhrṛgūśaśaṁhitā, p.15: esa vireśvaro devaḥ paraḥ paramakāraṇam; p.63: vireśāya nams tuḥyam; p.66: namo virāḍhvireśa) and makes Bhargaśikhā the first of his Śaktis (ibid., p.12, listing Bhargaśikhā, Bhīmā, Bhāṣvatī and Bhānavi). The Sun is also invoked as Vireśvara in the worship of the Grahas that occurs among the preliminaries in Śaiva rituals in Kashmir; see Kalādikṣpaddhati B f.4v9–10: tadbahir grahāḥ. tatrādau madhye sūryaḥ Oṃ RAM AGNAYE Oṃ HRĀM HRĪM SAH VĪREŚVARAYA NAMĀḤ Oṃ HRĀM HRĪM SAH VĪRALAKŚMYAI NAMĀḤ. The Bijas HRĀM HRĪM SAH are Śūrya’s. His consort is invoked as Vīralakṣmi here rather than as Bhargaśikhā because in the context of the ritual the pair are superimposed on the principal deities Amrutesvara[bhairava] and his consort Amṛtalaks.44

44 For the Paddhati of these rituals see Karmakāṇḍa, vol.4, pp.140–205. Here too the Sun is invoked as Vira/Vireśvara (p.196): vīra viṛēśa deveśa namas te ‘stu tridhātmaka | mahāmārtanda varada sarvābhaya-vāraprada ....

45 See, e.g., Jayadrathayāmala 4.4.8–17: sa ravir bhāsurādhāras tadādhāra hi kālika | ṣaḍare vipulādhāra ṣaḍosoddhotasannibhā || 9 sphuradvamanasanprāgrāśavākiṣṛṣṭikārikā | sa ravir devatākāro ravir eka<s>|| 10 raviḥ pradipakāloke sūryamadhyāyam samutthitaḥ | ravir antargato bhānur bhāsāyatī akhilaḥ jagat || 11 bhānavī kaullini yā sa tatpunjābharitaṁ jagat | āntropāna māhaṁantrā bhairavāstaṭṭhitayanayah | 12 na prakāśe na cākāśe nobhayo nobhayojjhitā | sarvāvanānanirnābagai sarvago bhāti bhāskaraḥ | 13 amatṛam prāntram yena ricitam ca kulākulaṁ | sa raviḥ sūryatūryante bhṛjate rauḍraudāmarah | 14 svasamvītparamādityanītayotmaricībhīḥ | bhacakram bhāsītēma yena sa vai kālānjarā bhavet; Ciṇcīnīmatāsārasamuccaya, ff. 30v7–21r4 (7.166–172 [Utataragharāmṇaya (Kālikula) section]); 166 raviḥ pradipadāloke sūryamadhyād vinirgataḥ | ravir antargato bhānur bhāsāyatī akhilaḥ jagat || 167 bhānavi kaullini yā sa tatpunjābharitaṁ jagat | āntropāna māhaṁantrā bhairavāstaṭṭhitayanayah || 168 raviḥbānunayī devi kauleśī kulagahvarī | kṣobhānandavirārā vasiṣṭaye kulaśatīmaratam | 169 mahāvyomānave sāive bhānavikunḍamadhyetath | tatra pralīnāḥ sarve bhairavāstaṭṭhitayonayah | 170 bhānavikunḍamadhye
constructed on the basis of Saura notions. But it is also possible that they are an independent development internal to Śaivism. In the absence of properly Saura literature it is impossible to be sure.

The cult of the Sun-god, then, appears to have survived in India after the rise of the Śaivism only in heavily Śaivized Purānic reflexes or subordinated in a Śaivized form within the Saiddhāntika cult of Śiva, and, perhaps, in some elements within the Śākta Śaiva tradition. Only in the Majapahit kingdom of East Java do we hear of the survival of adherents of a distinct Saura denomination. There a royal charter of c. 1350 tells us that a board of six learned men appointed to adjudicate law suits included two adherents of this tradition.⁴⁶

THE DECLINE OF VAIŚṆAVISM AND THE RISE OF THE TANTRIC PAṽCARĀTRA FOLLOWING ŚAIVA MODELS

Royal preference for Vaiṣṇavism, expressed in inscriptions by the epithets atyantabhagavadbhaktah, paramabhāgavataḥ, or paramavaɪṇavaḥ, all meaning ‘entirely devoted to Viṣṇu’, is mostly confined to the period from the fourth century to the seventh. The Bhāgavata faith was adopted and promoted by the Guptaś from the first half of the fourth century through to the end of the fifth,⁴⁷ and it was probably under their influence that it gained a foothold in the fifth century among the Śaiva Vākṣṭaka rulers of Nandivardhana in eastern Vidarbha, through the marriage in the last decade of the fourth century of the Vākṣṭaka Rudrasena II to Prabhavatīguptā, the daughter of the paramabhāgavataḥ Gupta emperor Candragupta II (c. 380–474).⁴⁸ Gupta influence may also explain the appearance of the Bhāgavata faith at the end of the fourth cen-

---

⁴⁶ See here p. 120.
⁴⁷ CII 3:8, ll. 1–2: paramabhāgavatamahārājādhirājāśriksumāragupta; ll. 20–23: paramabhāgavato mahārājādhirājāśriksandraguptas tasya puttras tatpādānudhhyāto mahādevyām dhruvadevyām utpānah paramabhāgavato mahārājādhirājāśriksamāraguptas tasya puttras tatpādānudhyātoḥ paramabhāgavato mahārājādhirājāśriksandraguptaḥ.
⁴⁸ On Śaivism and Vaiṣṇavism among the Vākṣṭakas of Nandivardhana and the influence of the Vaiṣṇava Prabhāvatīguptā on the religion of this dynasty see BAKKER 1997.
tury among the Śālaṅkāyana kings of Vengīpura in Andhra. The earlier kings of this dynasty were devotees of Śiva in keeping with the norm in this region. But Nandivarman II, a younger contemporary of Candragupta II, is styled paramabhāgavatāḥ. Other early Vaiṣṇava kings are the Mātharas of Kaliṅga, the Traikūṭakas of Nāsik, Koṅkaṇa, and Lāṭa, the Śarabhapuriyas of Dakṣinā Kosalā, and the Parivrājaka Mahārājas of Dabhālārājya (Dāhalā) in the fifth and sixth centuries, perhaps the early Maukharis of Kanyakubja before the reign of Īśānavarman (c. 550–76), the Nalas of western Orissa (c. 450+–700), the early Cālukyas of Vatāpi (Bāḍāmi) in the sixth and early seventh century, and the early Pallavas of Kāñcipuram to and including Simhāvisṇu II (c. 550–610). After Pulakesin II and Simhāvisṇu both the Cālukyas and Pallavas were Śaivas.

49 EI 42:11, ll. 7–9: bhagavacitra<rathasvāmya>nuddhyāto ... paramabhāgavatāś śālaṅkāyanaṃvamsaprabhavo vijayavarmmā. For this hypothesis of Gupta influence, which rests on slenderer evidence than that of Gupta influence on the Vākāṭakas, see S. Sankaranarayanan in EI 42:11, p. 92.

50 Tripathy 1997:2: bhagavatśvāminarāyaṇapādānudhyātah; 3: nārāyaṇasvāminah pādabhaktah paramadaivata<h>. Mirashi, CII 4i, p. xlv; CII 4i:8, ll. 1–2: bhagavatpādakarmmaka ro ... mahārāja-dahrasena<h>; CII 4i:9, ll. 1–2, 7–8: bhagavatpādakarmmaka raḥ ... mahārāja-vyāghrasena<h>.

51 EI 31:35, ll. 1–2; EI 22:6, ll. 3–4; EI 31:18, l. 3.

52 Of his predecessors Harivarman, Adityavarman, and Īśavaravarman, we know that the second at least was paramabhāgavataḥ.

53 EI 21:24 (Poḍāgadh inscription of the Nala Skandavarman, fifth century) and EI 26:3 (Rājim stome inscription of the Nala Vilāsatunga, c. 700); Singh 1994, pp. 89–90.

54 Of his predecessors Harivarman, Adityavarman, and Īśavaravarman, we know that the second at least was paramabhāgavataḥ.

55 EI 21:24 (Poḍāgadh inscription of the Nala Skandavarman, fifth century) and EI 26:3 (Rājim stome inscription of the Nala Vilāsatunga, c. 700); Singh 1994, pp. 89–90.

56 Kirtivarman I (r. 566–597) completed the Viṣṇu cave-temple at Vatāpi. His successor Mangalīśvara-Raṇāvīkṛṣṭa (r. 597–608) is styled paramabhāgavatāḥ in an inscription in the Vaiṣṇava cave 3 at Bāḍāmi recording the completion of the temple, the installation of the Viṣṇu, and the granting of a village (Fleet in Burgess 1877, p. 363, ll. 5–10; and Fleet 1881 [lithograph]: srīmangalīśvararaṇāvīkṛṣṭa ... paramabhāgavato layanam (corr. Fleet: layana Ep.) mahāviṣṇugraham ... kṛtvā ... On the Vaiṣṇavism of the early Cālukyas before Vikramādiṭya I (654–681) see Bošon 1979, pp. 254–256.


58 For the Śaivism of Cālukya Pulakesin II’s successors Vikramādiṭya I (654–c. 681), Vinayādiṭya I (681–696), Vijayādiṭya (696–733), Vikramādiṭya II (733–744), and
were the later Maukharis.⁵⁹

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

---

⁵⁹ On the Śaiva affiliation of the Maukharis Īsānavarman, Śarvarman, and Avantarman see BAKKER and ISAACSON 2004, pp. 32–33; THAPLYAL 1985: B 2, ll. 19–20; B 3, ll. 7–8; B 5, ll. 7–8. Another lineage that may have been Vaiṣṇava up to the early seventh century before turning to Śaivism is that of the Varmans of Prāgyotiṣa. Bhūtivarman of that line was paraṃbhāgavatāḥ according to his Baḍagāṅgā rock inscription of 553/4 (EI 27.5, ll. 1–2): sīrī paraṃdaivatapaṃbhāgavatamahārajādhirajaśvamedhajājin[āṃ] sīrībhūtivarmadevapādānām. But his great-great-grandson, Bhāskaravarman (r.c. 600–50), has been described in his Dūbh copper-plate inscription as having revived Śaivism; see SIRCAR 1983a:1, ll. 109–110): laks. mīh. ks. bavilāsāniṣṭhāna sam. skṛtaḥ bhūyo yena maṃśvarāśrayanayaḥ sphāyipratāpacīsā.

⁶⁰ Rājataranginī 1.15: ḍṛṣṭāiś ca pūrvabhūḥbhṛtpratiṣṭhāḥvastusāsanaiḥ (conj.:vastusāsanaiḥ Ed.) | praṣṭitiṣṭhānih sāstraīś cā sānto 'śeṣabramaklamāḥ 'I have removed all the troublesome errors [of my predecessors] by consulting in person the charters that record the [temples and other] edifices founded and consecrated (pratiṣṭhāvāṣṭu-) by the kings of the past, [their] panegyric donative inscriptions, and works of scholarship'.

---
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(4.695ab), Padmasvāmin (4.695cd), Dharmasvāmin (4.697ab), Kalyāṇasvāmin (6.697cd), and Mammasvāmin (4.698–699).

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

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

---

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

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


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

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

Thirdly, these early Pañcarātra texts show clear signs of having drawn on Śaiva sources. This is particularly obvious in the SvāyambhuwaPañcarātra, to which we have access in a single, incomplete Nepalese palm-leaf manuscript bearing a date of transcription that falls in A.D. 1026. The principal Mantra of

---

65 A vetālasādhanam is taught in Jayottara 8.23–26b.
66 Jayākhyasamhitā 6.73c–64 (JS) (=Jayottara 1.20 [J]): dhāyeyec caturbhujam *vipra (JS:devam J) śaṅkhaacakragadādham || catuvaktraṁ sunayanam sukhaṁ padmapānim | vaikuṇṭham *narasimhāyaṁ | (JS:nārasimham ca J) vāraṁkapilānanāṁ; Śātvatasamhitā 12.9, 14c–15: śaktiśo 'py atha samśantayāḥ pandarikanibheksanāḥ | ičchārāpadharaś caiva saumyaḥ praḥa- sītānanāṁ || ...nārasimhena vaktrena bhavabhītivighātakṛt | puṣṇāti sarvabhūtāṁ vāraṇaṁmarātmanāṁ | kurute paścicamasthaṇa kāpilenopasamhṛtim.
68 SvāyambhuwaPañcarātra, exposure 11b3: samvat 147 aśāḍhaśukla ekādaśyāṁ
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this text, which may well be the oldest of the seven, is the well-known Vaiṣṇava Dvādaśākṣara Oṁ NAMO BHAGAVATE VĀSUDEVĀYA NAMAḥ. But the principal among its ancillary Mantras are five that it calls the Brahmas. These are mani-

dvadaśāksara

69 The five Vaiṣṇava Brahmas are as follows (ŚvāyambhuvaPañcarātra, exposure 10a1–2): Oṁ NAREṆARENARAṆṆATHA NARA YASMĀN NAROTTAMA PRATHAMA BRAHMĀ | Oṁ YAJÑAYA NAMO YĀNAYA DHARMAYA NAMAḥ *PUNYAYA (corr.: PUNYA YAYA Cod.) NAMAH | VRATASA NAMAH | NIYAMAYA NAMAH | MĀRGANUSARINE NAMAH DUTIYABRAMHĀ | Oṁ KĀLEBHYA *THA KĀLEBHYAḥ (corr.: THA KĀLEBHYA Cod.) KĀLAKALANTAREBHYAS CA SARVVAṬA (+ + + + NA)MASE TE RUDRARUDREBHYAṬ TIRIYA BRAHMĀ | Oṁ TATSAṂYOΓAYA VIDMAHE HRŚIKESAṬYA *DHĪMAHI (corr.: DHĪTMAHE Cod.) TAN NO *VIṢṆUḤ (corr.: VIṢṆU Cod.) PRACODAYAṬ CATURTHABRAMHĀ | RODHAKA SARVVAVIDYĀNĀM DEVADĀNĀVADHIPATI MAHĀPURUṢA NAMO STU TE PĀṇCA<MA>brahmā. The four Brahmas after the first are evidenty modelled on the Śaiva Brahmas in the order (1) Vāmadeva (VĀMADEVĀYA NAMO JYEŚṬHĀYA NAMO RUDRĀYA NAMAḥ KĀLAYA NAMAḥ KALAVIKARAṆĀYA NAMO BALAVIKARAṆĀYA NAMO BALAPRAMATHANĀYA NAMAḥ SARVABHŪTADAMANĀYA NAMO MANONMĀNAṆA NAMAḥ), (2) Aghora (AGHOREBHĪYA 'THA GOREBHĪYA GHOARAGHORATAREBHYAS CA SARVATAH ŚARVA SARVEBHYO NAMAS TE RUDRARŪPEBHĪYAḥ), (3) Tatpuruṣa (TATPURUṢAYA VIDMAHE MAHĀDEVAYA DHĪMAHI TAN NO RUDRAḤ PRACODAYAṬ), and (4) Iśāna (ĪŚĀNAH SARVAVIDYĀNĀM IŚVARAḤ SARVABHŪTANĀM BRAHMAḤO 'DHIPATIR BRAHMĀ ŚIVO ME STU SADĀ ŚIVAḤ). The first Brahma has nothing in common with the remaining Śaiva Brahma, that of Śadyojāta.

– 63 –
The Śaiva prototypes are already found in the Atimārga of the Pāncārthika Pāśupatas. Indeed they constitute the whole Mantra-system of that tradition. However, it is clear that the Śvāyambhuvapāñcarātra has drawn them from the later tradition of the Mantramārga, because it goes on to teach the imposition on to the worshipper’s body of the thirty-eight parts of these Mantras (kalānḍyāsāh), a Mantramārgic feature, and under names specific to one Mantramārgic tradition, that of the Svacchandatantra, the principal scripture of the Mantrapīṭha.70

The Śvāyambhuvapāñcarātra survives only in this Nepalese manuscript. One might object, therefore, that it may be no more than a local oddity unrepresentative of the mainstream tradition. That it is not can be argued, of course, only through evidence that the text was more widely known in the form of references to it, citations from it, or accounts of its contents in other works. This is a difficult test to apply in the case of the early Pāñcarātrika literature, since in stark contrast to the case of the Śaiva scriptures, Pāñcarātrika commentarial works in which we could seek such evidence are almost completely absent until a much later period among the Śrīvaiṣṇavas of the South, when the range of relevant sources had changed greatly. The only exception is the Spandapradīpikā of the Kashmirian Bhāgavatotpala, probably of the tenth century.71 But that, though it cites a number of early Pāñcarātrika scriptural sources, does not cite this. However, there is evidence in a Śaiva source that this Pāñcarātrika text was known and followed outside Nepal. For I propose that it is identical with the Svayambhūpañcarātra that Somaśambhu cites as his authority in his account of the procedures for the installation of an image of Viṣṇu in the Kriyākāṇḍakramāvalī,72 the highly influential work on the Saiddhāntika Śaiva

70 Ibid., exposure 10a3–5: kalānḍyāsaṁ caturthu tu | śṛṣṭi vyṛddhi mati laṁśmī medhā kānti svadhā sthitā | raṣaḥ raṣaḥ rati pāḷyā kāmā trśnā mati jīyā | avidhi kāya tāta ca bhramaṇī mohāṇī tathā | i + i + i + i + i + dhāḥ kṣudhā mṛtyu jvarabhayaḥ | nīvṛtiṣ ca pratīṣṭhā ca | sānti vidyā tathāvah ca | tārā sutārā taraṇī tārayanti svatāraṇi | aṣṭātṛīṇśaḥ kalopeta (em. : kalopetaḥ Cod.) ācāryaḥ *samudāhṛtaḥ (corr.: samudāhṛtaḥ Cod.). Cf., to emend the names, Svacchandatantra 1.53–59b (%Svacchandalalitabhārava IFI T. 507, p. 6; NAK MS 1–224, f.3v–4r, the latter with different kalāh of Isana) and Netrotantra 22.26–34.

71 I am aware of no reference to the Spandapradīpikā or its author in any dated work. It is not possible, therefore, to fix a date before which this work must have been written, at least not a date earlier than that of its manuscripts. However, the fact that it quotes extensively from the Śaṅkta Śaiva literature current in Kashmir up to and including the Isvarapratyabhijñākārikā of Utpaladeva (fl. c. 925–975) but not from any of the works of Abhinavagupta (fl. c. 975–1025) makes it unlikely that its author wrote after the latter.

72 Verse 4.12ab in BRUNNER’S edition (Somasambhupaddhati, Pt. 4, p. 297) (B), = verse 1668cd in the KSTS edition (Karmakāṇḍakramāvalī) (K), and folio 71v2–3 in the Cambridge MS (Kriyākāṇḍakramāvalī) (C): svayambhū *pañcarātre (NK: pāñcarātre B) ca sarvam etad udīritam.
rituals\textsuperscript{73} that he composed in the eleventh century, probably in 1073,\textsuperscript{74} while he held the office of abbot in the kingdom of the Kalacuris of Tripuri at the illustrious Sāiddhāntika monastery of Golagī (golagīmaṭṭhāḥ), in the Rewa District of Madhya Pradesh.\textsuperscript{75}

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

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

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

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

\textsuperscript{76} The relevant passage in the Svāyambhuvapāṇcarātra (exposure 5b3–5a2) is as follows (with some restorations and emendations following the readings of a closely related passage in the eleventh Adhyāya of the Devamṛtaṇcarātra [D]): *yajanaṃ (em. D and here, exposure 8a3 : ++ nam Cod.) sampravakṣyāmi *divyaṃ (D : devaṃ Cod.) nārāyanaśa tu (D : tuh Cod.) | tribhīrāvāraṇaiḥ *kārayaṃ (em. : kāya Cod. : kāra D) durlabhamaṃ *tu surasuraiḥ (D : sasurasuram Cod.) | madhye cakramaṃ *prasīthāpyaṃ (em. : prasīthāyaṃ Cod. : prasīthāpya D) *dvādaśāram (corr. [D: arai<r> dvādaśabhir yutam]: dvādaśāna Cod. ) suṣobhanam | tanmadhye ka-
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unusual, especially in its set of nine ancillaries, it is extremely unlikely that Somaśambhu’s Svayambhūpañcarātra is not the Svāyambhūvapañcarātra of the Nepalese manuscript. Since Somaśambhu was a major figure and writing far from Nepal for a pan-Indian audience there are no grounds for considering this tradition to be a Nepalese aberration.

Furthermore, while the ritual systems taught in the scriptures of the Śaivas, the texts retain elements that make sense in the Śaiva world but not in the Vaiṣṇava;

---

malam proktam patrāṣṭakasakarnikam | sarvātmä *sakalo (em.: sakalā Cod.) *devo (corr.: deva Cod.) *dīvyamālāsasamanvitaḥ (conj.: dīvyamālāsanātanah Cod.) | śriyā madhye tu ṣrdayam hūṃkāraṇa tu pūjyayet | śrā<śrā pūrvadale *dadyād daksine tu śikham (D: da + + + + + + m Cod.) nyaset | paścime kavacaṃ *dadyād (corr.: dadyāv Cod.) āstraṇī caivottareṇa tu | gāyatrī āgneyadībhāge (corr.: bhāga Cod.) sāvitrīm īśvare svayam | *netraṇ (corr.: netraṇ Cod.) caiva tu *nairṛtyām (corr.: nairītyām Cod.) pīngalāstrāṃ tu *vāyave (corr.: vāyave Cod.) | gūhyād gūhyataraṃ gūhyām gārhāvāraṇom uttamaṃ | *dviyām (corr.: dviyām Cod.) *sampravakṣyāmi (corr.: sampravakṣyāmi Cod.) viṣṇu *mūrtih (corr.: mūrtī Cod.) prapājyey | dvādāṣe tathā ca kere nyase<d> dvādāṣe mūrtyayāḥ | *kēṣavaṃ tu are pūrve omkāreṇa (D: ke ++++++ reṇa Cod.) tu pūjyayet | dviyīyan tu nākāreṇa *pūjya (conj.: jēyām Cod.) nārāyaṇaṃ *tathā (corr.: tathāh Cod.) | tṛtiyam mādhavam *pūjya (em.: pūjya Cod.) mokāreṇa (D: māhātmanah Cod.) bhaṅkārāksaradevena govindam tu *caturthakham (D: caturthakham Cod.) paṅcāmanam tu gākāreṇa viṣṇu<m> caiva prapājyey | vākārāksaradevena saṣṭhe vai madhusūdanam | saṃtame vāmānaṃ *caiva (corr.: caivaḥ Cod.) tēkāreṇa tu pūjaye[T] | *yajed vākārabījena (conj.: +j, dvārabījena Cod.) āṣṭame tu *trivikramaṃ (corr.: trivikramaḥ Cod.) | śṛidharaṇ navamaṇa caiva sukāreṇa tu pūjyayet | daśame tu hṛṣīkēśam dekāreṇa tu pūjyayet | ekādaśe tu *vākāre (conj.: vākāra Cod.) padmanābhaṃ *prabhumn (corr. prabhū Cod.) vidūḥ | dvādāṣe <tu> bhakāreṇa nāmnā dāmodaraṃ śṛtām | *dviyīvaṇaraṇam khyātām (D: dviyīvaṇaraṇam khyātām Cod.) *tṛtiye śrāṇi (D: tṛtiyena śrāṇi Cod.) vinīyataṃ | śāṅkha<m> caiva nyase<t> *pūrve (em.: pūrvam Cod.) āgneyām tu gadāṃ nyaset (D: āgneyā ++++ Cod.) | *dakṣīṇaṃ (corr.: +kṣiṇena Cod.) bhave<>< cakram khadaṃ *nairṛtyavocare (corr.: nairṛtyavocare Cod.) | padma<m> paścimato vyīyā<d> vāyavyāṃ tu hala<m> nyaset | musala<m> *cortarato (em. in spite of the metre: cōttato Cod.) | dadyād iśānyā<m> *śārnga (corr.: sārṅga Cod.) vinīyataṃ | etad gūhyataram *vāyam (corr.: yāgām Cod.) durlabham paraṃ padāṃ. Somaśambhu sets out the same material in his Paddhati in 4.27c–33 of BRUNNER’s edition, =vv. 1681c–1686 in the Kashmirian edition, and f. 72r2–7 in the Cambridge manuscript (the last two sources offer no significant variants but only minor errors and corruptions that I have not recorded here): vinīyasa cādātās caṅkhaṃ dvādāsāraṃ subhāsāram || 28 tasya madhye punar deyam padamaḥ aśdalañam tataḥ | hrmmantraṃ karṇikāyām ca ṣrāṅga pūrvadale tataḥ || 29 śikham ca daksine patre paścime kavacaṃ nyaset | āstram uṭtaratār nyasaṃ gāyatrīm agnipatrake || 30 sāvitrīṃ īśapatre ca netraṃ ca nairṛte dale | tataḥ ca vāyupatre ca pīngalāstrāṃ vinīkṣipet || 31 gārhāvāraṇam ity uktam adhunāvaranāntaram | dvādāsāre ca kere śmin keśāvāyāṃ yathākramam || 32 pranavādyair yathākāram uktaśrīvīr vauṇāmabhiḥ | prāgaḍāṭaḥ ca vinīyasaḥ khadgāṃ gadāṃ anantaram || 33 caṅkhaṃ śāṅkhaṃ ca padmaṃ ca hālaṃ ca musalaṃ tataḥ | sāṛṅgaṃ ca vinīyased evam tṛtiyāvaṇaṃ bhavet.
and in some cases we find a degree of awkwardness that is consistent only with a clumsy attempt to adapt Śaiva materials to their new context.

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

77 The only edition of the Jayākhyā (Ed.), that of KRISHNAMACHARYYA, was based on south-Indian manuscripts of relatively recent date. I re-edit the text of the passage to which I am referring, 16.128c–134 [numeration of Ed.], with the help of the testimony of a Nepalese paper manuscript of 1454/5 (N), ff. 35v–36r, and a lemma in a Nepalese palm-leaf manuscript of 1187/8 of the Jñānalaks. mī of Śadhaka Cantradatta, pupil of Ekāyanācārya Nārāyanagarbha (C): susītam sūtram ādāya lāksālaktakabhāvitam || 129 sammukham cotthitam śisyam *samāpādaśirodham (corr. [=C]: semāpādaśirodham N: samāpādaśironnatam Ed.) || kṛtvānguṣṭhadvayasyāgrat samārābhya *dvijottama (Ed.: dvijottamaḥ N) || 130 yāvac chīkāvāsānam tu sūtra*mānaḥ (Ed.: māna N) samāharet || kuryād *ekagunām (Ed.: ve kagunām N) tad *vai (Ed.: ve N) dviguṇām triguṇaṁ tu vā || 131 *tris tris tad (conj.: tristrismad N: tristrītha Ed.) gunītām vātha *paṇcāvimsatidhāhavā (N: paṇcāvimsatī cāthavā Ed.) || avyaktalingasūtraṁ tu *tad rāgāvidyākalātmakam (em.: tadrāgāvidyākalātmakam N: prāgāvidyākalātmakam Ed.) || 132 *niyam jadām (Ed.: niyajade N) vyāpakam ca tasmin viśvam pratiṣṭhitam || tatraivāstam vrajad (corr.: tatravāstam vrajad N: tatrāptaṁ ayate Ed.: tatrāstam ayate conj. KRISHNAMACHARYYA) bhūyas tasmād eva pravartate || 133 tatrāsnīṁ cintayet sarvāṁ abhināṁ tattvapaddhatīṁ || *tattvodbhavās (N: tatrodbhavās Ed.) tu ye vipra *pāṣā (em.: pāṣā Ed.: teśām Ed.) bandhātmakā dr̥dhāḥ || 134 rāgena raṇjītāṁ *citrā (Ed.: cīti N) avidyāsamprādipitāḥ | vičchinnāś caiva kālēnā *niyatyāvāyāpakās (conj.: niyatāvāyāpakās N Ed.) tathā ‘O best of brahmans, after taking up a perfectly white cord soaked [red] with lac and making the candidate stand facing him with his feet together and his head upright, he should measure out [a length of] the cord from the tip of his two big toes to his hair-tuft. He may make [the cord of this length] single, double, triple, thrice triple, or twenty-fivefold. He should meditate upon the entire sequence of Tattvas as residing undivided therein. This thread, [which embodies] the subtle body [of the candidate], comprises Rāga, Avidyā, and Kalā (rāgāvidyākalātmakam). It is eternal, unconscious, and pervasive. The whole universe is grounded in it. Into it it disappears again and from it alone it comes forth. These binding cords are the firm fetters [of the soul]. They arise, O brahmin, from the Tattvas. They are coloured because they have been dyed with [the redness of] Rāga. They are illuminated by Avidyā, circumscribed by Kāla, and made non-pervasive by Niyati’.
(kañcukāni), except that there the second is generally termed vidyā rather than avidyā; and the other two factors, kālaḥ and niyatih join these three to form the group of five reality-levels (tātvāni) ranked immediately below māyātattvam, the upper limit and source of the ‘impure cosmos’ (asūddho ‘dhvā), and immediately above the individual soul (puruṣāḥ), constituting the factors that enable the soul to undergo embodiment in that impure world. Even the substitution of avidyā for the Śaivas’ vidyā does nothing to dilute the obviously Śaiva character of the set, since vidyā in that context is indeed a form of nescience (avidyā), being understood as the limited power of knowledge that characterizes bound souls, enabling them to cognize the objects presented by the faculties, as opposed to the pure, all-encompassing knowledge (śuddhavidyā) that operates above māyātattvam; and this understanding is maintained in the passage in the Jayākhya, because it speaks of the bonds as being ‘illuminated’ by avidyā. Indeed the line in which the bonds are said to be ‘coloured by rāgah and illuminated by avidyā’ unmistakeably echoes loci classici on the functions of rāgah and vidyā in the Mantramārga’s scriptures.

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

---

78 For rāgah, vidyā, and kāla as the three ‘shrouds’ (kañcukatrayam) of the Śaivas see, e.g., Matangapārameśvara, Vidyāpāda 11.33: rāgavidyākalākhyena kañcukatritayena vai; and Rauravasūtrasamgraha 1.3–4: rāgavidyākalāvyaktaganubuddhisamudbhavam, where they are the three ‘shrouds’ (kañcukāni) of the bound soul. For the addition of kālaḥ and niyatih seen in the last verse of the Jayākhya passage (16.134) see, e.g., Matangapārameśvara, Vidyāpāda 14.2: kañcukatritayaviddham kālena kalitam ‘sanaih niyatyalitam yātī punbhāvenātmavartinā; and Tantrāloka 9.204: māyā kalā rāgavidye kālo niyatir eva ca kañcukāni sad uktāni.


80 Pauṣkarasamhitā 1.24a: yady ekam tu mahāyāgaṃ navanābham samudyajet; 10.34cd: navapithē mahāyāge tāṃ ca kṛtaṃvam vadāmi te; 19.26: yair uddīṣṭām mahāyāge navābe.
long invocatory Mantra consisting of eighty-one units distributed one by one on the centre (nābhiḥ) and eight petals of each of the nine lotuses. This arrangement and correlation, which, to my knowledge, is found in the Pāncarātrika literature only in the Paūṣkara, is central to the Śaiva tradition of the Mantramārga, being the hallmark of a number of its earlier scriptures, where the Maṇḍala is taught under the same names, and the Mantra with which it is correlated is the well-known Śaiva Vymayāpimanastra of eighty-one units. In the Śaiva case the nine lotus-thrones (pīṭhaḥ) of the Maṇḍala are equated with nine Tattvas: Śiva, Sadāśiva, Īśvara, Vidyā, Māyā, Kāla, Niyati, Puruṣa, and Aavya (Prakṛti). In the Paūṣkara that element has been dropped, no Vaiṣṇava set of nine Tattvas being available for this purpose and the Śaiva set being unassimilable because it includes unmistakeably Śaiva elements such as Sadāśiva and Īśvara. Nonetheless the text contains a sign that the redactor was after all working with a Śaiva exemplar. For he calls his fourth ‘the lotus of Māyā’. Māyā is a Śaiva not a Pāncarātrika Tattva.

Furthermore, in the Paūṣkara, the Sātṛata, and the Vāsudevkalpa of the Maḥālakṣmisāṃhitā we find the term spandaḥ ‘vibrancy’ in the sense it has in the Śākta Śaiva Jayadrathayāmala and the Spandākārikā of Kallatā in the second half of the ninth century. However, I do not exclude the possibility that in this case it may be the Śaiva sources that are indebted to the Vaiṣṇava.  

---


82 Paūṣkarasāṃhitā 19.24c–26b, 27ab, 31ab, 37c–38b: jñātum ichāmi *vidyākhyam mantrānām (vidyākhyam em.:vidyākhyam Ed.) lakṣaṇām viḥo || 25 yaḥ padmakalpanāḥ kārṇāyā *padair (conj.: padmair Ed.) nirvartitaḥ prabhō | brahma-prakāsākānām tu mantrānām atha lakṣaṇām || 26 yair udiṣṭān mahāyāge navāyāṃ pūjanaṃ tatāḥ || 27 madhyapadme padānām ca ānukirtitām || 31 māyāmaya 'tho (conj. 'nte Cod.) kamale caturthe tu padām śrīṃ | ...iti vidyāpādaṇāṃ ca svarūpeṇa prakāśītan || 38 atha brahmānandaṃ ca lakṣaṇaṃ cavadhāraya.

83 See Paūṣkarasāṃhitā 27.274–276: śaṅtasaṃvatvarūpasya spandānanda-mayātmanaḥ | tāvaicyatam hi citspandam svayaṃ parinātām | smaret || 275 sahasrasaśāśisūryaṃ prabhāyām projitām sthīram | mariccakrasaṃpūrcnādgarbham sarvatomukham || 276 cidambarāntarāvastham susaṃtām bhagavatpadam; Sātvatasaṃhitā 3.15cd: evam jñātavā sthitām brāhmaṃ svānandaspandalakṣāṇām (conj.: svānandam spandalakṣāṇām Ed.); also also 5.99–101b: lolibhūtam abhedena smaret turyātmanā purā | nityoditām ca supade sthitām aspandalakṣāṇām || 100 athārcitum yam icchet tu viśeṣayavatīlakṣāṇam | sāmkalpya tu sva-buddhāyā tu tattkalāsamanantarām || 101 dhruvā śāmrthasyāsaktir vai spandalām eti ca svayaṃ || Vāsudevkalpa at 165ab: cicchaktau tu layam kṛtvā svānandaspandagocare; 238–241b: mānasena tu *yāgena (conj.: yagena draft Ed.) dravyaiḥ sāmkalpajaiḥ śubhahiḥ | hṛdambujapare turye *cidbhāṣārūpam (corr.:cidbhāṣā rūpam draft Ed.) uttamam || 239 kadambagolakākaraṃ
Nor was the influence of the Śaivism of the Mantramārga confined to the formative period of the Tantric Pañcarātra. For, as I have shown elsewhere, the Lakṣmitantra and Ahirbudhnyasamāṃhita, works composed in the South, derive their distinctive doctrinal character from the assimilation of the dynamic non-dualism of the works of the Kashmirian Śaktas Śaivas from Utpaladeva (fl. c. A.D. 925–975) to Kṣemarāja (fl. c. 1000–1050).  

ROYAL PATRONAGE OF BUDDHISM

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

The Viṣṇukundis of Andhra

Among the eight successive Viṣṇukundis (r. c. 375–612) known to us from inscriptions three of the last six are known to have been patrons of Buddhism: the third, Govindavarman I (r. c. 422–462), the fifth, Vikramendravarman I (r. c. 502–527), and the seventh, Vikramendravarman II (r. c. 555–572). In the Tummala-guḍem plates (Set I) issued by Mahārāja Govindavarman I he is described as having beautified his kingdom with many temples and Buddhist monasteries, as having given generously to brahmans and Buddhist monks, as having resolved to attain the Great Awakening for the salvation of all living beings, and as having donated two villages—the charter’s object is to record this grant—to fund the
expenses of a Buddhist monastery founded by his chief queen Paramadevi.\footnote{SANKARANARAYANAN 1977:1, ll. 8–24: anekadevāyatanavihārasabhāhāprapātañca
dāpanārāmapratisamskārāpāvakanenālaṃkṛtasakaladigantareṇa bhikṣu
dvijāṇāthayācakavyāḥhitadinākpanjañanopabhujamānanyādīghitavdbhava
dhanasamudayanāśaṃkṛt asakti svasarvasvatyāginaḥ ... sakalasattvadhitutṛanā
yotpāditamahābodhicittena mahārājaśrīgovindavanamāḥ ... svasyā agramahisīyāh
paramadevā vīhārasya dipahūpagandhapaspadhvaṃpaṇabhojanasyaṃdyāna
glānakhaṇḍayajakhaṇḍasphūṭitasirṇasamskārādikusālalāmālacchedārtham dvāv
ermaḍālaprenkaparṇyāmadhyeyau grāmā udakadānapūrvakam atiṣṭhaṃ ‘In
order that his roots of merit should not be cut off, through [the provision of funds
for] such [expenses] as lamps, incense, scents, flowers, banners, drinking water,
food, beds, seats, medicines for sick [monks], and repairs to whatever is broken,
cracked, and delapidated, the two villages named Ermadāla and Prenkaparṇa
have been donated to the monastery of his chief queen Paramadevi with the [due]
pouring of water [into the hand of the recipient] by Mahārāja Govindavarman,
who has adorned all parts [of his kingdom] through his unprecedented provision
of numerous temples, Buddhist monasteries, meeting halls, fountains, reservoirs,
wells, and gardens, all of whose great wealth, lawfully acquired, is being enjoyed by
Buddhist monks, brahmins, the unprotected, supplicants, the sick, the wretched,
and the poor, who has [in this way] repeatedly given away all his property, and
who has generated the intention to attain the Great Awakening for the salvation of all
living beings’.
\footnote{SANKARANARAYANAN 1977:8, ll. 10–18: paramasaugatasya mahārājaśrīvikrame
ndrasya sūnuḥ ... śrī-indrabhaṭṭārakavaṃsah priyasūnaḥ ... śrīmāñ śrīvikrame
ndrabhaṭṭārakavarnāḥ ... ittham avabadhayati ‘Vikramendraśrīvikramavarnman, the
beloved son of Indrabhaṭṭārakavarnman, the son of paramasaugatā Mahārāja Vikramendra informs you as follows’; ll. 24–33: atibahuprakāramanaramo
dāraṃcāndbhutastupaviharacūlamānibhir alamkṛtasakaladakṣināpathasya
... śrīgo[vi]ndarājasya mūrtimāṭaṃ śriyaṃ praty avisayikṛtmanorathayā para
maḥbhājaṭṭārikamahādevāḥ śrīmadindrapuram uccei alamkartukāmyayeva prati
sthāpite śrīmati paramabhaṭṭārikamahāvihāre ‘smābhī[ḥ] ... cāturḍāśārayavarā
bhikṣusamghaparibhogāya ... irundorō nāma grāmo dattāḥ ‘I have donated the
village called Irundora for the use of the community of excellent monks of the
city of the venerable Paramabhaṭṭārikamahāvihāra that was founded by
Paramabhaṭṭārikamahādevā as though desiring to bestow great beauty on
Indrapura, fulfilling [thereby] the desire for embodied [royal] splendour of [her
husband] King Govinda, who adorned the whole of the Deccan with splendid Stūpas
and monasteries that were marvelous in their most various, charming, and noble
workmanship’.}

A second set of plates discovered at Tummalagudem contains a charter issued by
Vikramendravarman II which records his granting a village for the support of the
Buddhist community at this monastery. The founder’s husband Govindavarman
I is described as having beautified the whole of the Deccan with splendid Stūpas
and monasteries, and Vikramendravarman I, his grandson and the grandfather
of Vikramendravarman II, is identified as paramasaugatāḥ ‘entirely devoted to
the Buddha’.\footnote{SANKARANARAYANAN 1977:1, ll. 8–24: anekadevāyatanavihārasabhāhāprapātañca
dāpanārāmapratisamskārāpāvakanenālaṃkṛtasakaladigantareṇa bhikṣu
dvijāṇāthayācakavyāḥhitadinākpanjañanopabhujamānanyādīghitavdbhava
dhanasamudayanāśaṃkṛt asakti svasarvasvatyāginaḥ ... sakalasattvadhitutṛanā
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as *paramamäheśvarah*, as is his father Indrabhaṭṭārakavarman,\(^{87}\) drawing to our attention that if a king supported Buddhism he did not necessarily cease to support other faiths or abandon his own.

**The Maitrakas of Valabhi**

Of the land-grant documents of the Maitrakas of Valabhi three quarters are records of grants to brahmans, but the remaining quarter report grants made by these kings to Buddhist institutions.\(^{88}\) Guhasena (r. c. 553–569) has the epithet *paramopāsakaḥ* ‘devout lay Buddhist’,\(^{89}\) Śīlāditya I Dharmāditya (r. c. 595–612) is praised for his support of Buddhism in the east-Indian *Rājavyākaraṇa* of the Buddhist Tantric *Mañjuśrīyamūlakalpa*\(^{90}\) and by the Chinese Huili in his account of the Indian travels of Xuanzang;\(^{91}\) and the latter, who visited the kingdom of Valabhi in the 630s, when the Maitraka Dhruvasena II was on the throne, reports that the king had recently developed a sincere faith in Buddhism and became a generous donor to the monastic community.\(^{92}\) Moreover, Valabhi became a major centre of Mahāyana Buddhist scholarship during this period, producing such eminent figures as Sthiramati (*fl*. c. 510–570), for whom a monastery was established in Valabhi during the reign of Guhasena.\(^{93}\) In their inscriptions, how-

---

\(^{87}\) The Chikkula plates of Vikramendravarman (SANKARANARAYANAN 1977:7), ll. 15–19: *parama[māheśvarasya mahārājaśyā śrī-indrabhaṭṭārakavarmāṇaḥḥ] priyajyeśṭhaputro ... paramamāheśvaro mahārāja[h] śrīmān vikramendravarmā evam ājñāpayati.*

\(^{88}\) SCHMIEDCHEN 2007, p. 360.

\(^{89}\) SCHMIEDCHEN 1993, p. 84.

\(^{90}\) *Mañjuśrīyamūlakalpa* 53.537d–540: *samudratīraparyantaṃ lāḍānāṃ jana-pade tathā || 38 śilāhvo nāma nṛpatiḥ buddhānām śāsane rataḥ | purīṁ valabhyā samprāpto dharmarājā bhaviṣyati || 39 vihārān dhātuvarān citrān *śreyase* (em.: *śreyasām* Ed.) prānīnāṁs tathā | kāraviṣyati yuktātmā bhūpatir dharmavatsalaḥ || 40 pūjaṃ ca vividhākārāṃ jinabimbāṃ manoramāṃ | pūjayed dhātuvarān agryān lokanāthebhavyo yaśasvisu | nāsa mantrasiddhas tu kevalaṃ karmajottamaḥ ‘In the land of the Lātas up to the shore of the [western] ocean a king called Śila, devoted to the teaching of the Buddhas, will become a Dharma-rāja in the city of Valabhi. That royal friend of Buddhism, of well-disciplined mind, will build monasteries and beautiful relic Stūpas for the welfare of living beings. [He will establish] the manifold worship of beautiful images of the Buddha; and he will venerate the most excellent of the relics of the renowned Buddhas. He will not achieve success through [the Buddhist Way of] Mantras, but will excel simply through acts of [lay] piety’. For the east-Indian origin of the text see *Mañjuśrīyamūlakalpa* 53.627a: *gauḍadeśe ‘smin*; and 53.810a: *prācyadeśe ‘smin.*

\(^{91}\) BEAL 1914, p. 148.

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

\(^{93}\) On the dates of Sthiramati and the evidence that a monastery was established for him see FRAUWALLNER 1961, pp. 136 ff.
ever, Śilāditya I Dharmāditya, Dhruvasena II, and generally Guhasena too, appear like almost all the other Maitrakas with the epithet paramamāheśvarah.94

The Kārkoṭas of Kashmir

No inscriptions have survived from the reigns of the kings of the Kārkoṭa dynasty of Kashmir. But from the account of this dynasty given by the Kashmi- ran historian Kalhaṇa we learn that although, as we have seen, the temples they established with their names were Viṣṇus,95 they or those closely associated with them also established several Buddhist foundations: the Anantabhāvanavihāra founded by the queen of Durlabhavardhana (r. c. 626–662); the Prakāśikāvihāra founded by Prakāśadevi, queen of Candrāpiḍa (r. c. 712–720/1); the Rājāvihāra ‘The King’s Monastery’ founded and richly endowed by Lalitāditya (r. c. 725–761/2) with a large Caitya and a huge Buddha image at his new capital Parihāsapura; the Kayyāvihāra, founded during the rule of the same by Kayya, a king of Lāṭa; a Vihāra, a Stūpa, and golden Buddha images established at Parihāsapura by Lalitāditya’s Central Asian chief minister Cāṅkunā; a Vihāra and a Caitya established by the same in the capital; and a large monastery and three Buddha images established by Jayāpiḍa (r. c. 773/4–804/5) in his new capital Jayapura.96

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

95 See here, p. 60.

96 Rājatarāṅgiṇī 4.3 (Anāṅgabhavana); 4.79 (Prakāśikāvihāra); 4.200–205 (Rājāvihāra etc.); 4. 210 (Kayyāvihāra); 4.211 and 215 (the foundations of Cāṅkunā); and 4.507 (the foundations of Jayāpiḍa). For the vestiges of Lalitāditya’s Rājāvihāra, his Caitya, and Cāṅkunā’s Stūpa at Parihāsapura (Paraspor) see Krishna DEVA in EITA vol. 2, pt. 1, pp. 366–367; plates 722–727. Cāṅkunā is evidently a rendering of the Chinese military title jiangjun ‘General’ rather than a name.
The Licchavis of Nepal

In the Kathmandu valley the inscriptions of kings throughout our period show their devotion to Śiva. But here too, where Buddhism and Śaivism co-existed among the Newars down to the present, there is ample evidence of royal support for the former. The Licchavi Vṛṣadeva is described in an inscription of his eighth-century descendant Jayadeva as having inclined towards Buddhism, a view confirmed by a local chronicle, which attributes to him the establishing of Buddhist images and in the first half of the seventh century Xuanzang claims that the king of Nepal was a sincere believer. The Gopālarājavamsāvalī, the earliest of the local chronicles, compiled during the reign of Jayasthitimalla (1382–1395), claims that the Caitya at Guṃvihāra and a monastery, the Mānavihāra, were established by Mānadeva, the Caitya of the Sinagu-vihāra (the Swayambhūnāth Caitya) by Vṛṣadeva, the Dharmadevacaitya (the Cābahil Caitya) by Dharmadeva, a monastery and the Khasaucaitya (the Bodhnāth Caitya) by Śivadeva, the Phutovihāra and a Caitya by Campadeva, the Rājavihāra by Amśuvarman, the Devalavihāra by Devaladeva, and a monastery at Nandiśālā by Śivadeva. To Narendradeva and his Buddhist preceptor Bandhudatta it attributes the instituting of the annual chariot festival (vāṭrā) of the popular Newar Buddhist deity Bugmalokeśvara.
Unsurprisingly, the Amarāvatī-mahāvihāra (Būga Bāhāḥ) at Bungamati, the home of Bugmalokeśvara, claims to have been founded by him.¹⁰⁴

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

¹⁰³ Gopālārajavamsāvalī f. 20v5: Caitya at Gumvihāra; f. 21r1: Mānaviga; f. 20v2–3: Caitya at Swayambhū; f. 21r3: Dharmadevacaitya; f. 21v1: Khasaucaitya; f.21v2: Phuṭovihāra and Caitya; f.22v1: Amśuvarman’s Rājavihāra; f. 22v3: Devalaviga; f.22v5: Śivadeva’s monastery; and ff. 22v5–23r1 (the festival of Būgadyah): śrī narendradeva varṣa 35 taṣya ācāryabandhūdattadavayena śrībugmalokeśvarabhaṭṭarakaṣya jāṭra kṛtā bhaṭavi ‘Narendradeva: [reigned for] 35 years. Jointly with his Ācārya Bandhudatta he established the festival of Lord Bugmalokeśvara’. On the festival of Būgadyah, also known (in Nepali) as Rāto (‘Red’) Matsyendranāth, which is still a major event in the Kathmandu valley, see Locke 1980, pp. 244–280.

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

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

¹⁰⁶ LKA 2, side 1, l.8–side 2, l.3: rājābūḥd vṛṣadevah . . . yasyābhūt tanayah . . . rājā śaṅkara-deva ity anupa[mo] . . . devī rājyavati tu taṣya nṛpater bhārya . . . yasyāṁ jāta . . . śrīmānadevo nṛpah.

¹⁰⁷ LKA 18, l. 18: kṣetraṁ cākṣayaṁ dattam [śrī]mānaviga.

¹⁰⁸ LKA 54 and 70.

¹⁰⁹ LKA 138 and 143.

¹¹⁰ LKA 133, ll. 4–11 and 134, ll. 4–12: ayaṁ grāmo . . . śrīśivadevaviga[re] caturdiśāyaḥbhikṣusānghāyaśmābhir atiṣṭaḥ ‘I have given this village to the congregation of noble monks of the four directions at the Śivadevaviga’.

¹¹¹ LKA 59 and 85.
the Rājavihāra attributed to him by the chronicle is mentioned in one of these, dated in 608. It also mentions the Mānavihāra and the Guṃvihāra, showing the accuracy of the report of the chronicle that these three monasteries are ancient Licchavi foundations. Moreover, it does so in a context that enables us to gauge their relative importance. For it fixes cash allowances from the court (rājakulam) to a large number of religious foundations and these are ranked into two groups.

The upper comprises the temple of Bhagavat Paṣupati, the national Śiva, to whom all Nepalese kings from the time of Aṃśuvarman onwards have declared their allegiance,112 Dolāśikharasvāmin (Cāṅgunārāyaṇa), the principal Viṣṇu of Nepal, then these three Buddhist monasteries, and two others not mentioned by the chronicle, the Kharjūrikāvihāra and the Madhyamavihāra. All of these are to receive the same allowance; and this is twice that to be received by the institutions listed in the lower group. That comprises “the ordinary monasteries” and the temples of various other deities, most of whom are Śivas, including Māneśvara, evidently the temple of a Liṅga installed by Mānadeva with his name.113 Narendra, whom the chronicle reports to have instituted the annual chariot festival of Bugmalokeśvara, has dated inscriptions from 643 to 679.114 The last two, issued in 679 and mentioned above for their reference to the Śivadevavihāra, record the granting of villages to that monastery; and the Chinese envoy Wang Xuan-ce reported that when he had an audience with

113 LKA 77, ll. 6–15: bhagavatah paṣupateḥ pu 6 pa 2 dolāśikharasvāminaḥ pu 6 pa 2 + + + guṃvihārasya pu 6 pa 2 śrīmānnavihārasya pu 6 pa 2 śrīrājavihārasya pu 6 pa 2 kharjūrikāvihārasya pu 6 pa 2 mādhyamavihārasya pu 6 pa 2 sāmānnavihārānām pu 3 pa 1 rāmeśvarasya pu 3 pa 1 hāmsagṛheśvarasya pu 3 pa 1 māneśvarasya pu 3 pa 1 sāmāpurasya pu 3 pa 1 vāgmatipārādevasya pu 3 pa 1 dhārāmānānāsvarasya pu 3 pa 1 parvatesvarasya pu 3 pa 1 narasimhadevasya pu 3 pa 1 kailāśeśvarasya pu 3 pa 1 bhumbhukkājālasayanasya pu 3 pa 1 tādanyadevakulānām pu 2 pa 2 ... 'six Pu[ṛaṇas] and 2 Pa[ṇa]s each for Bhagavat Paṣupati, Dolāśikharasvāmin (=Cāṅgu- nārāyaṇa), the Guṃvihāra, the Mānavihāra, the Rājavihāra, the Kharjūrikāvihāra, and the Madhyamavihāra; 3 Pu[ṛaṇas] and 1 Pa[ṇa] each for the ordinary Vihāras, and [the temples of Śiva] Rāmeśvara, the Lord of the Hāmsagṛha (=Viṣṇu Lokapāla- svāmin), [Śiva] Māneśvara, Śamba[śiva], Vāgmatipārādeva [Śiva], [Śiva] Dhārā- māneśvara, [Śiva] Parvatesvara, Narasimhadeva, [Śiva] Kailāśeśvara, and the [Viṣṇu] Jalasayana of Bhumbhukkikā (=the Viṣṇu of Budhanīkānta); 2 Pu[ṛaṇas] and 2 Pa[ṇa]s for the temples other than these ...'. The Kharjūrikāvihāra calls to mind the Stūpa which the Buddha predicts in the Mūlasarvāstivādavinaya will be built by the Kuṣaṇa emperor Kaniṣka at Kharjūrika four hundred years after his Parinirvāṇa (Gilgit Manuscripts, vol. 3, pt. 1, pp. 1, l. 20–2, l. 5: bhagavān kharjūrikkām anuprāptah | ...esa catuvraraṣaṇataparinarṣasya mama vaJRapāne kaniṣka nāma rāja bhaviṣyati | so 'smin pradeśe stūpaṁ pratiṣṭhāpayati | tasya kaniṣkastūpa iti samjñā bhaviṣyati.

114 LKA 123–134.
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Narendradeva in 643 the king’s belt was adorned with a Buddha.\(^{115}\) But here too we see that the support of Buddhism in Nepal as elsewhere was not a sign that a king had changed his religious allegiance in any radical sense. For in both of those inscriptions Narendradeva has the epithet \textit{paramamāheśvarah}.\(^{116}\)

\textit{The Thākuri Kings of Nepal}

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

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

\(^{116}\) \textit{LKA} 133, ll. 1–3: \textit{bhagavatpaśupatibhāṭārakapādānugṛhito bappapādānudhyāto licchāvikulaketuḥ paramamāheśvaraparamabhaṭṭarakaḥmahārājādhīrājāśrīnārren-dredevah kuśali gullāngangramānivāsināḥ pradāna-purapuhraraṁ sarvakutum-mbinaḥ saṁjñāpayati ‘Favoured by the venerable lord Paśupati, devoted to his venerable father, the banner of the Licchavi dynasty, entirely devoted to Śiva, the supreme Lord, the paramount king Narendradeva greets the elders and all the other householders who live in Gullaṅgaṅ village and commands them [as follows]’. The same formula is seen in 134, ll. 1–4. Only the name of the village differs.

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

\(^{117}\) Colophon of ASB MS 9973 (SHĀSTRI 1917, pp. 4–5): \textit{paramasaugataśrīmatimsaṁhadevasya vijayarājye}.

\(^{118}\) \textit{PETECH} (1984, p. 40) quotes the following colophon of an \textit{Aṣṭasahasrikā Prajñāpāramitā MS} (NAK 3-359) that he wrongly reports as \textit{Catuspīṭhanibandha}: \textit{samvat 100 60 5 śrāvaṇasukladāsāmyamāṃ śukradine | rājye śrībhāskaradevasya | śrīguṇakāmadevakaṁāri śrīpadmacakramahāvihāre sthitāśākyabhikṣukṣumār-candraṁ līkhitam} ‘Copied by Śākyabhikṣu Kumāracandra, resident of the Padmacakramahāvihāra founded by Guṇakāmadeva, on Friday, the bright tenth of Śrāvaṇa, in the year 165 during the reign of Bhāskaradeva’. The date of copying is 26 July 1045 (\textit{PETECH, loc. cit.}).
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(Dau Bāhāh) to Rudradeva I (c. 1007–1018) or Rudradeva II (1167–1175), the Hiranyavarṇamahāvihāra (Kwā Bāhāh) and the Pārśavatamahāvihāra (Itūm Bāhāh) to Bhāskaradeva (1039–1048), the Mayūravarṇamahāvihāra (Bhīchē Bāhāh) to Śaṅkaradeva (1069–1082), the Cakravarṇamahāvihāra (Kā Bāhāh) and the Śivadeva (1098–1126), the Jayamanoharavarṇamahāvihāra (Su Bāhāh) and Śaṅkaradeva (1069–1082), the Tedovihāra (Te Bāhāh) to Śivadeva (1098–1126), the Cakravarṇamahāvihāra (Kā Bāhāh) to Śāivadeva, Śivadeva, Mānadeva, and Narendradeva, that the attribution intended was to their Licchavi namesakes.

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

119 For these monasteries and the names of the kings by whom they are said to have been founded (samskārita-, kārita-) see Locke 1980, pp. 32–33, and 1985, pp. 29, 42, 74, 79, 82, 91, 95, 133, 140, 148. The dates of the reigns of these kings are as determined by Petech 1984.

120 Kaiser library Vamsāvalī fragment (Petech 1984, Appendix), p. 2: rājā śṛiṅgūnakāmadeva varṣa 85 māsa 6 || tena śṛiṅpaśupatibhaṭṭārakāya ekādaśakoṣaṃ pradattām tatraiva īśānescarīṭaḥbhāṭṭārakāya vāṣūkhaṭṭārakāsya tāmmasaṃśatī-cchādānāṃ kṛtya tatraiva *dīrgha*copārhikā (conj. : copāṛikā Ed.) kṛtya tatraiva swarṇanpanālī koṭihomaṃ kṛtā ceti || rājā śṛi udayadeva varṣa 6 || rājā śrīnirbhaya-deva varṣa 5 ‘King Guṇakāmadeva: 85 years and 6 months. He donated eleven [metal Linga] sheaths to Lord Paśupati. At the same place he covered [the roofs of the shrines] of Lord Īśānescara and [the Nāga] Lord Vāsuki with copper *sheets (?), built a long rest-house and a golden water conduit, and performed a fire-sacrifice with ten million oblations’. King Udayadeva: 6 years; King Nirbhayadeva 5 years || . . . ’; cf. Gopālarājavamsāvalī f. 23v1–2: rājā śṛiṅgūnakāmadeva varṣa 85 mā 6 tena śṛiṅpaśupatibhaṭṭārakāya ekādaśa koṣa sampradattā | tatraiva-m īśānye-svarbhāṭṭārakāya tāmmasaṃśatīcchādānāṃ kṛtā | tatraiva dīrghacopā<><<r>hī kṛṭhā tatraiva swarṇanpanālī | kṛṭhā koṭihomaṃ pūrṇa kṛtam. The word śaṃsālī (=saṃkhali or saṃkalikā) is evidently for Skt. śrīṅkhalā, śrīṅkalikā ‘chain’. I have conjectured the meaning ‘sheet’ considering the design of the Paśupati temple, whose roof is covered with interlocking metallic plates. panalī = pranālikā. With *copāṛhi (conj.) cf. Classical Newari capāṛha (Modern Newari capaḥ) ‘rest-house’ (Tamot et. al. 2000, s.v.).

121 Kaiser library Vamsāvalī fragment (Petech 1984, Appendix), p. 4: rājā śrīśaṅkaradeva varṣa 17 | tena hi nandisālayāṃ śaṃk<ar>-resvārabhaṭṭārakāya pratiṣṭhitā devakulama ca pūrṇaṃ kṛtya rāṣṭrasaṅtikā + + + + vihāras ca prayā<bh>ta ‘King Śaṅkaradeva: 17 years. He established [a Linga] for Lord Śaṅkareśvara and completed a temple [for him]. He also undertook the con-
replaced the god’s silver lotus, and donated a golden image of Śiva. Both In-
dradeva and Ānandadeva have the epithet paramaśaiva- attached to their names
in the colophons of manuscripts copied during their reigns; and an inscription
of 1143/4 records that Ānandadeva, while he was the heir apparent (Yuvarāja),
received Śaiva initiation from the Saiddhāntika Guru Rudraśiva of Benares, to-
gether with the princes Vasantadeva, Someśvara, Yaśomalla, and Arjunadeva.
Genesis and Development of Tantrism

In this [city] was born Ānandadeva, a jewel in the pearl-necklace of the lineage of Raghu, delighting the people like a gentle moon with its most charming rays. Being self-controlled and of indescribable greatness, though he had achieved the status of prince (kumāra-) of great power (/though he had achieved the status [only] of Kumāra who brandishes the javelin), he achieved when initiated by [Rudraśiva] the ultimate attainment of Śiva[hood]. Likewise Arjunadeva, Arjuna's equal in martial valour and a lover of virtues, conceived as great a devotion to this [Rudraśiva] as to the gods, when he had seen his virtues. As for the learned Vasantadeva, the wise Someśvara, and Yaśomalla, those princes too were initiated by the same [Guru].

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

The Bhauma-Karas of Orissa

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

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

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

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

---

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

129 *EI* 29:30, Baud plate A of Tribhuvanamahādevī, ll. 5–6: *sutottamas taśya samāśrayaḥ| śriyāḥ prāśasad śrīsubhe śubhākaraḥ| kaler alanghyam sukṛtaśrayaya yo vihāram uccair vidadhe śilāmayam ‘His superlative son Śubhākara, the resort of good fortune, [next] excelled ruling the land. To embody his merit he built a lofty monastery of stone which the degenerate age could not enter.’

130 Shastri 1916:G, ll. 7–9: *nirantaraviracitavidhamaṭhavihārapraśādaprabhandaḥ| purandarapūrārohanasopānabhandhairiva maṇḍitamahīmanḍaleṣvākhaṇḍalaprabhavaḥ| mahārājus vyattiteṣu ‘After the passing of those Maharājas, mighty as Indra, who adorned the land with the manifold sequences of Mathās, Vihāras, and temples that they constructed without interruption as though with stairways for ascending to the heaven of Indra . . . ’.

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

\textsuperscript{132} MITRA 1981, pp. 20–21. Xuanzang reports in the early seventh century that Buddhism was the principal faith of the region, with some 100 monasteries and 10,000 monks, all following the Mahāyāna; Xiyu ji, p. 204.


\textsuperscript{135} \textit{Samvarodayā} f. 56v3–4: \textit{śrīmadratnagirau sthitvā sarvasattvārthahetunā | kṛte-
yām maṇḍalopāyikā bhūvācār<y> | yena dhitamā | śrīsamvarodayā nāma maṇḍalo-
pāyikā} *samāptā (corr.: samāptah. Cod.) \& \textit{samvat a cū *proṣṭhapadarṣṇacatt-
turthyām (proṣṭhapada conj.: pretipada Cod.) rājādhīrājapāramesvaramarama-
bhāṭṭārakaśribaladeva + + vijayarāj<y> <e> likhitam | śrīmānadevamahā*vihāriyāsā-
kyabhikṣusādūśūrīdevasya (vihāriya conj.: vihāre Cod.) pustakam *<| yad atra
puṇyam tad bhavatu > (diagn. conj.) mātāpitṛgurūpdhyāyasakalasattvarāśe<r>
anuttara-jīnāna>phala*prāptaya iti (conj.: prāprnoti Cod.).

\textsuperscript{136} SHASTRI 1917, pp. 79–80 (ASB MS 10766). The manuscript is dated by the scribe in year 39 of the reign of Mahārājadhirāja Harivarman, on whom see MAJUMDAR 1971, pp. 209–210. Colophon: \textit{mahārājadhirājaśrimat-harivarmanda>prayasam-
vat 39 | sūryagatā ąsāhdhine 39. The postscript: sa>ca>tvārimaṣatigat e> vatsare
harivarmanah | māghasya kṛ>ṇasaptamātām ekādasadine gate | mṛtyuva cu>nicaduka-
yā gauryā svapnena drṣṭyā | kanisṭhāṅgu>lim adhyā *prṣṭayedam (corr.: prṣṭha-
yedam SHASTRI) udi>ritam | pūrvottare dīsōbhāge beṅgana>dyās tathā kule | | pacca-
tvaṃ bhāṣitavatāḥ| sapta>asamvatsarāriti.}
history of the transmission of its teachings maintained in the lineage that descends from Rva chos rab in the early twelfth century. For that relates that the Vimalaprabhā was transmitted by an emanation of Mañjuśrī to Paṇḍita Cilu, a native of Orissa trained at the Ratnagiri monastery, and reached Rva chos rab after being passed on through five intermediaries in Bengal and Bihar.\textsuperscript{137} A tradition that Cilu studied the Kālacakratantra in the Ratnagirimahāvihāra before seeking the Vimalaprabhā is recorded by Gzhon nu dpal.\textsuperscript{138}

The Candras of South-East Bengal

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

The Khadgas of Samataṭa

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

\textsuperscript{137} OROFINO 1994, pp. 17–23; Blue Annals, p. 755.
\textsuperscript{138} Blue Annals, p. 755.
\textsuperscript{139} EI 37:51, ll. 25–26.
\textsuperscript{140} EI 12:18, l. 6; EI 28:9, l. 8; and MAJUMDAR 1971, p. 201.
\textsuperscript{141} EI 38:35, no. 1, ll. 35–36; no. 2, ll. 6–7; no. 3, ll. 33–34. As for Pūrṇacandra (r. c. 850–875), there is no explicit evidence of his religious persuasion. MAJUMDAR (1971, p. 201) argues that since it is said in the Rāmpāl copper-plate that Suvarṇacandra, his son, “became a follower of the Buddha” (EI 12:18, ll. 5–7) it is probable that before him the family was non-Buddhist. This is not accurate, since the text says not that he became a Buddhist but only that he was one: buddhasya yah śaśaka-jātakam ankasamsthāṃ bhaktīyā bibhartiḥ bhagavān amṛtākarāṃśuh | candraśya tasya kulajātā itiva bauḍḍah[ḥ] putrah śruto jagati tasya suvarṇacandraḥ ‘His son was Suvarṇacandra, famed in the world, a Buddhist as though [simply] because he was born in the lineage of the Moon (/the Candra lineage), which out of devotion to the Buddha displays his incarnation as a hare in its markings’. The allusion here is to the story exemplifying the Buddhist Perfection of Generosity (dānapāramitā) that the Buddha gave away his own body as food when he was a hare in a former life, the śaśa-jātakam. The immediately preceding verse, which is devoted to Pūrṇacandra, says nothing substantive about him but only that his name is found as that of the first of the kings of this dynasty in Praśastis and other inscriptions.
the early years of the eighth century. Though the inscriptions do not include the epithet paramasaugataḥ they do speak of these rulers in equivalent terms. The first, Khadgodyama, is described in an inscription of his great-grandson Rājarāja as having conquered the earth after declaring his intense devotion to the Three Jewels: the Buddha, his teachings, and the Saṅgha.142 The same inscription tells us that Rājarāja gave land to these three;143 and another that Devakhadga, the father of Rājarāja, made a donation to the same for the longevity of his son.144 We have no evidence of any support given to Śaivism by these kings themselves. But a pedestal inscription on an image of the Śaiva Goddess records that it was gilded out of devotion by Prabhāvati, Devakhadga’s queen.145

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

That there were Buddhists among the Candras of Arakan is evident from the Mrohaung pillar inscription of Ānandacandra, which has been dated around the end of the third decade of the eighth century.146 This gives a list of the names and reign-durations of the kings who preceded him from c. 380 onwards with an interruption of unspecified length. After this interruption come the rulers of the Candra dynasty down to Ānandacandra himself, spanning in this second

---

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

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

144 Ashrafpur plate A (LASKAR 1907).

145 EI 17:24,4, ll. 1–2: tadātmajο dānapatiḥ pratāpi śridevakhadgo vijitārikhadgaḥ | rājñas tasya mahādevi mahiṣi śriprabhāvati | śarvāṇipratimāṃ bhaktā hemaliptām akhārayat ‘His son was the majestic donor (dānapatiḥ) Devakhadga, whose sword had defeated his enemies. The chief consort of that king, Mahādevi Prabhāvavatī, had [this] image of Śarvāṇi gilded’. The word dānapatiḥ is the standard Buddhist term for one who gives to monks, the Dharma, or the Buddha. The image (HUNTINGTON 1984, fig. 26) was found in the village of Deulbādi, near Comilla, together with a Śurya and small Liṅgas, all of brass.

The Śaiva Age

sequence a total of three hundred and fifty years. For most of his ancestors we are given no information other than their names and the lengths of their reigns, but the record is more forthcoming as it approaches the time of Ānandacandra himself. Vajraśakti (r. c. 649–665) is said to have died and gone to the world of the gods endowed with [the Buddhist perfections (pāramitāḥ) of] generosity, morality and the rest, and his successor Dharmavijaya (665–701) is said to gone to the same, this time defined as the Buddhist Tuṣṭa heaven, as a result of his firm commitment to the Three Jewels.147 Two short inscriptions from Vesālī of the time of his ancestors Nīticandra (r. c. 520–575) and Viracandra (r. c. 575–578) tell us that the wife of the former, queen Sāvitṛ-Çandraśrī, was a lay Buddhist (paramopāsikā) and that the latter established a hundred Stūpas.148

As for Ānandacandra, he calls himself a lay Buddhist and devotes nine verses to detailing his works of Buddhist piety, which included building many monasteries with his own name, establishing precious images of Buddhas, Bodhisattvas, and such [Mahāyāṇist] goddesses as Cunda, having hundreds of Buddhist scriptures copied, and giving to many monks from various lands, which is to say, that he fulfilled to the best of his ability his duty to honour each of the Three Jewels.149

Yet even this devoted patron of his faith did not neglect to extend his support to the followers of other religions in his realm. He tells us that although he is a Buddhist he desires the good of all beings, lest his cultivation of the Buddhist Perfection of Generosity (dānapāramitā) be incomplete, and so has established four Mathās for the housing of fifty brahmins, providing them with land and workers, and two others, the Ānandeśvaranātha and the Ānandamadhavamātha, whose names reveal that they were associated with a Śiva and a Viṣṇu established with his name.150 Moreover, a fragmentary copper-plate inscription (EI 37:13) from a

---

147 Inscription of the western face of the pillar at the Shittaung Pagoda, Mrohaung, Arakan (JOHNSTON 1944:A), vv.37c–40: vajraśaktis tataḥ [khśāto rājā devānayodbhavah || pratipāya jagat sarvam rājyam śoḍaśavatsaram | dānāśilādi-

148 samyukto devalokam sa yātavān || śrīdharmajayasamyukto lokānugrahataparāḥ || tatpaścād abhavad dhīraḥ śrīdharmavijayo nrpaḥ || saṭṭhīmśad abdāny upabhujya rājyam dharmeṇa nītīṣa ca jāyena caiva | ratnātrayānusmaranābhā-
yogāt sa devalokām tuṣitam prayaṭāḥ.

149 JOHNSTON 1944:A, vv.46–54.

150 JOHNSTON 1944:A, vv.55–56: pañcāsadbṛāhmaṇāvāsaṃ kṣetrabhrtyasamanvitam || vādyavādakasanyuktam kāritaṃ matācatusṭayam || somārthādviyājīve matḥās cānandamādhavah || ānandesvaranāmāpi naulakk[ē] ca mathaḥ || smṛtah. The practice of establishing a Viṣṇu with the founder’s name followed by -mādhava (as an alternative to the standard -svāmin) is in accordance with textual prescription; see Somaśambhu, BRUNNER 1998, p.311 (v.48), =Kriyākāṇḍakramāvalī,
site near Mrohaung recording a donation by queen Kimmājuvdevī of a village to a Buddhist monastery founded by herself begins by relating six generations of the ascendants of her husband the king. Unfortunately the names of this king and his ancestors have been lost through the scissoring off of strips from the top and right hand side of the plate. However, what remains conveys the unexpected information that all these kings were *paramāheśvarāḥ*. The editor of the inscription assigns it to the sixth century on the grounds of its close palaeographic similarity to the grants of Nīticandra and Viracandra, and argues that if the first of the six kings was, as is likely, Dveṇcandra, the founder of the Candra dynasty, then the king in question was Nīticandra’s father Bhūticandra (r. c. 496–520).\footnote{D.C. Sircar, *EI* 37:13, p. 64.}

Viracandra, he argues, is excluded by the fact that one of the two Vesālī inscriptions records his patronage of Buddhism. However, that a king should give to Buddhism and at the same time be declared a *paramāheśvarāḥ* in documents issued by the royal chancellery is quite within the bounds of possibility, as we have seen.

Other royals of eastern India who are identified as *paramasaugataḥ* in our period—apart from the imperial Pālas, to whom I shall turn presently—are Bhavadeva of Devaparvata in Samatāṭa (r. c. 765–780), the founder of the Buddhist monastery Bhavadevamahāvihāra at Paṭṭikera, modern Maināmati, Rājayapāla of the Kāmboja dynasty of Priyaṅgupura in the tenth, Madhusena, the Sena king of Gauḍa, in the thirteenth, and, in Orissa, Udayavarāha of the Mayūravaṇa at some time in the tenth to twelfth, the Nandodhava Dhruvānanda of Jayapura, the successor of the *paramāheśvarāḥ* Devānanda II, in the late tenth, and Kāntideva of Harikela in the ninth.\footnote{Sircar 1983a, Supplement:3, ll. 42–43 (Bhavadeva); Mitra 1971, p. 245 (Bhavadevamahāvihāra). *EI* 41:22, ll. 19–20 (Rājayapāla); the final colophon of ASB, MS 40785 dated in 1289; see Shastri 1917, p. 117 (Madhusena). Shastri 1920, p. 243, ll. 2–3, 6 (Udayavarāha). Tripathy 1930, p. 466, l. 24 (Dhruvānanda). *EI* 29:26, ll. 25–26 (Devānanda). *EI* 26:45, l. 14 (Kāntideva). The exact location of Harikela is uncertain, but it may be placed with some confidence in the area of Chittagong, that is to say, near Samatāṭa in the direction of Arakan.} The inscription that tells us that the last was *paramasaugataḥ* also conveys that Buddhism was the faith of his grandfather Bhadradatta. After a benedictory verse in praise of the Buddha it begins the eulogy of the donor’s forebears with this king, saying that his devotion to the Buddha had intensified his power and that he had [thereby] conquered all his enemies. His son Dhanadatta, the donor’s father, is
The Śaiva Age

praised only for his learning in poetry, the Epics, and the Purāṇas. Mention is made not of his religion but of that of his wife Bindurati, who is said to have been a devotee of Śiva.\(^{153}\)

The Pāla Emperors and the Great Monasteries of Eastern India

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

Under these rulers eastern India witnessed an extraordinary development

\(^{153}\) EI 26:45, ll. 3–: ...jayaty udāro durvāramāravisarasya jayī jinendraḥ || tadbhaktibalitāsaṅkrit bhujadvayaurjityavitijitipudarpatah || sa jayati dharmakarataḥ khyātaḥ śrībhadradatto yah || tasya subhāṣitabhāratapurūṇaraṇānāṁrāthavit tanayah || nāmnā śrīdhanadattah prakātiśaṁhitāmaṁāṇaṁyo yo 'bhūt || tasya gaurī mahābhūhṛṣṭutā budhagurustutā || patnī binduratir nāma yā babhūva śivapriyā

Victorious is the foremost of the Jinas, the exalted one who conquered the multitude of Māras so hard to ward off. His power intensified by devotion to him, the pride of his enemies overcome by the strength of his two arms, solely devoted to the Dharma, victorious is the famous Bhadradatta. His son was Dhanadatta. He understood the meaning of elegant poetry, the Mahābhārata, the Purāṇas, and the Rāmāyaṇa, and his uninterrupted greatness was made manifest [to all]. His wife was Bindumati, the fair-skinned daughter of a great king, praised by the learned and her elders, a devotee of Śiva.

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

\textsuperscript{155} The Derge edition of the Tripitaka contains 486 works (Tōh. 360–845) in the section of the Kanjur devoted to scriptural Tantric works and 2606 (Tōh. 1180–3785) in the section of the Tenjur devoted to works of Tantric scholarship, comprising commentaries on the Buddhist Tantras and works setting out observances (Śādhanas, Bali, Pratiṣṭhā etc.) based on them. All claim to be translations of Śanskrit originals and this claim is true in the great majority of cases. In addition there are numerous works surviving whole or in citation in Śanskrit that appear not to have been translated into Tibetan; and some of these, such as the Īśūdhopadā of Advayavajra, the Mandalapāyikā of Padmasūrimitra, the Vajravālodayā of Ānandagarbha, the Vajravāhīkalpa, the Sarvadevasamāgama, and the Herukasādhanā of Kalyāṇagarbha, have been used in this study.

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

Tāranātha, the author of this work, tells us that he wrote it on the basis of three Sanskrit sources that are now lost or inaccessible. The first is an unnamed work in 2,000 verses by a scholar of Magadha named Sa dbang bzung po, that is to say, Kṣmendrabhadra or a synonym such as Dharan.īndrabhadra. This covered the history of the religion up to the time of the Pāla king Rāmapāla (r. c. 1072–1126). The second is the *Buddhapurāṇa*, a work by Dbang pos sbyin (Indradatta) in 1,200 verses, which went beyond Rāmapāla to cover the successor dynasty of the Senas of Gauda. It may therefore be supposed to have been composed in that part of India, like the work of Kṣmendrabhadra. The third is a work of similar length covering the succession of Ācāryas and written by a brahmin scholar whom Tāranātha calls Bhaṭāghaṭī. This name is implausible as it stands. If, as is probable, it is is deformation of Vandyaghaṭīya, then it identifies him as a member of a well-known Rāḍhīya brahmin lineage of Bengal (> Bandyopādhya, Banerjee). Tāranātha claims to have relied primarily on the first of these three works, that is to say, for his account up to the time of Rāmapāla, since that source went no further. For the period of the Senas, who succeeded the Pālas, he must have relied on Indradatta alone. As for Vandyaghaṭīya's account of the succession of Ācāryas, it is probable that it consisted of, or extended to, an account of the succession of the Tantric Ācāryas of Vikramaśīla from its foundation in the eighth century to its destruction around 1200 by the forces of Muḥammad Bakhṭīyar Khaljī. For he adds a section in the manner of a supplement on the Ācāryas of Vikramaśīla after his treatment of the periods covered by his first two sources. His work, then, derives from Indian tradition, and while his sources were evidently inaccurate for the early history of Buddhism, we might expect them, particularly the work of Kṣmendrabhadra,

\[\text{the whole of Burdwan District, and Dakṣiṇarādhā, covering Bankura District and the non-coastal part of Midnapur District.}\]

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

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

Tāranātha attributes to Dharmapāla the building of the monastery of Vikramaśīla and to Devapāla the building of the monasteries of Somapura and Trikaṭuṭa). In this, however, he or his sources are confused. The claim that the monastery at Somapura was founded by Devapāla is contradicted by a terracotta seal found at the site bearing the legend śrisomapure śridharmmapāladeva-mahāvihare ‘in the Mahāvihāra of Dharmapāladeva at Somapura’, thereby indicating that it was founded not by Devapāla but by his father Dharmapāla. Evidence also contradicts Tāranātha’s claim that it was Devapāla that built the Trikaṭuṭa monastery. For Haribhadra reports at the end of his *Abhisamayalaṃkāraloka*, his great commentary on the *Āstasāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā*, that he composed it in this monastery during the reign of Dharmapāla and under his patronage.

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

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


162 *Abhisamayālaṃkāraloka*, p. 994, vv. 6–7: khyāto yo bhuvi puṇyākīrtinicyo vidvajjanalāmkrta tasmin sarvagnukanare trikaṭukṣaśrimadvihare śubhe dānāl labda-mahodayasya karunādevasya dharmatmanah sānāthyenā sukhopādhanānśaya sthitvā vivekāspade | krodhyautkūñjaraḥ khamapiḥ sūryāśīrṣāyıśaḥ śāktyātmanah puṇyaḥgāyasyāhābhīyogāvasat sampatsamādyayinaḥ | rājye rājyabhaṭṭidvāmsapaṭitāśridharmapālasya vai tattvālokavidhāhinyānās vairatī satpaṇjikeyam mayā ‘I have composed this excellent commentary that illuminates reality after taking up residence in the splendid Trikaṭukṣāvihāra that is famed throughout the world, the site of a mass of sacred edifices, adorned by learned men, a store of all the virtues, where [all] the means of happiness are to be found, a place of insight, through the support of the compassionate king Dharmapālā, who by means of donation has achieved pre-eminence; and I have done so] during the reign of this king, who born in the dynasty that descends from Rājyabhaṭa, full of power devoted to the rendering
In the case of the Somapura monastery it has been argued that we may salvage Tāranātha’s credibility by concluding that Devapāla did found this monastery, as Tāranātha claims, and that he gave it his father’s name rather than his own out of filial piety.163 This is indeed a practice of which there are other examples, its purpose being to transfer to the person named the religious merit generated by the creation and use of the foundation; but it is much more probable that Tāranātha is in error here, as he clearly is in the case of the Trikaṭuka monastery. For his history commits the fundamental error of reversing the true sequence of the two reigns, placing that of Devapāla before that of Dharmapāla.164 His attribution of the founding of Somapura and Trikaṭuka to Devapāla rather than Dharmapāla can, then, readily be explained as the result of this reversal. We may therefore suspect that his attribution of the founding of Vikramaśīla to Dharmapāla suffers from the same dislocation and that its true founder was his son Devapāla. That this suspicion is correct is confirmed by the Ādikarmapradīpa of Anupamavajra. For in its conclusion he tells us that he compiled the work following the instruction of Dharmākara, a monk whom he describes as “residing in the monastery called Vikrama constructed by king Devapāla”.165 Vikrama here is evidently a bhīma-vat contraction for Vikramaśīla.166 However, we may not conclude that everything that Tāranātha attributes to Dharmapāla was Devapāla’s doing, and vice versa. He reports, for

---

163 N.G. Majumdar in EI 21:16, p. 98, fn. 5.
164 Rgya gar chos ’byung, chapters 29 (Devapāla) and 30 (Dharmapāla). Tāranātha gives the order Gopāla > Devapāla > Rāsapāla > Dharmapāla; see Rgya gar chos ’byung, pp. 163–164: rgyal po de wa pā las lo bzhi bceu brgyad du rgyal srid byas | de’i rjes su sras rā sa pā la rgyal srid lo bceu gnis byas ‘King Devapāla ruled for forty-eight years. After him his son Rāsapāla ruled for twelve’. No Rāsapāla appears in the accounts of the dynasty given in the Pālas’ inscriptions. The name is perhaps a deformation of Rājyapāla (r. c. 917-952), the successor of Nārāyaṇapāla.
166 On Vikrama for Vikramaśīla see here p. 88.
example, Dharmapāla’s particular reverence for Haribhadra, a relationship that, as we have seen, Haribhadra himself attests. He also claims that Dharmapāla created about fifty religious foundations (dharmadhiḥkāraḥ), and that the majority, thirty-five, were for the study of the Prajñāpāramitā texts. It is at least probable that this bias was due to the influence of Haribhadra, given the latter’s close relationship with Dharmapāla and the fact that he was the pre-eminent scholar of his age in the exegesis of this literature.

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

---

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

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

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

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

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

\begin{flushright}
\textit{Rgya gar chos ’byung, p. 158, ll. 7–8: rgyal po go pa la ’di ’im de wa pa la i mtshams su dpal o ta nta püri’i gtsug lag khang bzheṅs ’The Otantapurī monastery was built in the period of this king Gopāḷa or that of Devapāḷa’; HBI, p. 262.}
\end{flushright}

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

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

As for Gopāla (r. c. 750–775), the father of Dharmapāla, whom all our sources make the first of the Pālas, there is no evidence in the inscriptions that he too was a Buddhist, unless it be his having been referred to in inscriptions of Nārāyaṇapāla (r. c. 860–917) and Vigrahapāla III (r. c. 1043–1070) as a second Buddha.174 However, the Rājavyākaraṇa claims him for the faith, saying that after a dissolute youth he converted to Buddhism and constructed various monasteries, Caityas, and temples.175 Tāranātha likewise claims that he served the cause of Buddhism by founding many monasteries, both in Bengal, which he ruled in the first part of his career, and Magadha, when he had added that great province to his kingdom through conquest.176 He also recounts a legend accord-
The Śaiva Age

ing to which Gopāla, when not yet king, found a jewel and used it as the fee for Tantric consecration from an Ācārya. He then successfully propitiated the Buddhist goddess Cundā following his instructions, and went to the monastery of Khasarpana Avalokiteśvara, and successfully prayed to him for kingship, which the deity promised he would obtain if he moved east.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

---

185 Rāmacarita of Sandhyākaranandin, introduction, p.9.
186 E.g. MOOKERJI 1951, p.595; Rahul SANKRITYAYANA cited by KOSAMBI in KOSAMBI and GOKHALE 1957, p.xxxviii; KRISHNAMACHARYA, p.1 of his Sanskrit introduction to Tarkabhāṣā (1942); MİTRA 1971, p.16; cf. HUNTINGTON 1984, p.196.
187 It is referred to as a Mahāvihāra in the colophonic verse of Muniśrībhadra’s Pañcakramaṭipanī (muniśrībhadra ciraṇ jagaddalamahāvihārasadbhikṣunā) and in 3.7 of the Rāmacarita of Sandhyākaranandin (jagaddalamahāvihāracitarāgām).
189 Subhāṣitaratnakoṣa, p.xxxvii, fn. 8.
190 bCom ldan ’das ma’i man ngag gi rjes su ’brung ba zhes bya ba ’i rnam par bshad pa, f. 320r2: mi yi dbang po rā ma pa las sa skyong mdzad pa’i <gnas kyi [Cone, Peking]> mu tig phreng ba ni | dpal ldan rgyal po dza ga ta la gnas par byed pa bdag gis rnam bshad ’di byas so.
191 Subhāṣitaratnakoṣa, p.xxxvii, fn. 8.
192 GOKHALE seems to have found his “coronation” in the dbang of mi yi dbang po rā ma pa las. The word is used in Tantric texts as a short form for dbang bskur ‘consecration’ (abhisēkāh), as at rGyud spyi, p.270, l.1. But in order to reach his understanding of the phrase in which it occurs he has had to forget the mi yi that
valuable information that the monastery was a royal foundation, since the Tibetan of its name dpal ldan rgyal po dza ga ta la, is evidently a translation of śrīmadrājajagaddala-, a form of the name confirmed by its occurrence in Sanskrit at the end of Mokṣākaragupta’s Tarkabhāṣā, in which he informs us that he too was a resident of this monastery (śrīmadrājajagaddalavihārīya-). But we remain ignorant of the king who founded it. We know that it existed in the time of Rāmapāla, and it is not impossible that it was indeed the work of this last great king of the dynasty; but no evidence of which I am aware precludes its having been created by a predecessor.

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

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

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

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

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

the Bodhi tree, as in the case of the approximately contemporary principal image in the central shrine of Monastery 1 at Ratnagiri, though that is somewhat larger than life-sized, the figure seated in the lotus posture being over two metres in height. See Harle 1994, p. 163; Huntington 1985, fig. 19.44. We see another example in the central shrine at Udayagiri (IAR 1997–98, Plate 101; 1998–99, Plate 48). 196 Rgya gar chos ‘byung, p. 165, l. 17–p. 166,5; HBI, p. 275. The three specialists are a gtor ma'i slob dpon, a rab gnas slob dpon, and a sbyin sreg slob dpon, i.e. a balyācārya, a pratiṣṭhācārya, and a homācārya.

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


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

200 This monastery is probably that known as the Sālban Vihāra, consisting like the monasteries of Vikramaśīla and Somapura of a massive cruciform shrine within a square enclosure which though considerably smaller than that of those monasteries was nonetheless of great size, each side being 550 feet in length; see Mitra in EITA, vol. 2, pt. 2, pp. 402–403.
monks there, all Mahāyānists, either as permanent residents or visitors, and over a 1000 learned scholars.\textsuperscript{201}

These royal monasteries are likely to have accumulated great wealth. The tax-exempt agricultural lands granted to them at the time of their foundation would have provided them with a substantial initial endowment: Huili reports that Nālandā’s was the revenue of about 100 villages;\textsuperscript{202} and the wealth from this source would no doubt have been augmented by subsequent land-grants\textsuperscript{203} and would certainly have been augmented by other votive donations, bequests from the estates of deceased laymen,\textsuperscript{204} and the profits of such non-religious activities as banking and the provision of irrigation and other agricultural facilities.\textsuperscript{205}

No doubt they would also have benefitted from the riches accumulated by individual monks in the form of the rewards (dakṣiṇā) that they earned by giving initiations, imparting instruction, installing images, consecrating monasteries and temples, reciting sacred texts, and performing rites for protection, funeral ceremonies, and the like.\textsuperscript{206} Tibetan sources record the very large amounts of gold which Indian and Tibetans required for such services. ’Brog mi agreed to give the Indian Gayadhara 100 gold srang, some 3,750 grams, each year for five years in return for the transmission of the esoteric Lam 'bras teachings;\textsuperscript{207} Zur po che să khya ’byung nas offered ’Brog mi 100;\textsuperscript{208} Rva los tsa bā gave 100 srang to the Nepalese Guru Bha ro phyag rdum for the Yamārī cycle instructions; Se

\textsuperscript{201} Beal 1914, p. 112.
\textsuperscript{202} Beal 1914, p. 112.
\textsuperscript{203} We have a record (\textit{EI} 17:17: the Nālandā copper-plate of Devapāla) of one such subsequent land-grant in the case of the monastery at Nālandā. This records that in the 35th year of Devapāla, c. 847, five villages were assigned for the support of the Buddha, the Dharma, and the Saṅgha of a new monastery (vihāra) constructed at this site by Mahārāja Bālaputradēva, the Śailendra king of Suvarṇadvipa (Sumatra). That the regnal year is the 35th is the view of SICAR (1983, p. 79, note 38). Hirananda Shastri read the numerals as 39 (\textit{EI} 17:17, l. 42).
\textsuperscript{204} The \textit{Mūlasarvāstivādavinaya} speaks of the validity of written wills in which wealthy laymen transfer their entire estate to the the Saṅgha; see Gilgit Manuscripts vol. 3, pt. 2, p. 140, l. 14–15, l. 1; and SCHOPEN 2004, p. 6. It also sets out rules obliging monks to accept permanent endowments of cash (akṣayaiṇī) (SCHOPEN, loc. cit.).
\textsuperscript{205} On the profit-making activities of Buddhist monasteries in the fifth and sixth centuries in India and in China under the Northern Wei (386–534) see Liu 1994, pp. 120–158. As for banking, the \textit{Mūlasarvāstivādavinaya} requires the funds of permanent endowments (akṣayaiṇī) for the Buddha, the Dharma, and the Saṅgha to be lent out on interest (vṛddhi) (SCHOPEN 2004, pp. 6–7, 47–49, 53). On monastic landlordism and the profitable management of irrigation works, in which local farmers were given access to such facilities in return for a share of their crops as a donation to the Saṅgha see SHAW and SUTCLIFFE 2003 and GUNAWARDANA 1979.
\textsuperscript{206} For the dakṣiṇā for the Tantric funeral ceremony see here p. 102.
\textsuperscript{207} Zhib mo rdo rje, p. 90, Blue Annals, p. 207
\textsuperscript{208} Zhib mo rdo rje, p. 92
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tsha bsod nams rgyal mtshan gave 50 srang to the Nepalese Kāyaśrī for the precepts of the Nam mkha’ skor gsum; Mar pa performed a rite to protect the sons of some wealthy men and charged 10 gold srang for each son;\(^\text{209}\) and the hagiographies of early Tibetans who travelled to India to acquire initiation and instruction abound in reports of the need to amass large quantities of gold for this purpose.\(^\text{210}\)

It would be rash to assume that the fortunes that were garnered in this way by Indian Ācāryas were added directly to the resources of their monasteries. A passage in the Mahāvairocanābhisambodhitantra, a text produced in the seventh century, at the beginning of the history of the Mantranaya as a fully-fledged path within the Mahāyāna,\(^\text{211}\) suggests that this was the case:\(^\text{212}\)

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

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

\(^{209}\) Blue Annals, pp. 377, 395, and 400.

\(^{210}\) See, for example, pp. 399–401 of the account of the life of Mar pa in the Blue Annals.

\(^{211}\) The earliest certain evidence of the text is its Chinese translation by Śubhākarasimha and Yijing registered in A.D. 725 (Taishō 848). But Hodge (2003, pp. 14–15) points out that Yijing’s Xiyuqiu faguosengzhuān (‘Record of Eminent Monks who Sought the Dharma in the West’) reports that the monk Wuxing, his contemporary in India, had died as he was setting out to return to China in 674, that texts he had collected were forwarded to China, and that three important Tantras are listed among these works: the Subhaupariprccchā, the Susiddhikara, and the Mahāvairocanābhisambodhi.

\(^{212}\) rNam par snang mdzad chen po mngon par byang chub pa’i rgyud, f. 173r4–7: sbyin sreg rjes la sngags pa yis | slob ma rnams la yon bslang ba | gser dang dangul dang rin chen dang | rta dang de bzhin glang po dang | rta mo ba lang ma he gos | gzhan yang dngos po ci yang rung | de tshe slob mas gus par ni | dad pa rab tu ldan pa yis | sems la dga’ ba bskyed nas su | bla ma ni yon bdul lo | yang na ci nas bla ma de | rab tu ngu bar ‘gyur bar bya | de ltar byas nas bdag bsrung ste | slob ma de pos bsgo ba ni | ’di ni bsod nams zhing yin zhes | sems can kun gyi don gyi phyir | skyob pa rnams ni kun gyi gsungs | rnam dag yon tan rgyas pa yi | dge ’dun la ni kun gyi byin.
at the head of the list, and the scripture *Laghusamvaratantra* goes so far as include a *rästram*, which I take to mean ‘the revenues of’ ‘a district’ or ‘sub-district’ of a kingdom and therefore to be envisaging the gift of a monarch. Moreover, the *Mūlasarvāstivādavinaya*, which was the predominant code of monastic law in eastern India and was thence adopted in Tibet, recognizes that monks had private property and that there could be great differences of wealth owned by individuals within the Saṅgha. However, it also insists that such property does not go to the king when a monk dies, as brahmanical law required in the case of those who die without offspring, but remains within the monastic community to which he belongs. Of course, a wealthy Guru could also donate his wealth to

---

213 Guhyasamājamanḍalavidhi, f. 16v1–2, v. 375c: bhūgajādisuvarṇādau ‘land, an elephant or [other mount], gold, and other [valuables]’. The *Mṛtasugati-niyojana* of Śunyasaṃādīvajra includes houses, land, and male and female slaves among the gifts that should be given to an officiant who performs the Tantric funerary ceremony (antyesṭiḥ): yojanako ‘pi suvibhavānuṟṟaṁ vastrālamkāraśayanānaśanapraghakṣetradāsidādikāṁ daksinām acārīya sādaram dadyāt (f. 4r2–3).

214 *Laghusamvara* f. 4r1–3 (3.11–14b): tatas tu gurave dadyāt tathāgatoktadakṣināṁ | nirjātyaṁ suvarṇaśatasahasramaṁ ratnāṁ vividihāni ca || 3.12 vastrayugmāsataṁ caiva gaja vājī rāstram eva ca || karnāḥharaṇa kaṭakaṁ ca kaṇṭhikāṅgulikaś ca samuttamam || 3.13 yajnopavītā sauvarnaṁ svabhārayām duhitām api || dāsa dāsī bhagnīṁ vāpi prānipatya nivedayet Then he should give to the Guru the daksinā prescribed by the Tathāgata. After prostrating himself he should give 100,000 [Palas] of the most precious gold, jewels of various kinds, 200 lengths of cloth, an elephant, a horse, and a *rāstram*, earrings, bracelets, necklaces, rings, and a crown, a golden caste-thread, his wife, his daughter, a male slave, a female slave, or his sister. The use of the term *rāstram* for ‘a district’ or ‘sub-district’ is seen in inscriptions; see SIRCAR 1966, pp. 277–278. My translation of the passage follows the text and interpretation of the commentator Bhavabhaṭṭa. The reading nirjātyaṁ, which he interprets as ‘most precious’, is suspect. The MS (*Laghusamvara*, f. 4r2) reads the much more satisfactory niryātya ‘having given’, as does the commentator Kambalapāda (*Sādhanaṇidhi*, f. 11v4); and this is also the reading seen in f. 54v3–5 of the *Saṃvarodayā nāma maṇḍalopāyikā* of Bhuvacārya of Ratnagiri in Orissa (see here p. 91), in the Nepalese *codex unicus* of 1056. See also *Catuspitihatantra* f. 60v1–2 (4.1.46–47), which includes a house, land with rights to mine, and grain: tato gurudaksināṁ dadyā śīya bhāvena nityasāh | atmapatīṁ saputraṁ vā bāndhavāḥ saha cētuṣkaṁ | haśi aśva gavādināṁ grha kṣetraś ca gotravān || sauvarnaṁ rajata tāmram vastrādī vrīdhānāyakaṁ. The *Vimalaprabhā* on *Kālacakratantra*, Abhisēkapāṭalā v. 198 explains that verse as meaning that the initiate should promise always to give to his Guru one sixth of all his inherited and self-acquired wealth in the form of gold, jewels, grains and the like, and a sixth of all his livestock. It adds that he is required to give his wife to the Guru five times each month (vol. 2, p. 144, ll. 17–22).

---

215 The inheritance of the property of deceased monks is treated in the *Mūlasarvāstivādavinaya* in the *Cīvaravastu* (*Gilgit Manuscripts* vol. 3, pt. 2, pp. 113–148). Particularly relevant in this context is its discussion of the case of the monk Upananda, who died leaving 300,000 in gold (pp. 117–121). King Prasenajit is persuaded that the estate does not belong to the crown and the Buddha rules that it should be
the monasteries during his lifetime by creating religious endowments. We have a striking example of this in the eleventh century. Rva Lo tsā ba, who had become extremely wealthy by charging for instruction in the Tantras—he is said to have established fixed rates for a wide range of texts—, sent 100 srangs of gold to Vikramaśīla to fund the recitation in perpetuity of a copy of the Pañcaviṃśatisāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā written in gold, two golden copies of the Aṣṭasāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā, and 100 srangs of gold to fund the recitation in perpetuity of eighty-four copies of the Prajñāpāramitāsāṃcayagāthā by eighty-four Panḍitas of the monastery.216

How closely the Pāla emperors and their bureaucracy were involved in the supervision of their Buddhist foundations cannot be determined from the available evidence. But it is almost certain that a Superintendent would have been appointed by the ruler to oversee their administration and that he would have required a substantial staff to enable him to do so. The Ratnāvali, a Mahāyānist work of uncertain authorship written before the sixth century,217 advises the unknown king to whom it is addressed on the proper administration of his realm distributed among the monks of his monastery: bhājayata yāyaṃ bhikṣava upanandasya bhikṣor mṛtaparikāram (p.119, ll.13–14). The main concern here is to ensure that the wealth of monks stays within the community, free of the state’s interfereee. For analysis of the treatment of these and related matters in the Mālasarvāstivāda-vinaya see SCHOPEN 2004, pp.3–6. The private property of a deceased monk was to be divided, directly or after sale, among the members of his community or, where this was not appropriate, as in the case of land, servants, and grain-stores, taken over for the use of the whole community (Gilgit Manuscripts, vol.3, pt.2, pp.141, l.4–143, l.1). But when the estate contained precious metals, worked or not, those were to be divided into three shares, one for each of the Three Jewels (Gilgit Manuscripts, vol.3, pt.2, p.143, ll.10–12: suvarṇaṃ ca hiranyan ca yac cānca ca kṛtakṛtaṃ trayo bhāgāh kartavyāh | eko buddhasya | eko dharmasya tṛtiyāh saṃghasya). That for the Buddha should be used for repairs to the monastery’s Buddha shrine (gandhakut) and relic Stūpas, that for the Dharma should fund the copying or enthroning of the Buddha’s teachings, and that for the Saṅgha should be divided among the monks (ibid., ll.12–14). In the case of jewels other than pearls half should go to the Dharma and half to the Saṅgha (ibid., ll.1–5). Manuscripts of Buddhist texts should be added to the monastery’s library and manuscripts of non-Buddhist texts should be sold and the proceeds shared (ibid., ll.5–7).

216 Blue Annals, p.377.
217 The work is attributed to the Nāgārjuna of Mūlamadhyamakakārikā fame. I consider this attribution to be doubtful in spite the fact that it is made by such authors of the sixth century and later as Bhāvaviveka, Candrakīrti, Haribhadra, Kamalaśīla, and *Ajitamitra (Mi pham bshes gnyen), who wrote the only known commentary on the text, which has come down to us in a Tibetan translation made by the Bande Dpal brtsegs with the Indian Vidyākaraprabha in the early ninth century. The Ratnāvali itself contains no evidence of its authorship and VETTER (1992) has cast doubt on the traditional attribution through an analysis of its metre and word frequency.
and begins by declaring: “Appoint for all religious foundations a Superintendent of Religion (dharmadhikṛṭaḥ) who is energetic, without avarice, learned, and virtuous, who will not oppress them”.\textsuperscript{218} It goes on to advise him on the qualities he should look for in those whom he appoints as ministers (sacīvāḥ), military commanders (daṇḍanāyakāḥ), and superintendents (adhikṛṭāḥ), telling the king: “Have them submit to you complete monthly accounts of revenues and outgoings and, after hearing these, personally conduct all business pertaining to religious foundations and the rest”.\textsuperscript{219} This, of course, is not evidence of what was done in the Pāla realm. But as I read the passage it is the qualities and duties of these various officials that are the subject of injunction, not their existence; and there is certainly nothing exceptional in the office itself, since we have evidence that it was normal in kingdoms throughout the Indic world.\textsuperscript{220} Ab-

\textsuperscript{218} Ratnāvalī 4.22: sarvadharmadhikāreṣu dharmadhikṛtam utthitam | alubdham pāṇḍitam dharmaṃ kuru tesāṃ abādhakam. The term dharmadhikārah, which elsewhere is used to refer to the office of the Superintendent, is clearly used here in the meaning ‘religious foundation’, as the Tibetan translation chos kyi gzhi agrees, and as it occurrence earlier in the same passage (4.18) confirms: dharmadhikārah ye cānaye pūrvarājaprawartīṭah | devadronyādayas te ‘pi pravartyantāṃ yathā sthitāḥ ‘And you should ensure that temples and other religious foundations created by former kings should continue as they are’. This sense of the word is also found in Licchavi inscriptions; see LKA 71, ll.12; and 81, l.11–12: bhaviṣyadhīn api bhūatibhīh pūrvarājaktadharmadhikārapālanādṛtair bhavitavyam ‘Future kings too must take care to maintain religious foundations created by kings of the past’.

\textsuperscript{219} Ratnāvalī 4.26: pratimāsam ca tebhyaṃ tvam sarvaṃ āyavyayam śṛṇu | śrutvā *dharmadhikāradyam kāryam sarvam (Tib. chos gzi sogs kyi don kun nyid) svayam kuru.

\textsuperscript{220} In the Abhijñānasākuntala of Kālidāsa Duṣyanta, wishing to conceal his identity from Śākuntalā tells us that he has been appointed by the king to the office of Superintendent of Religion and accordingly has come to her hermitage in his official capacity to satisfy himself that they are free of hindrances to the performance of their rites; Act 1, after v.22, p.38: bhavati yah pauraven rājā dharmadhikāre niyuktaḥ so ‘ham avighnakriyopaśambhāya dharmāranyam āyātah. The fifth Dāmodarpur copper-plate inscription, of 533/4, recording a formal request for the purchase of land in the Kot vaśī district to be given to a nearby temple, speaks of it being presented with the full knowledge of the Office of Religion (dharmadhikāra-buddhyā) (EI 15:7, p.143). A banker Ralhan. a has the title dharmakarmadhikāri ‘the superintendent of religious activities’ in the Kharod inscription dated in 1181/2 of Ratnadeva III, the Kalacuri of Ratnapura (EI 21:26, l.28: śrēṣṭhinā ralhane-nātra dharmakarmadhikārinā). The humorous play Āgamaḍambara, composed by the Kashmirian philosopher Jayantabhaṭṭa and set in the Kashmir of his own time, during the reign of Śāṅkaravarman (883–902), has a Śaiva ascetic inform us that a brahmin Śaṃkarṣaṇa has been appointed by that king to the dharmaraksādhikāraḥ, the ‘Office of Superintendent of Religion’ for the whole country (Act 3, Prelude, p.132: śakalāe yevvā vaśumdhalāe dhammalaśkādhihāle niutte (*sakalāyā eva vaśumdhāraiyā dharmaraksādhikāre nīyuktaḥ)). The term dharmadhikṛtaḥ occurs in a fifteenth-century inscription from Nīlācala, the site of the famous temple
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sence of thorough external control of the great monasteries seems all the more unlikely when one considers that apart from the fact that they were such large and wealthy establishments it was not the case that by building, equipping, and endowing a monastery a patron surrendered his ownership entirely. The patron continued to be the owner of the monastery and its contents (mahāvihārasvāmī, vihārasvāmī) in some sense and the monks were obliged to employ all these for the purposes for which they were designated, the return for the owner being the constantly augmenting merit that was generated for him by their repeated use (paribhogāṇvayam punyam). Only where there was no such use, as in the case of a Caitya, did a donor gain merit once and for all by the simple act of surrendering ownership (tyāgāṇvayam punyam).221

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

---

221 On this crucial distinction between paribhogāṇvayam punyam and tyāgāṇvayam punyam see Vasubandhu, Abhidharmakośabhāṣya on 4.121a (caitye tyāgāṇvayam punyam ‘In the case of a Caitya there is merit that accrues from surrender’): caitye sarāgasyatmārtham dānām ity uktam | tatrāsāt upabhoktari katham punyam bha-vati | duvidham punyam tyāgāṇvayam tyāgād eva yad upadāyate paribhogāṇvayam ca deyadharmaparibhogād yad upadāyate | caitye tyāgāṇvayam punyam (4.121a) ‘It has been said that a gift to a Caitya made by one who is not free of attachment is for his own benefit. Since there is no enjoyer of the gift in such cases how can there be merit [generated by such a gift]? Merit is of two kinds: tyāgāṇvayam, which arises only from the surrender [of ownership of what is given], and paribhogāṇvayam, which arises from the enjoyment of a pious gift [by the recipients]’. One should note that the restrictive particle eva is used here only after tyāgād. Vasubandhu does not state conversely in the case of paribhogāṇvayam punyam that this kind of merit arises only (eva) from the use of the donation. I infer that merit in such cases was understood to arise both from the act of surrendering possession and from subsequent use. This is confirmed by Candrakirti, who in his Prasannapadā, commenting on paribhogāṇvayam in Madhyamakakārikā 17.5a, speaks of the goods used as ‘surrendered’ (parityaktasya). See Abhidharmakośabhāṣya on 4.4ab addressing the conundrum of how the Buddha’s doctrine of moral action as intention (cetanā) can be reconciled with this claim of the accretion of further merit (punyavrddhiḥ) whenever a recipient uses something donated whether or not the donor is aware of it; and Sanderson 1995c, pp. 38–40.

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

homenāsrvgiśahasitena (em. [Tib., cited in Ed. mi rus kyi bye ma khrag dang dug dang bcas pa dang]: mānusāsthićurnahō + + + visahasitena Cod., Ed.) māndalavighnam nivārātyatmaśisyabhūpalādīsāntikahomam kuryāt ‘After having removed [all] impeding spirits from the Maṇḍala by offering into the fire powder of human bone mixed with blood and poison he should perform a fire-sacrifice for the warding off of dangers from himself, the candidate(s) for initiation, and the monarch or other [ruler]’; and Dīpankarabhadra, Guhyasāma jaman. d. alavidhi f. 16v1, vv. 373–374 (a concluding rite): saty eva saṁbhavate saṁtyekam vāmāpāṇinā | sauvānguṣṭhakam āghrya sāntim kuryād vidhānataḥ || trisaptāhutim ekām vā rājñō va bhūpatera atha | dikpālasvātmasāntu ca huvā yāceta daksinām ‘With his left hand he should take hold of the right thumb [of the person who has been initiated] and make offerings into the sacrificial fire in accordance with the prescribed procedure, doing this for each [of the initiates in turn], if that is possible. Having made twenty-one oblations or just one to ward off danger from [each of these and, then from] the monarch or [lesser] ruler, also from [the Vajrācāryas who have officiated as] the Guardians of the Directions and himself, he should request his fee’. The rite of offering at this point a sāntikahomah of twenty-one oblations for each of the candidates while holding their right thumbs with the left hand is derived from Mahāvairocanaḥbisambodhitrantra, but the extension of that rite in order to protect the king, the Guardians of the Directions, and the main officiant himself is an innovation not found there; f. 172v5–6 ... 173r3–4: slob ma sdig dang bral ba kun | de ltar legs par btsud nas ni | de dag zhi bar bya ba’i phyin sbyin sreg cho ga bzhin du bya ... de nas slob ma re re nas | mkhas pas lag pa gyon pa yis | g.yas pa’i mtho bong bsung nas su | mnyam par bzhag pas sbyin sreg bya | yid ni mnyam par bzhag nas su | sreg blugs re re las kyang ni | gsang sngags cho ga bzhin zlos shing | nyi shu rtsa gcig sbyin sreg bya | na ma sa ma nta bu ddhā nām | oṃ ma ha śaḥ *nti (em. : nta Cod.) ga ta śaḥ nti ka ra pra sha ma dha rmna ni rjā ta a bha ba svā bha ba dha rmna sa ma tā prā pte svā hā | sbyin sreg rjes la sngags pa yis | slob ma rnam las yon bslang ba ‘When he has in this way introduced all the sin-free disciples [before the Maṇḍala] he should duly perform a fire-offering to ward of danger from them. ... Then the learned [officiant], should concentrate himself and make offerings into the fire, after grasping the right thumb of each disciple with his left hand. With his mind concentrated he should offer twenty-one oblations for each, reciting according to the Mantra rite NAMAH. SAMANTABUDDHANAM | OṂ MAḤĀṢĀNTIGATA ŚĀNTIKARA PRAṢAMADHARMANIRJĀTA ABHĀVASVABHĀVADHARMASAMATPRĀPTE SVĀHĀ. After the fire-offering the Mantrin should request his fee from the disciples’.

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

225 On the imperial Great Monasteries of China and Japan (Ch. ta si, Jpn. daiji [Skt. – 107 –
than autonomous, self-governing institutions.

**The Pālas’ Engagement with Śaivism**

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

In the ninth century Devapāla is praised in a charter of his son Mahendrapāla for having built two temples of outstanding beauty during his rule, one for the Buddha and the other for the consort of Śiva; and Mahendrapāla is reported to have established a temple for the emaciated goddess Carcā (Carcikā/Cāmunḍā). An eleventh-century Prāsasti from Bāṅgarh, ancient Koṭivarsa in Varendri, also called Devikotā and Šoṅitapura, informs us that Nayapāla had the Sāiddhāntika Sarvaśiva as his royal preceptor (gaudarājaguruh), and that when Sarvaśiva retired he passed this office to his brother Mūrtiśiva. This implies that Nayapāla received Śaiva initiation, since to initiate the king is fundamental to the Śaiva Rājaguru’s role. It also tells us that at the site of this inscription Mahipāla I, Nayapāla’s predecessor, had bestowed a Kailāsa-like monastery on Sarvaśiva’s predecessor Indraśiva. Mahipāla is described here as a ‘knower of reality’ (tattvavit), which suggests in this Śaiva context that he too had received Śaiva initiation, which suggests in turn that the gift of the monastery was his Guru’s daks.īna. It is probable, therefore, that Indraśiva too, like his successors Sarvaśiva and Mūrtiśiva,
had held the office of royal preceptor.\textsuperscript{228} I know of no direct evidence that Mahipāla’s successor Vigrahapāla III had a Saiddhantika Rājaguru, but it is likely that he did, since in his Āṃgāchi copper-plate inscription he is described as ‘devoted to Śiva’s worship’,\textsuperscript{229} and there is evidence which strongly suggests that this tradition was still in place under his successor Rāmapāla. For in the twelfth century the South-Indian Saiddhantika Trilocanaśiva tells us that his preceptorial line descends from a Dharmāṃśaṃbhu (Dharmāṃśaṃbhu) who had held office as the royal preceptor of “the king of Gauda”, a standard expression for the Pāla rulers.\textsuperscript{230} Since three preceptorial generations intervene in that account between Dharmāṃśaṃbhu and Trilocanaśiva, it is probable that this king was Rāmapāla.\textsuperscript{231}

\textsuperscript{228} The Bāngarh Praśasti of Mūrtiśiva (SIRCAR 1983b), found at Śivavāṭi (mod. Śibbādi) in the vicinity of Koṭivarsa, ll. 8–9: 9 śrīmān indrasivāh sphutām hariharaprāyām śivendrākrtim bhīhrat vāṃsāvibhūṣaṇam samabhavac chisyo ‘śya punyātmanaḥ | yasmai kāṅkanaṃpuṇjāmājuraracitaprādamerusphurakālasābhamaṃthaṃ dadāv iha mahīpālo nṛpas tattvavīṣ: ll. 11–12, reporting that Indrasiva’s successor Sarvaśiva was the royal preceptor of Nayapāla: rājno śrīnayapālasya gurus tattvaśivām varaḥ | śrīmān sarvaśivas tasya śīśyo ‘bhūd bhūṣaṇam bhūwaḥ; and ll. 13–14, reporting that Sarvaśiva resigned his office as the Gaudārjaguru in favour of his brother Mūrtiśiva: 14 yenāvavijagauḍarjagurutālakṣmīr nibhāṛtarī śrīmān mūrtiśive nīveṣya vipināvīṣam suvayam vāṅchataḥ | kṣīrodārnavavamnathoṣṭhitimalalakṣmīṃ svāṣiṣye harāv ārōpyāharato viṣaṃ pasupater vṛttāntam udghāṭitam.

\textsuperscript{229} EI 15:18, ll. 17–19 (v. 12): pīta <h> sajanalocanaiḥ smarariṇō pūjānuraktāḥ sadā samgrāme caturo ‘dhikā ca haritā kālaḥ kule vīdeśām | cāturvarṇyasamā- śrayāḥ sitayasāhpunjājar jagad raṅjayān śrīmadvigrahapāladevanaprātī jajīte tato dhāmabhṛt ‘From [Nayapāla] was born the illustrious king Vigrahapāladeva, who was drunk by the eyes of the virtuous, ever devoted to the worship of Śiva, more skilled in battle than Indra, the god of Death to the families of his foes, support of the four caste-classes, white-washing the world with the multitudes of his stuccoed temples’.

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

\textsuperscript{231} Colophonic verses at the end of Trilocanaśiva’s Somaśambhupaddhativyākhyā (IFP, MS Transcripts 457 [T1] and 170 [T2]; edition in BRUNNER 1963–1998, Pt. 4, 422–427 [B]): 1 śrīcedirajabhuvi *śaivajānakārakhaśriγolakī- yaṃthagabhavāviṣaça yo ’sau (śaivajānakārakhaśriγolakī- yaṃthagabhavāviṣaça yo ’sau) (lista B) | 2 saivajānakārakhaśriγolakī-yaṃthagabhavāviṣaça yo ’sau (śaivajānakārakhaśriγolakī-yaṃthagabhavāviṣaça yo ’sau) (lista B) | 3 bhāvāviṣaça yo ’sau conj.: bhāvāviṣaṣaya&sau T1 T2 B | tadvāmṣaṣaḥ śivamātamalakṣmāvettā śrīdharmāṃśambhūr iti gauḍapatindranāthah | 2 tasmād asāv anala- śāṅkaradesiḥo bhūd divyāgamāṃbundhir *ihitakalpavṛkṣaṃ (T1: ititakalpavṛkṣaṃ B) | svargaukasāṃ api padām vacāsā labhante *yasayaiva (conj. B: yasyaiva T1 T2) janmamaraṇaiṅkaṃbhayāṃ (T2: bhayam T1) nirastāh | 3 *śrīγolakīyasamā- tānavyomavavāpyā (γolakīya T2 B: kolakīya T1) tataḥ śivah | śrīsomaśambhūr ity āśīt kalau lokahitaya vai || 4 jnānāsaktivapuṃs tasmāj jñānāsambhūḥ sadā- śivah | yenedam dyotitam sarvam śaivajānānāmalārcisā || 5 somārkavamāṃsaranṣa- mauli*vilolitāṅghri (T2 B: vilolitāṅghri T1) vidvajjanānānasarojadvākaro mām
There is other evidence of these kings’ engagement with Śaivism. The poet Saṃdhyaśakranandin describes king Madanapāla, Rāmapāla’s second son, as a devotee of Śiva; and a pedestal inscription of 1026 recording renovations of Buddhist structures at Sārnāth by two Pāla princes Sthirapāla and Vasantapāla, also tells us that Mahāpāla I had engaged them to have hundreds of temples of Śiva, Citraghanta, and other deities built in Benares and that he did so after offering obeisance at the feet of the Guru Vāmarāśi of that city, who, as we can infer from his name in -rāśi, was a Śaiva ascetic of the Atimārga.

232 Rāmacarita 4.35b: śivapraṇāya.

233 The Sārnāth inscription of Mahāpāla (HULTZSCH 1885): om namo buddhāya | *vārānasisarasyām (corr. : vārānaśisarasyām Ep.) guravasrīvamārāsipādābham | arādhya namitabhūpatishīrurhāiḥ saivalādhiśam (?) | iśānacitrabhūtādhitiratnātātāni yau | gaudādhipah mahīpālah kāsyāṃ śrīmān akārāyat | sapalikrtaṇḍitītyau bodhāv avinivartanau | tau dharmmarājikāṃ sāngam dharmmacakram puṇar nnavam | kṛtvāntau ca navēnām aśtamahāsthānasailagandhakutim | etām śristhirapālo vasantapālo 'nujah śrīmān ‘Obeisance to the Buddha. Sthirapāla and his younger brother Vasantapāla, whom the Glorious Mahīpāla, the ruler of Gauḍa, caused to erect hundreds of fine temples for Śiva, Citrāhaṇṭa, and [other] gods in Kāśi after worshipping the venerable Gurava Vāmarāśi’s feet, the lotuses that beautify the lake that is Vārāṇasi, with [strands of] duckweed *clinging to them (?) in the form of the hair of the kings that bow down to them, have made the Dharmaṛājikā, a new Dharmacakra together with its ancillaries, and a new Buddha-shrine from stones of the eight sacred places, having made their learning bear fruit, refusing to turn back in their quest for enlightenment’. The reading saivalādhīsam is surely a mistake, for if it were sound it could only yield the absurd meaning ‘overlord of duckweed’. The meaning required by the context would be secured by saivalāsāṅgam. This has the advantage that it echoes a verse in Kālidāsa’s Kumārasambhava (5.9), which is likely to have been in the
Similarly, the Bhāgalpur copper-plate inscription of Nārāyaṇapālā (r. c. 860–917) records his establishing a Śiva and granting a village to it and the association of Pāšupatācāryas (pāśupatācāryaparisaṭ) attached to the foundation; and though it gives him the epithet paramasaugataḥ it reports that he had been responsible for the building of a vast number of other temples for this deity.234

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

---

235 Verse 23ab: [su]dha`subhram kāncanasimhakumbha`irasaram . . . That a Vadābhi temple housing an image of a goddess should be distinguished from others by being surmounted by [two] lions and a finial, and that Vadābhi temples are principally for the housing of goddesses, is prescribed in the Śaiva Pratisthātantras, Tantras, that is, which specialize which the building and design of the various kinds of temple are being edited, translated, and analyzed in a doctoral thesis being prepared by my pupil Elizabeth Harris.


237 Verse 27: `sailāṇi mandirāṇy atra mandarāṅkāni `yāni ca | + + + + + + + + kṛtā `ya nava candikāh `and here stone temples of the Mandara kind . . . the Nine Candikās.

238 Verse 28ab: devikoṭe hetuksesaya sambhor yah prāśadām `śailam uccair akārṣit. For the Hetuksesvara of Devikoṭa/Kotivāra (modern Bāṅgapāl) see Sander son 2001, fn. 4, p. 7; also Picumata f.8r–3–4 (3.119c–123), which requires the installation of Hetuksesvara as Bhairava in the northeastern segment of the initiation Mandala: iśāne tu diśabhāge kotivarsa prakalpayet | 120 vaṭām tatra samālikhya tatra sūlokaṃ likhet | diksu caiva vidikṣu ca sūlaprotā likhet tathā | 121 sāla tasyāgātā likhya kuṇḍāsavyai ca mahātape | paṭṭisam pūrva nyāṣya vaṭasyādhaś tato priyē | 122 aṣṭapatram likhet padmaṃ tathaiveha na sambhayaḥ | hetuksesvaram ālikhya sādāśvatanus tathā | 123 karnikāyaṃ mahādevi mahābhairavarūpinaṃ | rudrāṣṭakasamapetam pūrvavad devi cālikhet; and Niśisāmcāra f.17v (4.20–21): koṭi`varṣe karṇamoṭi
finial and a water reservoir, a temple of Śiva Varākṣeṣvara together with a monastery and reservoir, a temple of Viṣṇu (v. 33), a temple of Ghaṇṭiśa and of Bhairava surrounded by the sixty-four Mothers ‘in his own city’, a temple of Śiva Vaṭeṣvara at Campā, and a Vādabhī temple on a hill-top with a flight of

\[ \text{mahābalakulodbhava | šūlahastā sthitā devi saravyogeśvaresvarī || tasmin kṣetre sthitā devi vaṭavṛksasamāśritā | kṣetrapālo mahākālīyo} \]

The origin myth of the cult of Heteṣvara, Bahumāṃśa (= Karṇamoṭi/Cāmuṇḍā/Carcikā), and the other Mothers (Mātris) at Kotivarṣa is narrated in chapter 171 of the early Skandapurāṇa-Ambikākhaṇḍa. Śiva promises the Mothers there that he will compose Tantras of the Mothers (mātr. tantrāṇi) to guide their worship. The names of these reveal them to be the Yāmala-tantras; see Sanderson 2001, pp. 6–7, fn. 4.

Verse 30: kṣemēṣvarasyāyatanam kṣemānkarogravamayasyamarāreḥ | cakāryo mūrdhṇi diptayatasatākumbhakumbham vyadhāt tatra mahāsaras ca. In a passage describing Varendrī (3.1–27) in the Rāmacarita, completed in the time of Madanapāla (r. c. 1143–1161) but relating events that occurred during the reign of Rāmapāla (r. c. 1072–1126), Śaṃdhīyakaranandin devotes six verses to the deities of the region (3.2–7). There Kṣemēṣvara appears with Heteṣvara or with Heteṣvara and Caṇḍēṣvara as one of only two or three deities individualized by a personal name (3.2–5: kurvadbhiḥ sam.devena śrīhetvāṣvara devena | caṇḍēṣvarābhidhānena kila kṣemēṣvarena ca sanāthaiḥ || ...sambhāvatākalusabhāvām), the others mentioned being generic: the twelve Ādityas, the eleven Rudras, Skanda, Viṣṇu, the Vasus, the Viṣṇudevas, and the Lokapālas. Heteṣvara here is surely identical with the Heteṣvara of Kotivarṣa mentioned above. As a synonymous form it was probably substituted for metrical convenience. It is not clear from the Sanskrit whether Śaṃdhīyakaranandin intended Caṇḍēṣvara to be understood as an alias of Kṣemēṣvara or as the name of third local Śiva. I am not aware at present of any external evidence that removes this doubt.

Verse 32: ...maṭham ca sarasim ca | dhāma varākṣeṣvara iti sambhor api śaīlam uttālam.

Verse 35: ghaṇṭiśaṃ yah svanagare nyadhāt kṣemāya dehināṃ | catuḥsastāḥ ca mātṛnām parītām tatra bhairavam. This Ghaṇṭiśa is perhaps a double of the Mahāgaṇṭeṣvara/Mahāgaṇṭha identified by the Picumata (3.77c–83) as the Bhairava of Virajā, modern Jajpur in the Cuttack District of Orissa, formerly the capital of the Bhauma-Kara kings: āgneye (em.: āgneyam Cod.) virajāyāṃ tu trikūtaṃ tatra cālikhet | 78 nānāvṛkṣasamākīrṇaṃ ulūkaiḥ ca pūrṣobhitam | nandiṇī ca chagalam caiva kumbhakarṇaṃ mahābālam || 79 hetukaṃ tatra devesaṃ śaṃsānena *samam nyaset (conj: samabhyaṣet Cod.) | tatropari likhec chaktim karāṇjaṃ ca mahādrumam || 80 tasyādāhastāl likhet padman aṣṭapatrām sakarnikam | karṇikāyam likhed devam mahāghaṇṭaṃ tu bhairavam || 81 kātiḍeṣe tathā caiva ghaṇṭāsaptapatiḥbhūtim | rudrāstakasampetām bhairavākāraprīpibhiḥ || 82 rudrānāṃ bāhyato devi yogināḥ sāt smālikhet | yamaghaṇṭa karāḷa ca mahājīvhā kharānanaḥ || 83 karāḷi dantura caiva nāmaïs caitāḥ prakṛtitāḥ | rudracakram ca sansvesyā śaddikṣa ca kramāt sthitāḥ; and 3.136cd (f. 8v2–5): āgneye mahāghaṇṭeṣvaram likhet; 30.25dc: āgneyapakajae caiva mahāghaṇṭeṣvaram nyaset. Ghaṇṭiśa- is evidently Ghaṇṭeṣa- modified by Middle-Indic Sandhi (−a/−a + i > ‑r).
steps for the emaciated goddess Carcā (Carcikā) previously established by king Mahendrapāla,243 the re-excavation of the step-well (vāpi) of the sage Matanga at Dharmāranya, the building of a lofty temple of Śiva Mataṅgeśvara at that site (v.43),244 the building of a temple of Lakṣmī (v.44), the erecting of a golden Triśūla at Sāgara (v.45),245 the building of a temple of the Sun-god (v.46), the provision of a golden cover for [the Līṅga of] Śiva Vaidyanātha,246 the installation of a golden finial on the temple of Śiva Aṭṭahāsa (v.50),247 the making of a silver image of Sadāśiva, golden images of Caṇḍikā and Gaṇeśa (v.53) with golden pedestals, a Moon-god, a Sun-god of silver, a golden lotus engraved with images of the Nine Planets (vv.54–55)—all these are ancillary deities of Śaiva worship—, and a bejewelled golden Śiva (v.56), the building of a monastery and the installation in it of an image of Viṣṇu in his [Pāñcarātrika] Vaikuṇṭha form (v.61), and the building of a high Vaḍabhī temple for the goddess Piṅgalāryā.248

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

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

modern state of Bihar.

243 Verse 40: mahendrapālacarcāyā mahendrasadrśodayah | yaḥ sa interle vadabhīṁ saile sopānena sahākarot. Carcā/Carikā is the fearsome emaciated goddess commonly known as Cāmuṇḍā or Karṇamoṭī; see here p. 231.

244 Dharmāranya is at Gayā in southern Bihar. Its Matanga hermitage, its step-well of Matanga, and its temple of Mataṅgeśvara are mentioned in Agnipurāṇa 115.34–36.

245 This is probably Gaṅgāsāgara/Gaṅgāsāgarasamgama, where the Ganges flows into the Bay of Bengal, listed in Śaiva sources as one of the Śaiva sacred power sites, e.g., in the list of the siddhiksetrāṇi given in the Niśvāsatattwasamhitā, f.42r1–3 (Niśvāsaguhyasūtra 1.29–33b).

246 Verse 48: kholam akāri rukmaracitam śrīvaidyanāthasya tat. Temples of Śiva Vaidyanātha are found in various parts of the subcontinent. However, SIRCAR is no doubt correct in his annotation of this inscription (EI 39, p.41) that this is the Vaidyanātha of Deoghar (24°29′ N, 86°42′ E) in Jharkhand, this being revered as one of Śiva’s twelve Jyotirlingas.

247 Perhaps at Aṭṭahāsa, now Labpur (23°50′ N, 87°49′ E) in the Bhirbhum District of Bengal. The name of the Śiva at this Śiva and Śākta sacred site is Mahānāda (e.g. Matanapāratmaśvara, Vidyāpādas 20.53ab: mahānādasya nāthasya cāṭṭahāsākhyan eva hi | vimalaṁ vimalasyoktam sthānaṁ rudrasya śobhanam); but Aṭṭahāsa being nearly a synonym as well as the name of the site may have been an alias.

248 Verse 63cd: iyam api valabhi grāvabhir uttungā piṅgalārīvyaḥ.

249 In addition v.34 records the founding of a hospital (ārogyaśālā), and v.57 gifts to brahmins.
reports that Nayapāla had a Buddhist preceptor in the person of Mahāvajrāsana Puṇyākaragupta.\footnote{Rgya gar chos 'byung, p. 185, ll. 7–9: rgyal po 'dis rdo rje gdan pa chen por grags pa la mchod de | de dge bsnyen gyi dus kyi mtshan pu nā ya shmicros | rab tu byung ba'i mtshan pu nā yā ka rā gu pta'o 'This king [Neyapāla] venerated [the teacher] called Mahāvajrāsana. During his time as a lay Buddhist, his name was Puṇyāsrī. His ordination name was Puṇyākaragupta'; HBI, p. 305. In Tāranātha’s text the name of the king is given as Neyapāla. But there can be no doubt that it is Nayapāla that is meant. For there is no other Pāla whose name ‘Neyapāla’ approximates, and Tāranātha’s chronology of Neyapāla fits this king’s reign. He relates that his reign began shortly before Dipankaraśrījñana (Atīśa) left for Tibet, which is not far out, since Nayapāla came to the throne in approximately 1027 and Dipankaraśrījñāna set out for Tibet in 1038.}

\textit{Buddhist Kings of Eastern India and their Commitment to Brahmanism}

Nor is it the case that royal devotion to the Buddha in eastern India during this period weakened in this region the traditional commitment of Indian rulers to the imposition and preservation of the caste-based brahmanical social order in which Śaivism was embedded. For in the Neulpur grant of the Bhāma-Kara king Śubhākara I his grandfather Kṣemāṅkara is described both as a Buddhist and as having ensured that the members of the caste-classes and disciplines observed their prescribed roles;\footnote{EI 15:1, l. 2: svadhāmāropitavarnāśramah paramopāsako ... śriṣemāṅkara-devah.} in his Terūndīā copper-plate inscription Śubhākara II, the grandson of Śubhākara I, is given the epithet paramasaugataḥ yet is also commended for having ‘propagated the system of uncommingled caste-classes and disciplines proper to the [perfect] Kṛta Age following the unexcelled [brahmanical] scriptures’;\footnote{EI 28:36, ll. 8–10: paramasaugataḥ ... niratiṣayaśastrānusārapravartitakṛtayugocītāsaṅkīrṇāśramavayavasthah.} the Pāla Dharmapāla is described in a grant of his son Devapāla both as a paramasaugataḥ and as taking measures to ensure that castes that erred were made to adhere to their respective duties, thereby discharging his father’s debt to his deceased ancestors;\footnote{The Mungir copper-plate grant of Devapāla, KIELHORN 1892, p. 255, l.28: paramasaugataḥparamesvaraparamabhaṭṭārakamahārājādhirājaśrīdharma-pāladevapādānudhyātah paramasaugataḥ paramesvarah <h> paramabhaṭṭārako mahārājādhirāja <h> śrīmān devapāladeva<h>; and ll. 8–9 (v.5): sāstrārthabhājā calato ‘nuśasya varṇān pratiṣṭhāpayatā svadharma | śrīdharma-pālāena sutena so ‘bhūt svargasthitānām anṛṇāh pitṛnām [Gopāla] became free of his debt to his ancestors in heaven through his son Dharmapāla, who, adhering to the teachings of the [brahmanical] Śastra, after chastising those [members of] caste-classes that stray makes them adhere to their prescribed duties’. Cf. Viṣṇudharmottara 2.65.55: varṇāśramavayavasthā tu tathā kārā viśeṣataḥ | svadharmaprayucitān rājā svadharme viniyojaye ‘The king must above all establish the castes-classes and disciplines with the proper distinctions between each. He should force those} and Vigrahapāla III is...
described in his Āṃgāchī copper-plate as the support of the four caste-classes.\footnote{EI 15:18, v. 13c: cāturvarṇyasyamāśrayaḥ.} Moreover, most of the surviving inscriptions of the Pālas, Candras, and Bhaumakaras record grants which they made in favour of Brahmins. The Rāmpāl copper-plate grant of the Candra Śrīcandra strikingly exhibits the extent to which this double allegiance was unproblematic for such Buddhist donors. Following a practice widely attested in non-Buddhist donative inscriptions the gift of land is said to have been made over to its brahmin recipient after the pouring of water and the performance of a fire-sacrifice, in this case a koṭihomah.\footnote{On the brahmanical koṭihomah see Sanderson 2005a, pp. 382–383.} This is simply adapted to the donor’s faith by dedicating the offerings to the Buddha rather than to Śiva or Viṣṇu.\footnote{DIKŚHIT 1938, pp. 39, 41–42, 49, 50, 52, 53, 54, and 58, commenting (p. 58) that brahmanical and Buddhist gods are equally and promiscuously represented on the terracotta plaques, and that among the brahmanical deities Śiva is the most frequently represented both on those and in the stone relief sculptures. For the forms of Śiva found here see his Plates XXXa–d, XXXa–e, XXXIXf (Linga), XLI d–2, and XLIV a and e, LVle (Mukhalinā), and LVIIIa (Umāmaheśvara).}

It seems, then, that royal patronage, reflecting no doubt the balance of allegiance in the wider population, ensured that Buddhism, for all the liberal support it received from the Pālas, was in no position to out or diminish Śaivism, even in this region. The monasteries themselves reflect this symbiosis. The excavations at Somapura revealed an abundance of non-Buddhist deities, particularly Śiva, among the stone relief sculptures around the base of the central temple and the very numerous terracotta plaques that decorated its walls.\footnote{EI 15:18, v. 13c: cāturvarṇyasyamāśrayaḥ.}
Excavations of the Vikramaśīla monastery also uncovered a mix of Buddhist and predominantly Śaiva non-Buddhist images, the latter Śiva, Umāmaheśvara, Śiva and Pārvatī, Bhairava, Mahiśāsuramardini, Pārvatī, Kaumārī, Cāmuṇḍā, Gaṇeśa, Kārtikeya, the Navagraha, Vṛṣabha, Viṣṇu, and Sūrya.258

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

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

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

---


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


262 FINOT 1904a, pp. 84–99.
kluñ Sudañḍa[vā]sa and his son Pov kluñ Dharmapātha installed a Śiva Deva-liṅgeśvara and in 911, the year of the inscription, built a Vihāra for a Vṛddha-lokeśvara, which is to say, a Vihāra associated with a deity Vṛddhalokeśvara, which was installed there around this time since it is evident from its name that it was established with the name of their grandmother, princess Lyaṁ Vṛddha-kulā, the grandmother of the senior wife of Jayasimha-varman I.  

A stele at Mi-son of 1092 records that King Jayendravarman (alias Paramabuddhaloka), described as versed both in the Mahāyāna and in the brahmanical Dharma-śāstras, established two Buddhist deities, a Buddhalokeśvara and a Jayendra-lokeśvara, but also two goddesses, a Jayendraśvari, and an Indragaurīśvari, both probably Śaiva, and between 1085 and the year of the inscription gave to Śiva Śiśanabhadreśvara a Liṅga-sheath of gold and silver alloy adorned with jewels, an inner shrine of sandalwood, silver, gold, and jewels, various items of gold and silver, elephants, and male and female slaves, and beautified his temple with silver and gilded its pinnacles.

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

---

263 HUBER 1911, pp. 299–311.  
264 FINOT 1904b, pp. 970–975.  
265 DE CASPARIS 1992, pp. 482–483; KERN 1885 and 1913, p. 104, ll. 14–15: mataṅ yan rake halu śrī lokēśvaradharmaṃśa ailingānantaikramottungadewa-sangijīṇā kāśṭvan śrī mahārāja, de mpunku sogata maheśvara mahābhrāmana iri-kang śākakāla 941 ‘Wherefore he was confirmed with blessings by the high dignitaries of the Buddhists, Śaivas, and Mahābrāhmaṇas under the name of Rake Halu Lokēśvara Dharmaṃśa Ailinga Anantākramottungadewa in Sāka 941’.  
266 Nāgarakṛtāgama 8.3–4; PIGEAUD 1960–1963, vol. 4, p. 13. This event is referred to by PIGEAUD in his translation (1960–63, vol. 3, p. 10) as “purification (ceremonies)”. The term used here is the Sanskrit prāyaścittam (8.3d: prāyaścittam ri kālaning *srauṣaṇa [conj. PIGEAUD : grahaṇa Cod.] phalagna mahapalha hay-waning sabhūvana). The function of the ceremony, therefore, was expiatory: to cancel the effects of any errors, omissions, or excesses in observances and conduct during the period since the last performance. KERN, accepting the reading
(dharmādhyakṣa) of these two communities had official quarters in the east and west to the south of the royal compound, and that his sovereign was dedicated

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

Nāgarakṛtāgama 12.5; Pigeaud 1960–1963, vol. 4, p. 25. For a map showing the location of these quarters within the palace compound (kraton) see Hall 1996, p. 99. Pigeaud claims (ibid.) that both are regularly mentioned in the preambles of the royal charters of Majapahit. This is so in the Decree Jaya Song of c. 1350, the Ferry Charter of 1358, and the undated Charter of Batur (Pigeaud 1960–1963, vol. 1, pp. 104–114 [edition]; vol. 3, pp. 151–164 [translation]). They are named in the first after the ministers: the Dharmādhyakṣa of the Śaivas (dharmādhyakṣa ring kaśevas), Rājapārakrama, alias Dharmarāja, and the Dharmādhyakṣa of the Buddhists (dharmādhyakṣa ring kaso-gatans) Āryādhīrāja Kanakamuni, described as a master of the Buddha’s teachings and grammar (bodhisāstrawāyakaranaśastrariparipūrṇa). In the second the Dharmādhyakṣa of the Buddhists has become Nādendra, described in the same way (bodhatarkkawāyakaranaśastrariparipūrṇa) and we learn that the second name Dharmarāja of the Dharmādhyakṣa of the Śaivas is his nāma puspapātā, that is to say, the name he acquired during his initiation through the casting of a flower (puspapātāḥ) in accordance with standard Śaiva procedure (e.g. Svācchānta-tantra 4.62cd: puspapātavāsāṃ nāma kārṇetā sādhakasya tu ‘He should name the Śadhaka in accordance with the casting of the flower’; Bhūtakālottara f. 91v4: puspapātānusāreṇa samjñā *taptpurvato [em.: taptpatrato Cod.] hitā ‘The [element of the] name before that [such as -śiva which indicates the initiate’s caste] should be [given] in accordance with the casting of the flower’). In the third the Dharmādhyakṣa of the Buddhists is Āryādhīrāja [Kanakamuni], as in the first, described as a master of grammar and the [Buddhist] Tantras (vyakaranatantraparipūrṇa), and that of the Śaivas is Ārya Harṣarāja, described as a master of logic and grammar (nyāyavyakaranaśastrariparipūrṇa). They are mentioned along with a number of other learned men, six in the first, seven in the second, and five in the third, referred to as “teachers of Law and settlers of law suits” (dharmmapra-wakta vyayagāravicchedaka) in the first and second and as “settlers of law suits as valid or not” (nyāyānyāavyayagāravicchedaka) in the third. They are no doubt the officials referred to elsewhere as the Dharmapapattis (see here p.105). In the first they are (1) Śivanātha, (2) Marmanātha, (3) Smaranātha, (4) Jayasmara, (5) Agreśvara, and (6) Munindra. In the second they are (1) Śivanātha, (2) Agreśvara, (3) Jayasmara, (4) Widyānātha, (5) Śivādhipa, (6) Śrīghana, and (7) Samatājñāna. In the third they are (1) Marmanātha, (2) Smaranātha, (3) Mahānātha, (4) a second Smaranātha, and (5) Agreśvara. Munindra in the first and Śrīghana and Samatājñāna in the second were Buddhists, a fact already evident from their names but confirmed by the charters’ reports of their fields of expert knowledge. We learn from the first charter that Śivanātha, Smaranātha, and Agreśvara were adherents of the Bhairava sect (bhairavapakṣa), that is to say, Sākta Śaivas, and that
to the support of both religions (81.1–2). Moreover, in the opening verse of his poem he pays homage to him as Śiva-Buddha in human form.\textsuperscript{268}

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

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

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

\textsuperscript{270}Nāgarakṛtāgama 36.2b: para wiku śai sogata āryya nālighī iniring nirekhi tān adoh.

\textsuperscript{271}Nāgarakṛtāgama 41.1d: pradipa *śiwabimba (KERN : śimbha PIGEAUD) śobhita rikang sudharmma ri kīḍal.
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at Jajagu;\(^{272}\) Kṛṣṇanagara, r. 1268–1292, who is depicted as a devout initiated Tantric Buddhist and described after his death as “liberated in the world of Śiva-Buddha”,\(^{273}\) and was installed in a Śiva-Buddha in “his own place” and, with his queen, Vajradevi, in a Buddhist image combining Vairocana and Locana at Sagala.\(^{274}\) Kṛṣṇarāja Jayavardhana (r. 1293–1309) was installed in a Buddha in the palace and a Śiva at Simping,\(^{275}\) and Jayanāga (r. 1309–1326), who is described as having returned to the world of Viṣṇu,\(^{276}\) in Viṣṇu in the royal compound, Śilā Pēṭak, and Bubat, and in a Buddha in the form of Amoghasiddhi in Sukhalila.\(^{277}\) We also learn that there was a temple founded by Kṛṣṇanagara at Jajawa, located at the foot of the sacred mountain Kukuwus, which was Śiva but had a Buddhist pinnacle and contained a Śiva with an image of Akṣobhya above its crown, and that both Buddhists and Śivas worshipped in it.\(^{278}\) The in-

---

\(^{272}\) Nāgarakṛta-gama 41.4b: ṇīnārma ta sire ṇiwaṭwīmbha len sugatawīmbha mungwīng jajaghu.

\(^{273}\) Nāgarakṛta-gama 43.5c: sang mokteng ṇiwabuddaloka. His commitment to Buddhist is indicated in 42.3c (samaya len brata mapagēh apākṣa sogata) and 43.2a (bhakti ri pada śri śākyasiniṁhāśthiti). As for his involvement in Tantric Buddhism we learn that he received Buddha consecration (jīnābhīṣekāḥ) and was then given the name Jñānavajrēśvara (42.2bc: lurmā nāma jīnābhīṣekānāra sang śri jñānabajrēśvara), that he devoted himself to Tantric worship following the otherwise unknown Subhātitantra as his principal guide (43.3b: mukyang tantra subhuti rakwa tinggōt kēmpēn), and that he celebrated the esoteric Tantric ritual known as gaṇacakram (43.3d), an indication that his Tantrism was that of the Guhyasamāja or one of the Yoginītantras. His initiation-name appears in the forms Jñānaśivavajra and Vajrajñānaśiva in the Śanskrit inscription (KERN 1910) on the lotus-cushion of an image of himself in the form of the Mantranaya deity Mahāksobhya installed at Simpang in Surabaya in 1289 (vv. 12–13: śrījñānaśivavajrākhyas cittaratnavibhūṣaṇaḥ jñānaramīvinśuddhāṅgaḥ samboḍhijñānapāraṇagahḥ || subhāktā taṁ pratiśthāpya svayam pārvam pratiśthitam śmaśāne vurarenāṃni mahāksobhyaṁyurūpaḥ; 19d: vajrajñānaśivā + +). All three forms of the name have the appearance of a Śaiva-Buddhist hybrid.

\(^{274}\) Nāgarakṛta-gama 43.5d: riṅke sthānanirān śīnārma śīwabuddārca haḷp nottama; 43.6: hyang werocana locanā luirirān ekārca prakāseng prajā.

\(^{275}\) Nāgarakṛta-gama 47.3b–d: drāk pinratiṣṭa jīnawīmbha sireng purī jro | antahpura ywa panlaḥ rikanung suḍārma saṭwāpratiṣṭa sira teko muwaḥ ri simping.

\(^{276}\) Nāgarakṛta-gama 48.3a: sang nrpati mantuk ing haripada.

\(^{277}\) Nāgarakṛta-gama 48.3bcd: śīghra sirān śīnārma ri dalm purārcanira wīṇawīmbha paraṃ | len ri šilā pēṭak muang i bubāṭ padā pratima wiṣṇumūrtty anupama ring sukhalīla tang sugatawīmbha śobhitām amoghasiddhi sakala. His installation in Viṣṇu is without parallel among the Singhasari-Majapahit kings; see PIGEAUD 1960–1963, vol. 4, p. 141. However, the kings of Kaḍiri, the principal court of East Java through the twelfth century to c. 1222, were devotees of this god. Most were described as his embodiments (DE CASPARIS and MABBETT 1992, p. 327) and his incarnations are central to the literary epics (kakawin) of the Kaḍiri court (HALL 2005, pp. 2 and 8).

\(^{278}\) Nāgarakṛta-gama 56.1b–2c: kīrtti śri kṛṣṭanāga prabhū yuyut nareśvara sira |
timate co-existence of the two traditions is also apparent in the intertextuality of religious texts in Java, as has been demonstrated for the Śaiva Jñānasiddhānta and the Tantric Buddhist Sang hyang Kamahāyānikan and Kalpabuddha. It is also seen in the great frequency with which the Mahāyāna-Buddhist concept of emptiness (śūnyatā) is incorporated in Javanese Śaiva sources through the inclusion of the terms śunya and śūnyatā among those used to characterize the highest reality, in the readiness of the redactors of Śaiva liturgies to supplement sets of Śaiva elements with Buddhist elements when they needed to make up a total for the sake of the numerical correspondence, and in the fact that the Kuṇjarakarṇa of the Buddhist Mpu Dusun the supreme Buddhist deity Vairo-
cana is made to equate the divine pentads of the Śaiva and [Pāśupata] Rṣi sects with the five Tathāgatas, teaching this in the context of an assertion that he is the ultimate reality that assumes the form both of the Buddha and of Śiva, and that it is because the followers of the three sects fail to understand this undifferentiated ground that they dispute with each other for the pre-eminence of their respective Gods. The same idea is seen in the works of the Buddhist Mpu Tantular. In his Arjunawijaya he has the priest of a Buddhist temple-complex (boddhaharma) explain to Arjuna that its central deity Vairocana is one with Sadāśiva, that its four ancillary deities, the directional Tathāgatas Akṣobhya, Ratnasambhava, Amitābha, and Amoghasiddhi, are one with Rudra, Brahmā, Mahādeva, and Viṣṇu respectively, that there is no distinction between the Buddha and Śiva, and that therefore it is the king’s duty to support all three sects, the Buddhists, the Śaivas, and the Rṣis. Later, in his Sutasoma, Mpu Tantular states that the Buddha and Śiva are “different but one” (bhinneka tu-nggal ika), the famous formula that has been adopted as its official national motto by the modern state of Indonesia, as two manifestations of the ultimate reality of the former.

---

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

283 Kuṇjarakarṇa 22.3.

284 Arjunawijaya 26.4–27.1

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

286 Arjunawijaya 30.1–2.

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

Now, this co-existence of Buddhism and Śaivism under royal patronage was surely facilitated by the fact that the form of Buddhism adopted and developed was one that had equipped itself not only with a pantheon of ordered sets of deities that permitted such subsumptive equations but also with a repertoire of Tantric ceremonies that paralleled that of the Śaivas and indeed had modelled itself upon it, offering initiation by introduction before a Maṇḍala in which the central deity of the cult and its retinue of divine emanations have been installed, and a system of regular worship animated by the principle of identification with the deity of initiation (devatāhamkārah, devatāgarvaḥ) through the use of Mantras, Mudrās, visualization, and fire-sacrifice (homāḥ); and this was presented not only as a new and more powerful means of attaining Buddha-hood but also, as in the Śaiva case, as enabling the production of supernatural effects (siddhiḥ) such as the averting of danger (śāntiḥ), the harming of enemies (abhicāraḥ), and the control of the rain (varsāpanām and ativrṣīḍhāraṇām), through symbolically appropriate inflections of the constituents of these procedures. The latter is particularly important from the point of view of Buddhism’s relations with its royal patrons, since such rituals enabled it to match the Śaivas by promising kings more tangible benefits than the mere accumulation of merit through the support of the Buddha, his teaching, and the Saṅgha. We have seen an example of such ritual for the protection of the state in Tāranātha’s report of the programme of Tantric fire-sacrifices performed at Vikramaśīla under the direction of Buddhajñāna during the reign of Dharmapāla (r. c. 775–812) to ensure the longevity of the Pāla dynasty;288 we have another example in the case of Kṛtipaṇḍita, a Mahāyāna-Buddhist scholar and Tantric expert who according to the Vat Sīthor stele inscription became the Guru of the Khmer king Jayavarman V (r. 968–1001) and was engaged by him to perform frequent fire-sacrifices in the palace for the protection of the kingdom;289 and the Javanese Prapaṇca tells us that the purpose of king Kṛtanagara’s adherence to Tantric Buddhism was and Śiva, whereas SUPOMO’s reading makes Mpu Tantular espouse a doctrine of absolute equality between the two religions within a reality beyond both. This is intrinsically implausible in a Buddhist work. My reading makes his view exactly that expressed by Mpu Dusun in 23.4bcd of the Kuṅjarakarna cited and translated above: “I, Vairocana, am embodied both as the Buddha and as Śiva”.

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

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

290 Nāgarakrtagama 42.3d: tumirva sang atitarāja ring usāna magēhakna wṛddining jagat; 43.3c: pūjā yoga samādi pinrihīran amriḥ sthyanyāng rāt kabeḥ; 43.4cd: darmmeṣṭapagēḥ ing jinabrata mahotsāheng prayogakriya nāhan hetuni tusni tusnira padaikacakatra dewaprabhu.
291 On the adoption by the Buddhists of the practice of royal initiation and its propagation in India, Tibet, Mongolia, China, Japan, and Southeast Asia see SANDERSON forthcoming a.
292 Maṃjuśriyamālakalpa, p. 32, ll. 21, 23, and 28–30; Sarvadurgatipariśodhana- tantra, sections 47b, 48a, and 49a.
twelve or six (about 5 or 2.5 metres).293

The Mantranaya also followed the example of the Śaivas by devising Tantric ceremonies for patrons in the public domain: for the consecration (pratiṣṭhā) of temple images (pratimā), paintings of deities on cloth (paṭah), manuscripts of sacred texts (pustakam), monasteries (vihāraḥ), shrines (gandhakuti), Caityas, reservoirs (puṣkarinyādi), gardens and the like (ārāmādi). It also adapted the Śaiva procedures for funerary initiation to produce a Tantric Buddhist funeral

293 Sarvavajrodaya, f. 29r5-29v1: evam kṛtvā pūrvasvām maṇḍalam ālīkhet. . . . rājīto hastaśataṃ paṇcāsaddhastam vā sāmamamahāsāmantānām paṇcāsat paṇcaviṃśatḥiḥastam vā sreṣṭhināḥ sārthvāhāṣya vā paṇcaviṃśatim tadadham vā sādhabakānāṃ dvādaśaḥbhastam sadghastam vā.

294 The details of this wide repertoire of the rituals that a Tantric Buddhist officiant (Vajrācārya) was called on to perform are set out in a number of manuals that are closely comparable to the Paddhatis of the Śaivas, notably the Kriyāsamagraṇhapāṇijīka of Kuladatta (TANEMURA 2004b), the Vajrāvalī of the great Abhayakaragupta of Vikramaśila (1064–1125 according to the chronological tables of Sum pa mkhan po Yes shes dpal 'byor [1704–1788]; works dated in the twenty-fifth, thirtieth, and thirty-seventh years of the reign of Rāmapāla [c. 1072–1126]; Vajrāvalī written before the first of these; see BÜHNEMANN and TACHIKAWA 1991, pp. xiv–xvi), which adds procedures for the consecration of reservoirs, gardens, and the like (A, f. 2r1 in the list of topics: pratimādiṣṭhā | puṣkarinīdiṣṭhā | ārāmādiṣṭhā), and the Ācāryakriyāsūmaccaya of Mahāmanḍalācārya Jagaddarpana, which incorporates much of the Vajrāvalī but adds some new material, notably a final section on the funeral ritual for a deceased Vajrācārya (nirūtavajrācāryāntyeṣṭilaksanavidhiḥ; B, ff. 240v7–244v4), which is an unacknowledged incorporation of the whole of the Mrtasugatiniyojana of Paṇḍita Śūnyasamādhivajra (less its two colophonic verses). One other text giving a Tantric funeral procedure survives in Sanskrit, the Antasthitikarmoddhāsa, at the end (ff. 15r8–15v11) of the Guhyasamāja-based Maṇḍalopāyikā of Maṇḍalācārya Padmas Kırimitra of the Khasarpaṇa monastery (f. 15v10–11: saṃpāt ca maṇḍalopāyikā | kṛitrīyam khasarpāṇya maṇḍalācāryapadmaśrimitraṣya). On these texts and the incorporation of the Mrtasugatiniyojana by Jagaddarpana see TANEMURA 2004a and 2007. On the Śaiva prototype of funerary initiation see SANDERSON 1995a, pp. 31–33 and, for its adaptation, the Mrtodḍhāraidāsa, in which a simulacrum is substituted for the body of the deceased, 2005b, pp. 264–267. A fourteenth-century Paddhati for this Mrtodṛhāraidāsa survives in ff. 88v1–91r1 of the Gurupustikā of the Kashmirian Rājānaka Śītikantha. In an earlier publication (SANDERSON 2007a, p. 395, fn. 549) I proposed that this work, then known to me only indirectly from the Rājānakaśvamśaprasāmsa of his patrilineal descendant Rājānaka Ānanda, who reports that it was composed at the request of [king] Saṃgrāmasimha, might be preserved in a Śāradā manuscript listed with this title as belonging to the Sayaji Rao Gaekwad Central Library of the Banaras Hindu University (MS CN. 4115). I can now report that this is indeed a manuscript of that work and, as far as I am aware, its codex unicus. The name of the author is confirmed on f. 1v11–12: karmāṇupārvīṣṇṛtaye keśāṃcid upayoginīm | śītikanthas samasyainām vidhatte gurupustikāṃ; and the claim that he wrote at the request of Saṃgrāmasimha is confirmed on f. 13v15–14r1: asmākāṃ kuṭāyāṣya saṃgrāmamahībhūḥ | abhyarthitānām dīkṣāthām ayaṃ paddatidodahāḥ. I am very grateful in this matter to my former pupil Christopher Wallis, who after
rite (antyeṣṭiḥ) for initiates, in which, as in the Śaiva case (antyeṣṭidikṣā), the officiant draws the consciousness (jñānam) of the deceased back into the corpse from the other world, takes it again through the initiatory process of consecration and the rest (abhisekādi) before a Maṇḍala, and then sends it out through the top of the head to ascend to liberation or a pure Buddha-field such as Sukhāvatī.

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

According to Padmaśrīmitra the ritual is to be done for Ācāryas and others who have practised the meditation-rite of Vajrasattva or some other Tantric deity; f. 15r8, v. 1: mṛtācāryādīsattvā ye vajrasattvādiyogināḥ | vakṣ<e> cāntasthite<h> kṛtyaṃ teṣām mārganidarsanāt. It may be done for a man or a woman; f. 15r10–11, v. 9ab: purusatanu<ṃ> nirūpyātha striya vā samyag eva hi. Śunyasamādhivajra does not specify those for whom it is intended. But Jagaddarpana adds a preamble to Śunyasamādhivajra's text in which he restricts it to Vajrācāryas; f. 240v7: adhunā parinirvṛtavajrācāryaśārīrasāṃyānteṣṭividhīr ucyaṭe.

In the Maṇḍalopāyikā's prescription the Ācārya visualizes that the purified consciousness of the deceased is drawn out of the corpse by a multitude of rejoicing deities filling the sky and placed by them in a world such as Sukhāvatī inhabited by Buddhas and Bodhisattvas; f. 15v2–3: 28 sambudhabodhisattvādi-viriniśvīrvardakah | siddhānandhavabhubhujaiḥ surair vidyāharaḥ api | 29 pūraṃ nibhastalah vīkṣya *nipatatpūpavrṣṭikam (nipatat em. : nipatatāḥ Cod.) | tad diyaundubhidvānumuraṇaḥ *mardaladhvani (mardala conj. : mardala Cod.); f. 15r13, vv. 18c–19: uttarābhimukho mantri samḍūpya maṇḍalam baliṃ | dattvārghādikāṃ caiva sam sādhya maṇḍalam kṛti | sthāpayen maṇḍaladavṛī prácyam tu daksīṇāmukham.
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Genesis and Development of Tantrism

*The Mahāvairocanābhisamābodhi, the Mañjuśrīyamūlakalpa, and Buddhaguhya*

That this transformation of the Mahāyāna had been achieved by absorbing and adapting non-Buddhist practices was evident from the beginning. For the *Mahāvairocanābhisamābodhi*, our first major Buddhist Tantra, later classified as the principal work of the Caryātantra class, was conscious that it would be accused of just this:

O [Vajrapāni,] Lord of the Yakṣas, in time to come there will arise people of inferior understanding and no faith who will not believe this teaching. They will dissent and have many doubts. They will hear it but they will not take it to heart and they will refuse to put it into practice. Being themselves unworthy they will bring others too to ruin. [For] they will say that this is not the teaching of the Buddhas but belongs to the outsiders.

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

298 See here p. 101.
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The Saiva Age

The Mañjuśrīyamālakalpa, another early Buddhist Tantric text, assigned to the lowest class of Mantranaya texts, known as the Kriyātantras, is more explicit in this regard; and it has good reason to be so since it contains in its chapters 47–49 an assimilated version of the cult of Tumburu and his four sisters, that is to say, the cult of the vāmasrotaḥ division of the Saiva Vidyāpiṭha, describing the Mantras of these deities as the highest and most secret of all the non-Buddhist (laukika-) Mantras. Moreover, it teaches that any of the

---

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

301 Mañjuśrīyamālakalpa, introductory prose before 47.1: sarvalaukikamantrāṇām sārabhūtata tamaṃ paramaraha syaṃ. The position within Śaivism assigned by this text to the cult of the four sisters suggests that, though later largely eclipsed by other traditions of the Vidyāpiṭha, it was once pre-eminent; and this is also circumstantial evidence in favour of the hypothesis proposed above (p. 50) that this cult was one of the earliest, perhaps the earliest, of the esoteric Śaiva systems. There is certainly much other evidence of its early centrality. As we have seen, it was known to Dharmakirti (here p. 50), and a 6th-century manuscript of one of its texts survives amid the otherwise Buddhist Gilgit manuscripts (here p. 50). The Viṣṇudharmottara shows knowledge of only two Śaiva deity-systems in its section on iconography: the Saiddhāntika and this (3, Adhyāya 66, teaches the iconography of Tumburu and his sisters). The Advaitin Śaṅkara in his Gitābhāṣya on Bhagavadgītā 9.25, in which it is said that those who worship the Spirits (bhūtejyāḥ) reach the Spirits (bhūtānī yaṁti) [when they die], glosses bhūtānī as vināyakamātrganacaturbhaginyādinī ‘such as Viṇāyaka, the Mothers, and the Four Sisters’. On his date, probably eighth century, see Harimoto 2006. These deities were also incorporated in the traditions of Māndalas of the Nayasūtra and the Mahāvairocanābhisambodhi that reached the Far East in the eighth century (see Sanderson 2001, p. 8, fn. 5). Their cult was the basis of the Śaiva ritual performed to inaugurate the kingdom of Angkor at the beginning of the ninth century (ibid. and 2005a, pp. 355–358); and there too, where the Mantramārga was preserved in an early form, we see only the Siddhānta of its earliest texts and this cult. This co-existence is also evident in the Śaiva liturgies of Java and Bali, which are of Saiddhāntika character but incorporate these deities (see Goudriaan 1973 and
Mantra-procedures taught in the Śaiva and Gāruḍa Tantras\(^{302}\) will be effective if applied by Buddhists in the Maṇḍala of these converted deities.\(^{303}\) Thus the Buddhists envisaged by this text have the whole array of Śaiva Mantras at their disposal; and this position, so surprising from the conventional Buddhist standpoint, is justified by the claim that what people have come to refer to as the Śaiva, Gāruḍa, and indeed Vaiśṇava Tantras are in fact Buddhist, since they were first taught by Mañjuśrī in this “vast Kalpa”, that is to say, in the Mañjuśrīyamūlakalpa or, more probably, in a hypothetical proto-text of which the actual text was thought to be an abbreviated redaction:\(^{304}\)

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

... The extensive Kalpas that have been related in the Vaiṣṇavas Tantras were taught by Mañjughoṣa for living beings who could only be trained by [this] device.\(^{305}\)

... All the extensive Kalpas taught in the Gāruḍa Tantras were taught by me in order to benefit living beings.\(^{306}\)

... It was I that first taught, in this vast Kalpa, everything that the inhabitants of earth without exception refer to as the teaching of Śiva. It was only later that others taught in the various texts [considered to be taught by him] the Kalpanamtras of the wise Śiva Tumburu the Trader.\(^{307}\)
If this is so, then the text has disarmed criticism that the Mantra-procedures that are presented as properly Buddhist in this text bear a suspiciously close resemblance to the non-Buddhist in their liturgical morphology. For if the Omniscient has revealed all forms of religion in consideration of the differing mental dispositions of his manifold audiences, then there is no reason at all why he should not in his wisdom have taught Tantric practice for Buddhists as well as for outsiders. The strict division between the Buddhist and the non-Buddhist has dissolved within a higher Buddhist intertextual unity. Indeed this very argument is deployed by *Buddhaguhya in the late eighth century in his commentary on the passage of the Mahāvairocanaḥhisambodhi cited above.308 He argues that what those who attack this Tantra for containing elements proper to the non-Buddhist Tantras fail to realize is that those Tantras too were taught by the omniscient Buddha.309 So it follows that there nothing inherently un-Buddhist in

---

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

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

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

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

311 See, e.g., Tantrāloka 29.186c–220; Tantrālokaviveka introducing 29.201c–202b: samāvesah sarvasāstresu avigānenoktaḥ; Sanderson 1985, pp. 200–202; 1986, p. 169 and fn. 2; and Wallis 2008. The centrality of possession in the Śaiva Śaiva domain may derive from its Kāpālika antecedents, since the Saiddhāntika Śaivas report that the Kāpālikas (of the Atimārga) defined liberation as arising from a state of possession (āvesah) by the qualities of the deity, analogous to the state of one who is possessed by a Bhūta (bhūtāviśṭapuruṣasavat [Naresvaraparīkṣāprakāsa on 1.61]); see, e.g., Paśkarabhāṣya, p. 232: svayam āvīśyate siddhāḥ puṇās tu gra-hair iva | ittham caiva tu kāpālās tat sāmyam muktum uci; and Śaivaparīkṣāśāstra, p. 156, ll. 22-24: kāpālikāḥ samāvesena sāmyam upagacchanti | tathā hi yathā grahāḥ puṇāsam āvīsanti tathēśvararagunāḥ muksaṃ āvīsantī. They are distinguished in this context from the two other Atimārgic traditions, those of the Pāñcārtha Pāśupatas, who defined liberation as the transference of the state of equality with Śiva in the manner in which one lamp is lit from another (sāmyasamkrāntivādaḥ), and the Lākulas, who defined it as the arising of this state (sāmyotpattivādaḥ); see Sanderson 2006, pp. 179–181. This hypothesis is strengthened by the fact that possession by the deity as the goal of practice is a marked feature of the Picumata and Yoganīśamcāra of the Vidyāpīthā, texts in which the perpetuation within the Mantramārga of the Kāpālika tradition of the Atimārga is particularly clear. Both describe the goal of their Kāpālika-style asceticism as the entry of the deity propitiated into the person of the propitiator. Picumata f. 101v1–3 (2.114c–117): duścaram dēvagandharvaiś tvaya cīrṇaḥ mahāvratam || 115 varam vareṣitaṃ vatsa udyaṇatu tva brahīhi me | yadi tuṣto ’si bhagavan praviṣa mama vigraham || 116 vaktrom prasārayaseti praviṣya bhagavān prabhuh | hṛdaye bhairavo devo guhyakā tu gale sthitāḥ || 117 mātaro hy aṅga-m-aṅgeṣu yogino sandhisu sāmāyā || sākino romateṣu pūtanādyā tathaiva ca [Bhairava says:] You have [now] completed the observance of the [Kāpālika] Mahāvrata, which is hard [even] for the gods and Gandharvas. Choose whatever boon you desire. Tell me without hesitation [what it is]. [The Śādhaka replies:] If you are pleased, O Lord, enter my body. Telling him to open his mouth the Lord God Bhairava enters his heart. [His principal Śaktis, the four Guhyakās occupy his neck, the Mother goddesses his limbs, the Yoginis his joints, and the Śākinis, Pūtānās, and others the pores of his skin; cf. f. 335r1–2 (87.126c–128b): bhairavasya mahāmudrā mudrāsānāidhyakārikā || 127 prayuktī tu yadda mudrā lakṣaṇena varānane | bhāvātmakavidhānena sadya
him cast a flower on to the Mañḍala to determine from the section on which it falls the Mantra-deity from which he will obtain Siddhi, and then, while he is still in this state, removes his blindfold to reveal the Mañḍala. He then consecrates him with scented water from a Mantra-empowered vase, places a Vajra in his hand, and gives him his initiation-name (vajranāma).\textsuperscript{312} The immediate effects of the possession are described as follows:\textsuperscript{313}

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

\textsuperscript{312} Sarvatathāgatatattvasamgraha, sections 224–234.

\textsuperscript{313} Sarvatathāgatatattvasamgraha, section 226: \textit{āviṣṭamātrasya divyaṁ jñānam utpadyate | tena jñānena paracittānā avabudhyātī sarvakāryāni cātītāṅgata-vartamānānī jānāti hṛdayāṁ cāsya dhṛthibhavatī sarvatathāgatasāsane sarva-duḥkhānī cāsya praṇāsyantī sarvabhyāvagataḥ ca bhavaty avadhyāḥ sarva-sattveṣu sarvatathāgataś cādhitēṣṭhanti sarvasiddhayeṣaḥ cāsyaibhumikibhāvanti āpūrvaṁ cāsya-kāraṇahārṣaratīprīti-kārāṇi sukhaṁ utpadyante | taṁ sukhāṁ keśāṁ cit samādhyo nispadyante keśāṁ cid dhārānyah keśāṁ cit sarvāśa-paripūrayo yāvat keśāṁ cit sarvatathāgatavām api nispadyata iti.}
and, after the bindfold has been removed.\textsuperscript{314}

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

Ānandagarbha gives a detailed account of the means by which the candidate is put into this state of possession in the \textit{Sarvavajrodaya}, his manual on the rites of initiation into the Maṇḍala of this Tantra, and makes it clear that entering this state is, as in the Kaula parallel, an absolute requirement. If the candidate fails to enter it by the standard means, the Vajrācārya is to perform a rite to remove the sins that are assumed to be the cause, and if the candidate still fails to enter the possession state, he may not proceed further.\textsuperscript{315}

If possession does not occur, because [the candidate] has committed [too] many sins, he should proceed to destroy those sins by repeatedly making the Sin-Destruction Mudrā. With concentrated mind he should kindle a fire with sticks of sweet wood and burn all his sins by casting into it oblations of sesame seeds with the Mantra \textit{OM SARVAPĀPADAHANAVAJRĀYA SVĀHĀ}. He should make a simulacrum of those sins with black sesame seeds on the palm of his right hand and visualizing the [ wrathful] syllable \textit{HŪM} in the centre he should offer it into the fire with his index finger and thumb. Then he should imagine that the sin is being incinerated in his body by Vajras wrapped in flames emerging from the fire-pit. [The candidate] will definitely become possessed. If possession does not occur even so, then he must not give him the consecration.\textsuperscript{316}

\textsuperscript{314} \textit{Sarvatathāgatatatvasaṃgraha}, section 231: \textit{mahāmaṇḍale ca dṛṣṭamātre sarvatathāgatair adhiśhyate vajrasattva cāsya hṛdaye tiṣṭhati | nānādyāni ca raśmi-maṇḍaladarśanādīni prātiḥāryavivitrīṇi paśyati | sarvatathāgatādihiśhitatvat kadā cid bhagavān mahāvajradharaḥ svarūpeṇa darśanaḥ dadāti tathāgato vetti | tataḥ prabhṛtī sarvārthāh sarvanābhirucitākāryāṇī sarvasiddhir yāvad vajradharaṃ api tathāgatatvam vetti.}

\textsuperscript{315} \textit{Sarvavajrodaya}, f. 61r4–v1 (exposures 009a and 008b): \textit{atha pāpabahutvād āveśo na bhavati punah pāpasphoṭanamudrayaḥ tasya punah pāpāni sphantayāni | samidbhir madhurair agnir prajvālya susamāhataḥ | nirdahet sarvāppānī tilahomena tasya tu | OM SARVAPĀPADAHANAVAJRĀYA SVĀHĀ iti | dākṣiṇa-hastatate kṛṣṇatilaiḥ pāpapratikṛtāh krtvā hūṁkāramadhyam vicintya tarjany-anugṛbhīhāṃ homam kuryāt | tato homakundan nirgatya śvālalakulakur vajraise tasya śārīre pāpaṃ dāhyamanāṃ cintayen niyataṃ avīśati | evam api yasyāveśo na bhavati tasyābhisekam na kuryād iti.}

\textsuperscript{316} Cf. \textit{Tantrāloka} 29.29.210–211b: \textit{athavā kasyacin naivam āveśas tad dahed imam | bahir antaś coṭkasaktayā pated ittham sa bhūtale | yasya tv evam api syān na tam atropalavat tyajet ‘Or, if some rare person does not become possessed by this}
It is certain that the possession intended is not nominal or figurative. For Ānandagarbha tells us that once the Vajrācārya is sure that the candidate is in this state he should use him as an oracle. Then when the Ācārya has ascertained that the candidate is possessed he should form the Samayamudrā of Vajrasattva and address him with the Mantras HE VAJRASATTVA HE VAJRAYATNA HE VAJRADHARMA HE VAJRAKARMA and NHṬYA SATTVĀ NHṬYA VAJRA (DANCE, O SATTVĀ; DANCE, O VAJRA). If he is indeed possessed he will adopt the Vajrasattvamudrā. Then the Ācārya should show the Mudrā of the Vajra Fist. By this means all the deities beginning with Vajrasattva make themselves present in him. Then he should ask him something that he wishes to ascertain, with the following procedure. He should visualize a Vajra on the tongue of the possessed and say SPEAK, O VAJRA. The candidate then tells him everything that he wishes to know.

means he should visualize him being burned both internally and externally by the Power [of the Mantra] taught above. By this means he will fall to the ground. If a person does not achieve the state of possession even by this means then in this system he must cast him aside like a stone'. Falling to the ground is commonly mentioned in Kaula texts as the consequence of initiatory possession; see, e.g., Matasāra f. 39v2–3: yāvanmātram vihālaṃ ca vedhaye pāṣapaṇijaram | pāṇastobhāt pataty āśu bhūtale nātra sāṃsārayaḥ; Jayādrathyāmalā, Śatka 4, bhairavānāvidhau bhūmikāpaṭalalah, f. 191v (v. 105ab): saktikṣobhāt tadā yogī vidhī patati bhūtale; Devīvidyādhaśatikā f. 16v: 197 tatksaṇāt patate bhūmau chinnamūla iva drumah; Chummāṣamketaprakāśa, first surviving verse: | bhūmau sampaṭitaḥ kṣiprāc chinnamūla iva drumah; Īrnikaulāṅgava f. 9r3: *paṇcāvasthāgataḥ (em. : paṇcāvacavatagataḥ Cod.) sāksāt sa viddhāḥ patate bhūvi; f. 19v5–6 (2.230–231): pracalanty *mahāpāśā (corr. : mahāpāśam Cod.) āvesāṃ tasya jāyate | ānando hy udabhavaḥ kampō nirdrā gührmis tu paṇcami || tattvasvādhasya deveśi paṇcāvasthā bhavanti hi | sa viddhāḥ patate bhūmau vajrapātād ivācalaḥ; the Kaula Vṛddhasvacchanda ff. 17v24–18r2, Ed. 10.15c–17a (using this MS alone): jñātāv ērṣiṣaktisamkrānmaṃ sadevāvahānānussaṃ || vedhayen (em. : vedayen Cod. Ed.) nātra sandeḥam pātayet parvatāny api || *sākṛtaṃ samkrāmanyogena (Cod. : cakrāt sāṅkṛāmayogena Ed.) *chinnamūla (Ed. : chinnamūlam Cod.) iva drumah || patanti dehinaḥ sarve; 10.25ab, Ed. 10.25ab: sa viddhāḥ patate bhūmau *vajrāgāhātād ivācalaḥ (em. : vajrāghātām ivācalam Cod. Ed.).

317 Sarvavajrāṣaya, f. 61v2–3: tataḥ saṃviṣṭaṃ jñāṭvācāryena HE VAJRASATTVA HE VAJRARATNA HE VAJRADHARMA HE VAJRAKARMA iti vajrāṣattvasamayamudrāṃ baddhvoceṣṭāryaṃ | punar NHṬYA SATTVĀ NHṬYA VAJRA iti | sa ced aviṣṭaḥ śrivajrāṣattvamudrāṃ baddhniyāt | taddācāryena *vajɾamuṣṭiṃudrapadārṣiṇīya (nīyā corr. : nīyāḥ Cod.) | evam sarve śrivajrāṣattvādyayaḥ *sāṅnīdhyaṃ (corr. : saṃnīddhyān Cod.) kalpayanti | tato *bhipravastu prched anena | jñāṭavyām *tasyāviṣṭasya (em. : tasyāviṣṭasyāviiṣṭasya Cod.) vajrāṃ vicintya brūḥi vajra iti vaktavaṃ | tataḥ sarvaṃ vadati.

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

into Chinese (T. 895) by Subhakarasimha in 726 and was in the hands of the Chinese monk Wu-xing in 674 (Hodge 2003, p. 18). We also see it in the Su ji li yan mo xi shou luo dian shuo jia lu luo a wei she fa 'The quickly effective method of possession (ävesah) taught by the god Mahesvara' (T. 1277). This short scriptural text, whose translation from the Sanskrit is assigned to Bukong (Amoghavajra) and to a date between 746 and 774, claims in its preamble that it is a teaching given by Siva (Mahesvara) to Narayana on Mt. Gandhamada in answer to the latter's request. It sets forth a procedure to induce the messenger (Duta) of Mahesvara to possess a young girl aged seven or eight so that he can then use her while she is in this state to answer any questions he has concerning the future. He should have her fast by eating nothing but pure foods for three or seven days. Then on an auspicious day he bathes her, anoints her with unguents, gives her clean clothes, puts camphor in her mouth, sits facing East, smears a low wooden platform with sandalwood-paste, has the girl stand on it, scatters flowers in front of her, sets up a vessel of Argha water, takes incense, empowers it seven times with the Mahamudr mantra, lights the incense and fumigates the girl's hands with it, takes a red flower, empowers it, places it in her hands, and passes his hands over her face. Then, with his hand forming a Mudra he touches and thus empowers five parts of his own body and then with the same Mudra touches the girl's head, her mouth, his heart, and his navel visualizing in these the symbols of fire, water, earth, and wind respectively. He then empowers his two legs, visualizes Garuda, puts the armour-Mantra on the girl's body, and visualizes himself as Mahesvara, three-eyed, with the digit of the moon on his crown, blue-faced, eighteen-armed, and brandishing various weapons, with a snake as his sacred thread, wearing the bleeding hide of an elephant. He then protects her with recitation, empowers flowers, incense, and Argha water with the Mahamudr mantra, and seals the ten directions. Then facing the girl the Sadhaka recites the Mantra of Mahesvara's Duta. The girl will start to tremble. This reveals to him that the Duta has entered her. He then snaps his fingers and recites the Mantra. If she does not fall into the possession trance he should recite a further Mantra to incite the Duta to enter her. By this means the result is certain. He then interrogates her about good and bad in the future and is told whatever he wishes to know. This account is based on an oral translation of the Chinese text very kindly provided by my colleague Notake Miyako (Leipzig). A French translation of part of the text, without the visualizations, is given in Hobogirin, p. 7.

Here too the model is Saiva, as the preamble and content of this text suggest. Putting children into a possession-state is already present in the earliest literature of the Saiva Mantramarga, where we find the use of Ksatriya and Brahmin boys for this purpose; see Nisvasatattvasamhitā f. 82v1–2 (Nisvasaguhya 10.116–117b): athävesaṁ kārtuka[mah] + + kṣatramukāram | snāpayivā tam ekaṁ tu śuddhadehaḥ savāsakam || pūrāvakhaṁ sthāpayītva hy udakenāvesayet; f. 112v6 (Nisvasaguhya 17.30): athävesaṁ kārtukāmo brāhmaṇakumāra[kam] + uḍakena snāpya tenaiva tādyamanam āveśayed vācayā mokṣah. The ritual also appears in narrative literature. The Kathārasātragāra (70.55–63) tells a story of an ash-smeared ascetic, a pupil of Sadhakirti, who has mastered many Mantras and claims to have done this with a Ksatriya boy (56cd: śubhalakṣanam āsādyā kāmcit kṣatrakumāra[kam], who in his trance revealed the whereabouts of many miraculous herbs and elixirs (57: sa kumāraḥ samāvistah prito nānāvidhañī me | siddhāsadhirasakṣettrāṇy udīryedam athābravīt), and, finally, a palace of the Nāgas in a pollen-covered pond in the jungles of the Vindhya mountains, where, with the help of Viras, he could obtain a sword that would make him lord of the Siddhas. The procedure is referred to there as a svasthāvesaḥ 'a rite of caus-
Nor is possession restricted in the *Sarvatathāgatasamgraha* to the context of initiation. The term *āveśaḥ* is used repeatedly in the text to denote the state that
the practitioner must induce in himself in order to accomplish both his Siddhis and his enlightenment, typically in the compound vajrāveśāḥ ‘possession by Vajra’. For example:

For by means of possession by [Vajra]sattva enlightenment will quickly be attained.319

... When he has given rise to āveśāḥ in this way whatever form he meditates on as his own will automatically become Buddha in form.320

... When vajrāveśāḥ has arisen he should visualize the water as an embodiment of the Vajra. Quickly achieving success he will be able to walk on [that] water.321

... Once he has generated vajrāveśāḥ, if with concentrated mind he makes a slight clap with his palms in the Vajrānjali [gesture] he can subject to his control even a mountain.322

... Likewise, by virtue of the practice of āveśāḥ, if he stretches out [his hands in] the Vajra gesture and strikes together the tips of his fingers he can kill a hundred families.323

Two other features of this seminal text evidence the influence of Śākta Śaivism. The first is the fact that after teaching the Vajradhātumanḍalā in its opening section it goes on to teach the Vajraguhyamanḍalā, in which the five Tathāgatas are replaced by goddesses: Vairocana at the centre by Vajradhātvariśvarī and, around her in the four directions, Akṣobhya by Vajravajrīṇī, Ratnasambhava by Ratnavajrīṇī, Amitāyus by Dharmavajrīṇī, and Amoghasiddhi by Karnavajrīṇī.324 In the preamble Vajrapāṇi makes the following joyous declaration (udānam):325

Ah, how benevolent is the Bodhicitta to all beings! For the Buddhas take on even female form to accord with [the expectations of] their disciples (vineyavasāṭ).
The second is the incorporation of sexual intercourse into the activities of worship as a higher form of practice. This element is not conspicuous because it is not mentioned in the treatments of the principal Maṇḍalas taught in the text and it was therefore easily pushed out of view when this text was propagated in China and thence in Japan. It is present nonetheless as an esoteric teaching reiterated many times throughout the text in the form of passages teaching that the pleasure of sexual union and indeed other sensual delights are a means both of worshipping the Buddha and of attaining Siddhis when combined with meditation on one’s Buddha nature. For example:

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

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

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

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

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

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

7: He will attain Siddhi if while meditating with in-turned mind on the purity of lust he worships the Buddhas with the drops of his semen.\(^{326}\)

---

326 1 Section 288: bodhicittadrṣṭhotpādād buddho 'ham iti cintayan | ratyā tu pūja-
In the next phase of the Mantranaya, seen in the *Guhyasamāja*, also a product of the eighth century, this esoteric eroticism has moved to the foreground; and this is apparent from the very beginning of the text. For the place where the Buddha is said to have been residing at the time that he revealed this Tantra, which was expected to be stated in the preamble (*nidānāvākyam*) of any scripture claiming to be Buddhist, is not one of the familiar sites of revelation such as Rājakīra, Dhāanyakāta, or, as in the *Sarvatathāgata-tattvasamgraha*, the Akaniṣṭha heaven, but the vaginas of the goddesses Locanā, Māmakī, Pāṇḍaravāsinī, and Tārā, that is to say, a timeless, unlocated bliss.\(^{327}\)

[I aver that] I once heard the following [teaching]. The Venerable Lord was residing in the vaginas of the Vajra-women of the body, speech, and mind of all the Tathāgatas . . . and this surprising relocation, no doubt provocatively shocking in its time, became standard in the subsequent literature of the Mantranaya, both in texts closely related to the *Guhyasamāja* and in the next wave of texts, the Yoginītantras, in which the influence of the Śākta Śaiva tradition became much more intense and pervasive.\(^{328}\)

---

\(^{327}\) *Guhyasamāja*, preamble: *evaṁ mayā śrutam ekasmin samaye bhagavān sarvata-thāgata-vyākṣitaḥ dayāvajrayosītāḥ u vijahāra.

\(^{328}\) This same formula, or a variant, is seen in the Vajramāla (*rDo rje phreng ba*), f. 208r2–3: *becom ldan ’das de bzhin gshegs pa thams cad kyi sku dang gsung dang thugs kyi sning po rdo rje bitun mo’i bha ga rnam las* (as in the *Guhyasamāja*), the *Krṣṇayamārī* (sarvatathāgatakāvākṣitasa sarvavajrayosīdhaśeṣu), and in those of the Yoginītantras that have a *nidānāvākyam*: the *Hevajra* and *Śamputodhava* (both as in the *Guhyasamāja*), the *Vajrārtha* (f. 1v1: *sarvatathāgata-kāvākṣitah dayavajrayaśeṣu*), Vajrārāli (*rDo rje a ra li*, f. 171r2–3: *de...*
In the *Guhyasamājā* the male deities, now multi-faced and multi-armed in a fusion of Śaiva and Buddhist iconography, are represented and visualized copulating with their consorts; and both initiation and subsequent practice now involve copulation with a female partner, as in the Śāktism of the Śaivas.

A further borrowing from the Vidyāpīṭha is evident in the introduction of a crucial element of what that tradition calls ‘non-dualistic practice’ (advaitacāraḥ) and both traditions call ‘practice free of inhibition’ (nihṣaṅkācāraḥ), namely the offering to the deities of such ‘impure’ substances as urine, faeces, semen, and blood, and their sacramental consumption.

---

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

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

331 See, e.g., *Guhyasamājā* 4.21: viṇmūtraśukraraktādīn devatānāṁ nivedayet | evam tuṣyanti sambuddhāḥ bodhisattvāḥ mahāsavyāḥ ‘He should offer to the deities such things as urine, faeces, semen, and blood. In this way the noble Buddhas [and] Bodhisattvas are gratified’ (cf. the following in the *Guhyasamājā*’s satellite Tantra *Vajrahṛdaya-āṃkāraḥ*, Paṭala 3 [IrDo rje snying po rgyan gyi rgyud f. 39v3–4]: bshang gei khu ba khrag rnam ni | dung chen po ru bzhag byas te | lha rnam la ni dbul bar bya ‘He should place faeces, urine, semen, and blood in a human skull [mahāsāṅkhe] and offer them to the deities’; 6.21: viṇmūtraḥrākṛtyartham kuryāḥ siddhiphalārthināḥ | sidhyate ‘nuttaram tattvam bodhicittan anāvilam ‘If he desires to attain Siddhi he should consume faeces and urine. [By this means] he will master the ultimate reality, the spotless Bodhicitta’; 7.33ab: samayāḥ ksared retaṁ tu vidhīnā pibet phalakāṅkṣināḥ ‘In accordance with the rule of the discipline he should ejac-
ulate his semen and drink it if he desires to attain his goal'); 12.47cd: *pañcāmrtaprayogena vajrasattvatvam āpnyāt* ‘By the use of the Five Nectars he will attain Vajrasattva-hood’; 16.7ab: *vajrasattvam prayogena vajrasattvatvam āpnyāt* ‘He must especially offer [to the Mantram] such substances as faeces and urine’; 17.47: ‘He must not feel disgust at faeces, urine, semen, and blood. He must regularly consume [them] according to the rite. [For] this is secret of the three Vajras [of body, speech, and mind]’; 18.67c–68b: ‘He should wander [fearlessly] like a lion, with a mind free of inhibition. For him there is no need to feel disgust at faeces, urine, semen, and blood. He must regularly consume [them] according to the rite. [For] this is secret of the three Vajras [of body, speech, and mind]’.
That Tantric Buddhists possessed the specialized knowledge of the Śaiva Mantramārga that would enable them to draw at will on the Śaiva Tantras in this period is placed beyond doubt by an early exegetical work in the tradition of the Guhyasamāja. For this, the Guhyasiddhi of Padmavajra, written in all probability in the eighth century, assumes that any initiate in the practice of this Tantra is not only familiar with the Śaiva scriptures but is able to enact their rituals by assuming the role of a Śaiva Guru, implying thereby that such initiates were typically converts from the Mantramārga with experience both of its texts and of its practices. For it tells the adept of this tradition that in order to acquire the female consort required for his post-initiatory observance he should enter the home of a family of untouchables who are observant devotees of Śiva, reveal to them one of the Saiddhāntika scriptures—the text specifically mentions the Kālottara and the Niśvāsa—give them Maṇḍala initiation [following this scripture], and then return to them the daksinā that they will give him, taking a girl from them in its place:

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

---

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

333 Guhyasiddhi 8.8c–16b: paryat ed *anyadesu (conj. [cf. 8.2cd: praviṣya cāṇyadesu]: diuyadesu Ed. [Tib. bzang po’i yul du ’khyam par bya]) yatra na jñāyate kvacit ⊗ 9 praviṣya *cāṇyajaṭinām madhye (em. [Tib. mthar skyes nang du ’jug par bya]) cāṇyajaṭinām madhye Ed.) ye tripurāntake | bhaktā jānanti naivānāṃ daivataṃ paramārthaḥ | 10 *siddhāntabhāvītā nityam (em. [Tib. rtag tu rang gi grub mtha’ bsgom (*svasiddhāntabhāvākā nityāṃ):] siddhyante bhāvītā nityam Ed.) snānadevārcane ratāḥ | kimcidaksaramārgena *prasaktāḥ (conj.:prasakte Ed.) śāstradarśane | 11 evam praviṣya tanmadhye sādhako drḍhanīścayaḥ | cāṇḍalaganarūpeṇa bhāvayaḥ bodhim uttamām | 12 *darṣayec ca tatas teṣāṃ dharmaḥ siddhāntapūrvakam (em. [cf. Tib. chos dang grub mtha’ sngon ’gro ba | de nas de la ston par byed]:darṣayec ca tatas teṣām dharmasiddhāntapūrvakam Ed.) | kālottarādiḥsamsiddhāṃ (em.:samsiddhāṃ Ed.) no cen niḥśvāsasambhavam | 13 pātayitum ca viśvāse sarvāṃ tāṃs tantracobiditān | kṛtvā caivatmānaḥ sīsyan dīkṣāmaṇḍalapūrvakam | 14 tato yat saṃcitaṃ dravyam tair dattaṃ gurupūjāya | tat teṣām arpayītvā tu pūrvam vittena samyutam | 15 gṛhitā kanyākāṃ teṣām cārvakaḥ suiloṣcayāṃ | tāṃ kṛtvā maṇtrasabdhaḥbhāhjiṇāṃ sāyaṃsamaṃvatām | 16 cared viḍyāvatam dīhmān buddhatvakṛtatesvanāḥ. I have emended antyajādinām to antyajāṭinām with the support of the Tibetan because the -adi- is inapposite: in 8.7 the Sādha is told to enter the home of an untouchable (antyajālayāḥ); and in 8.1 he is told that it is an untouchable girl (antyajā) that he is to acquire. I take dharmaḥ siddhāntapūrvakāṃ in 8.12c to mean ‘dharmaḥ preceded by [the word] siddhānta-’, i.e. siddhāntadharmam, an example of a not uncommon style of periphrasis.
and recognize no other deity as absolute, who are inspired by the Siddhānta, always attached to [the rituals of] bathing and deity-worship, and dedicated to the doctrines of its scriptures through some slight degree of literacy. After entering among them in the guise of an untouchable votary (caṇḍālaganah), he should, while cultivating insight into the highest wisdom, instruct them in the religion of the Siddhānta established in such scriptures as the Kālottara, or the Niśvāsa; and in order to win their trust he should take as his disciples all those who are enjoined by the Tantra after [initiating them before] the Initiation Maṇḍala [of Śiva]. Then he should give back to them all the goods and money that they will previously have gathered and given him as their offering to their Guru and take [instead] a girl of theirs with a beautiful face and eyes. After acquainting her with the essence of the Mantras and making her adhere to the rules of an initiate that wise one should practice the Vidyā observance [with her], after resolving to become a Buddha.

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

The Sarvabuddhasamāyogadākinījālaśaṃvara: Heruka and his Yoginīs, Kapālika iconography, the Gaṇamāṇḍala, and the beginning of Śaiva-Buddhist intertextuality

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

---

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

335 Padmavajra is elaborating on Guhyasamāja 16.93: sōdaśābādiṃ grhya sarvālakārabhiṣītām | cāruvaktām viśālaḥṣīṃ prāpya vidyāvratam caret ‘He should take a girl of sixteen with a beautiful face and wide eyes, adorned with every ornament, and practice the Vidyā observance with her’.

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

337 It is referred to by Āryadeva as a Mahāyogatantra in his Caryāmelāpaka-pradīpa, p. 82: adhunā prapañcatacārya śrīsaṃvabuddhasamāgamayogadākinījālaśaṃvara-mahāyogatantrād avatāryate. This term serves to distinguish it from the Yogatantras, namely the Sarvatathāgatatattvasamgraha and its satellites and to
group it with the Guhyasamāja and related texts, though which of the Yogatantras in the broad sense qualified to be considered Mahāyogatantras might be the subject of divergence of opinion. Dīpaṅkaraśrījñāna defines this class (rnal ’byor chen po’i rgyud) as comprising the Guhyasamāja and its explanatory Tantras (vyākhyātantrāṇi), which he lists as the Guhyendutilaka, the Kṛṣṇayamāra, the Paramādya, the Sarvadevasamāgama, the Sarvarahasya, the Vinayāmogha(siddhiḥ), the Vajrajñānasamuccaya, the Vairocanamāyājāla, the Laghukhasama, the Advaya[smatā]vijaya, and the Vajraśekhara (Byang chub lam gyi sgron ma dka’ grel, p. 286: de la rnal ’byor chen po’i rgyud ni dpal gsang ba ’dus par bshad rgyud dang bcas pa dang zla gsang thig le dang gshin rje’i gshed nag po dang mchog dang po dang lha thams cad ’dus pa dang thams cad gsang ba dang ’dul ba don yo pd ang ye shes rdo kun las btus pa dang rnam par snang mdziad sgyu ‘phrul dang nam mkha’ dang mnyam pa chung ngu dang gnyis med pa rnam par rgyal ba’i rgyud dang rdo rje gtsug tor rgyud la so gs pa rgyud sde stong phrag bcu gnyis te rgyas te byas na grangs pa med do.) An alternative terminology distinguishes these more esoteric Yogatantras as Yogottaratantras, perhaps originally in the meaning ‘Supplementary Tantras (uttaratantrāṇi) of the Yoga [class]’, and refers to the Yoginītantras as Yoganiruttaratantras, giving the ascending series Kriyātantra, Caryātantra, Yogatrantra, Yogottaratantra, and Yoganiruttaratantra; see, e.g., Rāmapāla, Sekanirdeśapañjikā, introducing verse 1, describing his teacher Maitreyanātha (Advayavajra) as an unsurpassed master of all of these: iha mahā-pandūtavadhūtaśrīmaityreṇāhāḥ kriyācaryāyayogayogottarayogainiruttaranyayav anuttaraguruh; Ratnakaraśānti, Muktāvalī, p. 223, on Hevajra 2.8:10: sarvam iti pañcavidham: kriyācaryāyoga*yogottarayoganiruttarabhedena (yogottara corr. [=Cod., f. 45v6] : yogāntara Ed.); Kānha, Yogaratnamālā, p. 156 (on Hevajra 2.8:10): sarvamantranayam iti pañcavidham kriyācaryāyogayogottarayogainiruttarabhedena; Advayavajra, Gud. hapadā, f. 6r6–7: vajram. pañca jñānāśābdena kriyācaryāyayogayogottarayoga*niruttarāṇi (em. : niruttarāṇa’ś ca Cod.) tantrāṇy ucyante. I have seen no occurrence in any Indian source of the term *Anuttarayoga, commonly encountered in secondary sources. It is evidently an incorrect modern translation into Sanskrit of the ambiguous Tibetan rendering of Yoganiruttara (rnal ’byor bla na med). Early authors attest a less developed hierarchy. Vilāsavajra, an author of the eighth century (TRIBE 1994, pp. 9–23) and the Guru of Maitreyanānāpa (Gzhon nu dpal (Blue Annals, p. 367), says that he writes his Nāmanartha after studying the Pāramitānaya and the Kriyā-, Caryā-, and Yogatantras (A f. 1v–2: yogacaryākriyātāntram tathā pāramitānayaṃ ...vi lo kya), but the last evidently includes texts such as the Guhyasamāja, Vajrabhairava, and Sarvabuddhasamāyoga, since he quotes these and other related works. *Buddhaguhya (rNam par snang mdziad chen po mgon par byang chub pa’i rgyud chen po’i grel, ff. 64v7–65r6) speaks of Kriyātantras, which emphasize external ritual practice (phyi’i spyod, bāhyacaryā), giving as examples the Susiddhikara and the Vidyādharaṇītaka, and Yogatantras, which emphasize internal meditation (nang gi sbyor, adhyātmayogā), giving the example of the Sarvatathāgatatattvasamgrahā, and says that the Mahāvairocanābhisambodhi, later classified as a Caryātantra, is a Yogatrantra in as much as it emphasizes the practice of Method and Wisdom (thabs dang shes rab gtsor gyur sbyor ba’i rgyud), but may also be referred to as a Kriyātantra or as an Umbhayatantra (bya ba’i rgyud dam gnyis ka’i rgyud), that is to say, as a Tantra of both (ubhaya-) classes, because it also teaches external practice for the benefit of those whose commitment is to this. In a parallel treatment in his Pīṇḍārthā commentary on the Mahāvairocanābhisambodhi he gives the Vajrapānyabhiṣeka among examples of Kriyātantras (see the translation in HODGE 2003, p. 449).
use of that tradition’s system of the four types of Mudrā (Mahāmudrā, Samayamudrā, Dharmanamudrā, and Karmamudrā) in Śādhanā texts based on this Tantra, such as the Vajraśālodayā of Ānandagarbha and the Herukasādhanā of Kalyāṇagarbha.338 But it initiates a new direction that would be followed in the next and final phase of the Mantranaya’s development, that of the Yoginītantras.339

---

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

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

dang sangs rgyas thod pa dang dgyes pa'i rdo rje bum phраг lnga pa la sogs pa rgyud sde stong phrag bcu gnyis bzhugs te rgyas par bya ba na grangs med do The Yoganiruttaratantra, endless in its full extent, contains 12,000 [texts], principally the Mahākhaṇḍasana in 100,000 [verses], the Cakrasanvara, the Vajradāka, the Vajracatusśpīṭha, the Mahāmāya, the [Sarva]buddhasamāyoga, the Buddhakapālā, and the Ḫevajra in 500,000 verses’. On the term Yoganiruttara see here p. 146. The origin of the name Heruka has not been explained in a satisfactory manner. Indigenous sources explain it only through artificial semantic analyses based on superficial similarities of sound. Thus, for example, we are told that ‘He’ means ‘uncursed’ (hetvarjītam), ‘-ru’ means ‘formless’ (ṛūpanirṇuktam), and ‘-ka’ means ‘free of sense-faculties’ (kaśānājīhitam); see Vajrapāṇi, Laṅghutantraṭīkā, p. 45; Bhavabhaṭṭa, Cakrasanvarapāṇījkā, p. 5; and the Tibetans, who translated names if they were meaningful, either left this untranslated or substituted a description, namely Khrag ‘thung ‘Blood-drinker’, a meaning that cannot be justified etymologically. So if the name was meaningful at some stage it appears that that meaning has left no trace in the surviving literature. The alternative is that it never was meaningful in this sense, being created on the basis of the unmeaning syllables HE HE RU RU KĀM that are found in Cakrasanvara’s Mūlamantra: OṀ ŚRĪVĀJRA HE HE RU RU KĀM HŪṂ HŪṂ PHĀṬ ṮĀKINĪJĀLĀṢĀMVARAM SVĀHĀ. Against this it may be said that the name appears without this doubling of the first two syllables in the earlier Sarvatathāgatatattvasaṃgraha, section 794, in the Mantra for the taming of all the Mother goddesses: OṀ HERUKA VAJRASAMAYA SARVADUṢṬASAMAYAMUDRĀPRABHAṆJAKA HŪṂ PHĀṬ. It might seem more reasonable, then, to see HE HE RU RU KĀM as a spell-element built from an already existing name. However, it is striking that we find almost the same element in the Vidyā of Pārṇā, an important Mantra of the Śākta Śaiva Vidyāpītha: OṀ AGHORE HṚḤ PARAMAGHORE HŪṂ GΗΟΡΑЎPE HĀḤ GΗΟΡΑΜUKHI BHĪMA BHĪṢANE VAMA PĪBA HE HE RU RA PAṬH HŪṂ HAḤ PHĀṬ (Siddhayogeśvarimata 3.23–39; Mālinivijayottara 3.42–50; Tantrāloka 30.20–24b; Trisūrobhairava quoted by Jayaratha thereon) and its variant taught in Kubjikāmaṭa 18.4–24: AIM AΓHORE HŘĪṀ HSAṀ PARAMAGHORE HŪṂ GΗΟΡΑЎPE HSAṀ GΗΟΡΑΜUKHI BHĪΜA BHĪṢANE VAMA VAMA PĪBA HAḤ HE HE RU RA RA HŘĪṀ HŪṂ PHĀṬ. We may note that the name Hevajra, that of the second major deity of the Yoginī tantras, appears to have a similar origin, having been conjured up from the Mantra HE VΑJRA PAŚYA ‘O Vajra[-being], behold!’ that is uttered when the blindfold is removed from the candidate’s eyes in the presence of the Maṇḍala (Sarvatathāgatatattvasaṃgraha, section 230). The origin of the Herukas Rīgī-ārali and Vajra-ārali of the Tantras of those names are also, it seems, the apparently unmeaning syllables of Mantras: OṀ ĀRALI RIGI PHĒṀ PHĒṀ BHYO SVĀḤĀ (Rī gi ā ra li’i rgyud f. 187v2) and OṀ VAJRA ĀRALI PHĀṬ . . . PHĒṀ PHĒṀ SVĀḤĀ (Rī gi ā ra li’i rgyud f. 187v7). The name of the Heruka Buddhakapālā of the Tantra of that name has likewise been conjured out of the feminine vocative BUDDHAKAPĀLĪÑ/KĀPĀLĪÑ that appears in its Mantras; see (Nispannayogāvalī, p. 31: OṀ BUDDHAKAPĀLĪÑ ĀḤ HĪ HAI HŪṂ PHΑṬ; Buddhakapālataṇtra, e.g., f. 5r1: OṀ BUDDHAKĀPĀLĪÑ MAṬA 2 ĄḤ PHΑṬ SVĀḤĀ puspanivedanamantraḥ).

---

\textsuperscript{340} Genesis and Development of Tantrism
dram), those to its right and left expressive of delusion and erotic passion, and that behind open-mouthed to devour. In his two uppermost hands he holds the freshly flayed skin of Bhairava over his back, in the two below a bow and arrows, in the third right in descent he shakes a blazing three-pronged Vajra, and in the fourth a skull-bowl filled with human blood (mahāraktam). In the third left in descent he brandishes the Kāpālika’s skull-staff (khaṭvāṅgaḥ), topped with a three-pronged Vajra and adorned with bells, and in the fourth a skull-bowl filled with human flesh (mahāmāṃsam). Or he may be single-faced and two-armed, with a five-pronged Vajra in his right hand raised above his shoulder and a skull-bowl full of human flesh in his left, with a skull-staff resting on his left shoulder and held in the crook of his left arm. He wears a chariot of skulls with the Buddha [Aksobhya] adorning his flaming hair, is surrounded by an aureole of flames, poses with his left foot on the ground and his right leg raised so that the sole of the foot touches his left thigh, has dancing eye-brows knitted in anger, and has round, fire-red darting eyes.  

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

An anonymous Sādhana text,  

---

341 Vajrajāvālodayā, f. 172v1–2: bhagavato mahāmudrāṁ baddhvā purata ākāśadeśe Hṛīh-kāreṇa viśvapadmaṁ nISPādyā tasyopari pañcāsticikāṁ jvalāvajraṁ HŪM A iti | tato vajrāhamkāra<|> bhāvayaṁ JVLĂVAJRO HAM HŪM iti | tatas tad vajraṁ śīrihurakāṁ átmānaṁ bhāvayaṁ ŚĪHERUKO HAM HŪM iti; f. 173r4–v4: caturmukham aṣṭābhujam | tatra prathamaṁ mukhaṁ raudram daksīṇa<|> dvitiya<|> mukhaṁ pramohā<|> pramodina<|> (?) prṣṭhaṁ tṛtiyakāṁ bhakṣāna-mukham vāmataś caturthaṁ śringāramukham | etac ca mukha<|> catusṭayaṁ (conj. ISAACSON: catuṣṭaya Cod.) gītyā nirdiṣṭam iti | dvābhyaṁ bhujābhyaṁ vāyu-patadāhāranayogena sārdrabhairavacardhamāṁ dvābhyaṁ dhanurbānadharam daksinātraṭyena triśucikājvalāvajrollālaṇataparam caturthana mahārakaparapi-pūnākapāladdharam vāmatrītye ghanṭāsahitavajrākhvaṅgadhamāṁ caturthana mahāmāṃsapairopiñca pāla dharam (corr.: dharah Cod.) | dvibhujam ekamukhāṁ <vā> vāmaskandhe yajnopitayogena ghanṭavajrakhaṅvaṅgasobhitam daksinākareṇa *tripatākāyuktena (corr.: tripatāka Cod.) pañcaśaścījvalā-vajradharam | vāmakareṇa mahāmāṃsapairopiñca pālānadharam | kapālaśalā-makaṭabuddhacudāmaṇi<|> uccaviśvapadmaṁ samapoviṣṭāṁ vāmapādaṁ bhūmi-stham kṛtvā daksināpāda<|> sattvaṁ pañcākṣayaṇaṁ nyasa | tatpādaśālam vāmorunā samputikaraṇayogenaṁ vāsthyāya nīlajvalāvajramayaṁ raktajvalābha-manḍalāṁ mahāpralayakāloragrasmaṁsānāṅg尼斯adṛśyam dīptakṣaṁ raurdrādīrasa-samyogavicītracahuvbhramaṁ | savibhramabhūbhṛkṛuti<|> pradīptalokanartitadṛśitam iti.  

342 Kalyāṇagarbha, Herukasādhana, pp. 470–471: adhomukhasya śavasyopari viśvapadamāṁ tasyopari sāryamandalam tanmatīyāḥ samupoviṣṭām *ekāsyaṁ dhuhjuh jāvayaṁ (ekāsya em.: ekāsya Ed.) iti vacanār dhupaparyānikāṁ bhasmoddhālita<|> raktaprabhāmaṁ niṇgāllodhvakesāṁ ... sādrāmarastakāmālā-kṛtasragdāmāṁ Ṛmaṇiḥkarālavadanaṁ caladvartulākāraḥ kātāksaṁ savibhrama-bhruḥkṛutiṇam.
which also teaches only that form, gives the further details that he is dark blue and clad in a garment of human skin, that his garland of heads is strung together with human entrails, that he is adorned with human bones, that is to say with the Kāpālika ornaments known as the Mudrās, and that his posture indicates that he is dancing.\footnote{Sādhanaṃalā no. 241: \textit{tato hriṅkāraṇispannaṃ nilakāralavajram hriṅkāraḍhirsthitatvāratake dhyaṭā tatarsarvaparinatam nilam naracāmbhṛtam kapālālaṃkobhyaśirāskam jvaladūrdeviapāṅgalakesaṃ raktavartulāksam antrasamgrathitamunḍamālāvalambiṇam narāsthirācalābharaṇaṃ dvibhujāikamukham daṃṣṭrākarālavadaṇam viśvapadmasūrye vāmapādam tasyaivarau daksiṇacaranaṃ vīnyasay aṃryaṃ kuruṃ antraṃ herukavāmaṃ bhāvayat. There are numerous two-armed Herukas conforming to the iconographical prescriptions of these Sādhanas in surviving statuary from eastern India, though this connection with the tradition of the \textit{Sarvabuddhasaṃyoga} has not been recognized to my knowledge. For examples from Ratnagiri in Orissa, Nālandā, Sārnāth, and Subhapur (in the Comilla District of Bengal) see Linrothe 1999, pp. 249–260, figs. 175–183, and 185–188, and Huntington 1984, fig. 215. The last lacks the prostrate corpse.}

He is surrounded in the style of the Vidyāpiṭha by twenty Vajraḍākīnīs.\footnote{Vajrajalodaya, f. 176v–v1: \textit{sarvaṃ śrīgauryāpāṃ vajraḍākinīṇaṃ nirmāya praṣvalitordhvakesaṃ | raktavālāḥamāṇḍalaṃ mahāpralayākālograsaṃśāṅgini sadṛṣaṃ samkruddhāṃ ekakapālaikabudhamakutaṃ svacchandaḥ śtuṣṭhāṃ nīcesayet.} The \textit{Sarvabuddhasaṃyoga} deploys a complex six-family Maṇḍala consisting of six sub-Maṇḍalas. The six families, each with its own sub-Maṇḍala, are those Vajrasattva, Vairocana, Heruka, Padmanareśvara, Vajrasūrya, and Paramāśva. Two Maṇḍala traditions deploy this pantheon. In one Vajrasattva occupies the central sub-Maṇḍala and in the other Heruka. In each sub-Maṇḍala one of these six occupies the centre surrounded by twenty goddesses. The last twelve goddesses are the same in each, namely Śuṣṭrā, Nṛtyā/Viṇā, Vitatā, and Ghanā, followed by Puṣpā, Dhūpā, Ālokā, Gandhā, Turagā, Vajramukhi, Vajramāmaki, and Bhasmapralayavetāli, the first eight of these being, as their names reveal, offering-goddesses (pṛjjādevyaḥ), personifications of offerings, and the last four gate-guardsians, except that in the retinue of Heruka Cāpadhārini, Khatvāṅgadhārini, Cakradhārini, and Citrapatākādharini are substituted for the first four, the musical offering-goddesses Śuṣṭrā, Nṛtyā/Viṇā, Vitatā, and Ghanā. The first eight of the twenty, then, stand apart as the retinue specific to each Tathāgata. The eight from Gauri to Herukasamnivesā formed the basis of the retinue of Hevajra in the Yoginītantra \textit{Hevajra}, with the difference that there we see Śabarī rather than Pramohā and Dombi rather than Herukasamnivesā. See Tomabechi 2007, pp. 919–921 for a complete tabulation of all one hundred and twenty-six deities and their seed-syllables as given in the \textit{Sarvabuddhasaṃyoga} and the \textit{Paramādyā}.}

first, in the innermost circuit the eight Garur, Cauri, Pramohā, Vetāli, Pukkasī, Caṇḍāli, Ghasmari, and Herukasamnivesā/Herukasamnibhā; then the four Cāpadhārini, Khatvāṅgadhārini, Cakradhārini, and Citrapatākādharini; then four offering goddesses: Puṣpā, Dhūpā, Ālokā, and Gandhā; and finally four theriocephalic gate-guardians: Turaṅgama, Vajramukhi, Vajramāṃkai, and Bhasmapralayavetāli.\footnote{The \textit{Sarvabuddhasaṃyoga} deploys a complex six-family Maṇḍala consisting of six sub-Maṇḍalas. The six families, each with its own sub-Maṇḍala, are those Vajrasattva, Vairocana, Heruka, Padmanareśvara, Vajrasūrya, and Paramāśva. Two Maṇḍala traditions deploy this pantheon. In one Vajrasattva occupies the central sub-Maṇḍala and in the other Heruka. In each sub-Maṇḍala one of these six occupies the centre surrounded by twenty goddesses. The last twelve goddesses are the same in each, namely Śuṣṭrā, Nṛtyā/Viṇā, Vitatā, and Ghanā, followed by Puṣpā, Dhūpā, Ālokā, Gandhā, Turagā, Vajramukhi, Vajramāmaki, and Bhasmapralayavetāli, the first eight of these being, as their names reveal, offering-goddesses (pṛjjādevyaḥ), personifications of offerings, and the last four gate-guardsians, except that in the retinue of Heruka Cāpadhārini, Khatvāṅgadhārini, Cakradhārini, and Citrapatākādharini are substituted for the first four, the musical offering-goddesses Śuṣṭrā, Nṛtyā/Viṇā, Vitatā, and Ghanā. The first eight of the twenty, then, stand apart as the retinue specific to each Tathāgata. The eight from Gauri to Herukasamnivesā formed the basis of the retinue of Hevajra in the Yoginītantra \textit{Hevajra}, with the difference that there we see Śabarī rather than Pramohā and Dombi rather than Herukasamnivesā. See Tomabechi 2007, pp. 919–921 for a complete tabulation of all one hundred and twenty-six deities and their seed-syllables as given in the \textit{Sarvabuddhasaṃyoga} and the \textit{Paramādyā}.}
According to Ānandagarbha⁴⁶ Gaurī (E) is fair in colour and tranquil-faced.

See also TANAKA 1996, pp. 199–201 for the Tibetan names of all the goddesses (and their Mantras) in the six sub-Mandalas, and the listings of the names and positions of all the deities of the two six-family Mandalas in BSOD NAMS RGYA MTSHO 1991, pp. 106–113. In the Heruka-centred Maṇḍala set out there each of the six deities presiding over the sub-Mandālas has a consort: Heruka + Iṣvārī, Vairocana + Locanā, Vajrāśūrya + Māmaki, Padmanartēsvara + Pāṇḍaravāsini, Paramāśva + Tārā, and Vajradhāra + Śaṁvārī; and the total of deities is 135, since two extra goddesses, counted as one, Citrapadma and Citrabhairā, are found in front of the central deity in the sub-Mandala of Paramāśva, and there are eight additional deities in the outer enclosure, since there too there are four offering goddesses within its corners and four animal-headed goddesses guarding its gateways. Theroicephalic female gate-guardians are a common feature in the Maṇḍalas of the Yoṅgitantrās; see, e.g., Samvarodaya 13.29c–31b; Jayabhadra, Caksaramvarapāṇikā, p. 113 on 2.8 (Kākāsya, Ulākāsya, Śvānāsya, Sūkārāsya; Nispannaoyagāvi, p. 15 (Hayāsya, Śvākāsya, Śvānāsya, and Simhāsya in the 17-deity Maṇḍala of Hevajra) and p. 90 (Sūkārāsya, Gṛḍhrāsya, Jambukāsya, Garudāsya, Vāyāhrāsya, Ulākāsya in the Mandala of Kālacakra).

Vajrājvālodayā, ff. 177r4–178r5: pūrvadīghāgā gauṇavāṇḍa śaṁtādṛṣṭī saumyamukhā yaugapadyenaiva tiṣṇadhenu ṣaṭpadpanāparikṣepān mahāprasahyāśīra-<s>catuṣṭayaṃ pātyaṃ pratyālīḍhasthaṇasthaḥ</s> | dakṣine caurī raktavāṇṇā raudrādṛṣṭīmuṇkā yajnopavītya yoṇaṃ vāmāsakandhe khaṭvāṃgām dhārayanti | kapālāmālāmuṇkā vāmakroḍhamuṇṇaṁ ha r̥y akuṣadhr̥arini daksinakarēṇa mādhāyāṅgulyāṅstārācakram utkāṣṭhānāṃ vāmapādē laṅghārayanti | paścime pramoṇhā ādvīrāmukhāṃ pramoṇhadṛṣṭīḥ kṛṣṇā caturbhūjā madya-pūrṇaṃkapāla vāmakarā daksinakarēṇa vajradhr̥arīṇi punar vāmādaksinābhujābhyaṃ *paraṃparābaddhābhyaṃ (corr. : paramparābaddhābhyaṃ Cod.) prthivyuddharaṃ kurvanti ādīdhapadavasthitāḥ | uttare vetāli sitavāṃṇā harṣamukhīm mrtakothāpandaḍr̥ṣṭīḥ daksinakaraṇa candrakāntābhakapalācakṣenaṃ mṛtavarīdhārām pātyauṇaṇāṃ vāmākaraṇa vajrātākārakaradhr̥arīṇaṁ yathēṣṭapadavasthitāḥ | tasmin eva maṇḍale pūrvaṅkoṣṭhe (corr. : koṣṭha Cod.) pukkasi viśvāvāṃ nyrtādṛṣṭīḥ daksināvajrāmuṇṇaṁ paṇcasaśicākāvājvārajāhrinī | vāmākaraṇa māruṭdhūtakapalavāṣaṃkātādhr̥arīṇaḥ kapālāmāládpipārūṇapaduddhāmaṃsaśānāmadhye nyrtvaprayogena | daksinē candāli nilavāṇā vāṭamandālikārdhā śavibhramamukhiḥ ārūḍhvādṛṣṭīḥ daksināmuṇṇaṁ vajrasūlaṁ ādāya | vāyupatādhāraṇena vātāmāndālikāpramokṣena śadhyā pranāmādaya patīti (<s> = </s>) | paścime ghasmārī kṛṣṇā varṇā (corr. varṇāṁ Cod.) mṛtacarvamukhi bhakṣanādṛṣṭīḥ | vāmākaraṇa vajrāvālaṅkuṇḍadhr̥arīṇī | daksinē vajramuṇṇaṁ khaṭgām ādāyaḥ pratyālīḍhapadavasthitāḥ | uttare śīrherukārupa-samnībhā vāmākaraṇa <s>cāṣakakapālām</s> (cāṣaka conj. : cāṣaka Cod.) ādāya vāmāsakandhe khaṭvāṃgām dhārayanti | daksinē tripātākārēṇa paṇcasaśicākāvājvāram ādāya śīrherukapade dvībhujaikaṃkumhiḥ samṣītāḥ | āyeyakosthake *cāpadhrīnī (em. : copodhrīnī Cod.) | raktavāṇṇā vāmākaraṇa vajradhrām ādāya daksinēṇa *vajracāpāsahitēna (corr. : vajracāpāsahitēna Cod.) dhanu-cṛgūnākāraṇayogena *vajrābānān (corr. : vajrābhānān Cod.) kṣipantī | nairṛte khaṭvāṅghadhārīṇi kapālāmālāmakuṭapadbuddhācūdamāṇi <s>cṛ</s> | dṛṣṭāra (?) hhasmaubhravāṇṇā daksinakaraṇa ca paṇcasaśicākāvājvāra<m>ṇ</m> pāṇya kṣipantī | *vāyaye (corr. : vāyame sensory ārūḍhavāsūtraṃ tarjanatātparāḥ | vāyavye Cod.) *cakra-dhrārīṇi (corr. : cakradhrī Cod.) gauraharīvāṇṇā vāmakroḍhamuṇṇaṁ tarjanatātparā | daksinākaramadhyāṅgulyāṅstārācakram (daksina conra : daksine Cod.) utkāṣṭhānāṃ | aśīṣe koṇe citrapatākādhrīṇi | *kanakopala varṇā  
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Eight-armed, she cuts off each of the four heads of Brahmā by simultaneously firing arrows from four bows. Caurī (S) is red and fierce-faced. Wearing a chaplet of skulls she holds a goad-hook (āṇkuśaḥ) in her left hand at her heart with a skull-staff in the crook of her left arm resting on her left shoulder, and holds aloft an eight-spoked discus with the middle finger of her right, pressing down on the three worlds with her left foot. Pramohā (W) is black and four-armed, with the face of Viṣṇu’s boar-incarnation (ādiوارāhamuk’hā). In her first left hand she holds a skull-bowl full of wine and in her first right a Vajra. With her other two hands she imitates the boar-incarnation by raising up the earth. Vetālī (N) is white and joyful-faced. With her right hand she pours a stream of the nectar of immortality from a transparent skull-cup and with her left shows the Vajra banner gesture. Pukkasā (E) is multicoloured (viṣṇavārṇā) and dancing in a smoky cremation-ground full of strings of skulls and the like. In her right fist she clasps a five-pronged Vajra and in her left a wind-buffeted tendril from the wish-granting tree of paradise (kalpavṛksalatā). Caṇḍāli (S) is dark blue and riding on a whirlwind (vātamanḍalikā). In her right fist she clenches a Vajra-topped trident and with her left releases a whirlwind against her victims. Ghasmarī (W), black like Heruka, holds a skull-cup [to her heart] in her left hand, with a skull-staff resting on her left shoulder, and a five-pronged Vajra in her right. Cāpadhārini (SE) is red and, holding a Vajra bow with her left hand, fires Vajra arrows by drawing back the bowstring with her right. Khaṭvāṃghārini (SW) is ash-white, wearing a chaplet of skulls and the Buddha on her crown, [holding a skull-staff with her left hand and] hurling a blazing fire-pronged Vajra from above and a red head below. Moreover, he has her raise with her two lower hands a wheel ('khor lo) rather than the earth (f. 203v3–5): "pra (em.: bra Cod.) mo dbu gnyis gong ma phag | 'og ma dmar po phyag bzhi pa | g.yon brkyang gar gnyis bzhugs mdzad cing | mda’ bzhi dus gcig bkang ba la | tshangs pa’i mgo bzhi spyangs pa ste.

conj.: varṇā Cod.) daksinakareṇa *saṃghata(?)vicitravarṇapatākā<ṃ> dhārayantī.

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

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

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

---

349 Ānandagarbha’s text is corrupt and lacunose at this point in the manuscript, omitting Vajramukhi and Vajramāmaki (f. 178r5–v2): vāmanuṣṭīnaḥ ?ghaty?avasthitāḥ ?tryāmāñjalināḥ puspadhūpadipagandhichadhārīṇīyāḥ aśvagojāsābhūti-samjñātāsatoppūjādevī | pūrvadvāramadhye turāṅgāsānā vāmahastena padmahastāḥ hayagrīvaharitam aśvamukhaṁ dhārayantīḥ | dakṣiṇe kare sthitena vajrānkuśena sarvakrodhakulam ākarsayaṁ | paścime dvāraā lokāṁ (corr.: dvāre lokāṁ) Candrasūryaman. d. ala?rayuktavajrāsphatānena (conj.: sphoṭanam Cod.) sarvāṃ krodhakulam bandhayantī | uttaradvāre bhasmapralayavetālī *vāmakareṇa (corr.: nāmañkareṇa Cod.) KAPālamadhye vīśavajrāsthāṁ buddhabimbam dhārayantī | dakṣiṇe kare sthitavajrāṅkhaṁvāndayanayogena sarvakrodhakulam vaśikurvanty avasthitāḥ (corr.: avasthitāḥ Cod.) | *sarvāś caitāḥ (corr.: sarvvañcetāḥ Cod.) Pratyālīḍhasthānasthāḥ <h> | sadṛṣṭibhāvarasānvitā<ḥ> A complete but less detailed description of these eight can be seen in the Tibetan translation of the *Herukasādhana of Hūṁkāravajra, f. 204r–7. The identity of the non-human heads of the gate-guardians is mentioned in these sources only in the case of the horse-headed Turāṅgāmā, by Ānandagarbha and Hūṁkāravajra (f. 204r5: shar sgo rta mgrin ’phang mtho dkar | g.yas na rta gdong g.yon lcags kyu), and Vajramukhi, by Hūṁkāravajra, who names this goddess Phag gdong ‘Boar-face’ (Sūkarāśya) (f. 204r6: lhor sgor phag gdong sngon mo ste | g.yas pas me ba g.yon zhags ’dzin). According to the tradition of the Ngor Manḍalas, the last two door-guardians, Snang ba ma (Ālokā) and Thal byed ma (*Bhasmakārīṇī?), are crow-faced and dog-faced (BSOD NAMS RGYA MTSHO 1991, p. 110). These animal-headed guardians exemplify the character of this Tantra as transitional between the Yogatantras and the Yoginītantras. The animal-headedness is shared with such goddesses in the latter (see here p. 151), but the hand-attributes, namely the hook, noose, chain, and bell, are those of Vajrāṅkuṣa, Vajrapāśa, Vajrāṣṭha, and Vajrāvēśa, the male gate-guardians of the Vajradhātumandala of the Yogatantra Sarvatathāgataatattvasamgraha; see TANAKA 1996, p. 271. For those attributes see the *Herukasādhana of Hūṁkāravajra, f. 204r–7 (I have restored the Mantras, which invoke the goddesses as the personifications of these attributes, to their correct Sanskrit form): OṂ *VAJRĀṅKUṢE (corr.: BA DZRA AM KU SHA Cod.) ṢAH | shar sgo rta mgrin ’phang mtho dkar | g.yas na rta gdong g.yon lcags kyu | OṂ VAJRAPĀŚE HŪṂ | lhor sgor phag gdong sngon mo ste | g.yas pas me ba g.yon zhags ’dzin | OṂ *VAJRAṢṬĀKHALE (corr.: BA DZRA SHRI KHA LE Cod.) VAMA | nub sgor snang byed dmar mo ni | phyaṅ gnyis nī zla lcags sgraṅ ’dzin | OṂ *VAJRAGHANTE (corr.: BA DZRA GA ṆṬE Cod.) HOḤ | byang sgor thal byed mdog ljang du | sang rgyas gzugs dang dril bu’o. -- 153 --
tathāgatatattvasamgraha,\textsuperscript{350} is very much in the Kāpālika style of the pantheons of Bhairavas and Yoginis taught in the Vidyāpīṭha.

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

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

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{350} See Sarvatathāgatatattvasamgraha, sections 165–176 and Nispannayogāvali, p. 46 (Vajradhūpa, Vajrapuspā, Vajrālokā, and Vajragandhā).

\textsuperscript{351} The practice and the jargon are outlined by Āryadeva in his Caryāmelāpakapradīpa (pp. 82–60: praipaścaitācaryā) on the authority of this Tantra. The Yoginis personified here are the twenty that form the retinue of Vajrasattva, the eight peculiar to him being Śaṃvarī, Ahosukhā, Pradīpā, Śisyā, Buddhabodhi, Dharmacakrā, Trailokāyā, and Kāmalatā.

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

\textsuperscript{353} The Tantra begins as follows (Sangs rgyas thams cad mnyam par sbyor ba, f. 151r1–2: 1.1 sens dpa’ sangs rgyas kun gyi dngos | rdo rje sens dpa’ bde ba’i mchog | gsang ba mchog gi dgyes pa na | thams cad bdag nyid rtag tu ghugu | 1.2 ’di ni rang byung coos ldan ’das | geig bu rab tu phye ba’i lha | sangs rgyas thams cad mnyam sbyor ba | mkha’ ’gro sgyu ma bde ba’i mchog (*rahasye parame ramye sarvatmane sadā sthitah | sarvabuddhamayaḥ sattva vajrasattvah param sukhah || asau suvayambhūr bhagavān eka evādhīdaivataḥ | sarvabuddhasamāyogadākinījālaśamvarah). Cf. the opening verses of the Laghuśaṃvaratantra, which are evidently based on it: athāto rahasyaṃ vakṣye samāsān na tu vistarāt | śrīherukasamyogam sarvakāmārthasādhanam || 1.2 uttarād api cottaṃ dākinījālaśvaram | rahasye parame ramye sarvatmane sadā sthitah || 1.3 sarvādākinīmayaḥ sattva vajrasattvah param sukhah || asau hi suvayambhūr bhagavān vīro dākinījālaśvaram; and the following citation of the Sarvabuddhasamāyoga in the Caryāmelāpakapradīpa, p. 82: athātah sampravakṣyāmi sarvato viśvam uttamam | sarvabuddhasamāyogam dākinījālaśvaram || rahasye parame ramye sarvatmane sadā sthitah | sarvabuddhamayaḥ śrīmān vajrasattvavadyah sukhah. These verses are 1–2 of the Kalpa 6 of the Tantra, corresponding to the Tibetan, except that that seems to have had a different version of the first line (f. 159v4–5): de nas gzhan yang thams cad du | rnam pa sna tshogs mchog ’byung pa’i | sangs rgyas thams cad mnyam sbyor ba | mkha’ ’gro sgyu ma’i
\end{flushright}
mentary continuation (uttaratantra) of this Tantra, that we see the first appearance in the Mantranaya of the Śaiva method of teaching Mantras in encrypted form to be decoded by the process known as mantroddhāraḥ; and with this development we encounter what is at present our earliest evidence of Buddhist-Śaiva intertextuality. A passage of seven verses that prescribes for this purpose the drawing of a square with forty-nine cells (kośṭhakāṇi) and the arranging of the forty-nine letters within them corresponds very closely to one in the Vīnāśikha of the vāmasrotaḥ division of the Vidyāpīṭha.354

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

---

354 This has been demonstrated in TOMABECHI 2007. The Śaiva passage is Vīnāśikha 52–58. That in the Sarvakalpasamuccaya is DK, Rgyud 'bum, vol. ka, ff. 194v6–195r5.

355 Śamvaratantra (= Sarvabuddhasamāyogaṇākinijālaśamvara) quoted in Jnānasiddhi 18.10–18 (pp. 153–154): sarvaśuddhyadhīmokṣeṇa prasahya balavān adhāḥ | parākramakramānāt tu sarvalokān pramādāyet | anyaṃ tu duṣṭaruardrogaṃ sattvadhātum anekadhā | pāvais coiraiv avaskandhaiḥ sarvam eva viśodhayet | cchālena māyāya caiva prasahya balavān adhāḥ | paśčāyudhanibandhaiḥ ca sarvalokān jayet tādā | viśajyā sakalām Siddhiṃ jagat sthāvarajjagamam | vicitravinayopāyaiḥ svaparān anupālayet | kāminīnām bhavet kāmo raudrāṇām raudram uttamaṃ | saumyānāṃ paramāṃ saumyam haṭṭhānāṃ haṭṭhavikramāḥ | paramesāṃ samākramya prasahya balavān adhāḥ | umādevīṃ samākṛṣya copabhogair bhunakty asau | nārāyāṇam samākramya prasahya balavān adhāḥ | rūpīnīṃ tu samākṛṣya upabhogair bhunakty asau | prajāpatīṃ samākramya prasahya balavān adhāḥ | prasāntadevīṃ āśāya upabhogair bhunakty asau | kāmadevaṃ samākramya prasahya balavān adhāḥ | ratipritidhṛtyāśvaryaṃ samākramya bhunakty asau. This corresponds to
rhetoric of appropriation is reflected in the Mantras of Heruka’s Vajraḍākinīs. Pramohā, who, as we have seen, has the boar face of Viṣṇu's Ādivarāha incarnation, is invoked as Vajraṇārayanī, Cauṛi as Vajracaṇḍeśvari, and Ghasmarī as Vajramāheśvari.356 Furthermore, Heruka’s first appearance in the Mantranaya is in the Sarvatathāgatatattvasaṃgraha, where his name appears in a Mantra for the drawing of all the [Śaiva] Mother-goddesses into Buddhism, and it is that, with the insertion of a single seed syllable, that is adopted as the Mantra of Heruka in the Sarvabuddhasaṃayogaḍākinījālaśaṃvara.357 The very title of the work alludes to this assimilation, since it is evidently calqued on those of two Vidyāpīṭha scriptures, the Sarvavīrasaṃayoga and the Yoginījālaśaṃvara.358

The Yoginitantras and the Full Appropriation of Vidyāpīṭha Śaivism

With the Yoginītantras proper we reach the final stage of this process of absorption. The principal among the numerous Tantras of this class are the...
Laghuśaṁvara also called Cakrasaṁvara and Herukābhidhāna, the Hevajra, the Catuṣṭiṭha, the Vajrāṁṛta, the Buddhakapāla, the Mahāmāya, the Rigyārali, the Vajrārali, the Caṇḍamahāroṣaṇa, and the Kālacakra. Two of these texts, the Laghuśaṁvara of the Heruka called Śaṁvara (bDe mchog) or Cakrasaṁvara (Khor lo sdom pa) and the Hevajra of the Heruka Hevajra held centre-stage, a position they later shared with the Kālacakra when that text was propagated towards the end of the tenth century, during the reign of Mahīpāla I (r. c. 977–1027). Their importance is reflected in the shere quantity of commentaries and other texts devoted to the cult of their deities. The Tenjur contains translations of eleven commentaries on the Hevajra and of eleven on the Laghuśaṁvara, and of about two hundred other explanatory texts related to each. Moreover, they both have a number of satellite Tantras, the Hevajra five and the Laghuśaṁvara over fifty. The principal among these, those that received commentaries, are for the Hevajra the Dākinīvajrapañjara and the Mahāmudrātilaka, and for the Laghuśaṁvara the Herukābhhyudaya, the Vajradāka, the Abhidhānottara, the Yoginīsaṃcāra, the Saṃvarodaya, and the Dākārṇava. Another major Yoginītantra, the Sampūtodbhava, on which we have an important commentary, the Āmnāyamaṇjarī, by Abhayākaragupta (1064–1125), pertains to both cycles.

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

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

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

362 Thus, though counted as an explanatory Tantra of the Cakrasaṁvara cycle, it is grouped with the Hevajra and Dākinīvajrapañjara as one of the three Tantras of Hevajra (kye rdo rje rgyud gsum) in the Sa skyā tradition of Tibet, and classified because of its mixed character as the Hevajra’s shared explanatory Tantra (thun mong bshad rgyud); see STEARNS 2001, pp. 173–174, n. 28. It also extends into the territories of the Catuṣṭiṭha, the Guhyasamāja, the Vajrabhairava, and, as we
CHRONOLOGY AND PROVENANCE. All of these Tantras were translated into Tibetan, and all but the latest among them, the Dākārṇava and the Saṃvarodya, were translated in the first half of the eleventh century, during the opening phase of the later diffusion (phyi dar) of Indian Buddhism to Tibet, as were commentaries on the majority of those named here, most written during the course of the tenth and early eleventh centuries.

The oldest is probably the commentary of Jayabhadra on the Laghuśaṃvara. In chapter 38 of his Rgya gar chos 'byung Tāranātha includes five of our commentators on the Laghuśaṃvara, Jayabhadra, Bhavabhadra/Bhavabhatṭa, Bhavyakīrti, Durjayacandra, and Tathāgatarakṣita, among ten persons whom he holds to have occupied the office of chief Vajrācārya at Vikramāśīla in rapid unbroken succession, and claims that Jayabhadra was the first of the ten (Jayabhadra, Śrīdhara, Bhavabhadra (Bhavabhatṭa), Bhavyakīrti, Līlāvajra, Durjayacandra, Kṛṣṇasamayavajra, Tathāgatarakṣita, Bodhibhadra, and Kamalarakṣita). Moreover, comparison of the commentaries, the Tibetan translation, and the only manuscript of the Laghuśaṃvara accessible to me at present reveals two versions of the text. Tāranātha’s claim that Jayabhadra preceded all the other commentators in his list gains support from the fact that Jayabhadra knew what is evidently the earlier of these two versions. It extends only to 50.19, ending with a passage on fire-sacrifices that may be performed if one wishes to subject another to one’s will (vaśyahomah). In the second, attested by all the other commentators except Bhavyakīrti,363 by the Tibetan translation, and by

---

363 In Bhavyakīrti’s Cakrasaṃvaraparājñākā the text of the Laghuśaṃvara ends exactly where it does in Jayabhadra’s. It is therefore likely to belong like Jayabhadra’s to the earliest phase of the exegesis of this Tantra. Jayabhadra’s appears to be the older of the two. In 41.8 Bhavyakīrti attests with the later witnesses the interpolation (see here p.199) *oddiyānjālandhara-pulliramalayādiśu (bDe mchog nyung ngu, f. 239r2: au dy na | dzā la ndha ra dang pu li ra ma la ya sogs), since he comments here (f. 36v6): o dyā na du ni ’od ldan ma’o | dzā la ndha rar ni gtum mig ma’o | pu līl ra ma la ya sogs, whereas Jayabhadra says that Pulliramayā has not been mentioned but must nonetheless be understood to be intended (p. 137: pullramālayo na nirīḍtah sarvāpiṭānām pradhanatvād upadeśād vāvaseyah). It seems probable, then, that Bhavyakīrti follows the reading of a subsequent redaction in which this ‘omission’ had been rectified.

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

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

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

364 Zhib mo rdo rje, p. 84.
365 Blue Annals, p. 380.
However, this chronology can be reconciled with other reports only at a great stretch, at least for the later teachers in Tāranātha’s succession. Thus Dmarston, pupil of Sa skya Pañḍita Kun dga’ rgyal mtshan (1182–1251) tells us\(^{366}\) that Durjayacandra, who by this calculation would have held office from 940 to 952, was the teacher of Prajñendra-ruci, also called Vīravajra, and that the latter taught ’Brog mi Śākyya ye shes. Now ’Brog mi is said to have let Tibet for Nepal and India when Rin chen bzang po was nearly fifty years old,\(^{367}\) that is to say around 1007 if Rin chen bzang po was born in 958, as his biography claims and Gzhon nu dpal accepts,\(^{368}\) and then, after spending one year in Nepal with Śāntibhadra\(^{369}\) and eight at Vikramaśīla with Ratnākaraśānti,\(^{370}\) to have studied with Prajñendra-ruci for three or four,\(^{371}\) that is to say, therefore, c. 1016–1020. If we accept that Durjayacandra is unlikely to have held such a senior post as that of the head Vajrācārya of Vikramaśīla in his youth and assume for the sake of argument that he was fifty-five when he began his tenure, then if that tenure began in 940, he would have to have been continuing to teach long after his retirement at sixty-seven in 952, and Prajñendra-ruci, if we take 945 as the latest plausible year of his birth, would have been about seventy when he accepted ’Brog mi as his pupil.

This scenario is not impossible; but neither is it comfortable. Nor is it helped by the fact that Prajñendra-ruci is reported to have collaborated with ’Brog mi on translations of texts pertaining to Hevajra and his consort Nairātmyā. This evidence is given in the colophons at the end of these translations\(^{372}\) and should be considered more reliable than that of hagiographical biographies.

Even more difficult to reconcile is the report in the Chos ’byung of Pad ma dkar po (1527–1592) that Durjayacandra taught the Mantranaya at Vikramaśīla to the translator Rin chen bzang po.\(^{373}\) For Rin chen bzang po is said to have left for India in 975, at the age of seventeen, and to have gone to Vikramaśīla only after a period of some seven years of education in Kashmir, therefore around 982. At that time Durjayacandra would have been nearly a hundred if we hold to the assumption that he began his tenure in 940 when he was fifty-five years of age.\(^{374}\) It is probable, then, that while we are indeed closer to the truth if

\(^{366}\) Zhib mo rdo rje, pp. 86–88.

\(^{367}\) Blue Annals, p. 205, ll. 26–31.

\(^{368}\) Blue Annals, p. 68, ll. 3–6.

\(^{369}\) Zhib mo rdo rje, p. 84, ll. 6–10; Blue Annals, p. 205, ll. 32–35.

\(^{370}\) Zhib mo rdo rje, p. 86, l. 10; Blue Annals, p. 206, ll. 18–19.

\(^{371}\) Blue Annals, p. 206, ll. 32–33 (three years); Zhib mo rdo rje, p. 88, ll. 7–8 (four years).

\(^{372}\) Tōh. 1185, 1236, 1251, 1310.

\(^{373}\) TUCCI 1988, p. 35.

\(^{374}\) TUCCI 1988, pp. 3–4.
we calculate back from the Door-keepers than forward from Buddhajñāna and Dipankarabhadra, Tāranātha has placed the later teachers from Durjayacandra onwards too early.

This suspicion gains further support from what we know of the life of Tathāgatarakṣita. If Tāranātha’s report were accurate, provided that we calculate backwards from the six Door-keepers, then he would have held office at Vikramaśīla c. 964–976. But we learn from the colophon of the Tibetan translation of his commentary on the Yoganīśamcāra that he translated the work himself with the help of the Tibetan Ba ri Lo tsā ba Rin chen grags. This places his activity well into the second half of the eleventh century. For Ba ri Rin chen grags is said by Gzhon nu dpal to have been born in 1040.375

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

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

375 Blue Annals, p. 211.
376 DAVIDSON 1981, pp. 7–8.
elephant’, to which Laghuśaṃvara 2.16c corresponds only in sense and then not exactly.\(^{378}\) As for the second citation,\(^ {379}\) the word kankāláḥ does appear in the Laghuśaṃvara, as the name of one of the twenty-four Vīra consorts of the twenty-four Đākinīs,\(^ {380}\) but as a single word its presence is not enough to establish the identity of Vilāsavajra’s Cakrasaṃvara with the Laghuśaṃvara. On the other hand, the fact that the first epithet attributed to the Cakrasaṃvara does not occur in the Laghuśaṃvara is not sufficient to prove the opposing thesis, that Vilāsavajra was referring to another work. For it is conceivable that he was citing the text not for the exact wording of Mañjuśrīnāmasaṃgiṭī 69d (gajacarmacāpaṭārdradhṛk) but only for an expression close to it in meaning. But if this is true it establishes, of course, only that Vilāsavajra may have been referring to Laghuśaṃvara 2.16c, not that he was. To continue to hold to the position that Vilāsavajra must have been referring to our Laghuśaṃvara in spite of these considerations, one has to put one’s trust in the fact that the Laghuśaṃvara is also known as the Cakrasaṃvara and the fact that no other work of this name is cited (unless it be here). One must also remain free of the suspicion that there might have been another, earlier work with this title among the numerous Tantras known in the eighth century that have failed to survive either in Sanskrit or in Tibetan translation.\(^ {381}\) One must also overlook the evidence of the Laghuśaṃvara itself. For that refers to a Cakrasaṃvara in a list of its own predecessors.\(^ {382}\) I conclude, therefore, that there is no more than

\(^{378}\) Vilāsavajra, Nāmanamantrārthāvalokini A f. 57r1–2, on Mañjuśrīnāmasaṃgiṭī 69d (gajacarmacāpaṭārdradhṛk): gajacarmacāpaṭārdradhṛg iti śrīcakrasaṃvare | gajasya carma gajacarma paṭaś cāsāv ṛdhraś ca | gajacarmaiwa paṭārdraḥ gajacarmacāpaṭārdraḥ | tām dhārayatiḥ gajacarmacāpaṭārdradhṛk. This error has been pointed out by Szántó (2008b, p. 217).

\(^{379}\) Vilāsavajra, Nāmanamantrārthāvalokini A f. 55v6, on Mañjuśrīnāmasaṃgiṭī 67cd (damstrākarālaḥ kankālo halāhalaḥ śatānanaḥ): kankāla iti śrīcakrasaṃvare.

\(^{380}\) Laghuśaṃvara f. 35r4–7 (48.9c–12): vajrasattva vairocana padmanarteśvaras tathā | śrīvajraherukaś caiva āhāṣagarbhaḥ hayaṃrūva eva ca || 10 ratnavajra mahābala virāpākṣa bhairavas tathā | vajrabhadra subhadrāś caiva <va>jrahūṃkāram eva ca || 11 mahāvīra vajrajañilaṃ tu aṅkurika vajradehaka | vajraprabha amitaṃbhah surāvairino viṅkātaṃśriniṃ eva ca || 12 kankāla mahākankāla khaṇḍakahāpālinādi tu caturviṃśatīvīraḥ niḥ sarvaṃ vyāpāt akhilam jagat.

\(^{381}\) Such works cited in Vilāsavajra’s commentary are the Krodhendutilaka (A f. 57r5), the Guhyakoṣa (A f. 57v1), the Vajroghanocaya (B f. 39r6), the Śatprajñānayaśaṃvara (B f. 40v3), the Sarvatantrasamuccaya (A f. 57r4), and the Vajrakirīti (A f. 56v6). Similarly, in the Tattvasiddhi of Śantaraksīta we find the Sarvadevasamāgama, the Laukikalokottaravajra, and the Vinukitsamudghātana, and in the Caryāmelāpakapradīpa of Āryadeva the Vajramukhīmahāyoga and the Vinayāmoghasiddhi.

\(^{382}\) Laghuśaṃvara 27.23–24a as transmitted in Abhidhānottāra, Paṭala 43, A f. 140r1–2f, B f. 180v3–4: tattvasaṃgrahaḥ yad uktam ca tathoktaṃ cakraṣaṃvare.
a possibility that Vilāsavajra knew the *Laghuśaṃvara* and, therefore, that the existence of this Tantra in the eighth century remains unproved.

What we can say with confidence is that the *Laghuśaṃvara* came after the *Paramādya*, the *Vajrabhairava*, the *Sarvatathāgatasamgraha*, the *Guhyasamāja* and, therefore, that the *Sarvabuddhasamāyogadākinījālaśaṃvara*, since it names these, and tacitly incorporates verses from the last three in its earliest accessible redaction. These borrowings do not rule out the possibility that the
Laghuśaṃvara was composed in that century, since none of the works is later than that time. But three considerations suggest a later date. (1) No text of the Cakrasaṃvara corpus, or any other Yoginītantra, was translated into Tibetan during the earlier diffusion of Buddhism (snga’ dar) that occurred from the eighth century to the middle of the ninth, during Tibet’s imperial period: this new literature reached the Tibetans only during the later transmission (phyi’ dar), that began c. 1000. (2) Among the many surviving stone, metalwork, and painted Indian images of Saṃvara none is demonstrably earlier than the tenth century. Finally (3), there is, as we have seen, no evidence of commentatorial work on the Laghuśaṃvara before c. 900. Of course, none of these facts proves conclusively that the Laghuśaṃvara was not in existence at an earlier date. But they do incline one to consider a later date more probable. This is particularly so in the case of the absence of commentaries. The Laghuśaṃvara is so problematic text from the Buddhist point of view that it is hard to imagine that it could have survived for long without the support of learned exegesis.

Whatever its date, the Laghuśaṃvara is likely to be a product of the first phase of the development of the Yoginītantras, if not the earliest of them all. This surmise rests on the assumption that Yoginītantras that are less sophisticated in the sense that they show a less developed Mahāyāna Buddhist theo-

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

As for the provenance of the Laghuśamvarā, it was certainly eastern India, the region in which most of the Indian learned exegesis of this Tantric corpus was produced. The Tantra does not state this explicitly. Claiming the status of revelation it would have been averse to doing so. Nonetheless, it reveals its provenance in spite of itself by giving BA in its encoding of some of the syllables of Mantras where correct Sanskrit requires VA. This is evidently an effect of the fact that va is pronounced ba in the Indo-Aryan vernaculars of this region. Thus 5.4 yields BHAGABATE rather than BHAGAVATE: pañcamasya yac caturtham prathamasya trīyam | trayoviṃśas tathaiva ca caturthasya yah prathamam (f. 5r3–4) ‘the fourth of the fifth [class of consonants] (BHA), the third of the first (GA), the twenty-third (BA), and the first of the fourth (T-)’; and 30.20–21 yields BHAGABĀM rather than BHAGAVĀM (for BHAGAVĀN): kośṭhakād dasamaṁ caiva vilomena tu sādhakaḥ | kośṭhakā ekoniṃśatimatam tathā trayoviṃśatikosthakād | dvitiyakośhahasamuktaṁ bindunā urvabhūṣitaṁ (f. 23v4–5) ‘The Sādhaka should select the tenth counting backwards from the compartment [of HA] (BHA), the nineteenth from that [of A] (GA), and the [letter] from the twenty-third box (B-) together with [the letter in] the second box adorned above with a dot (ĀṂ)’.

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

---

386 This is so in Bihāri, Maithili, Bengali, Kumāuni, Nepāli, Assamese, and Orīyā.

– 165 –
of this passage in Paṭala 54 of the Abhidhānottara (A f. 166r3: ekonnattrinśaṁ tathaiva ca). Likewise in 30.21 we find Jayabhadra giving ekonnattrimśati- (VA) in place of the reading trayoviṃśati (BA) attested by the manuscript, but here the ‘incorrect’ reading is also supported by the Tibetan translation and the commentary of Bhavabhaṭṭa. There can be little doubt that the non-standard readings giving BA rather than VA are original. For it is not surprising there should have been attempts to correct an original BA to VA, whereas it would be most unlikely that any redactor would have made the effort to rewrite a reading that gave VA in order to yield BA.\(^\text{387}\)

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

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

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

\(^{389}\) Bhavabhaṭṭa, Cakrasaṃvarapaṇjikā, explaining the title with the prefixed honorific Śrī- when it occurs in the final colophon in the words śrīcakrasaṃvaranāmni mahā-yoginītantrarāje ‘in the great king among the Yoginītantras called śrīcakrasaṃvara’ in the final colophon: śrīḥ punyajñānasambhārāḥ | cakram dharmacakram | śrīmac cakram śrīcakram | tena kāpathāḥ sattvānām manāḥ saṃvṛnotitī śrīcakrasaṃvarah śrīherukah | tadabhidhāyītvāt tantram api tathocyate ‘The word Śrī- ‘glory’ denotes the accumulating of [both] merit and gnosis. The word -cakra- ‘wheel’ refers to the wheel of the Dharma. It is prefixed by Śrī to express the fact that it [that is to say, the teaching of the Buddha,) entails this [provisioning with both merit and
Ratnakaraśānti explains it as meaning ‘the Highest (varam) Bliss’ (śam) when analysing its occurrence in the neuter in the compound dākinījālasaṅgavaram,390 and Bhavabhaṭṭa when analysing its occurrence in the masculine gender at the end of the same (dākinījālasaṅgavaraḥ) takes it to mean ‘[Heruka,] who protects Bliss (śam vṛṇotīti saṃvaraḥ) [by keeping it free of all defects]’.391 This line of analysis, which applies a meaning of śam that is well-attested in non-sectarian lexicography,392 is not the invention of these commentators. They draw on the authority of the Sarvabuddhasamāyoga, which refers to its deity Vajrasattva as Śaṃvara and explains that name as meaning ‘[he who has/is the] Highest Bliss’.393 That the -saṃvara form is not only old but also original is established

gnosis]. Heruka is called Śrīcakrasaṃvara [here] because he restrains [saṃvṛṇotīti saṃvaraḥ] by means of this [wheel, in the sense that he restrains] the minds of living beings from the false path. [This] Tantra has the same name because it is that which refers to him’.390 Ratnakaraśānti, Mahāmāyātiṣṭhā on 23d: saṃvaram sukhavaram mahāsukham ‘śam means ‘bliss’ and varam ‘best’. So saṃvaram means ‘the best bliss’ (sukhavaram) [i.e.] ‘the Great Bliss (mahāsukham)’. The same analysis is tacitly given in such parallel expressions as dākinījālasatsukham in Samvarodaya 3.6d and 26.10cd; and Vajradāka 1.1cd: sarvadākininamayah sattvo vajradākhaḥ param sukham; 1.12cd, 1.50, 1.71cd: sarvadākinisamāyogavajradākhaḥ param sukham.391 Bhavabhaṭṭa, Cakrasaṃvarapāṇḍikā on 1.2: dākinī sūnyatā. jālam upāyah | jālena hi matsyāibandhasiddhiḥ | upāyena hi klesāṇādīr niyāmaścīkṣikaraḥ kriyate | tābhyyām śam sukham avadvebhyo bahīṣkṛtya vṛṇotīti dākinījālasaṃvaraḥ [The meaning of the name] Dākinījālasaṃvara [applied to Heruka here] is ‘he who protects (-varah [vṛṇotīti varah]) bliss (śam) by means of the Dākini and the Net (jālam)’. The term Dākini [here] means ‘[Emptiness,] the fact that [all things] are void of [intrinsic reality]’ (sūnyatā); and the term ‘Net’ refers to the method (upāyah) [i.e., namely the compassion (karuṇā) that must accompany awareness of that Emptiness]. It is called a net [metaphorically]. For by using a net one succeeds in catching fish and other creatures. [Likewise] by employing the method [that is compassion] one restrains and so renders incapable of activity the ‘fish and other creatures’ that are the afflictions (klesāḥ), namely attachment, hatred and the rest). He protects bliss by means of these two, [emptiness and compassion,] in the sense that through these he protects it from [those] defects’.392 See, e.g., Hemacandra, Anekarthasamgraha, Pariśiṣṭakāṇḍa 21a: saṃ kalyāne sukhe ‘tha; Vardhamāna, Gaṇaratnamahodadhivṛttī, p. 39, on 1.15: saṃ duhkhopāsane; Yāska, Nighaṇṭubhāṣya, p. 521 (on Rgveda 5.4.5: saṃ no bhavantu vājinaḥ): sukkāḥ no bhavantu vājinaḥ.393 Sangs rgyas thams cad mnyam par sbyor ba, f. 15r6–7 (1.10): saṃḥ zhes bya ba bde bar bshad | sungs rgyas kun gyi bde chen yin | sgyu ma thams cad rab sbyor ba | mchog tu bde bas bde ba’i mchog (sukham śam iti viḥyātaṃ sarvabuddh hasattrasiukham | sarvajīlasamāyogah sukhavareṇa saṃvaraḥ) ‘The word śam means ‘bliss’, the Great Bliss of all the Buddhas. He is Śaṃvara because of [the fact that he possesses] the highest degree of [this] bliss’. The Sanskrit of the first half of this verse is supported by its citation by Vīśāvajra while explaining the epithet mahāsukhas in his Nāmamantarāthavālakīni, f. 57v1–2: mahāsukha iti śrīsaṃvare | tatra mahāsukha iti yat tāthāgatam anāsravam sukham tan mahāsukha iti ucye | tatraivoktaṃ sukham śam iti viḥyātaṃ sarvabuddhhaḥ mahāsukham iti.
by evidence outside the Buddhist corpus. For Yoganījālaśaṃvara is found as the name of a Bhairava in one of the secondary Kalpas taught in the Śākta Śaiva Picumata,\(^{394}\) which, as we shall see, was a major unacknowledged source for the redactor of the Laghuśaṃvara. That the form intended there is -śaṃvara-rather than -saṃvara- is certain, because the text provides a semantic analysis that takes the first syllable to mean bliss (sukham).\(^{395}\)

However, these are not the only views. Jayabhadra, commenting on 1.2 of the Laghuśaṃvara, takes the same expression to be Dākinījālaśaṃvara, understanding it to refer to the Laghuśaṃvara itself and explaining it as 'The Concealment of the Array of Dākinīs', deriving the last element of the compound from saṃvṛ- ‘to envelop’,\(^{396}\) and while the Tibetans usually render the

---

394 Yoganījālaśaṃvara in this text is a form of Bhairava and the term refers by extension to his Mantra and the associated system of practice (vratam). See Picumata f. 251r5–v1 (56.4c–6b): śrṇu devi pravakṣyāmi sarvayogiprasādhanam | yāgamantrasamopetam yoganījālaśaṃvaram | yena vijñātamātrenāella tānilkoye kecaripadam | āśāya kṛiḍate mantri kuḷaśiddhisamanvītaḥ ‘Listen, O Devī. I shall teach you about Yoganījālaśaṃvara together with the deities with whom he is to be worshipped (yāga-) and his Mantra, as the means of propitiating the Yoganīs. As soon as the Mantra adept has mastered this he will reach the domain of the Khecarīs and move freely through the triple universe, possessing [all] the supernatural powers of the [Yoginī] clants’.

395 Picumata f. 251v2–3 (56.12–13b): saṃhām jālam ity uktam yoginīnām maho-dayam | saṃ sukham vara dātṛtvā<\> *saṃhatvatvivakṣayā (saṃhatva em. : saṃhātvaam Cod.) | * yogesiyogabhāvaasthām (yogesiyoga conj. : yogayogīsa Cod.) yoganījālaśaṃvaram | mantram tu kathitaṃ devi bhairavasyāmātítmakaṃ ‘The expression Yoganījāla [in Yoganījālaśaṃvara] means the exalted totality of the Yoganīs, jālam ‘net’ denoting ‘multitude’ [here]. The saṃ of -saṃvara means ‘bliss’ (sukham). The Yoganījālaśaṃvara[mantra] is so named because it is the bestower (-vara) of that bliss, [-vara- being formed as an agent noun from the verb vṛ- ‘to give’]. It is the granter of this bliss to the Yoganījāla in as much as it is located in the inner state of *the Yoga of the Yogeśvarīs, the plurality of these being intended in the sense of their totality (conj.). The Mantra of Bhairava [that bears this name] is infinite [in its power].’

396 Jayabhadra, Cakramuṣvarapāṇijīka on 1.1–2b (athātō rahasam vaksye samāsān natu viṣtarāt | śrīherukasāmyogam sarvakāmārthāsādhakam | uttarād api cottaram dākinījālaśaṃvaram ‘Next I shall teach the secret, in brief rather than at length, the congress of Śrīheruka, the accomplishments of all desires, the Dākinījālaśaṃvara, higher even than the higher’): uttarād api cottaram iti desyadesakayor abhedat | yāṇy uttaratantrāṇi samājādīṇī teśām apy uttaratvād uktam | dākinījālaśaṃvaram iti | dākinīyā sarvā tricakra vyavasthītāḥ | tāsām jāalam samāhas tasya samvarah | samvaranam gopanam ity arthah ‘It is referred to as higher even than the Tantras [of the Yogottara class] headed by the [Guhya]samājā, which are ‘higher’ because the difference between teacher and the taught is absent [in them]. As for [the title] Dākinījālaśaṃvara, it means the concealing of the net, that is to say, of the totality of all the Dākinīs that are established
Cakra-name 'Khor lo sdom pa and so support the form Cakrasaṃvara, we also find 'Khor lo bde mchog in their translations, which supports the alternative Cakrabhūta.

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

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

---

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

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

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

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

---

\(^{400}\) This description of Heruka and Vajravārāhī follows that given by Jayabhada in his *Cakrasamvara-paṇḍjikā*, p. 109, on *Laghuśaṃvara* 1.10. for the iconography of the Yoganīṣ and Vīrās see Bhavabhāṭṭa’s *Cakrasamvaravivṛti* on *Laghuśaṃvara*, Paṭāla 4 (vol. 1, pp. 44–47). See also *Nispannayogāvalī*, pp. 26–29.
on his limbs. All these had entered Śiva’s iconography long before the formation of the Tantras of the Cakrasaṃvara cycle. Śiva’s trident appears on seals and intaglios during the Kuśāṇa and Kuśāṇa-Sassanian periods in Gandhāra and Afghanistan. The third eye appears in sculptures of Śiva from Mathurā around the beginning of the third century; and the ascetic’s piled braids and the new moon upon them appear there and elsewhere from the beginning of the fifth; and all these characteristics, the trident in his hand, the third eye, the ascetic’s braids, and the new moon, are mentioned in the Mahābhārata, as are his tiger-skin, his multiple faces and arms, his skull-bowl, his skull-staff, his brahmanical thread in the form of a snake, his sharp fangs, his garland of skulls, and his living in the cremation grounds smeared with ashes from its funeral pyres. His wearing a bleeding elephant hide is also a commonplace by that time, being mentioned along with his crematorial characteristics in the works of the poet Kālidāsa. As for the severed head of Brahmā, this too derives from a well-known Śaiva myth which though not found in the Mahābhārata in the text common to all the regional versions, does appear in the Skandapurāṇa-

---

401 For a recent analysis of Śiva images in the subcontinent, including those on coins, from the first century B.C. to the end of the Kuśāṇa period, see GHOSE 2002, pp. 70–96.

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

403 Mahābhārata 3.8.111a (trīṣūlapāneḥ); 13.14.119 (bālendumukutam ... tribhir netraiḥ krtoddyotam), 12.122.24b (śūlajaṭādharah), 7.172.59c (jaṭāmanḍalacandra-mauliṃ). See, e.g., Mahābhārata 13.127.18a (vyāghracarmāmbaradharah); 14.8.30d (mahādevam caturmukham), 13.14.116c (aśṭādasabhujam sthāṇum), 14.8.28a (virūpākṣam dasabhujam), 13.17.40a (dasābāhus tv animiso); 12.36.2c (kapalapāniḥ khaṭvāṅgi), 10.7.4d (khaṭvāṅgadhārīnam); 13.15.11cd (tiṣṇadamṛṣṭram ... vyāl-yajñopaviṭam), 14.8.21a (tiṣṇadāmaṃśtrāya karālāya); 10.6.33c (kapalāmālīnaṃ); 10.7.4a (śmaśānāvāśinam); 13.14.153c (śuklabhāsmaṭvaliptāya).

405 Meghadūta 36c: hara paśupater ārdranāgājineccchāṃ 'Remove Śiva’s desire for his [blood]-wet elephant hide'; Kumārasambhava 5.67d: gajājīnaṃ ṣonitabinduvārsi ca ‘his’ elephant hide that showers drops of blood'; 5.77b: trilokanāthah pītraṇāmocaraḥ ‘The Lord of the Three Worlds frequents cremation grounds’; 5.69c, 5.79b: citābhāsmarajāh ‘the ash-dust of funeral pyres’; and 5.71b: kapālīnaḥ ‘decked with skulls’. Rudra/Śiva frequently has the epithet kṛttivāsas- ‘wearer of the hide’ in the Mahābhārata. The Matsyapurāṇa (Patala 153) relates that this is the hide of the elephant demon Gajāśura killed by Śiva in a great battle between the gods and the Asuras. How the elephant hide was understood when incorporated into the iconography of Heruka is not stated in most instances of its mention. But in two Kalpas in the Abhidhānottara, those of Samayaśaṃvara and the Heruka of the ekāvīrvidhānam, it is said to be that of the elephantine Śaiva-brahmanical deity Gaṇapati (B f. 34v1: aparabhujadvayaṇa gaṇapaticarmāṃbaraḥ dharah (corr.: dharā Cod.) and (B f. 40v2–3: aparabhujadvayaṇa gaṇapaticarmāṃbaradharah).

406 There is a reference to it in a supplementary passage of 26 verses inserted within a...
Genesis and Development of Tantrism

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

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


See here p. 51.

Jayabhadra, Cakrasamvariapañjikā on Paṭāla 12: kṛtapūrvasevo mantriṇāḥ iti vajjarudrayogavān ‘When the king among Mantra adepts has completed the preparatory service (pūrvasevā), that is to say, when he has achieved a state of complete identification with Vajjarudra . . . ’; and on Paṭāla 27: jñānāhetuṣāya iti jñānasya prakarparyantam | tasya hetuh kāranam bhagavān vajjarudraḥ | tasmāj āto bhavatī yathaḥ ‘jñānāhetuṣāya means born from the cause of knowledge, where knowledge is wisdom’s ultimate degree and its cause is Lord Vajjarudra’. Vajjarudra appears already in the Sarvabuddhasamāyoga in a passage that associates the nine dramatic sentiments (rasāh) with Vajrasattva, Tathāgata, Vajrakara, Lokesvara, Vajrasūrya, Vajjarudra, Śākyamuni, Ārali (or perhaps Ārali), and Śāśvata (Vairocana) respectively. Vajjarudra’s is the sentiment of terror (bhayañakarasah) and it is probable therefore that we should understand Vajjarudra to be Heruka. Sangs rgyas thams cad mnyam par sbyor ba f. 128r3: rdo rje sems dpa’ stag pa la | dpa’ la dpa’ bo de bzhin gshegs | rdo rje ’dzin pa snying rje la | rgod pa ’jig rten dbang phyug mchog | rdo rje nyi ma khro ba la | rdo rje drag po ’jigs pa la | šā kya thub pa mi sdug la | ngo mtshar la ni a ra li | rab tu zhi la sangs rgyas rtag | ’sringāre vajrasattoo hi vīre caiva tathāgataḥ | vajrakara kartunāyām tu häsy caiva lokeśvarah | vajrasūryas tathā raudre vajjarudro bhayañake | sākyamunis tu bīhbatse ārallir abhūte tathā | prāsānte sāśvatas caiva).

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

412 Abhidhānottara B f. 40r3: athānya<m> sampravakṣyāmi ekavīravidhānākam | ... (f. 40r6) sṛṣṭiherukam ātmānaṁ bhāvayet | caturmukham dvādaśabhyajam ... (f. 41r1–3) tasyāgṛatanto ālikāsthitāḥ bhagavatī vajravārāhi raktavarnā caturvāktrā caturbhujā trinetraḥ muktakasiḥ | nagnā khaṇḍamaṇḍitamekhalāḥ | vāme bhujāgīnīganaṇapālam ca duśṭamāraṇīyārgbodhicittaparipūraṇām dākṣīne tarjanīvajrakartikā | aparabhaṇjadvaye damarukhatvāṅga<m>. The retinue is absent only in the sense that the deities are not positioned around Heruka and Vajravārāhi. Instead the twenty-four Yogiṇī-Vīra couples are installed from the head of Heruka down to his feet, and the four Yogiṇīs of the innermost circuit and the eight of the outermost are installed in the twelve objects in his hands.

413 Abhidhānottara B f. 50v5–6: tatparāvṛtyā sadvajrāṁ vajrasattvāṃ vibhāvayet | trimukham śaḍbhujam caiva triṇētram karunārasam | ... (f. 52v5–53r3) anena cōditō nātō bijām utpānam uttaman | kuṇkumākāraṇaṁbhām vajrachnāsamūttātritam | *saṃmukham (corr.: khanmukham Cod.) dvādaśabhyajam vārāhyāsamaṇalakṛtāṃ | *sada(?)vīramāhāvīrām ardhaparyakasamsthitaṃ | triṇētram hasitam raudraṁ karalam bhīthesam *lelihānānam (em.: lelihānālam Cod.) karunārasam | bhairavaṁ kālāṁtrīṁ ca pādāṅkrantatalaḥ sthitam | athavālīdhasamsthānākṛtayogam *mahāddbhumam (conj.: mahadbhūtam Cod.) | ... (f. 53r5–v2) *brahmaṇaḥ (em.: brahmaṇa Cod.) kṛtīṁ utkrtīya prṣṭhapavrātavigrāhad | raudrabhairavacarmena *kāṭīṁ (corr.: kāṭīr Cod.) āveṣṭya saṃsthitaṁ | kopaḥkhatvāṅgadharatr<m> asī-utpalasaradhiṁ | ankuśasādamarumundacāpadharaṁ tathā | tadvākhrtydvāvāryād mahāārīgape dhitiḥ | janghādavyasamāśśiśtā mahāsūrātā<em> sundarī (corr.: suṃdhārā Cod.) | mūndasragdāmadhegohrā śaṇmudrācīnhabhūṣiṭā | evaṃ bhāvayate yogī maṇjuvajramahāsukham.
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and in the eleventh, where a six-faced, twelve-armed Heruka wearing the flayed skin of Rudra on his back embraces a twelve-armed Vajravārāhī, and in the twentieth, in which a red five-faced and twelve-armed Heruka embraces a Vajravārāhī with same colour and hand-attributes.

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

---


415 Abhidhānottara B ff. 79v3–80r6: śadvaṃkrataṃ viraṃ bīhataṃ śringārāhasitam raudraṃ lelihanānam | saṃnūḍrāmudrātām dehaṃ nāṇābharaṇaṃanḍitām | vārāhyā *tu samāpannaṃ (em.: nusamāpanṇā Cod.) jānudvaysweśitām ...(f. 80r2) rudraccurmāmbaradharam ...(f. 80r5–6) tadvarṇabhujaśaṃsthānā muktaṃśa tu nagnikā.

416 Abhidhānottara B f. 113r3–v4: herukākāram ātmānaṃ dākinīcayaparārvṛtam | mahogram raktavapurasaṃ pañcajnāṇabhadhvadhavam | raktaṃ nīlāṃ ca haritaṃ pitaṃ śaṃtaśodhvākam | trinetram dvādaśabhujam ālāḍhapaḍasamsthitam | ...

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

\[418\] Abhisamayamaṇjarī, p. 142, ll. 13–19.
crow, owl, dog, and sow, stand naked in the warrior-pose, dwarfish, with squinting eyes. The four in the corners have the heads of a buffalo, an ass, a camel, and a horse, and like all but the door-guardians, are visualized in the dance posture. All eight of these outer Yoginis have the five Mudrás and chaplets of skulls, and are four-armed, holding a skull-bowl, the head of Brahmā in their left hands, and a chopping-knife and rattle-drums in their right.\footnote{This form is taught in Abhidhānottara ff. 63v1–70r4 (Paṭala 9 in the enumeration of this manuscript), from which it entered the Vārāhyābhudyāya. A lightly adjusted version of this Kalpa is found in the collection of Sādhanas of Vajravārāhī/Vajrayoginī that came to bear the title Guhyasamayasādhanamālā in the colophons of later manuscripts; see ENGLISH 2002, pp. 54–59.}

The cult of the independent goddess (Bhagavatī) appears to have been a particularly vigorous development, to judge from the exceptionally large number of variant forms that emerged.\footnote{See ENGLISH 2002 for an illustrated survey of these variants.} Within the earlier scriptural literature the Abhidhānottara contains several sections devoted to Sādhanas of Vajravārāhī;\footnote{Paṭala 12/9: Vārāhī Vajrayoginī (4-faced, 12-armed; ardhanārīśvarīmukhā); 22/19: Mrtasanjīvani (4-faced or 8-faced, 16-armed); 36/33: Vajravārāhī (3-faced and 6-armed or 6-faced and 12-armed, surrounded by Guhyottamā etc.); 37/34: Vajravārāhī surrounded by Yāmīnī etc.} in the Herukābhudyāya eleven of its forty-four chapters are devoted to her Mantras and their procedures;\footnote{Paṭalas 6, 8–11, 23–24, 29–31, and 34.} and the section of the Tenjur devoted to the Cakrasaṃvara cycle (Tōh. 1403–1606) contains over sixty texts devoted to the varieties of her cult as Vajravārāhī or Vajrayoginī (Tōh. 1541–1606). Sākyarakṣita, a pupil of Abhayākaraagupta (1064–1125), after detailing the Sādhana of several of her forms in his Abhisamayamañjarī,\footnote{The Abhisamayamañjarī is ascribed to Śubhākaraagupta in its sole edition. This is an error and goes against the evidence of the colophons of the manuscripts (ENGLISH 2002, p. 357, n. 6).} adds that these are but a few of the many that were current in his time:\footnote{Abhisamayamañjarī, p. 152: tad *evamādayaḥ (em. : evam ādāya Ed.) siddhopedasparamparāyātā vineyāśayabhedād anantā bhagavatyā āmnāyā boddhavyāh | dīṃmātram idam darsītam.}

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

This Śākta trend is also evidenced in the practice of the Newars of the Kathmandu valley down modern times. For their ceremony of initiation before the Maṇḍala of Cakrasaṃvara is followed on the final day by initiation before
the Maṇḍala of Vajrādevī (Vajravārāhī).\textsuperscript{425} Nor was this confined to the subcontinent. In Tibet too Vajravārāhī/Vajrayoginī rose to a position of special honour, notably in the bKa’ brgyud and Sa skya traditions, but also in later times among the dGe lug pas, rNying ma pas, and Bon pos.\textsuperscript{426}

There are other compilations, scriptural and secondary, that survive in Nepalese manuscripts but did not reach Tibet, which attest her prominence in the last phase of the Mantranaya: the Vajravārāhikalpa, of about three thousand verses, which interweaves the Dākārvardhaka and the Samvarodaya, and incorporates thirteen non-scriptural Sādhana texts of Vajravārāhī and one of Nairātmyā, the consort of Hevajra;\textsuperscript{427} the closely related Yoginījāla, of about one thousand verses; and the collection of forty-six Sādhana texts of Vajrayoginī known as the Guhyasamayasadhanamāla.\textsuperscript{428} Moreover, two texts devoted to the cult of this goddess were added to the canon of scripture received by the Tibetans. The first is the Vārahībhajyātantra, a short work of three hundred verses counted among the explanatory Tantras of the Laghuśamanvara but consisting almost entirely of passages lifted from the Sampṭodbhava, the Abhidhānottāra, and the Samvarodaya;\textsuperscript{429} and the second

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

\textsuperscript{426} See ENGLISH 2002, pp. xxii–xxvii.

\textsuperscript{427} I have not yet undertaken a thorough analysis of the whole text. The interweaving that I report is of Dākārvardhaka, Paṭala 2–3 and Samvarodaya 2–3 in the first 3 Paṭalas. The nidānавākyam of the Samvarodaya is borrowed with the substitution of vārahībhagesu for the Samvarodaya’s yoginībhagesu. I have noted the incorporation of the following Sādhana texts (identified here with the numbers ascribed in BHATTACHARYA’s composite Sādhananālā: 217–218 in Paṭala 36, 219–225 in Paṭala 37, 226–228 and 231 in Paṭala 38.

\textsuperscript{428} This is the title under which the work has been catalogued in TSUKAMOTO et al. 1989, p. 285. It is based, I surmise, on the colophon of the last Sādhana in the collection, the Dākinīguhyasamayasadhanā of Anāṅgayogin.

\textsuperscript{429} The correspondences are as follows (S = Sampṭodbhava; LŚ = Laghuśamanvara; AU = Abhidhānottāra; SU = Samvarodaya): 1.5–6b = S 6.3.26–27b; 1.17 = S 6.3.44c–45b; 1.18ab = S 6.3.45cd; 1.20cd = S 6.3.46cd; 1.21 = S 6.3.47; 1.31 = S 6.4.39; 1.33–43b = S 6.4.40–50; 2.15 = LŚ 1.19; 2.17c–18 = S 6.3.2–3b; 2.24–27b = S 6.3.3c–6; 2.27cd = S 6.2.2ab and 6.3.7ab; 2.28–29 = S 6.2.2c–4b; 2.31–33b = S 6.2.4c–6b; 2.34–40 = S 6.2.6c–14; 2.43–44d = S 6.2.15c–16; 3.1–2 = S 6.2.27–28; 5.8–14 = S 6.3.11–17; 6.1–2 = SU 7.1–2; 6.3b–6b = SU 7.14c–17; 6.6c–12b = S 6.3.35–40b; 6.14–19b = S 6.3.40c–45; 6.23–30 = AU 14.58–65; 7.3–7 = S 6.3.19c–24; 8.3–5 = AU 3.8c–11b; 8.17c–18 = AU 16.2–3b; 8.20b ≈ AU 16.3c; 8.20c = AU 16.4a; 8.21–22 ≈ AU 16.4b–5; 8.24–37 = AU 16.6–19; 8.39–41 = AU 16.23–25; 9.1c–5 = AU 4.3–7b; 9.6–17a = AU 4.9–20b; 9.21–39a = AU 4.24–38b; 9.39c–41b = AU 4.42c–44b; 9.41c–44 = AU 4.39–42b; 9.45–51 (‘47’, ‘48’ and ‘50’ are Mantras) = AU 4.44c–46 (with the same Mantras); 9.52ab = AU 4.51ab; 9.54ab = AU 4.51cd; 10 = AU 50.
is the Vidyādhārīkramavajrayoginīsādhana, which appears in the Kanjur (Tōh. 380) between the major Tantras of the Cakrasamvara cycle and those of contested authenticity, included perhaps, in spite of its genre, because it states in its opening words that it is part of the otherwise unattested Mahāmāyājālora dhvajaṭottaratantra, which, it claims, was extracted from the Trilakṣa, that it to say, from the vast mythical Ur-text of this cycle, the Trilakṣābhīdhiṇa.

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

---

430 In Sanskrit it is preserved as the twenty-first Sādhana in the Guhyasamaya-sādhanamāla, ff. 85r4–86r1.
431 Guhyasamayasādhanamāla, f. 62r2: athātaḥ sampravakṣyāmi trilakṣākṛṣṭamahāmāyājālor dhvajāṭottaratantra \ldots .
432 Bhavabhāṭṭa, Cakrasamvarapaṇijika, introduction: mahāvajradhara desakaḥ \ldots bhagavatī vajravārāhī adhyesikā vajrapāṇiḥ samgatā \ldots vajravārāhādhyesītasya bhagavataḥ prativacanam etad athāta ityādi \ldots adhyesikā devitī ko niyama iti cet | guruṇaprāmāṇo hi śrūyate mūlāntre saivādhyeshiketī | tata iḥāpi saiveti ganyate.
433 Ibid., following the preceding citation: bhagavān adhyeṣako bhagavatī desiketi kecit. acintyarūpo hi tathāgatānāṁ abhiṣprāyāḥ ‘Some say that the Lord [Mahāvajradhara] was the requester and the Goddess [Vajravārāhī] the teacher. For the intention of the Tathāgatas is inscrutable’.
434 Caturyoginisampuṭa 2.15d–16: atha sā vajrini devī idaṁ vākyam utīranyet \TEXTSUPERScript{1} | abhiṣekam *sukathitaṁ (conj. [=legs par brjod nas Tib.]) : kathitaṁ Cod.)
The ´Saiva Age

in the Caturyoginīsāṃpuṭa is evidence of a more Śākta tendency within the tradition is obvious in itself, but it is confirmed by parallel practice in the most Śākta of the ´Saiva scriptures, namely the Kālikulakramasadbhāva, the Kālikulapañcaśataka, and the Manthānabhairava.

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

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

435 E.g. Yogaratnamālā on Hevajra, p. 155: caryākāle gaṇacakrāduvā pañcānāṃ mudrāṇāṃ dhāraṇāḥ; Laghusaṃvara f. 37v3 (51.2): nivasanām pañcamudrādī gātrosa; Abhidhānottara B f. 10v2–2 (3.18): pañcamudrādhāro nityām kapālakṛtaśekhāraḥ | kapālakhaṭvāṅgādhārī ca hamsodhūlitavigrahaḥ; Bhavabhaṭṭa, Cakrasaṃvara paraṇīkī on Laghusaṃvara 51.21a: pañcamudrādīti. kaṇṭhikācūdakeyūrakundalabrahmasūtrāṇīti; Jayabhadra, Cakrasaṃvara paraṇīkī on Laghusaṃvara: p. 128: pañca mudrā rucakāsiromaniśradalakaṇṭhikāyaṇjopavitāḥ pañca | sarvādā tair avirahito bhavet; Yoginīsaṃcāra 6.12c–13d: kaṇṭhikārucakāśradalakāraḥbhāṣmabhāṣmasu kharucakāśramudrābhāṣmabhāṣmabhāṣmabhāṣmaḥ; Khrag ’thung mngon par ’byung ba f. 13r4 (Herukābhuydaya 15.27): nub mo ru ni dam tshig ste | dpa’ bo rtag tu gcber bu yin | sgrub pos sngags dang phyag rgya dang | phyag rgya lngo dang yang dag lan ‘Observing the vows (samaye), the Śādhaka Hero (vīrāḥ) [should] always [be] naked at night (rātrau ca satatam. nagnah. [?]), equipped with the Mantras and Mudrās (mantramudrāvahīnāḥ), and wearing the five [bone] Mudrās (pañcamudrāsamanvītāḥ); Hevajra 1.3.14: cakrī kūṇḍala kaṇṭhī ca haste rūcaka mekhāla | pañcabarudhivīnaḥ; Picumata, f. 101r3 (21.104): karn. au ’sirasi baḥubhyam asthiḥkaṇḍair vihūṣṭītaḥ; a verse cited by Yāmunācārya in his Agamaprāṇāya, p. 93 (Y), edited here by collaboration with the closely related verse cited by Nirmalamani as cited by Brunner in Somaśambhupaddhati vol. 3, p. 681, n. 7 (N): *kaṇṭhikā (em. : kaṛṇīkā
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The pan-Indian topography of the Śākta Śaivas’ sacred sites, their Pīthas, Kṣetras, Upakṣetras, Saṃdohas/Chandohas,⁴³⁶ and the like, is also adopted. Two lists of such sites are found: one in the Vajradāka and the other in the Laghuśaṃvara.⁴³⁷ Also adopted is the practice of visiting these sacred sites (piṭhabhramanam)⁴³⁸ in search of meetings with the Yoganis/Ḍākinis that are

---

⁴³⁶ See, e.g., Saṃvarodaya 8.29b,d: pithādidesagamanena viśuddhadeham ... vande ... "At all times, with head bowed, I venerate the best of Gurus, ... whose body has been purified by going to the Pīthas and other [such] sites." 9.25: pithopapiṭhasevanan nirmalo bhavati mānavah | bhraman nimittam samlakṣya nirvikalpena dhīmatah 'A man becomes pure by frequenting Pīthas and Upapiṭhas. The adept should wander [there] without hesitation, observing [any] signs [that may arise] without inhibition." 26.14 ... 18c–19:
believed to frequent them and to be incarnate there in human women enlightened from birth or in childhood, classifying such women as belonging to one of the Kṣetras. In a Pīṭha, Kṣetra, Chandoha, Melāpaka, a cremation-ground, or an encounter between worshipper and worshipped, wine is the highest guest-water. ... on the occasion of installation ceremonies, when wandering through the Pīṭhas, during worship of the Yoginis occasioned by some event, and when doing the Śādhana of a Mantra. He should know that there are a manifold [occasions] such as these [on which he may drink wine]. He will not be at fault'. Cf. Nīśisāmcāra, f. 10v2–3: evam eva prakāreṇa ghorasādhanatatparam | kṣetra paryātānāsaya sādhasākṣa mahādhiye | sādāṁ dādaṁ yaḥ kaścit tasya prāṣnaṁ vadāmy aham 'O you of great understanding, I shall teach [you] the requests [that should be addressed] to any [divine being] who speaks to the Śādhaka as he wanders in this manner visiting the Kṣetras, intent on the Ghorasādhanā'; Tantrāloka 29.40ab: iti samketaḥbhījñō bhramate pīṭheṣu yadi sa siddhiṣuḥ 'If a person seeking Siddhis wanders from Pīṭha to Pīṭha knowing these signs, the chummāḥ' ...
or other a fixed number of deity-clans (*kulam*) and of specifying various characteristics of appearance and behaviour that enable the adept to determine these clan-affiliations;\(^{440}\) the consumption and offering of meat and alcoholic liquor in their rites;\(^{441}\) the consumption of foul substances without inhibition as an initiatory test of nondual awareness;\(^{442}\) the sacrifice and consumption of the flesh

\(^{440}\) *Laghuśaṃvara*, *Patañlas* 16–24 (> *Abhīdānottara, Sampūṭodbhava, Samvarodaya, Mahāmuḍrātilaka, Vajraḍāka*); and parallel passages in the Viṣṇyāṭha texts Yo-

\(^{441}\) Bhavabhāṭṭa, *Cakrāsaṃvarapaṇḍjīkā*, p. 497: *āsu pūjaniyā madyaiś ca māṃsair api vajrādevyāḥ | tāḥ pūjita bhaktimato janasya śrīherukasyābhiratim gatasya sāṃstūçacītā varadā bhavanti* ‘On these [lunar days] [the women who embody] the Vajra goddesses should be worshipped with offerings of alcohol and flesh. When they have been worshipped they become delighted and bestow boons on any devotee who is attached to Heruka’; *Abhīdānottara* B f. 48v5–6 (5.50d–56a): *vividhaiḥ-c> samayottamaih | *madya* (em. : padma Cod.) *nānavidhaih<s> caiva surāpānais tathottamaih | *vīramelāpakaṃ (vīra corr. : vīrā Cod.) divyam yogini vivi-

\(^{442}\) Genesis and Development of Tantrism
of human beings believed to have been reincarnated seven times for this purpose (saptāvartaḥ), recognized in both traditions on the basis of similar physical characteristics, and the use of their skulls as skull-bowls;\(^{443}\) the practice of visualizations in which the Śadhaka enters the body of a victim through the channels of his vital energy (nāḍī), extracts his vital essences, and draws them into himself;\(^{444}\) that of yogically raising one's consciousness out of one's body through should sacramentalize in a skull-bowl some substance such as cat excrement. He should then lead the blindfolded candidate forward, protect him with the Gāyatrī [of Heruka] beginning with OM, and after addressing him with the word POTA˙NG¯I, the chommā of welcome] and having received [the chommā] PRATIPOTA˙NG¯I in response, he should bring him before [the Man.da] and place that substance in his mouth'. For the Śaiva literature see the passages cited in SANDERSON 2005c, pp. 113–114, fn. 63.

443 See, e.g., Laghuśamvara f. 10r3–4 (11.1–2) and 49.4–13 (49.4–8 = f. 35v5–7; 49.8–13 = bDe mchog nyung ngu, f. 244r2–5); Abhidhanottara, Patala 63; Herukābhhyudaya, Patala 13 (Khrag 'thung mngon par 'byung ba f. 10r7–v6); Hevajratantra 1.11.10–11; Mahāmudrātilaka f. 23r3–4 (12.20–21); tädr̥ṣam yatn̥at saptajanmāṇam àṇayet | nānāpūjopahārena pūjayed tām samāhitāḥ || tasyottamāṇgam utkṛtya kārayet padmabhājanam | tatraiva pātre madanam pūjayed prajñāyā saha 'He should with all effort bring such a man of seven rebirths. With concentrated mind he should honour him with the various offering-substances. Having decapitated him he should make the head into a skull-bowl. In that vessel he should drink wine with his consort'; f. 51r5–v2 (24.1–3c): athānyam *caiva (conj. : caika Cod.) karmāhyam pravakṣyāmy ādarāc chrnu | yena prāṣīnamātreṇā āśū siddhiḥ pravrta | susnigdhaḥ ca sugandhāṅgah sugandhasvedamanḍitaḥ | satyavādī salajjāṃ nīveśi tīrṇa vadā satyavādī nirāsrayah | saptajanmā trijanmā vā. In the Vidyāpītha literature see the treatments of this topic in Jayadradhayāmalā Śaṭka 3, Yoginīsamcāra, Kālajñānapatāla; Tantrasadbhāva, Adhikāra 7; and Tantrālaka 16.63–64 and Jayaratha's introduction to this passage.

444 See, e.g., Herukābhhyudayaapāṇīka on Herukābhhyudaya, Patala 13 p. 155: svadehāt dākinīḥ sphaṛayitvā sādhye gudena praveśyā navadvāraṁ nādīmārgena pāsoḥ sādhyasya *bijām (conj. : bijām jiṣvam bijām Ed.) sukrādikam grāhāyitvā niskāṣya svadehe praveśyat 'He should emanate the Dākinīs from inside his body, have them enter the victim through his anus [or any one of] the nine apertures and passing through the channels of the victim's vital energies, seize his seed, his semen and other [vital essentials]. Then he should have them exit [the victim] and return [with these] into [his own body]'; on Herukābhhyudaya, Patala 42, p. 167: athavā sādhyam ākrṣya tachukrādi pitvā bhakṣayet 'Having attracted the victim he should [extract and] drink his semen and other [essences], then eat [the flesh]'; Abhidhānottara B f. 51v1–3 (9.62–64b): vāraḥyātmabhāvena tarjanyā nābhi vedhayaḥ | dākinīyā tu cakrāsthā devya<h> *sucyākṛtis (em. : sucyākṛtis Cod.) tathā || navadvāre *praveśyatā (conj. : praveśa tām Cod.) *vedhayed (corr. : vi-dhayed Cod.) dhṛdayapankajam | yoginīya hata*mātre (conj. : mātram Cod.) tu pibet ksatajami uttamam || hatam ca bhakṣayet so hi buddho bhavisyaṁ nānyathā 'By identifying with Vārāhi he should pierce the navel [of the victim] with his index finger [in the gesture of threat] and cause the Dākinīs and other goddesses of the Maṇḍala to take on the form of a needle [through visualization]. When he has made them enter [the victim in this form] through the nine apertures [of the body] he should have them pierce through the lotus of his heart. As soon as the Yoginis have killed him [he should] drink his excellent blood and eat his flesh. For it is certain
that [thus] he will become a Buddha’; *Mahāmāyā* 2.10–14b. On the extraction of the vital essences by such yogic means in Vidyāpītha sources see, e.g., *Picumata* f. 10v1–4 (3.198c–207): pravīṣya ca puram divyam *japtvā* (em. : jāptā Cod.) cāstāsatam punah || 199 avadhātatanur bhūtāvā prayogam idam ārabhet | paśubījasāmayuktam Ī-kāreṇaiva bheditam || 200 kāṛṣye tu samādhistho raktaṃkāraya saha || tena raktena mantrajñah paripūrṇakapālaka || 3.201 sugandhakusair yuktā tenāṛgamḥ tu pradāpayet | devinām devadevāyā sarvasiddhyarthak ārāṇam || 3.202 dattē ‘ṛge tu prasiddhyeta trailokyam nātra sāṃsārayaḥ | aṭhāvā caiva Ī-kāṛaṁ paśubījasaamanvitaṁ || 3.203 codayitvā udānena avadhātatanum *sādā* (corr. : sādāh Cod.) || nirācāraṇa bhūvena paśudehaṁ viṣet tataḥ || 3.204 tatrastho grahāṇam kuryaṁ bhūtānām mantracintakah | apāṇena tataḥ sīghaṁ svadeham praviṣed budhaḥ || 3.205 paṇcābhūtāni cākṣyaṇa pūjāya ca kapālādhṛk || raktena prathamāḥ<n> devi<n> duṣṭyā<n> māṃsabhāksanē || 3.206 tṛtīyā tuv-ca-bhaksā tu caturthī medabhāksanā | snehena tarpayed devaṁ paṇcavayōmāntarsamsthitam || 3.207 etat te paramām guhyam yogeśinām tu pūjānam | siddhyartham caiva mantrinām khecaratvajigīṣunām ‘After entering before the celestial Maṇḍala he should repeat the Maṇtra eight hundred times. When [in this way] he has become one whose body has transcended all duality he should commence the following procedure. In deep meditation he should draw out a stream of the [victim’s] blood with the [Mantra of] Raktā conjoined with the Victim-seed with Ī as the [final] vowel. The Maṇtra adept should place fragrant flowers in a skull, fill it with that blood, and present it as the guest-offering to the goddesses and Bhairava as the means of accomplishing all Siddhis. Alternatively he should propel the letter Ī combined with the Victim-seed up [along the central channel] with the ascending vital energy and in the state that transcends convention he should enter the victim’s body. Once within it the adept should take hold of the gross elements [of the victim’s body] while meditating on the Maṇtra and then swiftly return into his own body by drawing in his breath. When he has drawn them into himself the Kāpālīka (kapālādhṛk) should worship [his deities with them]. He worships the first goddess by offering her the blood, and the second by offering her the flesh to eat. The third eats the skin and the fourth the fat. With the fluid of the body he should gratify the god [Kapālīśabhairava] who resides beyond the five voids [along the central channel]. This worship is the highest secret of the Yogeśvarīs. [I have taught it] to you so that Maṇtra adepts that seek to master the state of the Khecara may succeed’. See also *Tantrasadbhāva*, ff. 181v5–182r2 (27.1–10); *Jayadrathayāmala, Śaṭkā* 3, f. 184r6 (Yoginīsamcāra 5.40): yasmātra karmaṇo siddhiḥ raktakaśaṃnapūrvikā | tarpanāṃ devatānāṁ ca ‘For in this [system] the success of the ritual and the gratification of the deities requires the extraction of [the victim’s] blood”; *Tantrāloka* 16.35c–51b, describing the yogic process in detail; and *Netratantra* 20, which describes how Yoginīs extract life-essences from their victims in this way in order to offer them up to Mahābhārava and thereby liberate them.

445 *Catuspīṭha* ff. 68v–70r (Guhyapīṭha, Patala 3) and Bhavabhaṭṭa thereon (Catuspīṭhanibandha f. 50v4–52v7); *Vajraḍāka* ff. 50r7–52r3 (Patałā 21); *Sampujōdbhava* ff. 78r5–80r6 (Kalpa 8, Prakaraṇa 3); *Sānvarodaya* 5.67–69 and 19.35c–47. In Tibetan tradition this practice is one of the nā ro chos drug or Six Teachings of Nāropā (956–1040), commonly known in English as his Six Yogas. These have been the object of extensive Tibetan exegesis. For English translations of some of these works, including the Chos drug gi man ngag attributed to
means of assisting the dying and the dead—we have seen a ritualized realization of this in the Mantranaya’s funeral ceremony taught by Padmaśrimitra and Śūnyasamādhī; and the practice of transferring one’s consciousness out of one’s body to pass into and animate a corpse (parakāyapravēṣaḥ).

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

See also TANAKA 1996, p. 272.
but it is much developed in the latter’s ancillary scriptures such as the Vajradāka and Samvarodaya, and elsewhere in the Yoginitantras, notably in the Hevajra, the Sampūtodbhava, the Mahāmudrātilaka, and the Kālacakra.\footnote{That the Yoga of the energy channels was one of the principal features that distinguished the Yoginitantras was asserted by the learned of the Mantranaya itself; see Śraddhākāravarman cited here on p.239; also Mkhas grub rje, rGyud spyi, p. 256, ll. 6–7: phung khams skye mched kyi rnam dag gtsos bor ston pa’s rgyud yin na pha rgyud | rtsa’i rnam dag gtsos bor ston pa ma rgyud ‘If a Tantra principally teaches the purification of the Skandhas, Dhātus, and Āyatanas it is a Father Tantra. A Mother Tantra principally teaches the purification of the energy channels’. In this passage the distinction is between the esoteric Yogatantras (Mahāyogatantras, Yogottaratantras) headed by the Guhyasamāja and the Yoginitantras or Yoganiruttaratantras exemplified by the Tantras of Śāmbhoga and Hevajra, the two divisions of what the Tibetans called bla med kyi rgyud ‘the unsurpassed Tantra [class]’. Mkhas grub rje’s tradition rejects this criterion for distinguishing between the two divisions on the grounds that there are Yoginitantras (Mother Tantras) that also teach the purification of the Skandhas and the rest. That is true. We find this, for example, in the Hevajra (1.7.12; 1.9.6–9, 13–14; 2.2.31–36) and the Abhidhānotttara (e.g. B ff. 20v5–21r1; f. 26r3; f. 36r3–v6; f. 51r3–4; ff. 69v2–70r1). But that is because the second-wave Yoginitantras sought to encompass the tradition of the Guhyasamāja by incorporating many of its elements. He does not, we may note, support his argument by pointing to the presence of the purification of the energy channels in any Father Tantra. From the historian’s point of view the distinction that he rejects remains accurate in spite of his objections. \textsc{Van SchaiK} (2008, p. 50) has noted the absence of material on the manipulation of the internal energies in the Dunhuang manuscripts, which represent Tantric Buddhism up to about the middle of the ninth century.}

The elements of this model are ‘purified through equation’ (viśuddha-) with Buddhist soteriological factors, either newly acquired, such as the twenty-four sacred sites or long established in the Mahāyāna, such as the three bodies of a Buddha (nirmāṇakāyāḥ, saṃbhogakāyāḥ, and dharmakāyāḥ), equated with the three principal channels, and Means (upāyah) and Wisdom (prajñā), whose co-functioning (yuganaddhitā) is the way to liberation, equated with the lateral pair.\footnote{For a comprehensive listing of ‘purifying equations’ for the principal channels and four Cakras (the Nirmāṇacakra at the root of the navel, the Dharmacakra in the heart, the Saṃbhogacakra in the throat, and the Mahāsaṅgacakra in the head) see Jñānodayatantra, p. 6, ll. 1–14 (the four Cakras), and p. 6, l. 20–p. 7, l. 9 (the three channels).} But the basic conception is derived from the Yoga of the Śaivas in general and the Śākta Śaivas in particular.

**The Incorporation of Text-Passages from the Vidyāpīṭha.** In the light of this evidence of the pervasive similarities between the Yoginitantras and the Śaivism of the Vidyāpīṭha, and considering the fact that these similarities set the Yoginitantras apart from all earlier forms of Buddhism, the reader will not be surprised to know that there is also evidence that this tradition incorporated...
and adapted much textual material from the Śaiva scriptures in the process of producing its own.

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

---

451 The *Yoginīsāṃcāra,* though it comes to us as part of the *Jayadrathayāmala,* has very probably been incorporated from another source. This is evident from the register of its Sanskrit, from its style, and from its content. This source may be a text closely related to the lost *Yoginījālaśamvarā.* For it claims at its beginning to be about to explain what has already been taught in that Tantra. *Jayadrathayāmala,* Śatka 3, f. 169r8 (*Yoginīsāṃcāra* 1.1–6b):

> devy uvāca k purā tu śamvare tantre yad uktam paramesvara | *tan na (em.: tatra Cod.) jñātaṃ mayā deva guhyatantrasya vistarāt | 2 katham sa bhairavo dehas tvayi deva mahābalaḥ | katham devyo yajanty enam kulās tāsāṃ kati smṛtāḥ | 3 katham kramam mahāgūḍha<ṃ> cāram tāsāṃ katham vibho | carusiddhiḥ katham tāsāṃ etan me brāhiḥ vistaram | 4 evam ākārya devesyāvadanāmburuhacyutam | vacomṛtam mahādevo bhūyo vacanam abraviḥ || 5 sādhu sādhu mahābhage sarvajñānārthabhājane | mahārahaṣyam atulam yoginīcāram uttamam || 6 pravakṣyāmi samāsena śrṇuṣv ekāgramānasā | The goddess said: Paramesvara, I have not understood the teaching that you gave of old in the *Śamvaratantra,* because of the great length of [that] esoteric text. What is the nature, O god, of your mighty embodiment as Bhairava? How do the goddesses worship it? How many are their families held to be? How is the most secret procedure of their worship? How, O lord, do they rotate? And how is one to obtain the sacramental substances for them? Explain this to me at length. Having heard thus the nectar in the form of words that fell from the lotus of the mouth of the goddess Mahādeva replied and said: I congratulate you, illustrious and worthy receptacle of the teachings of omniscience. I shall concisely teach you the incomparable great secret, the unsurpassed Rotation of the Yoginī. Listen with attentive mind*. The last part of the first chapter of the *Yoginīsāṃcāra* gives an account of the many classes of female supernaturals as the constituents of the body mentioned in the list of questions and ends with the words: *ity evaṃ yoganiyamāṃ yoginījāla*śamvare (corr.: *sacare D | yathotpannam tu kathitam *niyogam (em.: *nyogam D) śṛṇu sāmpratam (D f. 172v4–5, 1.72c–d) “Thus I have explained to you the arising of the order of the pantheon of powers as [taught] in the *Yoginījālaśamvarā.* Hear now its application(s). See also D f. 199v6–7 (7.124c–125b): *uktāni yāni karmāni yogini- jālaśamvare || ayutam japtvā tu sarvāṇi karoty eva hi lilayā ‘After repeating the Mantra ten thousand times he easily accomplishes all the rites that I have taught in the *Yoginījālaśamvarā.*

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

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

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

453 For my tabulation of these correspondences see Sanderson 2001, pp. 41–47. See also Sanderson 1985, p. 214, note 106; Sanderson 1988, pp. 678–679; and Sanderson 1994, esp. pp. 92–96.
Comparison of the textual parallels reveals that it is the Cakrasaṃvara corpus that has adopted and adapted the Śaiva sources rather than the other way round. For the Buddhist versions abound in instances in which it can be seen that Śaiva material has been misunderstood, crudely, artificially, and incompletely modified, or rendered contextually incongruous. The Śaiva versions, on the other hand, seem to me to be entirely free of signs of textual dependence on Buddhist originals.

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

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

---


\(^{455}\) In fact it is not clear whether these authors think that the application of this principle means that the Buddhist versions cannot be secondary or only that it less likely that they are. The second alternative alone would accord with a more fundamental principle of textual criticism, namely that there are no hard-and-fast rules because every textual problem must be regarded as possibly unique (Housman 1921, pp. 68–69).
ment is unclear; but I assume that the authors had in mind not merely gram-
matical deviations from the Paninian standard of high scholarship, since those
are seldom difficult to understand, being characteristic of a particular register
of the language, but also and principally lack of clarity in meaning caused by
syntactical incoherence and the like, which is indeed a conspicuous defect in the
Buddhist versions. Indeed they are sometimes barely intelligible, as is revealed
by fact that the commentators confronted by these passages offer widely diver-
gent but equally arbitrary interpretations.\footnote{456 See here p. 216.}

Now, the objection that a version which is less clear in this sense must have
preceded one that is freer of these defects, proceeds from a serious ununder-
standing of how the rule of the \textit{lectio difficilior} is to be applied. Firstly, like all
other `rules' of textual criticism, it should never be put to work mechanically and
in advance, without the application of thought to the weighing of probabilities in
each case; and secondly, it should never be invoked to give precedence to readings
that are grammatically defective, incoherent, or contextually awkward.\footnote{457
This point has been made against DAVIDSON and GRAY by SZÁNTÓ (2008b, p. 218).
On the principle invoked here, that a `more difficult reading' must be plausible, see
WEST 1973, p. 51: `When we choose the `more difficult reading' ... we must be sure
that it is in itself a plausible reading. The principle should not be used in support
of dubious syntax, or phrasing that it would not have been natural for the author to
use. There is an important difference between a more difficult reading and a more
unlikely reading'; CHADWICK 1957, p. 255: `The principle \textit{lectio difficilior potior}
does not extend to nonsense, ...'.} Lack of clarity is hardly likely to the fault of the original framers of the text-passages,
who, after all, probably knew what they wanted to say in whatever register of
Sanskrit they chose to adopt. It is much more likely to be the result of incompete-
tence and/or carelessness on the part of Buddhist redactors who had difficulty in
understanding the Śaiva texts they were cannibalizing.

The secondary status of the Buddhist versions is also apparent in another
deficiency: their greater metrical irregularity. In principle that might be ex-
plained either as the result of the Śaivas' having polished the Buddhist versions
or as the result of indifference to the preservation of metrical form on the part of
Buddhist redactors as they adapted metrically correct Śaiva materials. But the
latter explanation is much to be preferred. For, as we shall see, metrical irreg-
ularity is particularly noticeable in the Buddhist versions at those places where
the imprint of Buddhism is apparent.\footnote{458 See here p. 207.}

Let us assume, however, that there are indeed readings in the Buddhist ver-
sions which do not derive from the Śaiva parallels that I have identified. Would
these not refute my conclusion that the Buddhist versions are secondary? No. For
the inference that they would rest on the assumption that I consider that the Śaiva text-passages redacted into the Buddhist versions were exactly those seen in these parallels. In fact I hold that the collation of these parallels with the Buddhist passages demonstrates that the former are, in most cases at least, closely related variants of the passages on which the Buddhist redactors drew, and that these passages were accessed in what were probably earlier and less elaborate redactions of the works in which I have found the parallels, or else in texts of the same corpus which are now out of reach, such as the Yoganījālaśaṇvara, the Sarvavīrasamāyoga, the long version of the Siddhayogēśvarīmata, and the Pañcāmṛta.459 For what survives in the manuscript collections of India and Nepal is only a part of what once existed, as we learn both from citations of other texts in the works of learned Śaiva commentators and from the surviving scriptural redactions themselves, which, when listing the canon of texts to which they belong, mention many works, such as those mentioned above, which have not survived or await discovery.460 My argument, then, is not that these Śaiva parallels are the direct sources of the Buddhist versions but only that the Śaiva parallels are close enough to the Buddhist versions to reveal the direction

460 See, for example, the list of Tantras ‘venerated by the circle of Yoganīś’ given in the first chapter of the Yoganīśamcāra as sources on the matters it covers (Jayadrathayāmala, Ṣaṭka 3, ff. D 170v2–171r3 [1.29–42b]): mūlatantraṃ kubjikā ca yoganījālaśaṇvaram | *aṭṭhasambaranāmānaṃ (ABCE : aṭṭhasasvaranāgānaṃ D) haṭṭadvīlaḥ tathāparā || 1.30 calākṣaraṃ māhātantraṃ viśvākṛtiśvātārakam | mahāmāyottaram nāma sarvavīratam tathā || 1.31 alamgrāṣaṃ māhātantraṃ *kuṇċikodghātaṃ (em. : kuṇċikodghātaṃ ABCDE) eva ca | siddhacakrama prakāśaṃ ca paṭaṃ tūraṃ *tathāparam (em : yathāparaṃ ABCDE) || 1.32 siddhakaulaṃ māhājālaṃ tathā bhairavagahvaram | kulagahvanāmānaṃ kulaḍāmarabhairavam || 1.33 jhāṅkārakulaṃ atyugraṃ tathā siddhāmatam sūbhāṃ | kācanāmatam evānyat kusumālikasamānjītaṃ || 1.34 siddhayogēśvarītantraṃ trikasārottaṃ dattā || picutaṃtraṃ māhāraudram vimalocchuṃenasamānjītaṃ || 1.35 khaḍgarāvaṇānāmaṃ tathānyaṃ takaṃṇḍalaṃ (em. : takaṃṇḍanaṃ ABCDE) | karoṭi muṇḍamālākhyaṃ śiracchedaṃ bhayānakam || 1.36 hāhārāvottaram tantraṃ krodham unmat-tabhairavam | rurayāmalaṃ atyugraṃ tathānyaṃ rudrayāmalaṃ || 1.37 umāyāmalam evānyad guṛtyāmalaṃ eva ca | skandayāmalam evānyam tathā bhairavayāmalaṃ || 1.38 viṣṇuṣāmalam eva svyāṃ nandiyāmalaṃ eva ca | śukrayāmalaṃ evānyad chakrayāmalaṃ eva ca || 1.39 kapālaśaṃtalam nāma meghanādiśvāram tathā | hamsayāmalanānānam caṇḍogram hāṭakeravaram || 1.40 mahāvāmeśvaratanaṃ lāṅkēśitaṃ uttamaṃ | lampatādyam ca raktādyam tathā haddāmatam param || 1.41 durvāsamatam evānyam evaṃdvāya hy anekasāḥ | ete tantravāraḥ praktaḥ yoginīcakravanditaḥ || 1.42 esu tantravareṣv eva tāsāṃ cāraṃ vicārītam. The great majority of these works appear to have been lost. Works that have survived with titles listed here are distinguished by bold characters. Works here that are known only by citations or as loci of attribution in early colophons have been underlined.
of dependence. It is possible, therefore, that any 'more difficult readings' were inherited from this earlier stratum in the development of the Vidyāpīṭha; and this mere possibility is sufficient to invalidate the inference of the priority of the Buddhist versions. If I am mistaken in my conclusion that the Buddhist versions are secondary that will have to be demonstrated by presenting a persuasive contrary analysis of the relationship between the Śaiva and Buddhist versions based on a detailed examination of the particulars I have identified. General arguments of this kind, which attempt to settle the matter in advance without engaging with the specifics of the parallels, will not suffice. 461

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

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

461 The same applies to a line of defence that objects to my conclusion in a manner that renders even a non-specific engagement with the parallels unnecessary. Confronted with the information that such parallels have been claimed some are inclined to respond with the question “Why would Buddhists have drawn on Śaiva sources?” The question is purely rhetorical and somewhat plaintive, implying that since the authors of these texts were Buddhists they would surely not have drawn on non-Buddhist scriptures. The inference has no force at all, because it invokes a notion of the nature of Buddhism and consequently of what Buddhists can or cannot have done that is derived from texts other than those of this corpus. No amount of evidence that other Buddhist scriptures were free of dependence on non-Buddhist texts can counter evidence that these Buddhist scriptures were not.

462 Closely related to the Niśisamcāra text is a version seen in Kubjikāmata 22.23–46, which lacks one of its elements, namely the specification of the high Tantric goddesses to whose families these local goddesses belong. Another, somewhat divergent and giving the sites alone and the points on the body that should be empowered by them through nyāsah, appears in the Vidyāpīṭha’s Mādhavakula (Jayadrathayāmalā, Satka 4, f. 124r1–5 [Kālikakule pūjānirñayā], vv. 16–22 (followed in Tantrāloka 29.59–63 (TĀ): parts of a Kashmirian redaction of the text are cited in Tantrālokaviveka on these verses (TĀV)); the procedure of the nyāsah is put in Paddhati form in Kālikulakramācana, f. 22r5–v5 [KKK]): aṭṭahāsaṁ śikhāsthane carītram ca karandhrake | *kulagiryam (corr. : kullagiryCod.) priye *karne (corr. : karnʿam Cod.) *jayantyā (corr. : jayamtya Cod.) *uttare punah (conj. [cf. jayantipithapāda vāmakarne KKK : uttaroyane Cod.] | 17 *ujjayanyā (corr. : ujjayanyām Cod.) tu bhrūmadhye prayāgām vakttramadhyagam | vārānasī tu hṛdaye śrīpiṭhaṃ skandhayaḥ dvayaḥ | 18 kaṇṭhadeśe tu virajam *hy erūṇdyā
this Śaiva pantheon and its ancillaries intact, the only major deviation being that it has four sites that differ from those in the Niśisaṃcāra. Particularly striking in the Vajraḍāka’s version is not only the fact that it transmits all the details of this distinctively Śaiva religious map, which includes such well-known deities as Mahālakṣmī of Kollagiri (Kolhāpur), Hetuka[hairava] of Devikottā, and Vettāḍa/Vetalā of Nagara (Pāṭaliputra/Kusumapura), but also that it preserves the classification of the goddesses of these sites as belonging to one or other of the families of Raktā, Karāli, Canḍākṣi, Mahocchusmā, Karālā, Danturā, Bhīmavaktā, and Mahābalā, information that is revelant only in the other of the families of Raktā, Karāli, Canḍākṣi, Mahocchusmā, Karālā, Danturā, Bhīmavaktā, and Mahābalā, information that is revelant only in the Śaiva context, since these are the four Guhyakās and their attendants that form the inner retinue of Kapālīśabhairava and Canḍā Kāpālinī in the Picumata of the Vidyāpiṭha and are not encountered to my knowledge in any Buddhist

---

463 See, e.g., Picumata f. 19r2–3 (4.254c–256): guhyakādyam tato vakṣye nāma.
context outside this text-passage and its derivatives. Thus, for example, the Niśisāṃcāra (4.10–13), covering Kolāgiri (Kolhūpur) and Jayantī, reads:

10 kolāgiryā<ṃ> mahālakṣṇī karālāyonisaṃbhavā |
kālarūpā sthitā devī danḍahastā subhīsānaḥ ||
11 tasmin kṣetre sthitā devi parvatāgrasamāśritā |
agniketi ca vikhyātaḥ kṣetrapālo mahātapa ||
12 jayantyā<ṃ> danturāyonī<ṛ> jvalāmukheti viṣrutā |
khadgahastā sthitā devi sarvasattvabhayāṃkārī ||
13 tasmin kṣetre sthitā devi nimbavṛkṣasamāśritā |
mahāpreteti vikhyātas tasmin kṣetre mahābalaḥ ||

ff. 16v4–17r3

13a tasmin kṣetre corr.: tasmiṃ kṣetra Cod.
and the corresponding passage in the Vajraḍāka (18.12–14) reads:

12 kollagiryāṃ mahālakṣṇī karālāyonisaṃbhavā |
karālarūpā sthitā devi vikṛtā cātibhiṣanaḥ ||
13 tasmin nagare sthitā cōgrā parvatāgrasamāśritā |465

Both the Niśisāṃcāra and the Vajraḍāka read parvatāgrasamāśritā (rDo rje mkha’ ’gro f. 49r7: ri yi rtse mor brten te gnas) ‘on a hilltop’ here. This is surprising because what we expect is a reference to the site’s sacred tree, as in the parallel expression nimbavṛkṣasamāśritā ‘by a Nimba tree’ in the next verse. It is tempting to emend, therefore to parpaṭāgrasamāśritā ‘in front of a Box [tree]’, since this is so close to the transmitted reading. However, two considerations oppose this: (1) in a passage on Kollāgiri in the Picumata (f. 7r3–4 [3.84–87]), which agrees in giving Mahālakṣṇī as the goddess, Agnika as the Kṣetrapāla, and danḍaḥ as the weapon, the sacred tree of the site is said to be a Vaibhāṭaka (84 daksīṇena likhen mantri mahāghoram bhayāvaham | mahāraudram śmaśānām tu nāmā kollagiri tathā || 85 tatra danḍam samālikhya madhye vaibhāṭakadrumam | nāvṛkṣasamākṛṇām kollāgiryoparī tathā || 86 citibhiṇ prajvalantibhiṃ samantāt parivarītam | dīkṣuṣ caiva vidīkṣuṣ ca bahis tasya mahāyaśe || 87 tasyādadhastā likhet padnam aṣṭapatram sakārṇikam | agonikam kṣetrapālam tu mahālakṣṇībhayāvaham); and (2) in the Kubjikāmata’s parallel version of this material Mahālakṣṇī is described as ‘residing on a hill’ (22.25: ag-
Moreover, this Buddhist parallel provides additional evidence of the direction of redaction through the state of verse 14. For it lacks the first quarter, which contained information vital to the coherence of the passage, namely the name of the site over which the goddess Jvālāmukhī presides and the goddess of the Pīcumata to whose family she is assigned. As a result of this error, committed either by a Buddhist redactor or inherited from a defective Śaiva manuscript, what was originally the second quarter has become the first. Aware that the metrical cadences required at the end of first and second quarters of a verse in this metre are different the redactor has removed the resulting metrical blemish by substituting the synonym vikhyātā for viṣrutā. But this was not enough, since to mend the unmetrical mess that resulted from the omission he would have had also to recast the quarters that follow. This was evidently beyond his competence or required more effort than he thought necessary. The result is a verse with five quarters (a, a, b, a, b) or one and a half verses of which the first half verse consists of a prior quarter without the posterior quarter required to complete it.

As for the four sites found in the Vajrādāka’s version but not in the Niśisamcāra, namely Udāiyāna, Jalandhara, Tibet, and Mālava, there can be little doubt that the presence of the third is the work of a Buddhist redactor, since Tibet had no religious significance for the Śaivas but much for the Buddhists from the eighth century onwards. As for the other three, their presence might be explained by assuming that the direct source of the Vajrādāka’s passage was not the Niśisamcāra as we find it in its single surviving Nepalese manuscript but rather a closely related redaction either within another version of the Niśisamcāra, such as we find in the paraphrases and citations of a work of this name in the Tantrāloka of Abhinavagupta and Jayaratha’s commentary,466

466 See the paraphrase of the Niśisamcāra’s treatment of these twenty-four Śākta sacred sites in Tantrāloka 15.88–97b and the direct citations in Jayaratha’s commentary on these verses. These show a list that differs somewhat from that found in the Nepalese manuscripts. The latter has Aṭṭahāsa, Caritra,
or within some other Śaiva source. However, this is improbable in the light of the Vajradāka’s treatments of all four of these sites. For what they have in common is that they deviate from the pattern of the rest of the passage in that their presiding goddesses, Mahādevī of Uḍḍiyāna, Caṇḍālinī of Jālandhara, Sahajā of Tibet, and Sekā of Mālava, are not assigned to one or other of the eight goddesses of the Picumata. Instead, in the case of the first three the redactor has filled in the text at these points by assigning them to the families of Guhyā (guhyākhyāyonisambhavā), Soma (somasambhava), and Svayambhū (svayambhuyonisambhavā), and in the case of the fourth omitting to assign her to any deity.467 Why he chose these names is unknown to me. Only one is a goddess and not one of them is of any significance in Tantric Buddhism, unless the Svayambhū intended is that of the famous Svayambhūcaitya of Kathmandu. It seems likely that he supplied these names at random in order to maintain the compositional structure. In any case, since it would have been an easy task to insert names from among those of the eight goddesses that structure his Śaiva source, it is evident that they meant nothing to him.

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

---


468 A related system of thirty-two sacred sites is taught in Hevajra 1.6.10–19, and, with some differences, in Mahāmudrātilaka, Paṭala 10 (ff. 17v1–20v5).
kulūtāyām aranyeṣe sindhudeṣe nageṣvare ||
62 samudrakuksyām saurāṣṭre pretapuryām himālaye |
kāncyām lampākaviṣaye kalinge kauśale sthale ||
63 triśakunūs tathā caudre kāmarūpe ca mālave |
devikoṭe sudhārāme godāvāryāṁ tāte 'rbude ||
64 ēsu desēsu yāh kanyāḥ striyo vā klinnayanayāḥ |
sarvās tāh kāmarūpingo manoṣevaṇuvṛttayah ||
65 śeṣeṣu yās samutpannāḥ sākinyo ghoramātaraḥ |
sad yoginyah kulūtāyām aranyeṣe ca mātaraḥ ||
66 sindhudeṣe bhaginyas tu nageṣe kulaṇāyikāḥ |
samudrakuksyām kāmpilyāḥ saurāṣṭre grhađevasaḥ ||
67 pretapuryām mahākālo rūpiṇyo himavagirau |
kāncyām ambāḥ samākhyaṭā lampākaviṣaye 'mṛtāḥ ||
68 kālinge vrataḥārīnyāḥ kauśale piśītāsaṇāḥ |
caṃravācyāḥ sthale proktās triśakunyāmarāḥ smṛtāḥ ||
69 desādava ye ca sākinyo nāyikā viṇāyikā<ḥ> |

126 yās ānyās ca viniristā raurāḥ bhairavamātaraḥ |
mahāmanthānaraudras tu tāsāṁ maṇḍalānāyakah469 ||

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


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

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

470 De mchog nyung ngu, f. 238v1–5 (= Laghuśaṃvara 41.6–15): kuluta dang dgon pa dang | si ndhu'i yul dang grong khyer dbang | gser gyi gling dang sau rā sa | de bzhin lha yi khyim dang ni | yi daggs grong dang kha ba'i gnas | kā ńci 'am la mpā ka yi yul | ka li ngga dang ko sa la | tri sha ku ne o tre dang | kā ma rū pa mā la la wa lha mo'i mkhar dang rā ma'i dbang | go da ba ri a rбу da | au ḍya na dzā la ndhar dang
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lemmata in the surviving Sanskrit commentaries, and a rewriting of parts of the passage in the Vajraḍāka.⁴⁷¹

41.6 kulatāyam arānye ca sindhudeśe nagaresvare |
suvarṇadvīpe saurāṣṭre tathā ca grhadevatā |
pretapuryām himālaye ||
7 kāncyāṃ lampākaviṣaye kālinge ca[iva] kosale |
trīṣakunis tathā oḍre kāmarūpe [ca] mālave ||
8 devikote rāmeśvare godāvaryaṃ [tathā]rbude |

oddiyānajālandharapulliramalayādiśu ||
9 eteṣu deṣetu kanyā yā virādvayavyāpiniḥ |
sarvās tāḥ kāmarūpīnyo manoveganivruttayaḥ ||
10 saḍ yoginīḥ kulatāyāṃ marudeśe ca mātarāḥ |
sindhudeśe [ca] lāmās tu nagare kulanāyikāḥ |
11 lampāke saurāṣṭre kuladevataḥ |
pretapuryāṃ mahākālyo ḍākini saha rūpiṇiḥ ||
12 himagirau kāncyāṃ sabālikāḥ |
paṇcālaviṣaye grhadevatā ||
13 kālinte vratadhārinīyaḥ kośale piṣitāsanāḥ |
pretapuryāṃ vajraḍākyāḥ sthalesvare ||
14 trīṣakunyāṃ [ca] amarāḥ pulliramalaye |
kanakagirau antyajāḥ striyaḥ sahasrāṇaḥ ekavīṃśatiḥ ||
The words within square brackets are purely conjectural

**TESTIMONIA:** BhBh = Bhavabhaṭṭa ad loc.; DG = Devagupta ad loc.; JBh = Jaya-bhadra ad loc.; KP = Kambalapāda ad loc.; Tib. = bDe mchog nyung ngu; VD = Vajraḍāka f. 41v3–6 (18c–10b).

**LEMMA:** 6a kulatāyām ityādinā BhBh • aranyam marubhūmiḥ JBh 6d ghrađevaseti saptamīlopat BhBh 8a āraṇo rāmeśvaraḥ JBh 8cd odṛjiyāṇājālandharapulliramalayā ādibhūtā yesam ta odṛjiyāṇājālandharapulliramalayādyayu rbudādayaḥ BhBh; pulliralamayo na nirṛiṣṭaḥ JBh 9ab eteṣu deṣeṣu KP, BhBh, VD • yā kanyā vīraṇāvayayiṇi VD, BhBh, KP; bu mo gang dpa’ bo gnyis med rnal ’byor ma (yā vīraṇāvayayiṇi) Tib.; 9c kāmarūpīṇya iti BhBh, VD 9d manoveganīrttaya iti BhBh, KP, VD 10a śaḍ yogiṇīḥ BhBh, KP, JBh, VD 10b marudeśe BhBh • mātarā iti JBh; mātaraḥ kākāsāvyāyāḥ JBh 10ab kulatāyāṃ marudeṣe ca mātaretayādi KP, VD 10c lāmās tu iti JBh; lāmā iti BhBh 10d kulamāyākāḥ JBh, BhBh 11ab lā mpā ka dang sa ṛa ṛa ṛa Tib.; lampāke saurāṣṭre ya<h> kuladevataḥ VD; lampāyāṃ saurāṣṭre kuladevataḥ BhBh; 11c mahākālo mahābhairavah 11cd pretapūryam mahākanyā dākinīsaharūpinī BhBh; dākinībir iti sahārthe triyāḥ | kiṃbhūtābhīḥ saha | rūpiṇyāḥ | rūpiṇity anyā rūpiṇyās cumbikāsabālikāprabhṛtyāḥ pythagbhūtāḥ saha rūpiṇibhir iti draṣṭavyāḥ 12ab himagrai ca kāciṃyam sabālikā iti BhBh 12cd paṇcālaciṣaye | ghrađevasa ghrađevasāyām BhBh; paṇcāla iti JBh 13a ka li nggar | brtul zhugs ’dzin pa nrmās yin no (kalinge vratadhāriniḥ) Tib.; kalinge ca vratadhāriniḥ BhBh 13b kośale piṣṭāśanāḥ BhBh 13cd pretapūryam vajradāyāḥ BhBh 14bcd pulliralamayā kanakagirī iti | iḥāntyajāḥ strīyaḥ | sahasrāṃ ekāvimsātīr iti bhāhuvyāsucanārtham BhBh; sahasrāṃ ekāvimsātīr iti KP 15ab śesāṃyeyuḥ yīvaṭāvah śiṛherukacakrayoginīyīdi KP, BhK (lḥag ma gzhan dag ji sneyed pa | dpal ldan he ru ka yi ni | ’khor lo’i rnal ’byor ma yin no), DG (lḥag ma gzhan nrmās ji sneyed pa | dpal ldan he ru ka yi ni | ’khor lo’i rnal ’byor ma yin no); śesāṃyeyuḥ hi yāvantya iti | śiṛherukasya yoginīti prathamabhaḥvacaṇalop BhBh; anyā api śesāḥ ca devatāvah śiṛherukakrayogināḥ JBh (cf. DG: lḥa mo gzhan dag ji sneyed pa | dpal ldan he ru ka yi ni | zhes bya ba la soṣ pa smos so | ji ltar zhen | he ru ka yi sbyor chen las | de yi dkyil ’khor gtso mo yin | zhes bya ba la soṣ pa la) 15cd mahāmānthana iti śiṛherukakrayosmānthānaṇyaḥ | tāsām iti nirdhāraneṇaḥ | śesāṃyeyuḥ iti tricakrayoṣvānaḥ caturvimsātīr dākinyāḥ JBh; mahāmānthanam praṇopayasvarūpataṃ upāyo vā | tenānuitah śiṛherukha praṇiṣūrpaḥ tasya sambhandhīṇaḥ tāsām madhye maṇḍalādānīyāḥ vajraśravāḥ samāpanneti bhāvāḥ | mahāmānthanam nirmāṇam nirvibhaktikām | tāsām nirmāṇam śiṛherukenaiva samādāyam yataḥ | śiṛherukamahāmudrāmaṇḍalādānīyiketi kecit BhBh

In the Buddhist version the total of twenty-one sites has been raised by the addition of Orḍjiyāṇa, Jālandara, and Pulliramalaya at the end of the first section (8cd). The reason for the addition is not made explicit in the Laghuṣaṃvara itself; but the fourth Paṭala had listed twenty-four Yoginīs from Mahāvīryā to Pracanaḍā;[472] and in the ritual system followed by the commentators and the

---

[472] *Laghusaṃvara* f. 4v4–6: *tato (JAYABHADRA : tataḥ Cod.) dākinyo bhuanāni vijrmbhayanti | 4.1 mahāvīryā cakravartinī mahābalā suvīrā cakrarvaminī |
corpus of explanatory Tantras the sacred sites, as we have seen, are likewise twenty-four because each is the location of one of these Yoganīs. We have evidence of two stages in the modification of the text that produced this result. For the earlier redaction, attested by Jayabhadra, states that Pullīramalaya is not mentioned in this passage but must be understood to be included.\textsuperscript{473} It is clear then that his text mentioned only Od. d. iyāna and Jālandhara in addition to the twenty-one of the Saiva source. Jayabhadra does not cite the actual wording of the insertion, and no other indications allow us to establish it. However, it is unlikely that the redactor took the trouble of stretching his interpolation of

\begin{footnotesize}
\textit{śauṇḍini} khaṇḍorohā cakravegā khagānānā || 2 haya*karnā (corr. : varṇā Cod.)
subhaḍrā ca *śyāmādevī (corr. : syāmāthavī Cod.) tathāvā ca | surābhakṣī vāyuvegā
tathā mahābhairavā || 3 aircavati drumacchāyā lāṅkēsvarī kharvari tathā | visramati
mahānāśa prabhāvati caiva caṇḍakṣī pracaṇḍa ca sādhaṅka || 4 etāḥ siddhās tu vai
pūrvaṃ caturvimśati dākinyāḥ. This list too has parallels in the Vidyāpitha, though I have found only partial matches. Thus the Yoganīsamāgana of Jayadrathayāmala, \textit{Ṣaṭka} 3, gives the following list of twenty-four Yoganīs whose names when uttered in the Śmaṣanabhūtas (f. 202r5–7 [9.58–61]): śarabhās-<an>ā suvīrā
cavajribhā *rāsabhā (conj. : rāsibhā Cod.) tathā | *cakravartī (corr. : cakravarti
Cod.) ca *śauṇḍī (em. : pauṇḍī Cod.) ca khadgakarnā mahātapā || 59 cakravegā
mahāyāṁyā subhaḍrā gajakarnīkā | carā vai somadevi ca gavakṣī vāyuvegāgā
|| 60 aircavati mahānāśa daṁṣṭrāḥ ca sukarkasā | vedhanī ca tathā bhaṭṭā
droṇā kākenakā tathā || 61 yatra nāmāni yoginām uccāryante mahātape | tatra
śmaṇabhūtās ca sāṁnidhyaṁ yā<n>ti tāṭksanāt. The eight names in bold characters are those that are among the twenty-four of the \textit{Laghuśaṃvara}. Compare also the names Śaṭabhānanā, Khaḍgakarnā, Gajakarnīkā, and Somadevi with the \textit{Laghuśaṃvara}'s Khagānānā, Hayakarnā, and Śyāmādevī. The names of four of the \textit{Laghuśaṃvara}'s Dākinis are found among the fourteen inner goddesses of the Picumata, i.e., the four Guhyakās, their four Dūtis, and the six Yoganīs, namely Caṇḍakṣī (the third Guhyakā), Mahābālā (the fourth Dūti), and Cakravegā and Mahānāśa (the fifth and sixth Yoganīs). For the first eight see 4.254c–256 cited here p. 193. For the six Yoganīs see f. 19r3 (4.257): kroṣṭukī vijayā caiva gajakarnā mahāmukhī | cakravegā mahānāśa śaḍ yoginiyā prakīrtitāḥ. Suvīrā appears in Kubjikākāma 21.45c and Matasāra f. 138r1, \textit{Khagānānā} as one of the eight Śaktasiddhās of the Kālikula/Krama, \textit{Lāṅkēsvari} in Matasāra f. 81r1 as one of eight Yoganīs in a variant of the inner retinue of the Picumata, and \textit{Prabhāvati} in Kubjikākāma 11.115a and 12.23b. See here p.158. Kānha, \textit{Yogaratnamālā} on Hevajra 1.7.12, identifies Pullīramalaya with Pūrṇagiri and that appears in its place in listings of these sacred places in later texts of the Cakrasaṃvara cycle, as in \textit{Samvarodaya} 9.14. In the treatment of the thirty-two sacred sites of the Hevajra system in the tenth Patała of the Mahāmudrātilaka we find Pūrṇagiri and Pullīra denoting the same place (f. 17r5–v1: odiyānaṃ pūtham ākhyaṇam pūtham jālandharaṃ smṛtam | pūtham pūrṇagirīs
cavaya kāmarūpaḥ tathāvā ca ... f. 18r1–2: śirasi sthitam vajrapitham śikhāyāṁ
jādisaṁjñitam | pullīram mastake jīnaye bhrāmadhye kāmarūpakaṃ). On the location of Pūrṇagiri, in the Deccan, see SÁNDERSON 2007a, pp. 298–299. In Śākta Śaiva sources it is one of the principal Pithas and is often referred to, but never under the name Pullīramalaya/Pullīra.

\textsuperscript{473} See Kānha, \textit{Yogaratnamālā} on Hevajra 1.7.12.
the names of these two places to fill a whole line (8cd). The later reading, \textit{oḍḍiẏānajālandharapulliriramayādiśu}, attested by the Tibetan translation and by the lemmata in the commentaries of Bhavyakirti and Bhavabhaṭṭa, supplies the missing Pulliriramalaya and, incidentally, is an almost metrical half-verse: its first half \textit{oḍḍiẏānajālandhara} is unmetrical, but the second is not, and together they provide the required total of sixteen syllables. As for the meaning of the insertion, ordinary usage suggests that it is ‘Oḍḍiẏāna, Jālandhara, Pulliriramalaya, and others’. But that would not sit well with the closed list of twenty-four Yoginis to which the sacred places were required to correspond. Thus it has been interpreted by Bhavabhaṭṭa to mean ‘beginning with Oḍḍiẏāna, Jālandhara, and Pulliriramalaya’, this compound with its locative plural ending being read as qualifying the twenty-one sites, each listed in the common text with actual or virtual locative singular endings. Thus we have twenty-four Yoginis in twenty-four sites. All that was needed to make this fit the system known to the commentators was to claim that the \textit{Laghusamvara} is deliberately concealing the true order of the items, both the names of the Yoginis in Paṭala 4 and the names of the sacred sites in Paṭala 41. For in their system that order is not Oḍḍiẏāna, Jālandhara, and Pulliriramalaya followed by the twenty-one from Kulutā to Arbuda, as the \textit{Laghusamvara} itself indicates, but the added three in reverse order followed by the twenty-one in reverse order, with the order of the Yoginis also reversed, so that the true sequence is from Pracaṇḍā in Pulliriramalaya to Mahāvīrā in Arbuda.

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

---
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475 On the passage listing the twenty-four Yoginis/Dākinis in Paṭala 4 Jayabhadra comments (\textit{Cakrasamvarapaṇjikā}, p. 115): \textit{tricakravyavasthitānām dākininām prthak prthān nāmāni kathante | mahāvīryetādīnī vilomena kathitaṃ} ‘The names of each of the Dākinis that occupy the three circuits are now taught. This has been done in the reverse order, beginning with Mahāvīryā [and ending with Pracaṇḍā].’ The order in which Mahāvīryā is the last and Pracaṇḍā the first, the order of their ritual application, is, however, indicated later in the text, in f. 35r7 (48.13): \textit{yoginīḥ pracaṇḍādayas tathā}.

Most of the few other differences between the version in Laghuśaṁvara 41 and that seen in the Śaiva source are of little significance. But there is one that is more revealing. The Tantrasadbhāva has Sthala between Kosala and Triśakuni (16.62c–63b: kāṇcyāṃ lampākaviśaye kālinge kausale sthale | triśakunis tathā ca uḍre kāmarūpe ca mālave), whereas the Laghuśaṁvara lacks it (41.7: kāṇcyāṃ lampākaviśaye kālinge ca[iava] kosa[l]e | triśakunis tathā oḍre kāmarūpe [ca] mālave), and instead between Saurāṣṭra and Pretapurī has Gṛhadevata (41.6: kulatāyāṃ arāṇye ca sindhudeśe nagareśvare | suvarṇadvīpe saurāṣṭre tathā ca gṛhadevatā pretaṇḍurāṃ himālaye), which the Tantrasadbhāva lacks (16.61c–62b: kulūtāyāṃ arāṇyeśe sindhudeśe nageśvare | samudrakukṣyāṃ saurāṣṭre pretaṇḍurāṃ himālaye). Two features are immediately obvious here. The first is that the additional words tathā ca gṛhadevatā have been added to an otherwise metrically correct verse with the result that it has five Pādas rather than the required four, with the fourth and fifth both with the cadence restricted to the second and fourth Pādas of the Anusṭubh, thus crudely violating the required metrical alternation of evenly and unevenly numbered Pādas that is hallmark of this metre. The second is that Gṛhadevata, meaning ‘household deity’ is a most implausible place name. The key to the mistake, which became a permanent part of the ritual system of the Cakrāsaṁvara cycle, is in the second part of the passage in the version of the Tantrasadbhāva, which tells the reader the classes of supernaturals that are present in the sacred sites. For there gṛhadevatāḥ ‘household deities’ are said to be present in Saurāṣṭra in a verse in which the items Saurāṣṭra, gṛhadevatāḥ, and Pretapurī are stated in that order (16.66c–67b: samudrakukṣyāṃ kāmpilyas saurāṣṭre gṛhadevatāḥ | pretaṇḍurāṃ mahākālyo rūpiṇyo himavādgirau ‘In Samudrakuḵṣī Kāmpilis, in Saurāṣṭra Gṛhadevatās, in Pretapurī Mahākālis, in Himālaya Rūpiṇiṣ’). Evidently the redactor has read the sequence saurāṣṭre gṛhadevatāḥ pretaṇḍurāṃ as though these were three sites rather than one site followed by its resident supernaturals and another site. Probably his manuscript read gṛhadevatā rather than gṛhadevatāḥ and he took it as a stem-form to be understood as locative, a licence of kind seen elsewhere in both the Laghuśaṁvara and its Śaiva sources, as, apparently, in the unmetrical insertion that this error prompted: suvarṇadvīpe saurāṣṭre tathā ca gṛhadevatā pretaṇḍurāṃ himālaye. Bhavabhaṭṭa duly comments on the occurrence of gṛhadevatā in that
part of the passage with the words *grhadevateti saptamīlopāt* ‘[We have the form] *grhadevata* [here] because zero has been substituted for the ending of the locative’.

The direction of redaction is also unmistakeable in the passage of the *Laghuśaṇvara* (1.15–4.1) (B) that prescribes the ritual of initiation. This has evidently been redacted on the basis a Śaiva source of which an expanded variant is seen in 8.3–28 of the *Yoginīsaṃcāra* (A) redacted in the *Jayadrathayāmala*:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8.3 girigahvaraghuyesu</td>
<td>1.15 girigahvarakuñjesu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mahodadhitatesu ca</td>
<td>mahodadhitatesu vā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ādisiddhe śmaśāne vā</td>
<td>ādisiddhe śmaśāne ca</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ālikhen maṇḍalam śubham</td>
<td>tatra maṇḍalam ālikhet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>iti herukābhīdhāne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>maṇḍalāvadhārapataḥ prathamaḥ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.4 śmaśānabhasmanā miśraṃ</td>
<td>2.1 tatra pānagomayena</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kapilāgomyaṃ śubham</td>
<td>maṇḍalabhūmi pralepayet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>raktodakavimisrena</td>
<td>śmaśānabhasmanā yuktaṃ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tena bhūmiṃ pralepayet</td>
<td>paṃcāmṛtasamanvitam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.2 upalipa tato bhūmiṃ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>tatra maṇḍalam ārabhet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>śmaśānaṃ tu samācare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.5 śmaśānabhasma samgrhya</td>
<td>2.3 cityaṅgāracūṛṇena</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>śmaśāne ‘ṣṭadalam śubham</td>
<td>śmaśāneṣtakasamytam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>śmaśānāṅgāracūṛṇam tu</td>
<td>ālikhen maṇḍalam divyaṃ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ācāryaḥ susalakṣaṇaḥ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>trirekham maṇḍalam likhet</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.6 ekahastaṃ dvihastaṃ vā</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>caturasṭakaraṃ tathā</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cf. B 2.12cd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sūtrayed rudhirāktena</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sāvasūṭrena sūtrādhṛk</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.4 samyagjñānatantrajñāḥ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>śrīherukamantrajñāḥ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.7 akrodhanaḥ śucir dakṣo</td>
<td>akrodhanaḥ śucir dakṣo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ācāryo jñānāpāragaḥ</td>
<td>yogaṅo jñānapāragaḥ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kapālamālabharanō</td>
<td>2.5 kapālakārtamārdhajaḥ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>raudrabhasmāvagunṇhitāḥ</td>
<td>bhasmānuliptāṅgāḥ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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8.8 pañcamudrāvratadharo
bhairavāṅgair vibhūṣitaḥ
mahābhūtāstraḥālaña
samantāt pariveṣṭītīt

8.9 ālikhen maṇḍalavaraṁ
ghorasiddhipradāyaḥ

mudrāmantrai aromaṁkratam

2.11 ālikhen maṇḍalam ghoraṁ
mahāsiddhipradāyaḥ
tato mṛtakasūtraṇa
mahārūdharaṇījitenā vā

Cf. A 8.6cd

2.12 śūtrayen maṇḍalam ghoraṁ
herukasya paraṁ puram
ekaḥastāṁ catur aṣṭaṁ ca

Cf. A 8.6ab

Caturaśraṇa caturdvāraṇa

caturaśrāṇa tu samantataḥ
caturdvārasamākīrṇaṁ
catustorāṇabhūṣitam
vicared dvīgūṇam mantri
yajed dākinijālaṁśatvarām

madhye padnāvibhūṣitam

2.14 tasya madhye pratiśthāpya

8.10 aṣṭapatraṁ tu tat padmaṁ
karnikādhiṣṭhitam śubhaṁ
tasya madhye nyased devi
bhairavam bhimavikramam

sapatraṁ karṇikōjvalam
pūṣkaraś ca kesarānvitaṁ
tato karṇikāyaṁ nyased vīraṁ

mahābhairava bhīṣaṇam

Cf. A 8.6ab

8.11 dakṣinābhhumukham diptaṁ
bhīmarūpaṁ bhayāvaham

tajaskam tu sudiṃṭāṅgam
atāṭṭhahāsamahāraṁ

2.15 karṇikāyāṁ nyased vīraṁ

khaṭvāṅgakṛtaḥastāṁ tu

samatālārdhābhūṣitam

2.16 kapālamālobharaṇaṁ
divyaṁ triṇetaṁ caturmukham
hasticarmāvaruddhaṁ ca
vajrasambhinīnabhravāṁ

2.17 khaṭvāṅgakṛtaḥastāṁ tu

samatālārdhābhūṣitam

2.18 mahābhairavābhhumukhaṁ kṛtvā tu

tasyāgraṭaṁ sthitām deviṁ
vajravrāhiṁ sughorāṁ

8.12 bhairavābhhumukhaṁ kruddhāṁ
raudrarūpam nyaset tataḥ

2.19c tataḥ śīyān praveśayet
sopavāśāṁ suciṁ snātān
arcayed uttarāmukhaṁ

8.20 kapālana siraḥ śrīvīvā
sampaṭāṁ hṛdaye nyaset
khaṭvāṅgena tu sarvāṅgān
ālabhet putramasya tu
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8.21 agrato vādayed ghanṭāṁ
paṭahīṁ damarūṁ tathā

vastracchannamukham devi

puspānjalidharaṁ tathā
8.22 pradakṣiṁṇikṛtya puraṁ

dakṣiṇāmūrtim āśritaḥ
tato dāvāpayet puspān
devasyopari putrakam
8.23 yasminst tat patate puspāṁ
tat tasya kulam ādiśet

hṛṣṇmantraparipajāptena
tilakaṁ tēṣu kārayet
8.24 raktena darśayet tasya
mukham udghāṭya maṇḍalam
yad yasva devatāsthānaṁ
tat sarvam tasya darśayet
8.25 samayāṅ śrāvayitvā tu
pranipatya purāṁ guroḥ
susrāvyu pūrvavidhinā
samśiddhaputrakānvitām
8.26 gurum sampūjya vidhivad
vittasaśṭhyavivarjitaḥ

pragrhyā kulajān mantrān
vratāṁś ca samayāṁs tathā
8.27 tāvat ārādhyed devi
yoginyo mātaro gurum

mātrādyo vratāṁś caiva
yāvadantaṁ krameṇa tu

3.2 ghanṭānādām ālambya
puppadhūpair ālaṁkṛtām
ghanṭāṁ vādayet susvarāṁ
paṭahīkāṁ vāpi sādhakaḥ
3.3 hāhākāraṁ ca kārayet
evam vidhivat pūjya
maṇḍalam sarvākāmikām

3.4 saṁchādyā paṭavastreṇa
mukham teśāṁ tu putrakām
puspapūṇāṅjaliṁ praksiṇet
3.5 pradakṣiṇāṁ ca tataḥ kṛtvā
sādhakaḥ susamāhitaḥ
praveśayet tat puravaraṁ ramyaṁ
dakṣiṇāmūrtim āśritya

3.6 puspāṅjalin tataḥ kṣipet
maṇḍalasyopari
yasmin patati tat puspāṁ
kulaṁ tatra vinirdeśe
tat pujayan mudrāṁ
3.7 śṛtherukādipitaṁ darśayet
ācāraḥ susamāhitaḥ
3.8 sīṣyaṁna tu dvitiye ahani
raktena trijāptena
tilakāṁ tasya kārayet
3.9 yad yasva devatāsthānaṁ
tatra tāṁ darśayet samyak
mukham udghāṭya sīṣyaṁ
darśayen maṇḍalāṁ tataḥ
pranipatya tataḥ paścād
8.27 tu gurave dadyāt
tathāgatotkadakṣiṇāṁ

3.11 tatas tu guravā dadāyāt
pranipatya tataḥ paścād
tathāgatotkadakṣiṇāṁ

3.15c tatas tasya tūṣyanti
dākinyo yogamātarāḥ
dākinyo lāmayaś caiva
khaṇḍaroḥā tu rūpinī

...
8.28 ārādhanakramād yāti
triṣaṭicarUSRādhētaḥ
bhairavibhuvanā devi
4.1 tato dākinyo bhuvanaṁ
vijṛmbhayanti mahāvīryā
sarvaśaktibhir āvṛtAḥ

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

APPARATUS CRITICUS OF B
Codd. : f. 2r3–. TESTIMONIA : AbhU = Abhidhānottara 46.10–57 (A f. 146r6– [<Laghuśāntara 2.1–]); BhBh = Bhavabhat.t.a ad loc.; BhK = Bhavyakīrti ad loc.; IBh = Indrabhuti ad loc.; JBh = Jayabhadra ad loc.; SV = Śāśvatavajra ad loc.; Tib. = De mchog nyung ngu; VV = Viravajra ad loc.
1.15c ādisiddhe Bbh : ādisiddha Codd. 2.1a tatra pānagomayena Codd. AbhU, BhBh, SV (chu dang ba byung blangs ‘water and cow dung’) : *tatrijāptagomayena Tib. (der ni lci ba ma ltung bas), BhK (de la lci ba ma ltung bas) 2.1b prale-payet Codd., AbhU : upalepayet BhBh 2.3a cityāṅgāra BhBh : cityāṅgāra Codd. : cityāṅgāraka AbhU 2.3b samyuktam conj. (= AbhU); cf. Picumata 5.116cd: kākavīṣṭa samādāya śmasāneśakasamyuktam) : samyuktam Codd. 2.4a samyagjñānatantraṭajñena Codd., BhBh : samyagjñānesu tattvajñāḥ AbhU 2.4c akrodhanaḥ JBh AbhU : akrodhas ca Codd. BhBh 2.11d mahārūdhiraraṇītena vā Codd., Tib. : (de nas sens med srad bu ’am | ru di ra ni chen pos brlan) mahārūdhirāṇītena vā BhBh : mahārūdhiraraṇītām AbhU, Tib. 2.13d yajed JBh : japed Codd. : pujyayed BhBh, Tib. (mka’ ’gro dra ba’i bde mchog mchod) 2.17c tasyāgraṭaḥ sthitām devīm JBh, BhBh, Tib. (de mdun gnas pa’i lha mo ni) : tasyāṅgatāśṭhīta devī Codd. 2.18a mahābhairavābhikhukhāṃ kṛtvā tu JBh : mahābhairavābhikhukhām kṛtvā AbhU, VV (rab ’jigs byed che la phyogs) : śrīrūkabhimukhāṃ kṛtvā tu Codd. BhBh : *mahāśrīrūkabhimukhāṃ Tib. (he ru ka dpal che la phyogs) : *śrīrūkajñānābhikhukha- (he ru ka dpal ye shes phyogs ni IBh 3.2c vādayet Codd. : nādayet BhBh 3.3a pujya BhBh : sampujyā Codd. 3.4b putrakāṁ em. [Aiśa gen. pl. ; =AbhU] : putrakān BhBh : putrakānem Codd. 3.7a śrīrūkādpitā BhBh (śrīrūkādpitiṣṭi dvitīyalope) : śrīrūkādpitam pithan Codd. 3.7bc tataḥ pujyayen mūdram ācārayah susmāhitah BhBh, Tib. (de nas slob dpon legs par ni | mnyam par bzhag ste phyag rgya mchod): tataḥ pujyayen mūdram ācārayaḥ susmāhitaḥ Codd. : tato hi pujyayen mūdram ācārayaḥ susmāhitaḥ AbhU : tataḥ pujyayen mūdram suvāmudrāṃ susmāhitaḥ JBh 3.9a yad yasya JBh, BhBh : yo yasya Codd., AbhU.
Here we see several tell-tale signs. In the Buddhist version the disciples undergoing the initiation are referred to as putrakāḥ (3.4ab: saṃccchādyā paṭavastreṇa mukham teṣāṃ tu putrakām ‘Having covered the faces of those disciples with a piece of cloth’), a term that is standard in this technical sense in the Śaiva literature but to my knowledge appears with it nowhere else in Buddhist Tantric sources.

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

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

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

\textsuperscript{477} See here p. 190.

\textsuperscript{478} See 2.4ab: \textit{samyogīnānātantrajñāḥ śrīherukamantrajñāḥ}; 2.13d: \textit{yajed dākinījālaśaṁvaram}; and 3.7a: \textit{śrīherukādiṣṭha dārsayet}. The reading \textit{mahābhairavābhimukhāṁ kṛtvā tu} (2.18a) probably represents a first attempt to differentiate the Buddhist version from its metrical Śaiva prototype by adding \textit{mahā-}.

\textsuperscript{479} This substitution of inauspicious and dangerous substances in the preparation of the Maṇḍala is a marked feature of accounts of initiation found in Vidyāpītha texts. See, e.g., \textit{Picumata} f. 5v1 (3.12ab), concerning the Aghorimandala: \textit{asti-cūrṇatađaṅgāraih manṛtrañṇo ālikhet puram} ‘The mantra-master should draw the Maṇḍala with powdered bone and charred bone’; f. 5v6 (3.31ab): \textit{śmāsānottthena sūṭrēṇa sūtrañṇam tu kārayet} ‘He should do the outlining with a cord from the cremation ground’; f. 10r2–3 (3.184–185): \textit{śmāsānottthāni bhāṇḍāni vas-trasatradikāṇī tu | vasstrai<rp> dvajā tu kartavyā sūṭrēṇa karaṇī tathā || keśair darbhā<rp> yathāyāyam *acchinnāgrah (corr. : acchinnāgraḥ Cod.) prakalpayet | veṣṭyāyen maṇḍalam tais tu astra-jāpataḥ saṃ-mantataḥ ‘The cloths, cords and clothes should be made with what has come from cremation grounds. With [funeral] shrouds he should make the banners and with threads [therefrom] the pitching cord. With the hair [of corpses] he should provide the uncut-ended stems of [protective] Darbha grass. After empowering them with the weapon-[mantra] he should surround the maṇḍala with them’; \textit{Jayadrathayāmala}, \textit{Ṣathka} 4, f. 65v7 (Rāvinīyāgapataḷa, [concerning the Maṇḍala of Rāviṇī in the Kālīkula section of the \textit{Jayadrathayāmalatantra}], v. 101cd: \textit{sāvasūṭrēṇa sāṃsūtrya asthi-cūrṇādi-bhir likhet} ‘He should colour [the Maṇḍala] with powdered [human] bone and the like after pitching its lines with a corpse-cord’; \textit{Jayadrathayāmala}, \textit{Ṣatka} 3, f. 200r5–6: \textit{sātrayed rudhirāktena *sāvasūṭrēṇa (corr. : sāvasūṭrēṇa Cod.)} ‘He should outline the Maṇḍala with a corpse-cord smeared with blood’. The nature of this cord is indicated by Ksēmarāja on \textit{Svachchandatantra} 13.21b: \textit{maṛtasūṭrēṇa vakṣyamāṇačchurna-kāya-uktā maṛtasāyaṇā} ‘The expression ‘with a corpse-thread’ means ‘with the sinew of a corpse’ in accordance with the secret vocabulary to be taught below’. He refers here to \textit{Svachchhandatantra} 15.5: \textit{snāyuh sūṭram prakīrti-tam} ‘The word cord means sinew’. This understanding is also seen in Buddhist Tantric literature. In his commentary (-\textit{piṇḍārtha-śikā}) on the \textit{Hevajratantra} Vajragarbha glosses \textit{śmāsānasūṭrēṇa ‘cremation ground cord’} as \textit{ro'i rgyus pa' \textit{r}nams kyi sbyas pa'i sran bus} ‘a cord made from the sinews of a [human] corpse’ (SNELL-GROVE 1959, Pt. 1, p. 51, n.1, who mistranslates this to refer to ‘a thread made
foreheads of the candidates with human blood (3.8).\footnote{480} It is more because the redactor has not added what from the time of the \textit{Mahāvairocanābhisaṃbodhi} onwards had been the most marked characteristic of the Mantrānaya’s adaptation of Śaiva Maṇḍala initiation, namely the series of consecrations known as \textit{abhiṣekāh}. The commentators evidently could not accept that this crucial Buddhist signature might be absent. For they have resorted to strained exegesis in order to impose it. Jayabhadra claims that the terse injunction to worship the Mudrā in 3.7 alludes to the \textit{guhyābhisekāh}, in which the Guru unites with a consort (\textit{mudrā}) and the candidate swallows the semen. Then avoiding the difficult task of reading in allusions to any of the six consecrations that normally preceded this climactic act in his time he simply asserts that they should be done following the procedure familiar from other Tantras.\footnote{481} Bhavabhaṭṭa, however, adopts a more bold and imaginative strategy, finding all seven con-

\begin{quote}
\textit{from the guts of a corpse}). We also read of the use of the hair of corpses for this purpose: \textit{Jayadrathayāmala, Śaṭka} 3, f. 181r4: \textit{ālikhen maṇḍalavaram tato raudrena bhasmanā | prathamaṁ sūtrayitvā tu śavamūrdhajārajunā ‘He should draw the excellent Maṇḍala with human ash after first pitching its lines with a cord of corpse-hair’; Siddhāyogeśvarimata 8.8: naraśeṣasamutthena karpāṣādīmayena vā | sūtrayen maṇḍalam divyam sarvasiddhīhalodayam ‘He should trace the excellent Maṇḍala, which bestows the reward of all the Siddhis, with [a cord] made from human hair or from fibres such as cotton’. This option is no doubt fixed: cremation-ground substances for ascetics and conventional substances for householders; see, e.g., \textit{Jayadrathayāmala, Śaṭka} 2 f. 9v2 (Vāmeśvarīyāgapata, vv. 48c–49): vāmāṁrātādibhir lipyā tatra maṇḍalam ālikhet || rajobhir *vīrāmgāsthaś (em. : vīramārgasthaiś Cod.) *cītyāngārādibhasmabhīḥ (cītyāngārādi Cod\textsuperscript{ac} : cītyāngārādi Cod\textsuperscript{ac}) | ratnādīśājitāīśa ca ghṛthaḥ ca likhet tataḥ ‘Having smeared [the ground] with wine and the like he should draw the Maṇḍala upon it with powders such as the charcoal and ash of funeral pyres, if he follows the path of Heroes, and with [ground] precious stones or rice flour [etc.], if he is a housholder’.

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

\footnote{481} Jayabhadra, \textit{Cakrasaṃvarapaṇīkā}, p. 114, ll. 9–11: \textit{kulaṁ tasya vinirdiśed} (3.6) \textit{itiyparyaṇtaṁ sukaram eva | tadanantarāṁ tantrāntaraprasiddhena vidihīna sarvam abhiṣekam abhiṣekadhiḥpradhānatvatū pujaye mudrām (3.7) ityādīnā guhyābhisekāṃ sūcayati ‘The text up to ‘he should indicate his Family’ is easy. He now alludes to the \textit{guhyābhisekāh} with the words beginning ‘he should worship the Mudrā’. He does so because this is the most important [of the consecrations]. [It is should be understood that] ‘he should worship the Mudrā [i.e. the consort] after he has completed the whole consecration [process that should be performed] immediately after that [determining of the candidate’s Family by casting the flower] following the procedure that is well known from other Tantras’. The expression ‘the whole consecration’, though singular, should be understood to refer to the whole sequence of the consecrations that precede the \textit{guhyābhisekāh}.}
secrections up to and including the guhyābhisekaḥ in 3.2–3.3a.: ghanṭānādam ālambya puspadhūpair alaṃkṛtām | ghaṇṭāṃ vādayet susvarāṃ paṭahikām vāpi sādhakaḥ | hāhākāraṃ ca kārayet ‘Resorting to the resonance of the bell the Sādhaka should ring the bell after it has been adorned with flowers and [fumigated with] incense; or he may [beat] a drum. He should also laugh wildly’. He asks us to accept that the ringing of the bell refers to the consecration of [the giving of] the bell (ghanṭābhisekaḥ) and, more astonishingly, that the wild laughter enjoined, literally ‘the sound hā hā’, is the consecration of [the giving of the initiatory] name (nāmābhisekaḥ). Having conjured up these two consecrations he then asserts that the three that precede them are therefore implicitly intended, namely the consecration with water (udakābhisekaḥ), the consecration with the crown (makuṭābhisekaḥ), and the consecration with the Vajra (vajrādhipatyabhisekaḥ).

He then subjects this same passage to a second reading in order to force it to refer also to the two consecrations that follow these five: the acāryābhisekaḥ, which qualifies the initiate to officiate as a Vajrācārya, and the consecration of the secret (guhyābhisekaḥ). He claims that in this second reading the resonance of the bell, the ringing of the bell, and the beating of the drum refer to the Guru’s uniting for the purpose of the second of these consecrations with a girl of twenty-five, twelve, or sixteen respectively.

---

482 Bhavabhaṭṭa, Cakrasamvarapañjikā, p. 37, l. 17: ghanṭānādam ityādinā ghanṭābhisekaḥ pratipādyate ‘The passage beginning with ghanṭānādam teaches the consecration of the bell’.

483 Bhavabhaṭṭa, Cakrasamvarapañjikā p. 38, ll. 6–7: hāhākāraṃ ca kārayed iti | hāhākāraṃ nāmābhisekaḥ | tam guruḥ bhavaḥ-ārakanaṭmanāḥ kāreyet ‘In the expression “He should have the hāhākāraḥ done”, the hāhākāraḥ is the consecration of the name. He should have that done for himself by the venerable Guru’.

484 Bhavabhaṭṭa, Cakrasamvarapañjikā, p. 38, l. 10: tata udakāmālīvajrādhipatyabhisekānām grahamat tatparvavatāt tayoḥ ‘From this [reference to the consecrations of the bell and the name] it follows that the text also refers [by implication] to the consecrations of water, crown, and the Vajra Lord, because those two have to be preceded by these [three]’. The five consecrations covered here are as in Samvarodaya 18.27, where they are associated with the five Tathāgatas.

485 Bhavabhaṭṭa, Cakrasamvarapañjikā, p. 38, ll. 13–14: ghanṭānādaḥ svālingavasthitapaṅcavimśatikādhihānam (em.: svālingavasthitāḥ paṅcavimśatikādhānam Ed.) | ghanṭā dvādasābdikā | paṭahikā śodaśābdikā | ghanṭānādo vajrapaṇḍukālam | ghanṭā ratnakulaṃ | paṭahikā padmakulaṃ | hāhākāraṃ tathāgatakulaṃ | cakrāraṃ anyac ca | ghanṭānādadindvānam anyatamāṃ ācārāyaḥ svayet (em.: ghanṭānādānāyaḥ anyatamāṃ ācārāyaḥ svayet). The five consecrations of the bell, the ringing of the bell, and the beating of the drum refer to the Guru’s uniting for the purpose of the second of these consecrations with a girl of twenty-five, twelve, or sixteen respectively.
Having made the text refer to the guhyābhiṣekah, he finds the ācāryābhiṣekah by using the same argument that he had employed to arrive at the full sequence of the five consecrations that precede it, namely that its presence is entailed by the supposed reference to the guhyābhiṣekah, because that requires it as its antecedent. He finds a reference to the final consecration that he needed to discover here, that of wisdom (prajñābhiṣekah), in the statement in 3.7 that Jayabhadrā had taken to allude to the preceding guhyābhiṣekah: tataḥ pūjayen mudrām ācāryaḥ susamāhitaḥ ‘Then the Ācārya, fully concentrated, should worship the Mudrā’. If, as is highly probable, the consecration understood by Bhavabhaṭṭa here was the prajñājñānābhiṣekah of the initiation manuals, then there would appear to be a problem, because the active agent in that consecration was not the Ācārya but the candidate, who now unites with the consort himself. Bhavabhaṭṭa is very terse at this point but it is likely that he was attempting to remove this difficulty when he wrote that the text refers to the agent as Ācārya here because he is endowed with such qualities as self-control. I take him to mean that it is indeed the candidate rather than the officiant that is the agent here and that he is referred as an officiant only figuratively, because he has all the qualities that are required of an officiant. These readings are, of course,
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artificial and could be imposed on the text only because Bhavabhaṭṭa, like Jayabhadra, could not accept the possibility that there might be no reference to the consecrations in a Buddhist Tantra’s treatment of initiation.

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

mūlasūtrādikānāṃ tu kramaṃ sādhanaṃ lakṣaṇam ||
10 durlabham trīṣu lokēsu samayaṃcārapālaṇam |
yāgāṃ vidhis tathā jnānam cakrāṃ yogāṃ ca sūbhānam ||
11 kathayāmi mahādevi yat tvayā coditāṃ *balam (?) |
madhyomattamacchāgena gandhodasahitena tu ||
12 vaṭikāṃ prāṣayet prajñāḥ pūjākāle viśeṣataḥ |
vīdhānaṃ tu sādā yoṣyāṃ carvahāreṇa suvrate ||
13 samaye sādhane caiva dravyālābhanakarmanī |
tasyaiṃ dūtayaḥ siddhāḥ sahajā vīravandite ||
14 guruṇādivibhāgena srṣṭidrayvādisāṃgrahahe |
ṛtuṇgaviyogena anulomavigomajā ||
15 yāgādhaḥvagata devi sarvakāmaṇilakṣāṇā |
kundagolodbhavenaiva svayambhukusumena ca ||
16 japahomārocanāṃ sīṇāṃ bukapuṣpasamanvitam |
niyojyam svena mārgena svakāle yāgāpūrvakam ||

f. 319v3–5

11c madhyomattamacchāgena em. : adhamottamacchāgena Cod.488

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

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

(15.6) sngags dang phyag rgya sbyar bar bya |
dam tshig thams cad bsbyang bya ste |
$jig$ rten gsum na rnyed dka’ ba (durlabhāṃ triṣu lokeṣu) |
g.yon nas skyes pas byed pa yin |
(7) dam tshig spyod pa’i mtshan nyid dang (samayācāralakṣaṇam) |
sbyor nyid cho ga’i yi ge shes ni (yoga eva vidhiṣñānām) |
de ni nga yis bshad kyis nyon (tan me nigaditaṁ śrṇu) |
dbugs dbhyung mchog gi bar dag ni (madhyamottamaśvāsena) |
(8) dri yi chu dang bcas po dang (gandhodakasahitena [tu]) |
rtag tu ril bu bza’ par bya (vatīkāṁ prāśayen nityam) |
mchod pa’i dus kyi bye brag la (pājākālaviśeṣataḥ) |
pho nyas lhan cig skyes dngos grub pa (dūtayāḥ sahaṇāḥ siddhāḥ) |
(9) dman pa mchog dang ’bring rnams kyi (adhamottamamadhyamāḥ) |
de yis sbyor bas dngos grub ’gyur (tābhīr yogena siddhiḥ syāt) |
’dod pa’i don kun sgrub pa’o (sarvakāmārthasādhakah) |
dpal ldan he ru ka las byung (śrīherukodīvam) |
(10) rang byung me tog nyid dag gis (svayambhukusumair api) |
cho ga shes pas kun tu spyod (vidhiṣñānasamācāra-) |
bzlas dang bsam gtan mchod po dang (jāpadhyānapūjā) |
me tog gcig dang yang dag ldan (ekapuspasamanvitam) |

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

TESTIMONIUM—Kumāracandra, Katipayākṣarā nāma Herukābhhyudayaapaṇḍikā, p. 156: evam mayā nigaditāṁ śrṇu | madhyamottamaśeṣāsah paṇca pradīpāḥ |
gandhodakam paṇcāmārtāni | vatīkāṁ prāśya (Cod. [f. 3v6]: prāpya Ed.) |
*bhāvanāgaṇaṃandaladāv (bhāvanāgaṇa corr. : bhāvanā gaṇa Ed.) dūtim pūjayet | adhamāḥ mantraṭāḥ | uttamāḥ sahaṇāḥ | madhyāmāḥ kṣetraṭāḥ |
tābhīḥ siddhiḥ syāt tasya yoginaḥ.

The version of the Laghuśaṃvara reads:

1.4 sambhāvān nādarūpād viṇiśkrāntāḥ samayācāragocarāḥ  |
durlabhāṃ triṣu lokeṣu ādīmadyāntasamṣṭhitam ||
5 manthyamanthānasamyoṣaṃ yathā tathā mantraṭāpādhyāṇādiyuktaṁ |
yogaś caiva vidhiṣñānam tāntre nigaditaṁ śrṇu ||
6 madhyamottamocchvāsena gandhodakasahitena tu |
kulikām pūjayen nityaṃ kālaviśeṣeṇa tu ||
7 dūtayāḥ sahaṇāḥ siddhāḥ adhamottamamadhyamāḥ |

f. 1v2–5

6a madhyamottamocchvāsena JAYABHADRA : madhyamottamaśvāsena Cod. BHAVABHAṬṬA

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

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

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

1.7 nāḍarūpād vinīśkṛntā samayācāragocaram |
durlabhāṃ triṣu lokeṣu ādamadhyāntanirmalam ||
8 manthamanathānayogena samyogād yatra yat tathā |
prakṛtiprabhāsvaram śuddhaṃ guhyāpiṭhodbhavadbhavam ||
9 nirdoṣaṃ sāśvataṃ sāntaṃ khasamāṃ srṣṭikārakam |
svabhāvasuddham svayambhūtaṃ yoginīnāṃ sukhapradam ||
10 jāpadhyānādibhir yuktaṃ yogasyaiva vidhiṃjataḥ |
tantre nigaditaṃ tattvaṃ guhyakādhipate śīru ||
11 madhyamottamaśvāsena gandhodakasahitena tu |
gulikāṃ kārayed dhīmān pūjayet parśamaṇḍalam490 ||
12 kālaivelāviśesena pūjayet tatra dūtayaḥ |
sahajāḥ siddhidāḥ sarvā adhamottamamadhyamāḥ ||
13 antaratgatena manasā kāmasiddhim tu sādhayet |

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

7ab nāḍarūpād em.: nāḍarūpa B: nāḍarū + A • vinīśkṛntā samayācāragocaram B: + + + + + cāragocaram A 7d nirmalam A: nirmmalāḥ B 8b samyogād yatra tatra yathā B: sayogād yatra yat tathā A: *yatra tatra yathā tathā (Tib. srub dang brsbr par yang dag sbyor | gang la de la ji ltar bzhiṅ) 8cd prakṛtiprabhāsvaram śuddhaṃ guhyāpiṭhodbhavadbhavam B: prakṛtiprabhāsva + + + + + thodbhavadbhavam A 9a sāśvataṃ A: sāsanam B 9c śuddhaṃ svayambhūtaṃ conj. [= Tib. dag pa rang byung ste]: śuddhasambhūtaṃ B: śuddham adbhūtaṃ A 10ab dhyānādibhir yuktaṃ yogasyaiva B: dhyānādibhir yu + + + va A • jñata A: jñeyā B

The otherwise unattested kulikām was then construed by force to mean yoginiṃ ‘a/the Yogini’, and the verb prāśayet ‘let him swallow’, since it now made no sense, altered to pūjayet ‘let him worship’.491

489 For gulikā (variant forms: guṭikā and gudikā) see here p. 217.
490 The reading of 11c is further supported by the Tibetan translation: mkhas pas dril bur byas nas ni. Note that dhīmān (mkhas pas) here is synonymous with prājñāḥ found at the corresponding point in the version seen in the Picumata (vaṭikām prāśayet prājñāḥ). This, then, has probably survived from the Śaiva source on which the first Buddhist version drew.
491 Bhavabhāṭṭa, Cakrasaṃvarapaṇjikā, p. 20: kulikā yoginī | tām pūjayed ārūdhayet | nityam sarvakālam pratidinam ity arthaḥ ‘[The word] kulikā [means] yogini. It is she that he should propitiate [in this way]; and he should do so constantly, at all times, that is to say, every day’. Cf. Jayabhadra, Cakrasaṃvarapaṇjikā, p. 110: kulikāṃ iti tantre samayabhāṣā | vajrārāhīśvarūpāṃ bāhyānganāṃ pūjayed
That the Buddhist versions arose from Śaiva prototypes is clear from the detailed analysis of these and many other parallels. Other features reinforce this conclusion. In all cases the Śaiva passages fit neatly into the contexts in which they occur, without ragged edges, as it were, at their beginning and end, whereas this is often not so with the parallels in the Buddhist texts, a circumstance that fits well with a scenario in which the latter where constructed by a rather careless process of extraction, insertion, and superficial editing.

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

We have a good example of this in the passage just discussed, in the words madhyamottamaśvāsena gandhodakasahitena tu ... The meaning of the Śaiva prototype as seen in the version of the Picumata, namely madhyamottamacchāgena gandhodahasahitena tu vaṭikām prāṣayet prājñāh, is perfectly clear to anyone who has read the whole chapter of which it is part. It means 'The wise [initiate] should swallow a pellet made from beef, human flesh, or goat mixed with scented water'. Their madhyamottamaśvāsena surely began life as a copyist’s corruption; for it yields no sense in either Śaiva or Buddhist terms in the context of this rite of the pellet or, indeed, in any other. Kumāracandra, therefore, in his commentary on the passage as it appears in the Herukābhuyudaya, could only guess at the meaning on the basis of the one part of the sentence that made undoubted sense, namely the injunction to swallow a pellet. Knowing that such pellets were made in practice from the five meats and the five body nectars he tells us that madhyamottamaśvāsah 'the intermediate and upper breath' means those meats and that the gandhodakam 'scented water' with which this 'breath' is to be mixed.

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

\[492 \text{See the footnote on my emendation madhyamottamacchāgena on p. 212.}\]
Jayabhadra and Bhavabhatṭa commenting on the same expression when it occurs in the *Laghuśamvara*, where the second part of the sentence has emerged through further confusion as *kulikāṃ pūjāyet*, impose quite different but equally arbitrary interpretations, which are based not on the text itself but, in the absence of evident meaning, on their own notions of what the text ought to be saying here. Thus Jayabhadra, who has the variant *madhyamottamocchvāsena*, makes *madhyama*- mean ‘vagina’, *uttamocchvāsah* ‘the placing of the tongue’, and *gandhodakam* ‘semen’, interpreting the sentence to mean that the adept should worship the Kulikā, that is to say, his female consort identified with Vajravāraḥi, by placing his tongue (*uttamocchvāsena*) together with his semen (*gandhodakasahitena*) in her vagina (*madhyama*-).

493 Kumāracandra, *Herukābhhyudayaapāṇijīka*, p. 156: *madhyamottamaśvāsah pañca pradīpaḥ | gandhodakaṁ pañcāṃṭṛtāni* ‘The word *madhyamottamaśvāsah* means the five ‘lights’; and *gandhodakaṁ* means the five nectars’. On the five lights and five nectars see, e.g., Vāgīśvarakūti, *Tattvaratnāvalokavivarana* 18: *pañcapradīpasadbena gokudahanalakaṃsasya amṛṭasadbena vimūrāśulaṃsasya satatānuṣṭhānam eva sādhyaṃ manyante* [The learned] hold that the expression *pañcapradīpas* refers to the accomplished regular practice of the [five meats] of the cow (go-), dog (ku[kkura]-), horse (da[mya]-), elephant (ha[st]-), and man (na[ra]-), and the expression *amṛta- to that of excrement (vi[ṭ]-), urine (mū[tra]-), flesh (mā[msa]-), blood (ra[kta]-), and semen (su[kra]-). Cf. Jayabhadra, *Cakrasaṃvarapaṇijīka*, p. 108: *ādau tāvan manonukūle śhāne niśadaya pañcāṃṭraṭkṛtagulikāṃ mukhe kṛtvā ... ‘At the beginning [before he begins the Śādhanā] he should sit in a place conducive to meditation, place a pellet of the five nectars in his mouth, ...’; Bhavabhatṭa, *Cakraśaṃvarapaṇijīka*, p. 24: *gokudahananām pañcāṃṭrasya ca vaṭikām bhāvanārambhe bhāksaṃyet ‘At the beginning of his meditation he should swallow a pellet consisting of [the flesh of] cow, dog, horse, elephant, and man, and the five nectars’; Śādhanamālā 251 (Advayavajra, *Saptāksarasādhanā*), p. 490: *yogī prātar utthāya samayaṃgulikāṃ mukhe praksiṭyā ... ‘The meditator, having risen before sunrise and placed a Samaya pellet in his mouth ...’. The term *samaya-* in *samayaṃgulikāṃ* means the five nectars; see Bhavabhāṭṭa, *Cakraśaṃvarapaṇijīka* p. 18: *samayapālanam samayarākaṃsam pañcāṃṭrabhakṣaṇam ‘maintaining the samaya- means keeping the pledges [and] swallowing the five nectars’; Jayabhadra, *Cakraśaṃvarapaṇijīka*, p. 109: *samayo dvividhāḥ rakṣaniyo bhakṣaniyāḥ ca The samayaḥ is of two kinds: that which is to be maintained [i.e. the post-initiatory pledges] and that which is to be swallowed [i.e. the five nectars]*.

494 Jayabhadra, *Cakraśaṃvarapaṇijīka*, p. 110: *madhye bhavatītī madhyamaḥ | padma ucycate | tasmīnna uttāmocchvāśa jihvāvīṃśyah | tena kimbhūtīna | gandhodakasahitena tu bodhičittasaḥṣṭinai vitya arthāḥ | kulikāṃ iti tantro samayabhāṣā | vajrārāhīśvarūpām bāhyānānām pūjayed iti | yathā samstosō jāyate tathā karaṇīyam ity arthāḥ ‘The word *madhyama-*, meaning ‘that which is in the centre’, refers to the Lotus [i.e. the vagina]. The word *uttāmocchvāsaḥ* means ‘the placing of the tongue’ and *madhyamottamocchvāsena* is a locative Tatpurusa compound meaning ‘by the placing of (his) tongue’ in that. The words *gandhodakasahitena tu* ‘together with the scented water’ describe that [placing of his tongue in her vagina] and mean that it should be together with [his] Intention to Attain Enlightenment
In Bhavabhāṭṭa’s commentary we find an entirely different understanding. According to him madhyamottamaśvāsenā gandhodakasahitena tu | kulikāṃ pūjayet means ‘he should worship the Yoginī with the place or time (-śvāsena) of fire (madhyama-) and earth (-uttama-) together with wind (gandha-) and water (udaka-).’ The purpose of this invention, which the Sanskrit entirely fails to support, is to find a reference (1) to the symbols of the four elements as constituting the thrones of the various groups of Yoginīs in the Maṇḍala and (2) to various time periods considered to be governed by these elements as the occasions for the successful performance of rituals for hostile purposes (abhicāraḥ), re-invigoration (pauṣṭikam), expulsion (uccātanam), and the averting of danger (śāntikam) respectively. That Bhavabhāṭṭa has decided what he would like to find here and then imposed it is clear from the extreme artificiality of the glosses that bend the text to his will: ‘the intermediate’ (madhyama-) is fire (vahniḥ) because it is falls in the middle of the list of the four elements (actually in the penultimate position); the ‘highest’ (-uttama-) is that of Mahendra, the presiding deity of the symbol of earth (pr thi) because he is the king of the gods; gandhaḥ means not ‘fragrance’, its lexical meaning, but ‘that which possesses fragrance’, namely the wind (vāyuḥ), since that is the bearer of fragrance; udaka- is not udakam ‘water’ but an unattested udakah meaning Varunā, literally ‘he who possesses the waters’, since Varuṇa is the presiding deity of the symbol of water (udakam); and śvāsah means not ‘breath’ but ‘that in which X breathes’, that is to say, by an entirely unwarranted leap, the locus or time of X’s operation.

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

495 Bhavabhādra, Cakrasaṃvarapañjikā, p. 20: madhyama uttamaḥ śvāsya asminn aneneti vā | śvāsah sthānam kālo vā | madhyama vahniḥ prthivyaṇtejovāyava iti vacanena madhyodbhavatvāt | madhyodbhūtavate ‘py upāyagrahaṇam yatas tām vaksyati | uttamo māhendro devarājatvāt | madhyamottamaśvāsah sthānam kālo vety arthāḥ | tena kulikāṃ pūjayed iti sambandhāḥ | kimbhūtenetī āha gandhetvādi | gandho ’syāstīti gandho gandhavāhatvād vāyuḥ | udakam asyāstīty udako varunāḥ | tayoḥ sthānena sthito gandhodakasahita iti madhyapadalopī samāsah ghṛtapiṇno ghaṭo ghratghaṭo yathā. ‘The term śvāsah is to be understood here to be derived from the root śva ‘to breath’ in the meaning ‘that in which X breathes’, X in this case being madhyamaḥ and uttamaḥ. The śvāsah, then, is the locus of these or their time-period. The madhyamaḥ ‘intermediate’ is ‘fire’, because it arises in the middle, in accordance with the text ‘earth, water, fire, and wind’; and the uttamaḥ ‘highest’ is the [symbol] of Mahendra, the presiding deity of the earth symbol, because he is the king of the gods. So the meaning of madhyamottamaśvāsah is ‘the locus or time of the madhyamaḥ and the uttamaḥ’. With this he should worship the Kulikā. Such is the core syntax. The compound beginning gandha- describes this śvāsah further as ‘accompanied by gandha- and udaka-’, meaning ‘together with the locus of these [other] two (gandhodakasthānasahitaḥ). This is a com-
Since these confused and barely comprehensible verses are found in the opening chapter of the *Laghuśāṃvara* the redactor has made a greater effort than usual to assimilate them to their new Buddhist milieu. But he has not done this by rewriting them in such a way that Buddhists would recognize and understand them as formulated within their own established discourse. His approach is rather that of montage or bricolage, in which bits and pieces of various texts have been clumsily combined. Instead of rewriting the verses he has sandwiched them between others derived from well-known Buddhist sources. Thus the opening verses of the work (1.1–3), which immediately precede this passage, are a version of the opening of the Buddhist *Sarvabuddhasamāyoga*;496 and the verses (1.7c–13b) that follow it contain awkwardly collocated variants of verses found in that text and the Buddhist *Sarvatathāgatatattvasamgraha* and *Guhyasamājā*.497

But this attempt to lend the compilation a Buddhist character by embedding the passage from the Śaiva Vidyāpīṭha between verses that Buddhist Tantrics would immediately recognize as Buddhist is mostly restricted to this first section. The rest of the work up to the point at which the redaction known to Jayapanu

---

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

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

---

498 See here p. 154.
499 The special character of the added, 51st chapter is indicated in the spiritual biography (rnam thar) of Tilopā ascribed to Marpa (Mar pa chos kyi blo gros). For there the Jñānadhākinī and her retinue are said to have taught it to Tilopā together with the oral transmission (TORRICElli and NAGA 1995, p. 12): gsungs nas rtsa rgyud le'u nga gcig pa bshad rgyud dang bcas pa dang snyan rgyud gnang ngo. The extended Tantra was already current when at least some of the Vyākhyātantras were redacted. The Adhidhānottara contains 50.20c–51.12b. It is possible that the text was extended first only to this point. Parts of the 50th chapter after this point are seen in the Sampūtodbhava: 50.21–23b and 24ab > Sampūtodbhava 5.1.16–19b; and 50.25 > Sampūtodbhava 5.1.19cd. Verses from the remainder of the longer text, from 51.12c to the end, are found in the Yoginisamcāra and the Samvarodaya: 51.7ab > Yoginisamcāra 17.10ab; 51.13c–16b > Yoginisamcāra 17.21c-24b; 51.18–19 > Samvarodaya 32.29c–30b; and 51.21d > Samvarodaya 32.31d. 
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into accounts of the interaction of the gods with demons and men. Thus we find our evidence in a variant of the famous narrative of Śiva’s burning of the celestial cities of the three demons (tripuradahanam) given in the Haracaritacintāmaṇi, a collection of Śaiva myths for the instruction of the laity compiled in the thirteenth century by the Kashmirian Śaṅka Śaiva Jayadratha.\footnote{Jayadratha was the brother of Jayaratha, author of the Tantrālokaviveka, on whose date see SANDERSON 2007a, pp. 418–419. That Jayadratha shared his brother’s Śaṅka Śaiva adherence, in keeping with the family’s long-established tradition, is evident throughout his work, but particularly in the opening verses of each chapter, in which he gives a metaphysical reading of the myth that follows. Thus in 13.1, introducing this narrative of the destruction of the three cities, whose point is to glorify the Kashmirian sacred site of the volcanic fire-Linga (jvālālingam) at Suyam (Svayambhū) (on which see STEIN 1900, vol. 2, pp. 484–485), he equates the three cities with the cognizer, cognition, and the cognized differentiated in contracted consciousness, and the fire that destroys them with the all-inclusive nonduality whose emergence bestows liberation: \textit{etad vedakavedyavedanamayam dagdhvā prānāṃ trayām pūrṇād vairutāsanaena śaṃyān māyāmyapradravam | jvālālingatayāśphuraṇ (A: sphuraj Ed.) jagadanugrahi svayambhū asau devah samprati bhāsatām mama parām uśāsayan nirvṛtim ‘May that god Svayambhū blaze forth for me now, revealing the highest bliss, he who has favoured the world by manifesting himself as the fire-Linga after burning these three cities that are the cognizer, the cognized, and the cognition, putting an end to the torment of bound existence with the fire of all-inclusive nonduality’. This is exactly in the conceptual mode of the Śaṅka Śaiva nondualism of Kashmir.}

According to that account Brhaspati, the ingenious Guru of the gods, puts an end to the invincibility of these demons, the reward of their devotion to Śiva, by fooling them into abandoning the worship of that deity. He composes and introduces to them various texts for the visualization of Buddhist deities in which Śiva and other Śaiva deities are portrayed as their inferiors. Then, once they have become used to these, he adds Mantras by adapting those of the Śaiva Tantras and composes passages giving instruction in Tantric ritual procedures by cobbling together various excerpts from the same sources. Finally, he composes Buddhist treatises which supplement this Tantric corpus with reasoned arguments designed to undermine the demons’ commitment to their rites and belief in God.\footnote{Haracaritacintāmaṇi 13.61–83: ripūṇām bhagavadbhaktir vijaye mūlakāraṇam | sā śaithilyam avāpnoti kena yatnena cintyatām || 62 tatrābhupāyah prāyena kaścit sancintito mayā | śukrasya saṁvidhāne tu kathāmkāraṃ pragabhate || 63 teṣām hitam *prāpyayitum (conj.: prārthityitum Codd. Ed.) śukra eva dine dine | bhagavadbhaktidārḍhyāya prayatnam adhit śhati || 64 svayaṃ yady api *te (Codd.: ye Ed.) bhaktas tathāpy aśvayagarvitāḥ | mitaprajñāḥ ca yoijyante helayaiva viparyayere || 65 ity utkāvān mahendrena *prchyaṭe (A²: prchate Ed. A²BC) sma sa kautukāt | bhagavan brāhi tām yuktāṃ teṣāṃ lingācānapāḥ || 66 śruteti so ‘bravīt paśya prāyaḥ sarve ‘pi sarvadā | uttarottaram uktāṃ jñātāv rajyant’ jantaravāḥ || 67 tād iśvarād ‘te ko ‘tra sarvesaṃ mārdhāni sthitāḥ | svavikalpena tasyāpi kaścid ārdrvāsthā ucyate || 68 evaṃ māyāyam teṣāṃ varṇyate svopakalpitam | śāstraṃ ca darṣyate kiṃcīl likhitvā nījayā dhiyā ||}
Genesis and Development of Tantrism

[Bṛhaspati:] “The root cause of the victory of our enemies is their devotion to Śiva. We must think carefully what will cause that to fade. I have already thought in general terms of a means of accomplishing that. But how[,] I wonder[,] will it succeed while [their Guru] Śukra is with them? For he exerts himself day after day to strengthen their devotion to the Lord in order to *secure (conj.) their welfare. [But] although they are genuinely devoted [to Śiva] they are proud of their power and of low intelligence. It should therefore be easy to lead them astray”. When he had said this Indra eagerly asked him to explain the stratagem that would put an end to their worship of the Liṅga. Having heard this he replied and said: “Behold. All persons usually assign their devotion on the basis of their understanding of an ascending hierarchy. Who but Śiva is at the summit [of this hierarchy], surpassing all [others]? Nonetheless I shall use my imagination and tell [them] that there is a being above even him. In this way I shall give them false instruction of my own invention. I shall also use my wits to compose and show them some learned writing [in support of my teaching]. I shall deceitfully write visualization-texts of deities in relation to whom this Śiva will be placed in a position of inferiority, and I shall tell them that these show that there is another being who is greater even than him, so that they may give up their worship of the Liṅga and so be destroyed. However, these false teachings will have no effect while Śukra is present.
Thus said the Atharvavedic priest [of the gods]. Then Indra respectfully asked him to explain the stratagem more fully. After some reflection Brhaspati said to Indra: “It is entirely inappropriate that it should be you that has to divert [these demons] from the worship of Śiva’s Līṅga. [So I shall take on this task myself.] My way of destroying their understanding will be this. I shall call this teaching Buddhist, [appropriately enough] since it will be born of [nothing more than] my intellect (buddhiḥ). The well-known Buddha will be conceived therein as the sole lord of the gods. Even the greatest deities will be portrayed as his chowry-bearers. Gods that I shall call Buddhist will be depicted positioned on top of Gaṇapati and others of the highest Śaiva deities. When the demons see these falsely conceived visualization-texts they will certainly make the mistake of thinking that these gods are greater than Śiva. Once these texts have been established and I have accustomed the demons to them I shall introduce Mantras modelled on [those of] the Śaiva Tantras (śaivatantrānuvādena) and by redacting various passages from these same scriptures (uddhṛtya śivasāstrebhyaḥ khaṇḍan khaṇḍan) I shall add a worthless, concocted system of [Tantric] observances involving Mantras, ritual, and the rest. The learned [Buddhist] literature that I shall compose to define bondage and liberation will be nourished by higher reasoning of an exceptional degree of rigour. It will explain, of course, that of these two bondage includes such activities as worshipping the Līṅga; and liberation will be [defined as] a voidness [of self] that [once accepted] will subvert [their commitment to their] religious duties. Their sacrifices and other rituals will be opposed there; and coming to believe [though this teaching] that there is no soul they will denigrate Śiva himself [for teaching otherwise]. Indra, when I have composed learned teachings of this kind I shall insinuate them into their hearts and so put an end to their devotion to Śiva. For the plan to succeed we have only to wait until Śukra is absent”.

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

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

---


503 That this is the Buddhism envisaged here is in keeping with another anti-Buddhist myth in this collection (Haracaritacintāmaṇi, chapter 17 and SANDERSON 1995b, p. 94 for a summary). For there the adherents of Buddhism are said to be led by three demons: Heruka, Śaṃvara (the two Vajraḍākas), and Ādibuddha (Kālacakra).
The redactional relation between the Yoginītantras and Śaiva Tantras of the Vidyāpiṭha may not, of course, have been so obvious to learned Buddhists once these texts had been propagated and the work of commentary undertaken, let alone the context that they refer to distinct groups among the Buddhists (bhramamohatmakāḥ kēcī mityāijñānātmakāḥ pare) I take them to mean ‘those who are devoted to the delusion of [the objective existence of] non-objective cognitions’ and ‘those who are devoted to the view that [belief in this reality of] cognitions [containing the appearance of their objects] is false’, understanding these expressions to refer to the two kinds of Yogācāras, those who hold mind-only with form and mind-only without form respectively to be ultimately real, that is to say Sākāravijñānavādins and Nirākāravijñānavādins. Classifying Mahāyāna Buddhists into Mādhyamikas and these two kinds of Yogācāras and the classification of all these into those who follow the Mantranaya and those who do not, that is to say, those who follow the non-Tantric Parāmitānaya, is a commonplace in the doxographical tradition of late Indian Buddhism; see, e.g., Advayavajra, Tattvaratnavālī, pp. 4–8; Sahajavajra, Sthitisaṁśa ff. 4v1–6r2 (nirākāryogacārasthitisaṁśāh), ff. 6r2–7r1 (sākārayogacārasthitisaṁśāh), ff. 7r1–11r3 (madhyamasthitisaṁśāh), and ff. 11r3–18v5 (Mantranaya); Vāgīśvarakirti, Tattvaratnavālokaśāraṇa, pp. 141–142 (mantranaye ca vijnānavadamadhyamakamatayor eva pradhānatvāt . . . ); Mokṣākaragupta, Turkabāṣa, pp. 107–110; and KAJIYAMA 1998, pp. 148–151, 154–158.

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

This must have been especially so in east India. For the Sākta tradition was particularly strong there, as it still is, and had deep roots in the domain of popular religion, as is evident from such Purāṇas as the Devīpurāṇa, Brhannārādyapurāṇa, Brhadādharmapurāṇa, and Kālikāpurāṇa,505 from non-eastern testimony,506 from the fact that east-Indian locations are conspicuous in early lists of the Sākta sacred sites,507 and from the inscriptions and other his-

505 See Chakrabarti 2001 passim. The Devīpurāṇa (39.143–145) lists places where the Mother goddesses are especially present. In this list are Varendra, Rādhā, and Kāmarūpa: veyyasu gopabālās tuṇḍahānakhāsa ca | pīthe himavatāś cālpa (?) *jālandhare (corr.: jālandhare Ed.) savaidiśe || *mahodare (?) varendre ca rādhāyām kośale pure | bhoṭadesēe sakāmākhye *kīśkindhe (corr.: kīśkindhe) ca nāgottame || malaye *kollānāme (conj.: kollānāme Ed.) ca kāncyām ca hastināpure | ujjayināyām ca tā vidyā viṣeṣaṇa vyavasthitāḥ Those Vidyās are especially present among courtesans, cowherd girls, *Tuḍas (?), Hūnas, and Khasas, in the sacred site of Himālaya* . . . (?), in Jālandhara, Vidiśā, *Mahodara (?), Varendra, Rādhā, the capital of Kosala, Tibet, Kāmarūpa, the great mountain of Kīśkindhā, Malayā, *Kollā[gi]ri (conj.), Kāncī, Hastināpura, and Ujjayinī.

506 A verse in a Purāṇic passage on the calendrical festivals of Kashmir cited by Lakṣmīdhara early in the twelfth century in the Niyatākalakānda of his Kṛtyakalpatarū (p. 410, ll. 4–5) associates the sanguinary cult of Durgā/Bhadrakāli with the peoples of Bengal and Orissa (Àṅga, Vāṅga, and Kālinga), the Kinnaras, the Barbaras, and the Śakas: evaṃ nānāmlecchhaganāḥ pūjyate sarvadayuṣbhīḥ | angavangakalingais ca kinnarair barbaraikaih sakaih ‘She is worshipped in this way by various foreign communities, by all the Dasyus: the people of Àṅga, Vāṅga, and Kālinga, the Kinnaras, the Barbaras, and the Śakas’. In this list only the people of Àṅga, Vāṅga, and Kālinga and the Iranian Śakas (if this reading is sound) are well-known. As for the Kinnaras and Barbaras, Varāhamihira locates the former, under the synonym Àśvavādana, in the east (Brhatsamhitā 14.6ab: khasamagadhasībiragirimirthisamataḥodrāṣvavadanadantarurakāḥ), and the latter in the southwest (14.18c).

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

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

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

---

508 For Nayapāla’s foundations see here pp. 111–114.
509 Saṃdhyaṅkaranandin, Rāmacarita 4.21: cāndicaranaṇasarojaprasādasampannavigrahasīkitam | na khalu madanam sāṃ�geṣam īṣam agāj jagadvijayaśrīḥ ‘Did not the glory of world-conquest come to King Madana when, with the king of Anga, he had achieved success in battle by the favour of the lotus-like feet of Cāndi?’
511 See here p. 112.
512 om namaḥ carciḥkāyi || surāsurasirāḥśreṇiḥpāṭavāsasamā jagat | pāṇtu viśvākṛtā-
Obeisance to Carcikā.
May the world be protected by the dust from the feet of Carcikā, worshipped by the creator of the universe, fragrant powder for the heads of all the gods and demons.
May Carcikā protect the world, who at the aeon's end, garlanded with human skulls, with her body becoming desiccated out of anxiety at the poverty of her fare, thinks: "What shall I eat? If I devour this universe in a single bite, it will be no more than a fragment that will lodge between my teeth. What shall I drink? The water of [all] the seven oceans is insufficient to be visible in the hollow of my palm."

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

Indeed, as this anomalous foundation suggests, the cult of the emaciated Carcikā seems to have been particularly well-established in the region. There are numerous surviving images of this goddess at or from sites in Bihar, West Bengal, Bangladesh, and Orissa, dating from the ninth century to the fourteenth, she figures prominently in the east-Indian Śākta Devīpurāṇa, and

bhyaṛcāś carcācaraṇaṛṇaṇavāḥ || daṃśtrāṃśカルiṇiṁ ēkākāvalam viśvaṁ tad aśnāmi kim saṃṭaṃbhodhjalāṇi hastasūśire guptāṁ kim pīyate | ity āhāradaridra-tākula-tayā susyaṭtanum bibhrati kalpānte nṛkapālaṁandaṇavidiḥ pāyāj jagac carcikā.

513 With these verses compare those of the east-Indian poets Bhaśoka and Umāpatidhara in the anthology Sadukti-karṇāmṛta (vv. 126 and 129), compiled by the east-Indian Śrīharadāśa in 1205 under Laksmanasena. Bhaśoka's being east-Indian is evident from his name in -oka; see the many names of this kind in the east-Indian anthologies Subhaśitaratnakosā, and Sadukti-karṇāmṛta, Amṛtoka, Saṅgokā, Uchoka in the inscriptions of Bengal (N.G. Majumdar 2003, pp. 179, 27, 37, 178), and Dibboka and Rudoka in the commentary on Rāmacarita 1.39. Umāpatidhara composed the Deopārā inscription of the Sena king Vijayasena (r. c. 1096–1159) and is reported in Merutunga’s Prabandhacintāmāni to have been a minister of the Sena Lakṣmānasena (r. c. 1179–1206); see N.G. Majumdar 2003, p. 45.

514 See Camunda (Cāmundā) in the Huntington Archive. For Orissa see also Donaldson 1991.

515 See in particular Devīpurāṇa, Patalas 7 and 9 (> Agnipurāṇa 135) on Cāmundā’s Padamālāmantra. In that Mantra Cāmundā is described as having her body clothed with an elephant hide (gajacarmaprāvṛtasaṭāre). This feature, which was borrowed from the iconography of Śiva not only by Cāmundā but also, as we have seen, by Cakrasaṃvara and Vajrārāhī, is found in most of her east-Indian images. See Huntington Archive, Scans 0058416 (Bangladesh), 0006042 (Itahar, North DinaJPur District, West Bengal), 0013693 (findspot not recorded), 0013697 (findspot not recorded), 0002686 (Harsinghpur, Darbhanga, Bihar), 0000308 (West Bengal),
in early canonical treatments of the Śākta Śaiva sacred sites this goddess is said to preside at Devīkoṭa,⁵¹⁶ Puṇḍravardhana,⁵¹⁷ both in Varendri, and Ekāmra (Bhubaneswar) in Orissa.⁵¹⁸ In the first she has the name Karṇamoṭi,⁵¹⁹ according to the Niśiṣamārā, Picumata, and Kubjikāmata, and Bahumāmsa according to the Skandapurāṇa-Ambikākāṇḍa.⁵²⁰ In the other two she is called Cāmuṇḍa.

0013061 (Dighapatiya, Natore District, Bangladesh), 0002607 (Munger [Monghyr], Bihar), 0013063 (Bangladesh), 0013062 (Mahātore, Dinapur District), and 0013476 (Vikramapura, Dacca District, Bangladesh); also AIIISP Acc. no. 32782 (Advahati, Burdwan, West Bengal). It is not generally seen in images of Cāmuṇḍa from other regions. An exception is a fine sculpture at Khajuraho (AIIISP Acc. no. 45199) from the Chandella period (c. 900–1150). It is perhaps to be introduced by emendation into the description of Cāmuṇḍa’s icon in Agnipurāṇa 50.21c–23b: cāmuṇḍa koṭarākṣī syān nirṃmāṇa tu trilocanā || nirṃmāṇa asthisārā vā ārdhvakāśī kṛṣodāri || *dvīpacaṃmadhara (dvīpa conj.: dvīpi Ed.) vāmē kaṇḍalā paṭṭiśam kare || śūlaṃ karṭī daksīne 'syāḥ savārūḍhāsthithibhūṣanā.

See here p. 112.

⁵¹⁶ Niśiṣamārā f. 18v2–3 (4.35–36): cāmuṇḍetī ca *vikhyātā (em.: vikhyā Cod.) devyā vā *puṇḍravardhanē (corr.: puṇḍa Čod.) || mahābalākuloṭpannā khatvāṅga-karasobhitā || 36 bhuktimuktikārā devyā samdohaksetrasaṃśītī || kumbhākhyo kṣetrapālaṁ ca tasmin kṣetre vyavasthitāḥ; Kālikulakārmācana f. 21v1: Hṛīm Śrīm Śrīṃ*Puṇḍravardhanamahopakṣetra Cāmuṇḍa-Âmbâpâda (puṇḍra corr.: pûnda Cod.).

⁵¹⁷ Niśisamārā f. 31r1–2: *ekāmre (em.: ekāte Cod.) *samśhisto (corr.: samśītī Cod.) devi kiṃti*vāseti (corr.: tāseti Cod.) *kiṃritiḥ (corr.: kiṃritī Cod.) || cāmuṇḍayā (corr.: cāmuṇḍāyā Cod.) samāyu*ktaḥ (corr.: āt̄m Cod.) sthāna-balisanuvī*tam (corr.: taḥ Cod.); Kubjikāmata 15.28–30: vartamānīkakalpte tu ekāmracavānanāntagāh || kapālisha*kulesānacāmuṇḍācakramadhyagāh (kulesāna corr.: kulesānaṃ Ed.) || 29 śrikiṃśulapadavesvasya hṛtādhe śadāle sthitaḥ || isānakramayogena sṛṣṭimārgavālambikāh || 30 karnikāyām sthitō devaḥ caṭuṣka-parivāritāḥ || rakta-kārālacandākṣāmaḥ-cuḥschuṣmāsanavitāḥ; Kularatnoddhotā f. 16r2 (3.140c–142b): ekāmracavānanāntasthā utpannya<h> parameśvarī || 141 kapālisāsamopetās cāmuṇḍā*cakramadhyagāh (corr.: ścakra Cod.) || pithasthānā-srayodbhātās catasro nyāḥ<h> parāmbike || 142 rakta kārālā caṇḍākṣī uccuṣmēti prakīrtītāḥ.

⁵¹⁸ Karṇamoṭi is listed as a synonym of Cāmuṇḍa in Amarakoṣa 1.1.92 (see here p.231). The name appears for Cāmuṇḍa in the series of eight Mother goddesses when these are given as the deities of the seven sets of sounds of the Sanskrit syllabary plus Kṣa in Siddhayogēsvarimatā 16.41c–43c: kavarge samsthītā brāhmī cavarge caiva vaisnavī || māheśvarī tavargasthā yāmyā pūjyā ta-mādīnā | kaumārī sarpavalyā pādyenaitam prapūjayet || yavarge vāsāvi tatra karṇamoṭi sā-mādīnā | krodhe *jñeyā (conj.: seyā Ed.) parā saktī aghoreṣvī ‘Brāhmaḥ is in the gutturals, Vaiśnavī in the palatals, Māheśvarī in the retroflexes, and Yāmyā in the dentals. He should worship snake-bangled Kaumārī with the labials. Aindrī is in the semi-vowels and Karṇamoṭi (= Cāmuṇḍa) in the bilabials. Know that the goddess in kṣa is the supreme Power Aghoreṣvī’. The origin of the name is unknown, the common interpretation ‘Ear-pearl’ being implausible since it fails to account for the retroflex f.

⁵¹⁹ Skandapurāṇa-Ambikākāṇḍa 171.109, 112, 124 This name is probably an epithet that served as this Karṇamoṭi’s personal name and so does not indicate a different goddess. The epithet, meaning ‘having much meat’, no doubt refers to her insa-
Of these sites Devīkotā appears to have been of special importance from early times. The MādHAVAKULA refers to it simply as Śrīpūṭha, that is to say, as the Seat [of the Goddess], and the Skandapurāṇa-Ambikākhaṇḍa describes it as a city originally fashioned by Brahmā where this goddess and the other Mothers who accompany her were created by Śiva and the other gods from their own bodies in order to destroy the demons who had seized it. After the city has been freed Śiva declares that henceforth it will be the Mothers’ sacred abode, that he will reside here with them as Hetuksēvara, and that they will be worshipped following ritual procedures taught in Tantras that will be composed for this purpose by the grateful gods. The titles of these Tantras of the Mothers (mātr. tantrāni), which are listed in the narrative, reveal them to be Yāmalatantras, headed by the Brahmayāmala.

---

521 See here p. 192 and Tantrāloka 29.60cd.
522 Skandapurāṇa-Ambikākhaṇḍa 171.78–137, referring to Devīkotā under its name Kotivarṣa. See here p. 113.
523 Skandapurāṇa-Ambikākhaṇḍa 171.120c–121b [Śiva addresses the Mothers]: bhavatīnām idām sthānām kotivarṣam iti śrutam | bhavisyati jagatkyāyāṁ sarvapāpapramocanam ‘This place known as Kotivarsa will be yours, famed throughout the world, with the power to free from any sin’; 171.133cd: kotivarṣam idām sthānām mātīnām priyam uttānam.
524 Skandapurāṇa-Ambikākhaṇḍa 171.121c–122b [Śiva addresses the Mothers]: aham hetur hi yuṣmākām yasmāt srṣṭā mayāvai ca | herukesvaranāmāhām sthāśāmy atra varapradāḥ | yuṣmābhīhi saha vatsvāmi nāyakate vyavasthitāḥ || yas tu yuṣmān mayā sārdhāṁ vidhitav pūjavisyati | sarvapāpavimuktātmā sa paraṁ gatim āpsyati ‘Because I am your cause (hetuḥ) and it was I that created [you], I shall be present here to bestow boons with the name Hetuksēvara. I shall dwell here with you as your leader. Whoever correctly worships you with me will be freed from all sins and attain the highest goal’.
525 Skandapurāṇa-Ambikākhaṇḍa 171.127–132b [Śiva addresses the Mothers]: aham brahmā ca viṣṇuṣ ca rṣayaś ca tapodhanāḥ | mātrtantrāṁ divyāṁ mātryajñāvidhiṁ *prati (conj. : param Cod.) || 128 puṇyāṇī prakārasyāmo yajanaṁ yair avāpsyathā | brāhmaṁ svāyambhūvam caiva kaumārām yāmalaṁ tathā || 129 sārasvataṁ ca gāndhāram aśiṣānam nandiyālam | tantrāṇy etāni yuṣmākām tathāyāṁ sahasraśāḥ || 130 bhavisyanti narā yais tu yuṣmān yaksyante bhaktītaḥ | narāṇāṁ yajamanānaṁ varān yuṣmān pradāsyatha || 131 divyasiddhipradāḥ devyo dīvayogā bhavisyathā | yāś ca nāryāḥ sadā yuṣmān yaksyante sarahasyataḥ || 132 yogesvaro bhavisyanti rāmā dīv aparākramāṁ ‘I, Brahmā, Viṣṇu, and the ascetic sages will compose excellent and holy Māttatantras for the rites of the worship of the Mothers, by means of which you shall receive offerings. The Brah-
Moreover, it is probable that some at least of the surviving east-Indian images of the emaciated goddess reproduce the iconography of this important local form. An image of Carcikā from the Dinajpur District of Bangladesh, in which Devikotā was located, shows the goddess seated beneath a banyan tree,\textsuperscript{526} and we see the same in an image from an unrecorded site in West Bengal.\textsuperscript{527} In both images severed human heads are attached by their hair to the tree’s branches, indicating that the site of this tree is a cremation ground, since cremation grounds were also places of execution.\textsuperscript{528} Now, in the tradition of the \textit{Picumata} and the \textit{Niśisamācāra} each of the major Śākta sites is a cremation ground with its own distinctive sacred tree; and in the case of Koṭivarṣa/Devikotā this is in-

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

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

\textsuperscript{528} See, e.g., \textit{Kumārasambhava} 5.73cd; \textit{Kathāsaritsāgara} 18.130d; \textit{Rājatarāṅgini} 2.79–84; \textit{Picumata} 3.32d–93, describing the depiction of the cremation ground at Prabhāsa: \textit{tato nimbām samālikhet | saptaḍālam mahābhīmaṃ citibhiḥ prajvalantibhiḥ | ekaikasmin likhet dāle nagnam ubdaddhakam naram Then he should depict a Nimba tree with seven branches, most frightening with the burning pyres [around it]. On each branch he should draw a naked hanged man’; 15.16: \textit{kṛṣṇaśtaṇmāyāṃ caturdasyāṃ śavam grhyā ṭha sādhakah | ubdaddham śūlaprotam vā aksaṭāṅgāṃ tu dārakam; Jayaḍrathayāmala, Ṣaṭṭa 3, Yoginīsamācāraprakaraṇa 8.71e–72b, describing the depiction of cremation grounds: \textit{yāmādyair nairṛtāntais tu dīśāir uṛksāṁ samālikhet | ubdaddhanarapraçchannān; Vajragarbha on \textit{Hevajra} 1.7.21 (\textit{dhvajam  śastrahatam caiva) quoted in \textit{Snellgrove} 1959, Pt. 1, p. 71, n.: \textit{rgyal mtshan ni rgyal pos rkun po la sogs pa skyes pa ’am bud med ’ga’ zhiḥ chad pas bcad de lus mtshon gyis dral nas ro shing la dpyangs pa’o ’a dhvajāḥ is a corpse of some man or woman guilty of theft or some other crime whom the king has had executed with the sword, which has then been hung up on a tree [in the cremation ground]’}.}
This strongly suggests that the local Carcikā of Devikota may have been multiplied in the manner of the Naṭarāja of the Tamil country, which though originally the deity of Cidambaram was established in secondary forms in temples throughout the region. We may note also that most of the surviving east-Indian Carcikās hold the trident, often as the most conspicuous of their held attributes. Both the Picumata and the Niśisamācāra specify this as the weapon distinctive of the Karṇāmoṭī of Devikota, and the Skandapurāṇa-Ambikākhaṇḍa says that it is because the goddess of this place slew the demons with her trident here that the site contains a sacred bathing-place called Śūlakunḍa ‘the pond of the trident’ and that anyone who drinks its water (śūlodakaṁ) after doing obeisance to her will be safe from all harmful beings (171.124–125). The Picumata too refers to this Kunda.  

Finally, the pre-eminence of the emaciated goddess in the Śaṅkta Śaiva tradition during this period is strongly underlined by the fact it is she that the Buddhists of the cult of Cakrasaṃvara chose to represent supine beneath the right foot of Śaṃvara and Vajravaṭāhā as the female representative of the Śaṅkta Śaiva tradition. 

In textual references to that Buddhist icon she is generally called Kālarātri. But there can be no doubt about her identity. For (1) she is called Carcikā in the Vajravaṭāhāsādhaṇa of the Siddha Lūyī and Cāmūnda in a Kalpa of the Abhidhānottara and in the anonymous Trayodāśatmakavajraḍākini-vajravaṭāhāsādhaṇa, which is based upon it, (2) Carcikā is called Kālarātri in a

---

529 See here p. 112. That the sacred sites are the cremation grounds (śmaśānam) of the places listed is clear from the context in the Picumata, that (3.8–127) being a description of the nine cremation grounds that must be installed in the initiation Maṇḍala (mahāmaṇḍalaṁ), one at the centre (Prayāga) and eight around the periphery (Vārānasī, Vīrāja [Jajpur in Orissa], Kollagiri [Kolhāpur in Karnāṭaka], Prabhāsa [in Kathiawar], Ujjainī [in Malwa], Bhūtēśvara [in Mathurā?], Ekāmraka [Bhubaneswar in Orissa], and Koṭivārṣa). It is also clear from the account of Koṭivārsa given in the Skandapurāṇa-Ambikākhaṇḍa, since that prophesies that the site will become a great cremation ground (171.133c–134b): koṭivārṣam idaṁ sthānaṁ mātṛṇaṁ priyaṁ uttaṁ sam || śmaśānaṁ pravaraṁ divyaṁ bhaviṣyatī sukhapradam.

530 Picumata f.8r3 (3.119c–121b): iśāne tu diśābhāge koṭivārṣam prakalpayet || 120 vatām tatra samālikhya tatra śūlodakam likhet | dikṣu caiva vidikṣu ca śulaprotā likhet tathā || 121 śūla tasyāgrato likhya kuṇḍasayaiva mahātāpe. It appears from this that the pond (kuṇḍam) was also known as the Śūlodaka.

531 Guhyasamayāśadhanāmāla f. 11r1–2: vāmabāhustananandandalahṛdayasambhvā-śmiladaksināṅgheṁ (em.: militā | daksināṅghir̥ Cod.) carcikā<ṃ> raktā<ṃ> daksināśirāhpatī<ṃ>.

532 Abhidhānottara, Paṭala 56, A f. 173v2: pādatalākrāntabhairavacūmaṁda ‘treading on Bhairava and Cāmūnda with the soles of her feet’; Trayodāśatmakavajraḍākini-vajravaṭāhāsādhaṇa in Guhyasamayāśadhanāmāla, f. 78r4–5: pādākrānta<kṛta>-sambhucūmaṁdaṁ (em.: kṛtaṁ | sambhuceṁdaṁ Cod.). For the full visualiza-
verse by the east-Indian poet Bhāsoka; and (3) the goddess beneath the foot of Śaṃvara/Vajrārāhī is depicted as emaciated, with sunken eyes and withered breasts, holding a skull-bowl and chopping knife in her two hands. The emaciated Carcikās of our surviving images have four, six, eight, or ten arms, but the skull-bowl (kapālam) and chopping knife (kartrikā) are indeed among their four primary attributes, the other two being the trident and a severed head. The goddess beneath the right foot is, as it were, the east-Indian Carcikā reduced to essentials: the emaciated body, the red colour, and only two arms, brandishing what were felt to be her two most basic attributes.

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

In explanation of why this profound transformation of Buddhism occurred, we might be tempted to say that Buddhism was simply yielding ever more completely to the Śākta Śaiva religious tradition then dominant in the region, failing, as it were, to maintain its original purity in the face of this external pressure and the concomitant expectations of its patrons. This was perhaps how the matter would have been represented by the Śrāvakayānists; and no doubt there is some truth in this assessment, since it is extremely unlikely that east-Indian Buddhists would have chosen to develop this new manifestation of their religion if Śākta Śaivism had not become the pre-eminent religious idiom of the region. But
the iconography of the humiliation of Carcikā and Bhairava and the extensive learned literature that developed around the kernel of the Yoginītantras alert us to the fact that those who created and refined this tradition saw the matter in an entirely different light. In their view they were not succumbing passively to an alien influence. Fully conscious that they were assimilating the dominant Śākta Śaiva idiom of the region, they justified their doing so as a means of converting non-Buddhists, taking their practices and encoding them with Buddhist meaning so that outsiders could rise effortlessly through what was familiar to them to what would save them, a view exactly reflected in Jayadratha’s myth of the compilation of anti-Śaiva iconography, Śākta Śaiva liturgy, Mantras, and Buddhist doctrine as a means of luring devout Śaivas away from their faith.

For while the learned literature of Tantric Buddhism claims with sincere conviction that its special methods are designed for exceptionally able aspirants within the Buddhist fold, its point of entry, namely initiatory introduction before the Maṇḍala, was designed to facilitate the recruitment of those outside it and to this end access was rendered as easy as possible. Thus in the seventh century the Mahāvairocanābhisambodhi sets out a number of qualities to be sought in candidates but states that if even only one of these is present there is no need to investigate further, and in the eighth century the Sarvatathāgata-

536 See, for example, the doctrine of the four points of superiority of the Tantric form of the Mahāyāna, the Mantranaya, over the non-Tantric Way of the Perfections (pāramitānayaḥ) asserted in the “Nayatrayaradipā by an author whose name appears in the Tenjura as Tripitakamala, an implausible name, perhaps an error for Tripitakamalla (Tshul gsum gyi sgron ma, f. 16v3: de yang pha rol tu phyin pa’i theg pa chen po dang don gcig pa las de’i khyad par gang dag yod pa de brjod par bya'o | don gcig nyid ’ang ma rmongs dang | thabs mang dka’ ba med phyir dang | dbang po rnon po ’i dbang byas pas | sngags kyi bstan bcos khyad par 'phags) Moreover, although there may be no difference in the goal [of the Mantramahāyāna] from that of the Pāramitāmahāyāna the points that distinguish [the former] should be stated[. This has been done done in the following verse]: “Though the goal is one and the same the Mantra Śastra is superior (1) because it is free of delusion [on the path], (2) because it offers many methods [for reaching the goal], (3) because it is free of difficulties, and (4) because only those with the highest capacity are qualified [to undertake it]”. The Sanskrit of the verse is preserved through citation (without attribution) in the Tattvaratnāvali of Advayavajra (p. 8) (A), the Sthitisamāsa of his disciple Sahajavajra (f. 11v2 [6.5]) (B), and the anonymous Subhāṣitasaṃgraha (part 2, p. 31) (C): ekārthatve ’py asammoḥād *bahūpāyād (AB Tib. [thabs mang] : vajropāyād C) aduṣkarāt | tikaṃksaṃdiyādhihikārāc ca mantrasāstraṃ viśisyaṭe. It has also been cited by Ka ro pa (Kāropā?), wrongly attributing it to a *Pradipoddyotatantra (sgron ma gsal ba’i rgyud), in his commentary on the Caturmudrānvaya (MATHEs 2008, p. 96). According to the view of some, as reported by Gzthon nu dpal, Ka ro pa was another disciple of Advayavajra (Blue Annals, pp. 842–843, 847–849, reported by MATHEs [2008, p. 89] as saying that he was a disciple of Advayavajra’s disciple Vajrapāṇi).

537 rNam par snang mdzad chen po mngon par byang chub pa’i rgyud (Mahāvairocanā-
Next is [the topic of] the detailed procedure that begins with the entry of Vajra disciples into this Great Maṇḍala of the Vajradhātu. In this the first step is entry in as much it is the means of rescuing all persons without exception and of bringing about the accomplishment of the highest joy for the benefit of all. With regard to this entry before the Great Maṇḍala [the officiant] need not examine candidates to determine who is and is not worthy. Why is that? Venerable Tathāgatas, there are (1) people who have committed great sins. By seeing and entering this Great Maṇḍala of the Vajradhātu they will be freed of all the bad rebirths [that would be the consequences of those sins].

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

---

538 Sarvatathāgatasamgraha, sections 210–213: athātra vajradhātumahāmaṇḍale vajraśisyapraśveśādvidhivistarō bhavati | tatra prathamām tāvat praveśo bhavaty aśeṣānavaseṣasattvatdhatuparītṛyānasarvavhitasukhottamasiddhihikārakaryatayātra mahāmaṇḍalapraśveśe pāṭrāpātraparīkṣā na kārya | tat kasmād dhetom | santi bhagavantas tathāgatāḥ kecit saṁś ca sarvapāyayitā bhaviṣyantī | santi ca bhagavantaḥ sattvāḥ sarvāḥ bhajanaśanapakāmaṁganaḥraḥsāt mahāmaṇḍalaśapradhānam. sarvatathāgataḥ api na durlabham. kim anyā punar anyā siddhir iti.
there are (2) people who are attached to every [kind of] wealth, food, drink, and other sense objects, who are [therefore] averse to [submitting to] the rules [of the initiated] (samayāḥ) and incapable of such disciplines as the Preliminary Observance (puraścaraṇam). If they enter this [Maṇḍala] they too will have all their

540 This is the practice otherwise known as pūrvasevā. It consists of a high number of repetitions of a Mantra along with ascetic restraints by means of which the practitioner qualifies himself to undertake procedures that require its use. See, e.g., Maṇjuśriyamūlakalpa, p. 236: ādau tāvāt parvatāgram āruhya vimśallakśaṇi jape | pūrvasevā krta bhavati | kṣirāhāreṇa mauninā nānyatra mantragrahanipravṛtiṣṭhitena utpādita-bodhicītena ca posadhasaṁsāvvarasamadāpanābodhisattvasamvaraparīṣṭhitena japtavam | tataḥ karmāṇi bhavanti 'Before [beginning the Kalpa] he must first climb to a mountain top and [there] repeat the Mantra twice million times. [Thus] the Preliminary Service [of the Mantra] will have been accomplished. He must repeat the Mantra while sustaining himself with [nothing but] milk, maintaining silence, with his mind fixed on the Mantra and nothing else, after taking the three Refuges, having formally resolved to attain the Awakening, and having taken up the Pośadhā fast, the restraint of morality, and the restraint of a Bodhisattva. [Only] then can the rituals be undertaken.' This, barring the specifically Buddhist vows, is exactly as prescribed in the Śaiva Mantramārga, where, as here, the terms pūrvasevā and puraścaraṇam/puraścaryā are standard and synonymous. See, e.g., Niśvāsaguhya, f. 80v3: japamāna-m eva māṣena pūrvasevā krta bhavati 'By repeating the Mantra for a month the Preliminary Service will have been accomplished'; and Kṣemarāja Śvacchandoddyota ad 7.104cd: puraścaryā prathamam eva mantragraha-pūrvaṁ vratam niyata-japādikaraṇam 'The puraścaryā is the observance that follows immediately after receiving the Mantra. It is to do a fixed number of repetitions [of that Mantra] with certain other [requirements].' Living on a diet of milk and maintaining silence is also a standard feature of Śaiva Mantra observances; see, e.g., Niśvāsaguhya f. 81r4: dasāhaṁ kṣirāhārena japtavyaḥ kālamṛtyuṁ jayati; f. 82vr4: naktāśti kṣirāhārō vā maunena tu japed yas tu | sa śivo 'bdena mānavah; f. 84v6: anena mantrenā kṣirāhāro saṁvatsaraṁ japat.
hopes fulfilled in accordance with their desires. Venerable [Tathāgatas], there are
(3) people who cannot grasp the nature of the understanding of the Mahāyāna of
all the Tathāgatas because they are attached to dancing, singing, joking, amuse-
ments, and the pleasures of eating, and [so] take initiation before the Maṇḍalas of
other, non-Buddhist families of deities. Being afraid of the moral regulations of
Buddhism they do not enter the Maṇḍalas of all the Buddhas, which comprise the fulfitment of all aspirations, which bestow the highest happiness, de-
light, and joy. It is for these too, who are inclined to enter the way of Maṇḍalas
that lead to bad rebirths, that this entry into the Maṇḍala of Vajradhātu is ap-
propriate, so that they may experience every happiness and delight, the highest
Siddhi, joy, and contentment and be turned aside from the path that leads them
to enter all [Maṇḍalas that result in] bad rebirths. Venerable [Tathāgatas], there
are also (4) pious persons, who seek the Buddhas’ enlightenment by means of
the morality (śīlam), concentrations (samādhiḥ), and wisdom (prajñā) of all the
Tathāgatas but who experience hardship as they strive to attain the levels of the
meditations (dhyānam), liberations (vimokṣah), and the other [states on the path
taught in the Pāramitānaya]. They will easily attain All-Buddha-hood without
difficulty in this very life (atraiva), all the more so other Siddhis, simply by enter-
ing this Maṇḍala of Vajradhātu.

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

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

541 The dating of Ānandagarbha in the ninth century seems probable solely on the
grounds of the range of his exegesis, which covers the Yogatantra systems of the
Sarvatathāgataattvasaṃgraha (his Sarvavajrodaya, his commentaries on the
Sarvatathāgatatattvasaṃgraha [Tōh. 2511]), the Paramādyya (his commentary
[Tōh. 2512]), the Māyājāla (his commentary [Tōh. 2513]), Guhyasamāja (his
commentary [Tōh. 1917]), and the Sarvabuddhasamāyogadākinījālasamvara (his
commentary on the Sarvakalpasamuccaya [Tōh. 1662]). In the last of these Tantric
systems we also have in Sanskrit but not in Tibetan translation his Vajraśalodāyā
nāma śrīherukasādhana theikā in a codex photographed by Rāhula Sānkṛtyāyana
in his commentary on the Guhyasamājayatantra to explain the extraordinary fact that the place where the Buddha is said to have been residing at the time that he revealed this Tantra is the vaginas of the goddesses, declares:542

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

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

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

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

Similarly Śraddhākaraṇavaran, one of the Indian teachers of the Tibetan translator Rin chen bzang po (958–1055), says in his *Yoganiruttara-
tantrārthāvatārasamgraha, referring to the Yogatantras as the Tantras of Method (Upāyatatantras) and to the Yoginītantras as the Tantras of Wisdom (Prajñātantras).

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

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

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

---

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

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

**The Reflux of Buddhist Śāktism into the Śāktism of Bengal.** Indeed, Buddhism had assimilated the Śākta Śaiva style of religion so thoroughly that some of its creations went on to be adopted into the later Śākta Śaivism of eastern India with little or no revision. This is the case with the goddesses Chinnamastā and Ugratārā. The Buddhist origin of Chinnamastā is certain, since her Śākta Mantra is ŚRĪHM HRĪM KLĪM AĪM VAJRĀVAINOCĪYE HŪM HŪM PHAT SVĀHĀ, and the two companions that flank her are Dākinī and Varṇinī.548 In the Buddhist prototype the flanking goddesses are Vajrāvarṇāni and Vajrāvainocānī, and the Mantra for recitation (jāpamantrah.) is OṂ SARVABUDDHAHĀKINīYE OṂ OṂ VAJRĀVAINOCĪYE OṂ VAJRĀVAINOCĪYE HŪM HŪM HŪM PHAT PHAT PHAT SVĀHĀ.549 Moreover, the procedure of her visualization retains features distinctive of her Buddhist Sādhana, notably that one is to visualize the goddess standing on a red sun-disk marked with a Yoni triangle on a white lotus in one’s navel.550 The only differences here are that in the Buddhist Sādhana the triangle

---

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

548 Śāktaprāmoda, p. 222 (her Mantra); pp. 221, 224–225 (the visualization of Chinnamastā, Dākinī and Varṇinī)

549 Abhisamayamaṇjarī, pp. 151–152.

550 Śāktaprāmoda, pp. 224–225, Purāscaryārṇava, p. 816, Karmakāṇḍa, vol. 4, p. 239d–240a (in the Kashmirian Śāktasrāddha): svanābhau nīrajarām dhyāyec chuddham vikasitam sitam | tatpadmakośamadhye tu maṇḍalam canda-rociṣāh | japaṃkumāśaṃkāśaṃ raṅkānbadhukasamanibham | rajahsattvatomerekhaṃyoṃmandalamandhitam | madhye tasya mahādeviṃ sūryakośamaprabhām | chinnamastām kare vāme dhārayantim svamastakam | prasāritumkhīm bhīmām lelihānagrāhīvīkām | pibantiṃ raudhīrīm dhārām niśanāthaṃhavīrīgatām | viṃkṛnaṃkāpāsām ca nāṇāpuṣpasamāvanītām | daṅkṣīne ca kare kartrīm mun-domālāvibhūṣitaṃ | digāmbarāṃ mahāghorāṃ pratyālīdhopade sthitām | asthimālādharam deviṃ nāgayodiḥpūtīnīṃ | ratikānopariṣṭhām ca saḍā dhyāyantī mantriṇāh ‘He should visualize a pure, open, white lotus in his navel, the disc of the sun in the centre of the seed-pod of that lotus with the colour of the Japā flower, resembling the red Bandhūka blossom, adorned by a Yoni triangle with [three] lines, red, white, and black representing the Guṇas] Rajas, Sattva, and Tamas. At its centre Mantra adepts always visualize the Great Goddess Chin-
has the strictly Buddhist name *dharmodayā* and that the goddess is visualized as a transformation out of a yellow ṢRī visualized in that triangle.\(^{551}\)

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

I am unable to determine within narrow limits how long after Śāśvatavajra this Tantra was composed.\(^{552}\) The earliest mention of the text in sources known to me is in 2.15 of the *Sarvollāsatantra* of Sarvānandanātha, in a list of a canon of sixty-four Tantras cited from the *Toḍalatantra* but not appearing in the published text of that work. It is probable that Sarvānandanātha, who wrote his work in Senhati in what is now Bangladesh, was born around the beginning of the fifteenth century.\(^ {553}\) It is tempting to assume that the *Phetkārinī* was written at a time closer to Śāśvatavajra’s than to Sarvānandanātha’s, that is to

---

\(^{551}\) *Abhisamayamāṇjarī*, p. 151: *svanābhisthaśukakalamalasūryasthistindūruṇa-dharmodayāmadhye pīтаhīrkhārajā svayam eva kartītasvamastakam vāmahastasiṃbhāthīṃ dhrārayati* … *‘Arising by transformation of a yellow syllable ṢRī in the centre of a vermilion-red Dharmaṇḍayā triangle upon a sun[-disc] on a white lotus in his navel, holding her own head, which she herself has severed, in her hand . . .’.*

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

\(^{553}\) SANDERSON 2007b, p. 236, fn. 89.
say, when the Buddhist Mantranaya was still at its height in eastern India, before the destruction of the great monasteries around 1200. But this destruction did not eliminate Tantric Buddhism and its literature from the region at a single stroke. For it was still alive in the early fifteenth century, when Vanaratna (1384–1468) travelled to Tibet in 1426, 1433, and 1453, gave various Tantric initiations, notably in the Kalacakra according to the system of Anupamaraksita, and assisted in the translation of Tantric texts, as is attested in the biography of this extraordinary figure given by Gzhon nu dpal (1392–1481), who collaborated with him in a translation of the *Trayodaśāmatakaśriyakrasaṃvaramaṇḍalavīdhi (Tōh. 1489). We also have the Vanaratnastotrasaptaka, a Sanskrit hymn in praise of Vanaratna composed during his lifetime by a devout lay Buddhist Āditya, whom both the Sanskrit and Tibetan colophons say was a native of Magadha; and we have a manuscript of the Mahāyāna classic Bodhicaryāvatāra copied by a lay Buddhist in Bengali characters at Venugrāma in 1436.

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

The importance of Tārā in late east-Indian Śāktism is independently

---

556 SHASTRI 1917, p. 21: ASB MS 8067. The scribe identifies himself as Saduddhakaranakāyaasthāthakkura Amitābha.
confirmed by the existence of substantial texts devoted exclusively to her worship, notably the *Tārārahasya-vartti* of Gauḍīya Śaṅkara composed in 1630, the *Tārābhaṭṭisudhārṇava*, a work in some 11,000 verses composed by Nṛṣimha Ṭhakkura c. 1688, the *Tārābhaṭṭita-rāṅgini* of Kaśinātha, composed in 1682 at the request of Krṣṇacandra, Mahārāja of Nadia in West Bengal, and two other works with the same title, one by Vimalānandaṇātha and the other by Prakāśānandaṇātha.

**The Jains’ Adaptation of the Śaiva Mantraśāstra**

Jainism too enjoyed royal support during this period, notably in western India under the Caulukyas and in Kaṇṭātaka among the Gangas of Taḷakāḍ, the Rāṣṭrakūṭas, and Hoysaḷas, and it too developed a Tantric ritual culture along Śaiva lines for the propitiation (*ārādhanā*) of Mantra-goddesses for mundane benefits using Mudrās, Japa, and offerings into fire (*homah*). Among goddesses worshipped in Jaina rites for such purposes are Lakṣmī and Vāğiśvarī (Sarasvatī) belonging to the higher world, the Vidyādevīs belonging to the middle, and, most important, in the lower world the Yakṣī attendants of the Tīrthankaras, associated with major Jaina pilgrimage sites, notably Ambikā (/Kūṃśaṃṭīni), the attendant of Neminātha at Gīnār, Cakreśvarī, the attendant of Rṣabh at Śatruṇjaya, Padmāvatī, the attendant of Pārśvanātha at Śravaṇa Belgoḷa, and Jvālāmālinī, the attendant of Candraprabha.

That these deities were developed on the basis of the Śaiva tradition is more transparently obvious here than in Buddhism. Thus the *Bhairava-padmāvatikalpa*, the Digambara Mallīśeṇa’s Paddhati on the propitiation of Padmāvatī, written in 1057 equates her with Totalā, Tvaritā, Nītī, Tripurā, and Tripurabhairavī, all well-known Mantra-goddesses of the Śākta Śaivas.

---

558 See STEIN 1998, especially pp. 147–152.
559 In the classical listing these are the following eighteen: Rohini, Prajñāpti, Vajrāśrīkhalā, Vajrāṇkuṣā, Apraticaṅkā, Puruṣadattā, Kāli, Mahākāli, Gaurī, Gāndhāri, Sarvāstramahājāvālī, Mānāvī, Vairoṭyā, Acchuptā, Mānasī, and Mahāmānasī.
560 For images of Ambikā, Cakreśvarī, Padmāvatī, and Jvālāmālinī see, e.g., AIISPL, Accession numbers 45246, 10029, 58659, and 19995. On the cult of Padmāvatī see JHAVERY 1944. On the cult of Jvālāmālinī see SETTAR 1969.
561 On the worship of goddesses in Jainism and their division between the three worlds (*ūrdhvalokah*, *tiryaglokaḥ*, and *adhlokaḥ*) see CORT 1987. On the centrality of the culture of Mantras and Mantrasiddhas in medieval Jainism see the survey and analysis by Paul DUNDAS (1998), who writes there of “the Jain *mantraśāstra*’s partial linkage to an ultimately Śaiva-inspired style of religiosity” (p. 36), of the *Jñānārṇava* of the Digambara Subhacandra, probably in the tenth century, that it “blends much of the “software” of Śaiva *mantraśāstra* with specifically Jaina so-
Unlike Śaivism, Pañcarātra, and Tantric Buddhism in its mature form, Jaina Tantrism did not claim to offer Jainas a new path to liberation. It remained entirely focused on mundane benefits. Nonetheless it was not the preserve of the laity. Monks produced the manuals and monks were held to perform these propitiations. Thus Yasobhadrasūri and other Mantra-adepts (māntrikāḥ) use the power that they have obtained by propitiating the goddess Kurukullā to unblock the throat of Devācārya when on the sixteenth day of a debate in the court of the Caulukya Siddharāja between him and the Digambara Kumudacandra the latter had used his supernatural power to silence him by causing him to choke; the Jaina Guru of king Ajayapāla undertakes a two-month propitiation of Ambikā on the Raivataka mountain at Gīnār in order to gain for himself the boon of equality with the renowned Śvetāmbara Hemacandra and for his patron that of equality with Kumārapāla, the great Caulukya king of Gujarāt. Hemacandra, Devendrasūri, and Malayagirisūri go to the same mountain at night to undertake the propitiation of the Siddhacakramantra, after first performing preliminary rites to summon the presiding goddess Ambikā into their presence, and Hemacandra propitiates the spell-goddess Tribhuvanasvāmini in Anāhillapattana, the Caulukya capital, in order to ask her about the previous birth of his pupil Kumārapāla.

As in the non-Jaina tradition the goddesses were put to work to serve the interests of rulers. The Prabandhacintāmaṇī of Merutunga, written at Vardhamāna (Vaḍhvān) in eastern Kāthiāvād in 1304, claims that Padmāvatī was propitiated by means of a fire-sacrifice by a Digambara monk in order to protect Vārānasi, the capital of king Jayacandra (in the late twelfth century), from attack by a Muslim army; bards in Kārtiṭaka at the court of Yaśodhara
are said to have invoked Aparājītā to secure the king victory in battle;\(^{567}\) and these powers are fully confirmed by the manuals for these rites. According to the unpublished Jvālāmālinīkalpa, composed by the Digambara Indranandin in Karnāṭaka in 939, the benefits that can be attained by propitiating Jvālāmālinī include the splitting open of the gates of enemy forts; and the Bhairava-padmāvatīkalpa teaches a spell (vidyā) for making one’s enemies fall asleep and magical receipts both for causing dissension among them (vidvesaṇam) and causing their death (māranaṃ). Moreover, Padmāvatī was the lineage goddess (kuladevī) of a number of Jaina ruling houses in Karnāṭaka\(^{568}\) and functioned in this capacity much as she would have done if they had not been converted. Thus she appears in a local manifestation as the Padmāvatī of Śaśakapura (Sosavūru) in a Jaina myth of the origin of the name of the Hoysala (Poysala) dynasty related in an inscription of 1133.\(^{569}\) When a Jaina ascetic Yōgīn was trying to subjugate this goddess with a Mantra and a tiger sprang out to break its power the ascetic commanded king Sāla, saying “Strike [it], O Sāla” (poy sala).\(^{570}\) The king then worshipped the goddess under the name Vāsantikā. Since this story introduces an account of the conquests of the dynasty it is probable that the goddess is seen here in the manner of the martial lineage goddesses of the Śākta Śaiva type venerated by non-Jaina kings during the early medieval period as the source of their sovereignty and military might.

In one important respect, however, Jaina lineage goddesses were bound to differ from their non-Jaina counterparts. Since Jainas are the strictest of vegetarians and are rigorously opposed to the harming of any living creature, their goddesses, like those of the Buddhists, had to renounce the animal sacrifices that were so conspicuous a part of their cult in non-Jaina lineages.\(^{571}\) Thus the Osvāl

---

\(^{567}\) Cort 1987, p. 248.

\(^{568}\) Notably the Śilāhāras, Rāṭṭas, and Śāntaras; see Cort 1987, p. 243.

\(^{569}\) EC 5:124.

\(^{570}\) Cf. EI 6:10, l. 6: sa hoy saleti prāpat tam kila vinihatyā hoysalākhyām.

\(^{571}\) In the Buddhist case, however, animal sacrifice, though unusual, does occur. We see it in the mahābali sacrifice performed by the Buddhist Newars at Lāgalakhey in the occasion of the chariot festival of Bugmalokeśvara (Karanāmaya); see Sinclair 2008. Nor is this a recent innovation. See Catuspīṭhatantra ff. 30r2–32r3. The Mantra for the Bali there (f. 31v2–) is derived from a Śaiva prototype seen in the Vidyāpīṭha’s Niśisāmca (14.56–63; ff. 47v5–48v2: ekavirke śmasāne vā . . .). My pupil Péter-Dánél Szántó has kindly informed me (personal communication, 4 March, 2009) that the verses that immediately precede that Mantra in this manuscript, containing the reference to sanguinary offerings, are not part of the original Catuspīṭha but have been added from the Catuspīṭhamandalopāyikā of Cāryāvratipāḍa (19.30–33 [f. 20r]). On that work, its author, and the incorporation of material from it in this MS of the Catuspīṭha see Szántó 2008a. He has also drawn my attention to references to sanguinary offerings elsewhere in the Catuspīṭha itself, in the Sādhana of Dākinī (2.4.63–66) and in that of Cūṣini (2.4.75),
Jainas of Rajasthan and Saurashtra hold that their lineage deity Saccikā or Sacciya adopted her present non-violence only when she and they were converted to Jainism by the monk Ratnaprabhasūri, probably in the twelfth century, in consequence of his having miraculously cured a boy of snake-bite when he had already been thought dead and prepared for cremation. They claim that before their conversion they had been Rajput warriors—a claim also found among other Jain castes—and she a fierce Cāmuṇḍā whom they propitiated with the Tantric rites of the Vāmamārga. Her pre-Jaina past is still visible in her temple at Osiān near Jodhpur, the Osvāls’ original home. For the outer wall of her innermost shrine shows images of Cāmuṇḍā, Mahiśāsuramardini, Śītalā, and a naked Bhairava.

We have another story of the conversion of a lineage goddess in Jaina accounts of the life of the Caulukya king Kumārapāla of Gujarat (r. 1143–1174), who converted from Śaivism to Jainism under the influence of the illustrious Śvetāmbara scholar monk Hemacandra. According to these accounts Kanṭheśvarī, the lineage goddess of the Caulukyas, and the other goddesses associated with her had always been placated during the nine days of the annual
Navarātra festival by the sacrifice of thousands of goats and buffaloes.575 But this stops when Kumārapāla, now a convert to Jainism, declares a fourteen-year ban on the taking of life. Kanṭheśvarī appears before the king and demands to know why she and the other goddesses have been denied their usual sacrifices. When he explains that he cannot sacrifice to her now that he is a Jaina she is enraged and strikes him on the head with her trident, causing leprous sores to break out on his body. Hemacandra miraculously cures his affliction, tries to persuade the goddess to accept in future offerings of vegetarian food of equal value, and when this fails binds her with a Mantra. Thoroughly humbled, she begs the king to free her, promising that if she is released she will give up her ways and work instead to police his ban on the slaughter of animals throughout his realm. With Hemacandra’s permission he releases her and she takes to her new role as the king’s informer with all the zeal of the convert.576 She reports a vassal king in Saurāstra for secretly butchering goats in his home: Kumārapāla sends his minister Udayana at the head of an army to punish him.577 She reports a merchant for plucking a louse from his wife’s head and crushing it: his entire property is seized and the money used to fund the building of a Jaina monastery, named accordingly the Monastery of the Louse (Yūkāvihāra).578

575 Three thousand seven hundred goats and thirty-seven buffaloes were to be sacrificed: a hundred goats and one buffalo on the first day, two hundred goats and two buffaloes on the second, three hundred goats and three buffaloes on the third, and so on, so that nine hundred goats and nine buffaloes were sacrificed on the ninth (Mahānavami). See Somatilakasūri, Kumārapāladevacarita vv. 387–389: 

suddhasamayakutpūtātmā mahānāvamāparvāṇi | kumārapālabhūpāla

āmiḍādbhir ākhyata || 388 devi *kaṇṭheśvarī (corr.: kaṇṭheśvarī Ed.) gotradevi svam bhāvyam ihate | ekam chāgaṣṭa ta caiko mahiṣāḥ prati paddine || 389 etāvad eva dvīganum dvitiye divase punah | tṛtiye trigunam yāvan navame *nava samgumam (corr.: nava samgumam Ed.); and Kumārapālaprabodhaprabandha §75: 

athāmārim pravartayati rājani āśīvānauklapakṣo ‘gat | tatra *kaṇṭheśvāryādevatānām (kaṇṭheśvāryādi corr.: kaṇṭheśvāryādi Ed.) arca kair vijnātama deva saaptamāṁ sapta satāni paśavaḥ sapta mahaśā ca devatānām puro dīyante rājāḥ | evam aṣṭamāṁ aṣṭau satāni navamāṁ nava satānī. In the editions of the Kumārapāladevacarita and the Kumārapālaprabodhaprabandha the goddess’ name appears in the form Kanṭheśvari. I have corrected this to Kanṭheśvari on the dubious strength of a passage in the Prabandhacintāmaṇī of Merutunga in which the author implies that she owes her name to the fact that in the eighth century Vanarāja, the founder of the Cāpotkāta dynasty that preceded the Cālukyas at Anahillapattana, had a shrine built for her in the kaṇṭhāh (‘narrow entrance’) of his palace (p. 35: 

tathā ca tena dhavalagṛha kanṭhe kaṇṭheśvārī prāsādas ca kaśītaḥ).

576 Kumārapāladevacarita, vv. 387–396 and Kumārapālaprabodhaprabandha §75.

577 Kumārapālaprabodhaprabandha §85.

578 Kumārapāladevacarita, vv. 404–406; cf. Kumārapālaprabodhaprabandha §77. The same sources relate another occasion on which the Jaina Mantravāda was used to curb a sanguinary goddess. Hemacandra and Yaśaścandra fly through the
Thus, while drawing heavily on the Śākta Śaiva tradition of the propitiation of Mantra-goddesses, the Jain Mantravāda, was bound to keep itself free of the sanguinary aspects of those cults and, also, one would assume, of all other transgressive elements that would conflict with the ascetic character of the Jaina path, notably the use of flesh and alcohol, and the employment of female consorts. However, that exclusion was not as complete as one would expect in respect of the last of these elements. This is apparent in the accounts of two of the propitiations mentioned above. We are told that when Hemacandra, Devendrasūri, and Malayagirisūri undertook the propitiation of the Siddhacakramantra on the Raivataka mountain they did so with a Padminī in the person of the wife of a village headman as their Tantric assistant (uttarasādhatatvena). How the wife of the village headman assisted in the propitiation is not stated. But the story of Hemacandra’s propitiation of Tribhuvanasvāminī is more explicit. Again he has the assistance of a Padmiṇī. The daughter-in-law of a farmer is brought to the city for this purpose and the goddess shows her favour after Hemacandra has

---

579 Kumārapālaprabodhaprabandha §61: te ca trayāḥ kṛtapūrvakṛtyāḥ śrī-ambikā-krtaśānnidhyāḥ śubhadhyānadhīrādhiyāḥ śīrāivaivasdevatādṛṣṭau triyāminyām ā-hvānavaṃṭhanamudrākaraṇaṇamantranyāsavisarjanāṇidibhir upacārair gurūktavi-dhīnā samīpsthapadministrikṛtottarasādhaṅkakriyāḥ śrīsiddhacakramantram *a-sādhaḥ (em.: asādhatvat Ed.). ‘And those three, after performing the preliminary service (pūrvasevā) and bringing about the presence of Ambikā, with their mind firmly concentrated in the ‘pure’ mode of meditation, in the sight of the goddess of the Raivata mountain, performed at night the Śādhanā of the Siddhacakramantra following the procedure taught by the Guru, with all the [required] rites of summoning, enclosing, making the Mudrās, installing the Mantras [on their bodies], dismissing and the rest, with the actions of the Tantric assistant performed by that Padmiṇī beside them’. According to the erotological literature Padminīs are one of four classes of ideal love-partner (nāyikā); see, e.g., Pañcasāyakamanjarī 1.6: sampūrṇendumukhi kuranganayanā pinastani daksinā mṛdvāṅgi vikacārindasurasurāhī śyāmātha gauradyutīḥ | alpāhāraṇa viśāsakusalā hamsasvanā sadgatir lajālur gurudevapuṣpanaprāḥ śyān nāyikā padminī; and in Tantric literature Hevajratantra 2.7.2–5 and Saṃvarodayatantra 31.3–5b.
repeated the Mantra for three days on the Padmini’s vulva (tasyā yonau).\textsuperscript{580} The text tells us that Hemacandra’s mind remained undisturbed during this practice, no doubt wishing to stress that he was not compromising the monastic rule of celibacy. Indeed there is no evidence of which I am aware that the Jaina Mantravāda, unlike Śaivism and Tantric Buddhism in its later phases, created two levels of discipline, one for ordinary practitioners and one for an élite that transcended the rules that apply to the first. Nonetheless, we see from this story that it had gone surprisingly far in this direction, too far for some, one suspects, who would have preferred monks to avoid any practice in which they could be suspected of departing from the straight and narrow Jain path of purification.

ŚAIVISM IN THE BRAHMANICAL SUBSTRATE

As for the long-established brahmanical tradition, the Śaivas saw it as subsumed within their own, accepting it as the only valid source of authority in what they saw as the lesser domain of mundane religion (laukiko dharmah). This perception is much emphasised in their literature,\textsuperscript{581} and it is expressed through the

\textsuperscript{580} Kumārapāladēvaprābandha \S\textsuperscript{21}: aṭha śrīhemacāryaścā tribhuvanasaṃvāminīṃ vidyāṃ arādhayitukāmā bhāndāgārikam kapardinam prāhur yan mehatāgrāme triṇuṇasimhaṃ kauṭumbikāḥ | tasya putrāś ca tvārāḥ | laghor vacāḥ padminī | yadi sāyāti tadā *tasyā avācyapradēṣe (corr.: tasyāvācyapradēṣe Ed.) dinatrāyam jāpe datte devī prāśadati | etad atidūkaram | kapardinoktam | cintā na vaiḥyā | bhāndāgārikas tatra gataḥ kauṭumbikagṛhe | tena saṭkṛtāḥ | prayajanam prṣṭāḥ | bhāndāgārikenoktam laghuprutwuddhām mamārpayā | tenoktam kim idam ādiśasi | evam eva | vicārā ‘pi na kartavyah | tenoktam yadi bhavatām *vicāre samāyātam idam (?) tadaivam astu | sukhāsane ‘āhiropya pattane samāgataḥ | śrīhemasūribhīḥ paramānāhāravaparir avikrtacētaitas tasyā yonau dinatrāyam jāpah kṛtāḥ | devī tustā ‘Then Hemacārya, desiring to propitiate the spell-deity Trivihuvanasvāminī said to his treasurer Kapardin: “There is a farmer called Trihun . asim. ha in Mehatā village. He has four sons. The husband of the youngest is a Padminī. If she comes here and I offer Japa for three days on her unmentionable part the goddess will favour me. This is extremely difficult [to accomplish]”. Kapardin told him not to worry. So the treasurer went to the home of the farmer in that [village] and after being honoured was asked his purpose. The treasurer said: “Give me the wife of your youngest son”. [The farmer] said: “Is this an order?”. He replied that it was but that he should not be concerned. [The farmer] said: “So be it, if this is *what you have decided after due deliberation (?).”. So [the treasurer] put her in a comfortable sedan and returned with her to the capital. The venerable Hemaśūri did the Mantra-recitation on her vulva for three days, intent on eating paramānān, with his mind undisturbed [by lust]. The goddess was pleased’. The food paramānām is, I presume, the dish of rice, milk, and sugar or jaggery otherwise known as pāyasam and considered the ideal food for offering to a vegetarian deity.

\textsuperscript{581} It is encapsulated in the often cited words of their scripture Bhārguvottara: iti varṇāśramācārāṇ manasāpi na langhayet | yo yasminn āśrame tiṣṭhan dīkṣitah śivāśāsane | sa tasminn eva samāṭiṣṭhe cihadharman ca pālayet ‘So he should not transgress the practices of his caste and [brahmanical] discipline even in thought.
collocation of the epithets *paramamāheśvaraḥ* and *paramabrahmanyaḥ* that is sometimes found with the titles of our kings in inscriptions.  

But the brahmanical tradition was not merely accepted by the Śaivas. It was also influenced by them. During this period we find an ever-growing corpus of traditions that while claiming to be on the brahmanical side of the divide derive from the Śaiva, both Śaiva devotional literature assigned to the Purāṇas and a form of worship that followed Śaiva models. In Purānic texts such as the *Uttarabhāga* of the *Liṅgapurāṇa*, the *Kālikāpurāṇa*, the *Devīpurāṇa*, and the *Agnipurāṇa*, the boundary between the Śmārtas and Tantric domains has almost completely dissolved, prompting the conservative brahmanical author Ballālasena, the twelfth-century Sena king of Gaṅḍa, to reject them as invalid as sources of the knowledge of religious duty, objecting particularly to their containing instruction on such matters as Śaiva initiation and idol consecration.

In reality there was no reasonable hope of turning the tide by this period, as had to be conceded even by so conservative an authority as the *Nibandha* on the *Yājñavalkyasmrī* compiled by or under Aparāditya, the Śilāhāra king of Koṅkan, in the last quarter of the twelfth century. While firmly denying in general the validity of the practices taught in the Śaiva scriptures, it admits a partial exception in the case of the Sthāpaka, the priest who consecrates idols and shrines. It is admitted that he may draw on these texts to supplement the

---

582 We see this combination in the case of the Pāṇḍavamāṁs/Pāṇḍavas of Mekal in the fifth century (Shastry 1995, nos. II: I–II), the Śailodbhava Māḍhavarāja of Koṅgoda in the seventh (*EI* 6:14), the Pallavas Paramēśvaravarman I (c. 669–690) and Narasimhavarman II (c. 690–728/9) (Mahalingam 1988, nos. 45, 53) around the turn of the seventh and eighth, the Bhaṇja Neṭṭabhaṅja of Orissa in the eighth (*EI* 28:41, ll. 16–17), the descendants of King Nimbara of Kārtikeyapura in Himachal Pradesh in the ninth and tenth (*EI* 31:38), and the Eastern Cālukyas in the eleventh (*EI* 6:35; *EI* 6:36).

583 On the presence of the Śaiva Mantramārga in its Saiddhāntika, Daksīṇa (Bhairava), and Śākta forms in the *Uttarabhaga* of the *Liṅgapurāṇa* see Sanderson 2005b, pp. 235–236.

584 On the *Agnipurāṇa*’s incorporation of the Saiddhāntika Śaiva Paddhati of Somaśambhu see p.65 above.

585 In vv.55-67 of the introduction to his *Dānasāgara* Ballalasena rejects on these and allied grounds the *Garuḍapurāṇa*, the *Brahmapurāṇa*, the *Agnipurāṇa*, the *Vaiṣṇavapurāṇa* in twenty-three thousand verses, the *Liṅgapurāṇa* in six thousand, the *Devīpurāṇa*, and parts of the *Bhaviṣyapurāṇa*. That he did not include the *Kālikāpurāṇa* in his list strongly suggests that it postdates him.
ritual of consecration when installing a Śiva, and likewise on the other appropriate bodies of non-Vedic scripture when consecrating images of the Goddess and the like, provided that his Vedic procedure needs to be supplemented, provided that the imported auxiliary does not offend the Vedic procedure in any way, and provided that he does not take the initiations (dīkṣā) which those scriptures require.\(^{586}\) In other words it had to be conceded that a hybrid of Tantric and Vedic rituals procedures was already an institutional reality; and that this was so is confirmed by a Śaiva source, which protests against their existence, insisting that patrons should engage only initiated Śaiva officiants of full conviction, who would perform Śaiva rituals of consecration uncontaminated by such hybridization.\(^{587}\)

\(^{586}\) This position is established at length in the course of the commentary on Yājñavalkyasūtra 1.7, which lists the valid sources of knowledge of religious duty (dharmaṁlaṁ), namely Śruti, Smṛti, and observation of the practice of exemplary brahmins, supplemented by personal judgement and preference where the other sources of knowledge leave scope for them. Aparāditya considers at length and rejects the proposition that the scriptures of the Pāṇḍavatas, Śaivas, Pāṇcarātrakas, and others not rooted in the Veda (vedamūla-) should be added to the list (vol.1, p.10, 1.6 ff.). He concludes: tataś ca devapujādau narasimhapurāṇādiprasiddhāvaitikartavyā grahyā nannya | evam dīkṣāyām api avagantavyam | na hi purāṇaprasiddhāyāṁ dīkṣāyām jātiśodhanam asti (vol.1, p.14, ll.17–19) . . . evam pratiṣṭhāyām api purāṇādyuktaivaitikartavyā grahyā nannya teśāṁ eva vyāmiśradharmapramāṇatvena bhavisyatpuraṇe pariṣṭhitvatāt (p.15, ll.1–2) ‘And so the procedure for such [rituals] as the worship of deities that may be adopted is that taught in such Purāṇas as the Narasimha-, and no other. The same should be understood to apply in the case of initiation. For in the initiation established in the Purāṇas the [objectionable Śaiva] rite of the elimination of [the initiand’s] caste is lacking. . . . Equally, in the case of rituals for the installation [of the image of a deity and the like only the procedure taught in Purāṇas and [related texts] may be adopted, since the Bhavisyatpuraṇa acknowledges none but these as sources of valid knowledge of hybrid religious duty’. By ‘hybrid’ (vyāmiśra-) Aparāditya means procedures that incorporate auxiliary elements from the Tantras. The issue of this hybrid installation rituals is taken up in detail on pp. 16, l.1–19, l.12.

\(^{587}\) This source is the Saiddhāntika scripture Devyāmata. It devotes several verses to distinguishing types of Sthāpakas and to exhorting patrons to avoid all but one, who is described as learned both in the general Śaiva scriptures and in the specialized Tantras of Installation, as content with the teaching of Śiva, focused wholly upon it, strictly adhering to the discipline of the initiated (saṁayācāraḥ), without any inclination towards the scriptures of the uninitialized (paśuśāstraḥ), taking no pleasure in the mundane religion, but delighting in the religion of Śiva alone: (2.16c, 17a, 19a, 20ab): acāryaṁ śivaśāstra-praśīnaṁ pratiṣṭhānitrapurāṇāh || . . . 17 śivaśāstrārthaḥ saṁantuṣṭaṁ saṁayācārapālaḥ | . . . 19a śivaśāstra-akacittātīma paśuśāstrapurāṇa-ṃukhāḥ | . . . 20 viraktā laukike dharmaḥ śivaḥdhammaṇaṇaṁjītaḥ. Sthāpakas to be avoided are those who are Vaidika in their religious commitment and learning. Some of these have no more than a partial knowledge of the Tantras of Installation; but they should be avoided even if they mastered both the Tantras of Installation and the general Śaiva scriptures (2.7–8b and 2.13–14):
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Instances of incorporation of Śaiva ritual in the Smārta domain can be aduced from most regions and periods, but perhaps the most striking because it was so widely disseminated and accepted by those who considered themselves to be on the Smārta side of the divide is represented by the Prapañcasāra attributed to Śankarācārya and the closely related Śaradātilaka of Lakṣmanadēśika. These two texts, which, I have argued, were composed in Orissa or on the basis of Orissan tradition, most probably in the twelfth century, present a system of ritual that differs from the properly Tantric only in its catholic character—in Smārta fashion it includes rituals of propitiation for all the main deities, its avoidance of all the elements of ‘impure’ practice that the Smārtas castigated in the Śaiva cults of Bhairava and the Goddess, and its expurgation of doctrines that were contrary to what could be found in acceptably brahmanical sources, notably the doctrine of the thirty-six levels of reality (tattvānī).

THE CAUSES OF THE DOMINANCE OF ŚAIVISM

Śaivism, then, was undoubtedly the most successful among the religious systems that received royal patronage during the early medieval period. It was the most commonly adopted. Of the others some were absorbed by it and the rest while flourishing independently beside it came to remodel themselves along Śaiva lines.

No doubt there were many factors that led to Śaivism’s rise to dominance within this complex environment, and no doubt many of these will remain invisible to us, since they could be discerned and weighed only if we had access to much more detailed evidence of the activities and motivations of individuals and institutions, both religious and political. Nonetheless, I venture a general explanation.

THE EARLY MEDIEVAL PROCESS

On the basis of the epigraphical record of acts of patronage, and considering evidence of changes over time within the Śaivas’ prescriptive literature, I

588 One of these, the assimilation of Śākta Śaiva propitiation rites by the Atharvavedic tradition of the Paippalādins of Orissa, has been demonstrated at length in Sanderson 2007b.

propose that the fundamental reason for the religion’s success, underlying and structuring the mass of particulars now lost to view, was that it greatly increased its appeal to royal patrons by extending and adapting its repertoire to contain a body of rituals and theory that legitimated, empowered, or promoted key elements of the social, political and economic process that characterizes the early medieval period.

These elements were:

1. the spread of the monarchical model of government through the emergence of numerous new dynasties at subregional, regional, and supraregional levels;
2. the multiplication of land-owning temples, both royal temples in nuclear areas and lesser temples in peripheral zones, often established by subordinate local lords, thus promoting the rural economy and the progressive penetration of the authority of the centre into new territories;
3. the proliferation of new urban centres, both commercial centres that grew from below through a process of agglomeration, and planned settlements, growths from above, founded by rulers;
4. the expansion of the agrarian base through the creation of villages, land reclamation, and the construction of water-reservoirs, wells, and other means of irrigation, with the steady growth in population that these developments imply; and
5. the cultural and religious assimilation of the growing population of communities caught up in this expansion.\footnote{For this positive characterization of the period I am indebted to the work of a number of historians who in recent decades have shown the invalidity of the widespread view that it was a time of decline, de-urbanization, fragmentation, and general impoverishment in the aftermath of a glorious classical age that culminated under the Gupta kings and ended with their demise. I acknowledge in particular the research, conclusions, and hypotheses of Noboru Karashima (1984), R. Champa\-kalakshmi (1986), Hermann Kulke (1990, 1995a, b), Brajadulal Chattopadhyaya (1994), Upinder Singh (1994), Burton Stein (1994, 1998), James Heitzman (1995), and Cynthia Talbot (2001). That judgement, which owes more, one suspects, to the concept of the European Dark Ages after the collapse of the Roman empire than to unbiased analysis of India’s epigraphical and archaeological record, has its counterpart in the not uncommon assessment that these centuries also witnessed a progressive degeneration of Sanskritic literary, intellectual, and religious culture. It is refreshing to see that the work of those historians who are engaging vigorously with the epigraphical and archaeological evidence of the age has brought forth a view that is more consonant with the abundant literary evidence of intellectual and aesthetic vigour.}

At the same time it took steps to integrate itself with the brahmanical sub-
strate in ways that rendered it accessible and acceptable to a far wider constituency and therefore all the more appealing to rulers in their role as the guardians of the brahmanical social order.

**Śaivism and Monarchy**

Śaivism’s engagement with the first and most crucial of these elements is apparent in the fact that from the seventh century onwards inscriptions and prescriptive religious texts reveal that Śaiva brahmin Gurus were holding the position of royal preceptor (rājaguruḥ) in numerous new kingdoms both on the Indian subcontinent and in Southeast Asia and in this capacity empowering and legitimating the monarch’s rule by granting him Śaiva initiation (śivamanḍaladikṣā).

It might be thought that this would have been an unappealing step for any but the most reclusive and ineffectual of kings, since after initiation Śaivas were obliged to adhere to a complex and time-consuming program of daily and occasional rituals. However, early in the development of the Mantramārga, the Śaivas, no doubt in order to extend their recruitment and hence their influence, admitted a category of initiates who in consideration of the fact that they were incapable of taking on these onerous duties were exonerated from doing so.\(^{591}\) The king was considered to qualify for this less arduous route to liberation by reason of his royal obligations. He was therefore required to adhere only to the obligations of an uninitiated devotee of Śiva taught in the texts of the Śivadharmā corpus, which in his case were principally to support the religion and its institutions and to sponsor and appear in conspicuous ceremonies in the civic domain.

Moreover, according to prescriptive sources the king’s initiation was to be followed by a Śaiva modification of the brahmanical royal consecration ceremony (rājyābhiṣekah), bestowed both on the king and his chief consort, and also given to the heir apparent at the time that he was consecrated to succeed to his father’s...

\(^{591}\) The distinction between these two categories of initiate, those who receive initiation with post-initiatory duties (sabījā dīkṣā ‘initiation with seed’ ) and those who receive it without (nirbījā dīkṣā ‘initiation without seed’), is not present in the earliest Saiddhāntika scriptures, namely the corpus of Niśvāsa texts found in the Niśvāsatattvasamhitā codex, the earliest of which, the Mūlasūtra, was probably composed at some time between 450 and 550, for which dating see the conclusions of a recent workshop on this text summarized in the newsletter of the Nepal-German Manuscript Cataloguing Project (GOODALL and ISAACSON 2007). On the relatively archaic character of the Niśvāsa corpus see SANDERSON 2001, pp. 22–31 (archaic features listed in fn. 32, pp. 29–31), and SANDERSON 2006. The category of exonerated initiates appears later in the Kirāṇa, the Pāramesvara, and the Svacchaṅda, and, following the latter, in the Paddhatis. The textual evidence is given in SANDERSON forthcoming a.
This new ceremony was added to the purely Śaiva consecrations recognized by the core tradition, through which a Śaiva Guru empowered an initiate to take office as a Sādhaka (sādhakābhiṣekah), a specialist in Mantra-rituals for supernatural effects (siddhiḥ), and that through which a retiring Guru (acāryah) consecrated his chosen successor (acāryābhiṣekah), passing on to him his duties. In this way the monarch was incorporated as a third kind of Śaiva initiate, who differed from the Sādhaka and the Guru not in the character of the initiation itself but in the consecration ceremony that followed it: while they were to be consecrated for purely Śaiva functions, the king was to be consecrated to take up office as the “head of [the brahmanical social order of] the caste-classes and religious disciplines” (varnāśramaguruḥ), the role already assigned to him by brahmanical prescription.

As the function of the Śaiva consecration is modified in this case, so its form, though in general Śaiva, incorporates distinctive non-Śaiva elements appropriate to its mundane and brahmanical aspects, such as the inclusion of the royal

---

592 The textual and epigraphical evidence for the practice of royal initiation, and the textual evidence for the king’s exoneration from Śaiva duties, and this ancillary Śaiva modification of the brahmanical royal consecration ceremony are presented in SANDERSON forthcoming a. On the brahmanical consecrations of the king, queen, and heir apparent see SANDERSON 2005a, p. 382 and notes 115–117.

593 Naimittikakarmānusamdhāna f.74v1: [4.118] varnānāṁ āśramānāṁ ca gurubhāvāya bhūpateḥ yo bhiṣekavidhiḥ so ‘pi procyate dīkṣitātmanah ‘I shall also teach the rite of consecration as the means by which a king, provided that he has received [Śaiva] initiation, becomes the patron of the caste-classes and brahmanical disciplines’.

594 Manusmṛti 7.35cd: varnānāṁ āśramānāṁ ca rājā srstō ‘bhirakṣitā ‘The king has been created as the guardian of the castes and disciplines’; Brhaspatismṛti 1.9ab: tasmād varnāśramānāṁ tu netāsau nirmītaḥ purā ‘he was created of old as the leader of the castes and disciplines’; Viṣṇusmṛti 3.1–3: atha rājadhammad. prajāparipālanam | varnāśramānāṁ sve sve dharme vyavasthāpanam ‘Next the duties of the king: protection of his subjects [and] ensuring that the castes and [followers of the] disciplines keep to their respective duties’; Viṣṇudharmottara 2.65.55: varnāśramavyavasthā tu tathā kārīya viṣēṣataḥ | svadharmapracyutān rājā svadharme vinyojayet ‘And his special duty is to establish the castes and disciplines. The king must force those who have fallen away from their duties [as members and followers of these] to practice them’. The characterization of the king in accordance with these injunctions as the Guru of the castes and disciplines (varnāśramaguruḥ) is a commonplace in our period. See, for example, Sātvatasamhitā 24.16–17 (> Īṣvarasamhitā 17.14–15); Somadeva, Kathāsaritsāgara 12.6.85; Čandrāprabhasūri, Prabhāvakacarita v. 284ab; Kṣemendra, Avadānakalpalatā 2.60c and 27.22b. See also the cognate expressions sarvāśramaguruḥ and āśramināṁ guruḥ in Ne-tratatra 19.87 and 20.55b, varnāśramadharmaṃyadācāryah and akhilāśramaguruḥ in Āgamañambāra, Act 2, prose after 20 and Act 3, v. 4, and varṇaguruḥ in Rājatarangini 3.85ab.
banners, weapons, and armour in the objects of worship, the seating of the king on a platform covered with the skins of a fighting bull and a cat, the seating of the king on a platform covered with the skins of a fighting bull and a cat, the seating of the king on a platform covered with the skins of a fighting bull and a cat, the seating of the king on a platform covered with the skins of a fighting bull and a cat, and the seating of the king on a platform covered with the skins of a fighting bull and a cat.
recitation of the Mantra text of sixteen verses prescribed for the brahmanical prototype when the water of consecration is poured over the king's head, and, after the ceremony is complete, the king's return to his palace in full military parade, mounted on an elephant or white horse, preceded by the royal banners, and showered with parched rice by the women standing on the roofs of the mansions along his route.

Just as this brahmanical rite is subsumed within the Śaiva process of initiation and consecration, so its outcome, the king's entitlement to rule as guardian of the brahmanical social order now entails the additional requirement or, one might say, compensation to the Śaivas for this descent into the mundane, that he should ensure that the authority of brahmanical prescription be subsumed within, and subordinate to, that of the Śaiva scriptures, an injunction supported by the promise that by enforcing this hierarchical relationship he will secure the stability of his rule and kingdom, implying that by neglecting to do so he will bring about their collapse.

---

vrṣadamśasya dvīpīnaś ca bhṛgūttama | teṣām upari śiṁhasya vyāghrasya ca tataḥ param.

597 Naimittikakārmānusāṃdhāna ff. 78r1–79r1 (interrupted by the loss of a folio), beginning (4.168–169): loke vede prasiddhā<Ś>-ś ca vīprān etarhi pāṭhayet | abhiṣekāśīṣah (corr.:abhiṣekāśikah Cod.) ślokān ṣīṣproktā<Ś>-ś ca tad yathā || surās tvām abhiśiṣcantu ye ca siddhā<Ś>-ḥ purātanaḥ | brahmā viṣṇuṣ ca saṃbhūṣ ca śakrāyāṣ ca marudganāḥ || . . . . These verses are prescribed for this purpose by Varāhamihira in the first half of the sixth century in Brḥatsāṃhitā 47.55–70.

598 Naimittikakārmānusāṃdhāna f. 84r2–5: ārūḍho bhadramātāngam athavā vājināṁ sitam || atapatrena śubhrenā hemadandena *cāruṇā (conj.:cā + + Cod.) | *nigṛhitātapaḥ (conj.: + + hitātapaḥ Cod.) | svetār viṣyamānaś ca *cāmaraḥ (em.:cāparaḥ Cod.) || cāturāṅgabadopetaḥ purataḥ ketumālāya || astavighno 'nukūlāna dhūtāya + + vāyunā (diagn. conj.: + + + Cod.) | saudhāgraśedikāstabhāṁhi kulapatnībhir ādarāt || prayuktam lājavarṣam ca manyamāno *bahupriyām (conj.:vahupriyām Cod.) | praviṣet svapuraṁ *pauraiḥ (conj.:pau + Cod.) + + + + vikāsibhiḥ.

599 Mohacūḍottara f. 21v–22r (4.276–281): śrutismṛtipurāṇāṁ āgāmā dharmadesakāḥ | etair yo vartate rājā sa rājyaṁ bhuṭjate citam || 277 purāṇaṁ bāḍhyate vedār āgamais ca taduktaḥay | sāmāyam ca viśeṣam ca śāivam vaiśeṣikam vacaḥ || 278 bādhyaśādhakabāhyena no vivekaryam vicaksanaiḥ | yad yathāvasthitam vastu sarvajñas tat tad āvadet || 279 āgamānāṁ bahūte tu yatra vākyadvayam bhavet | kim pramāṇam tataḥ grāhaye pramāṇam sāṅkrama vakcaḥ || 280 *granthād granthāntaram titkā (?) sāpeksanirapekṣayoh | samādhānam tayah kāryam arthaśātelīśadvāhanaiḥ || 281 evaṁ jñātvā surādhyakṣa nivrūtim paramāṁ vṛjā | evaṁ dharmāṁvīte rājīṇi svarāṣṭre sarvada śiṇam [The sources] that teach religious duty are the Vedas, the Dharmacāstras, the Purāṇas, and the Āgamas. The Purāṇas are outweighed by the Vedas and the teachings of the latter by the Āgamas. The common and the special, the latter being the teachings of Śiva, are related so that the second outweighs the first. The learned should have no doubt about this. [For it is] all-knowing [Śiva that] has taught everything as it truly is. When, there being a plurality of scriptural authorities, there are two [contradictory] text-passages.
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The Śaivas also adapted the theory of their ritual practice to enable them to claim that those rulers who underwent their ceremonies would be empowered in their efforts to maintain their supremacy and extend it through conquest. The ceremony of initiation had been conceived as the means of obtaining liberation and was always presented in these terms in theoretical texts. But a fifteenth-century Kashmirian scholar can proclaim in a eulogy of his patriline that by receiving initiation from one of his ancestors kings had expelled their enemies and long enjoyed distinguished reigns. Similarly, an inscription of the twelfth or thirteenth century from Hariyāṇa tells us that the effect of the initiation of King Sūrapāla was to give him power beyond that of all his rivals. It adds that if his Guru Mūrtigana initiated a brahmin, a king, or his minister he thereby made them [respectively] the repository of knowledge, the master of all the earth, and the foremost of men. In the Malkāpuram inscription of A.D. 1261 we are told that the effect of the initiation given by Viśveśvaraśiva to the Kākatīya prince Rudradeva was to make the might of his [right] arm, that is to say his valour in battle, shine more brilliantly. The same notion is apparent in the great Mebon inscription of A.D. 953 of the Khmer monarch Rājendra Varman.

\[one non-Śaiva and the other Śaiva] and the question of which is valid arises one must privilege the teaching of Śiva. The two should be reconciled, as respectively dependent and independent [in their validity], by means of implication and other exegetical tools, [on the evidence of] the texts [themselves in which those statements occur], related texts, and commentary (?). Having understood this, Indra, achieve the highest bliss. Provided that the king adheres to religion in this manner, his kingdom will always prosper'.

\[continuous with the passage cited in the preceding note\]: \ldots vi-pram bhūmipatim tadiyam athavāmātyam sa yaṃ dīkṣayet | tam tam bodhanidhim samastaparthivinātham pradhānaṃ nrṇāṃ sthāṇum patrinam atarot tarum iva śrīyājñavalkyo munih 'Any brahmin, king, or minister that he initiated he made the repository of [all] knowledge, lord of the whole earth, and the foremost of men, just as the sage Yājñavalkya caused a tree, a [mere] plant, to burst into leaf'. When the dissolute king Supriya contemptuously refused the sacred water and grain that Yājñavalkya had brought to the palace to restore his health, Yājñavalkya sprinkled them on to a rotten tree and departed. Seeing that the dead tree immediately burst into leaf the king tried without success to have him return.

\[PANTULU 1930, v. 22\]: śrīviśveśvaradesīkendraśivahastodbhāsidorvikramas.
In a passage describing his marching forth to war it speaks of the ceremony of [Śaiva] Maṇḍala initiation as intensifying his brilliance, a statement that in the context must be taken to refer to his power to conquer his enemies.604

Nor was it only the theory that was adjusted to suit their patrons. According to the Brhatkālottara the Śaiva Guru was to close the initiation ceremony by giving abhiṣekah to the horses, elephants, chariots, and soldiers of the army by sprinkling them with the water from the vase of the Weapon-Mantra (astra-kalasah), one of the two main vases prepared in the course of the ceremony, “in order to remove all obstacles and to ensure victory in battle”.605 The Śaivas also created a double of their ritual of post-initiatory consecration (abhiṣekah) to be performed for the king before he entered the fray.606 A much elaborated form of this ‘consecration for victory’ (jayābhiṣekah), involving Śākta Śaiva rather than Śaiva Mantra-deities and one thousand vases, is taught in the 248 verses of the 27th chapter of the Uttarabhāga of the Lingapurāṇa.

They also offered a wealth of apotropaic, invigorative, and hostile Mantra-rites that could be performed on demand for the benefit of the realm, to promote the success of royal patrons, and to frustrate their enemies. The evidence for such

---

604 The Mebon inscription (in FIORI 1925 [=K. 582], pp. 309–352), vv. 39–40: itas ta-to vidyud ivādyutac chriṣ tāvan nrpanām pracalā prakṛtyā | ramyā sarat prādur abhūn na yāvad yadīyaśṛtāsaṃayo niranṛhā || 40 tūrāstranirājanarājājaśīr dipto mahāmaṇḍaladiṅṣaṭaḥ yah | vidyāṅgamantraś ca kṛtātmaguptih āsādhayaśā śiddhim udārabhūtim ‘The fortune of kings, [though] unstable by nature, did not flicker here and there like lightning until the charming, cloudless autumn appeared, the season of his marching forth. His splendour enhanced by the lustration of his mighty weapons, he himself [made more] brilliant by initiation before the Great Maṇḍala [of Śiva], his person protected by the Vidyāṅga Mantras, he accomplished the Siddhi of total success.’

605 Brhatkālottara A, f. 45v2–3 (22.24c–25b): hasṭyaśvaratha*vodhānām (em.: yo-dhyānā Cod.) secanam astravārinā | kartavyam vighnaśamanam samgrāme jaya-kāranam ‘He should [then] consecrate the elephants, horses, and soldiers with water from the Weapon[-vase] to remove obstacles and [so] bring about [the king’s] victory [in war].’

606 Kirāṇa f.52v (27.23c–25b): prokto ‘yaṃ abhiṣeka<h> syā<d> vijāyārtham nrpasya ca | 27.24 saubhāgyajananam mukhyaṃ grahapidānivartakam | sarvasampat*pradaṃ śrīdām (corr. : prada śrīdā Cod.) yaśokārtivīvādhanaḥ || 27.25 śāntipuṣṭikaraḥ proktah seko ‘yaṃ vighnaśakah ‘This consecration that I have taught may also be performed to ensure a king’s victory. It is the principal means of bringing about good fortune. It removes oppression by possessing spirits. It bestows all success and wealth. It augments [the king’s] fame and reputation. I have also taught it as the means of warding off ills, restoring vitality, and eliminating obstacles’; Cf. Siddhāntasārapaddhati: evam anenaiva vidhinā rājaṅkāmasya bhraṭtarājāsyasya putrākāmāyā saubhāgyakāmāyā abhisekam kuryāt ‘Following this same procedure he may perform the consecration for one who desires sovereignty, for one who has lost his kingdom, and for a woman who desires a son or good fortune’. 
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rituals in the scriptural literature of the Śaivas, especially in its Śākta Śaiva texts, is pervasive.  

There is also historical evidence of specific performances. For example, an inscription of the fifth year of the reign of the Cola Rājahindrāja II (r. 1163–1179 or 1166–1182) from the Tiruvālinśvara temple at Ārppākkam near Kāncipuram608 tells us that when an army from Sri Lanka had invaded the Pāṇḍya country, plundered the treasury of the temple of Rāmeśvaram, and interrupted the cult of Śiva there, the emperor, fearing that the war might spread approached a certain Jñānaśivadeva of Gauḍa, who can be seen from his name to have been a Śaiddhāntika Śaiva Guru, to free the country from this menace by ritual means. The Guru, we are told, then worshipped Śiva for this purpose for twenty-eight days continuously, and it was reported subsequently that these ‘attackers of Śiva’ (śivadrohī) had indeed been defeated. The Badāun inscription of Lakaṇhaṇapāla praises the Rāja-guru Mūrtigaṇa for his expertise in “the great rites of subjection and attraction” (l. 13: vaśyākṛṣṭimahāvidhānanipunah); and Hrasvanātha, a Kashmirian Guru of the Kālikula who also held office as the minister of peace and war under Yaśaskara (r. 939–948), performed a ritual to kill his king and other rituals to cause dissension and immobilize, presumably directed against an invading army.609

Just as the Guru imbued the king through the ceremonies of initiation and consecration with the numinous power of Śivahood in the exercise of his sovereignty, so the Śaiva rites by which the Guru assumed his office ensured that he, as Śiva’s agent among men, was imbued with the numen of royalty. As in the brahmanical consecration of a king, in which the royal astrologer was to provide him with the royal elephant, horse, throne, parasol, fly-whisk, sword, bow, and jewels,610 so at the time of a Guru’s consecration he received from his predecessor the non-martial symbols of sovereignty (rājāṅgāni, rājacīhānāni), such as the turban, crown, parasol, sandals, fly-whisk, elephant, horse, and palanquin.611 To these we may add the throne supported by sculpted lions

---

607 For some examples see Sanderson 2007a, p. 281, fn. 166.
608 ARE 20 of 1899, SII 4:456; ARE 1899, §§23–38 (partial translation in §34).
610 Viṣṇudharmottara 2.4.18c–20b: tato bhisekasāṃbhārāṃ tasya kuryāt sa daivavit | kuḍijaram turagam kuryāt tasya rājñāḥ parikṣitau | bhadrīsanam ca chatraṃ ca vālavajanan eva ca | khadgaratnam tathā cāpam ratnāni vividhāni ca.
611 Bhojadeva, Siddhāntasārapaddhati f. 41v (< Svacchandatantra 4.470): uṣṇīsa-makuṭacchatrapādūkācāmarahastyaśvaśibikādīrājāṅgāni ... dattvā. Svacchandatantra 4.70b has a throne or seat (chatraṃ pādukam āsanam) where Bhojadeva has a fly-whisk, but his account agrees with that of the Svacchandatantra as transmitted in Nepalese and Grantha manuscripts. Thus NAK MS 1-224, f.48r3: uṣṇīsamakuṭādyāṃś ca cchatrapādūkācāmaraḥ | hastyaśvaśibikādyāṃś ca rājāṅgāni aśeṣataḥ; and IFI T. 1032, p. 96: uṣṇīsamakuṭādyāṃś ca cchatracāmarapādūkāḥ | hastyaśvaśibikādyāṃś ca rājāṅgāni aśeṣataḥ. In
(simhāsanam) so intimately associated with kingship in the Indian tradition. For a manual for royal initiation, the Amṛteśadikṣāvidhi, instructs the king to reward his Guru with gifts that should include golden jewellery set with rubies and pearls, a pair of jewelled sandals, a parasol, two white chowries, an elephant, and also a golden lion-throne, and the Malkāpuram inscription of A.D. 1261 describes Viśveśvarasaṅivacārya sitting on such a throne by virtue of his office as the Śaiva Guru of the Kākatiya king Gaṇapati of Warangal (r. 1199–1261), decked out in royal splendour, “with his mass of tawny locks adorned with a diadem trembling [as he speaks], with the full-blown lotus of his face radiating blessings, with his pearl ear-rings striking the tops of his shoulders [as he moves his head from side to side], entrancing with his strings of pearls”.

Furthermore, according to the prescriptions of the Śaiva scriptures the residence to be built for the Guru by his royal disciple was in many respects similar in its layout to the royal palace. It included, for example, an arsenal for the storage of weapons of war. That Gurus should have needed the

---

612 For an image of such a throne see, e.g., the eighth-century metal Tārā from Sirpur (Srīpura) in Huntington 1985, plate 30. The notion that the throne is the very embodiment of sovereignty and imparts its power to the enthroned is already found in the Vedic literature, in the Śatapathabrāhmaṇa (12.8.3.4) (Gonda 1966: 45–46):

āsandyām abhiśiṇcati | āsandī sad vai sāmrājayam sāmrājayenaivaṁ sāmrājayam gamayati 'He consecrates him by affusion on the throne. The throne is indeed true sovereignty. Through [this] sovereignty he causes him to achieve sovereignty'.

613 Amṛteśadikṣāvidhi f. 16v2–3: 37 paścād gurur daks. āny. svarn. abhār. *su-vistaraih. (em. : suvistaraih Cod.) | māṇiyamuktiḥkaitair alankāraśa ca adbhutaśa | 38 navaratnamayair dāntais tathā vai ratnapāduke | haimam simhāsanam chaṭṭaṁ dattvā vai cāmāre śubhe | 39 manimuktāsvanāgendra-uṣṭra-mesagavādhibhiḥ | kṣetragrāmaśivāśivair maṇḍalaiś ca suḥhair vairaiḥ 'After that the Guru should be rewarded with extremely large quantities of gold, with marvellous jewellery set with rubies and pearls, made of the nine jewels, and of ivory, and, having given him a pair of jewelled sandals, a golden lion-throne, two white chowries, with jewels, pearls, horse, elephants, camels, rams, cows and the like, fields, villages and the like, districts, and fine provinces.'

614 PANTULU 1930, v. 38d: tasmin gaṇapatyadhiḥṣurūtāsimhāsanādhyāsīni śrīviśvēśvaraśānavādeśaṇā 'While the Guru Viśveśvara[śiva], occupies the lion-throne of his office as Guru of King Gaṇapati'. Note also the reading chatrapādakam āsanam 'parasol, sandals, and throne' in the Kashmirian text of Svacchandatantra 4.470.

615 PANTULU 1930, v. 39: tvangotpīṇgajātakīram udayasmrāraśivānānāṃ muktā-kunḍalatādiṭāmāsikharame hārrāv manohāraiṇāṃ | vidyāmandaśivapavartināṃ gaṇapatiḥmāḍalikṣāṣgūrūm śrīviśvēśvarāśambham ikṣitavātāṃ te caścaṣu caścaṣaiś.

616 Mayasamgraha 5.182ab: dhanuḥkhadgaśāraṇāma vidyādhyāt tu gṛhākṣate;
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means of warfare may surprise. But a fragmentary inscription of the late tenth century from Kadwāhā in the Guna District of Madhya Pradesh relates that when hostile forces had invaded the region and the king had been slain, the Śaiva ascetic Dharmāśīva, abbot of the Arāṇipadra monastery, went into battle and routed the enemy through his skill as an archer, at the cost of his own life. Nor is this an isolated instance. From the Jubbulpore stone inscription of Vimalaśīva, Rājaguru of the Kalacuri kings Jayasimha (r. c. 1163–1188) and Vijayasiṃha (r. c. 1188–1210), we learn that the activities of his predecessor Kṛtiśīva, Rājaguru of Narasimha (r. 1153–1163), extended beyond the spiritual to those of a military commander who expanded his monarch’s realm and added to his own through the appropriation of temples in the territories gained.

_Piṅgalāmata_ f. 71r1–2 (10.28c–31): _grhakṣate grhāṃ caiva śastrasamsthāpanāya tu_ | _ḥhagabāṇadhanus caiva kuthāro mudgaras tathā_ | _cchurīkā kuntadaṃtaś ca citradaṃga tathaiva ca_ | _lakuṣṭa sakti pāsaś ca kaṇayaḥ śūlaprat rakāḥ_ | _cakrāśi gadavajrajā ca anuṣaśa ca kupaṭṭisiḥaḥ_ | _evamādīṇa cāstraṇi pharāṃividhāni ca_ | _sthāpitavāyīni deveśe gra ṣeh grhakṣataṣaya tu_. The term _grhakṣataḥ_ here denotes [the deity of] a segment immediately to the east of its centre of the southern edge of the square plan. In the last verse I take _phara_- to be a variant of _sphara_- ‘shield’ from Iranian (Old Persian _spara-barai_ ‘shield-bearer’; Persian _ispar_ ‘shield’).

EI 37:20, ll. 10–16. The inscription is fragmentary, but this much of its meaning is clear: while the ascetic Dharmāśīva was in the monastery at Arāṇipada (elsewhere called Arāṇipadra) performing austerities (tenāraṇipadaṃ nāma kṛtam padam anindiṣaṃ...dattvārāṇipade...tasya dharmāṣīva ity abhavaj iti tattavāmīsaḥ...tasyāśre me vardhayas tu pāmām [ll. 10–12]) a ruler called Gobhatā came there with a force of elephants (tatrājagāmamadāsindhūrāṇāṃ balena bhūpah kila gobhata-khyāḥ [ll. 12]). Someone, perhaps the local ruler, was killed by this king ( _ṇṛṛpena parāgatāsuḥ sahasā papāta_ [ll. 12–13]); and he, evidently Dharmāśīva, wept with compassion for a while when he heard the news (tasyāḥvagamyāḥ sa kathāṃ karunāvimuktabāṣaḥ kaṇāṃ [ll. 13]), then, flying into a rage ( _tad anu kopavipāṭaḥ_[l¯aṣ. ah.] [l. 13]), went into battle, a veritable Śiva on earth, armed with a bow _that had come_ (down to him) from Prabhāva[śīva?] (?) ( _atha prabhāva-gata-kārmukaṇa bāṇaś ca diptaḥ sa dhārāvṛśaṅkḥ_ [l. 14]), and, like Śiva in his Tripurāntaka embodiment, routed the whole army of the enemy before ascending to the incomparable world [above] in a shower of flowers scattered by Indra’s celestial nymphs (_āṭṭa[svallīlas tripūrāntakasya...sakalam api sa jītvā śātravāṃ śarvakalpaḥ| surapatrīmanī-nāṃ puspavṛṣṭivākīrṇaḥ puram anupam[am]..._[l. 15]). The poet refers here to the reward conventionally attributed to a warrior who dies bravely when fighting to protect his country; see, e.g., _Mahābhārata_ 8, supplementary passage 14, ll. 31–34; 13, supplementary passage 15, ll. 1388–1361.

EI 25:33 (A.D. 1174), vv. 23–24: _na syandanam vasumatī na ca candrasūryau ca kare na sārathīri abhūt sa viṣayaḥ | nesur hariḥ parapurūṇi tathāpi bhasma ca kare yataḥ sa iti kṛtiśīvaḥ spuṭaṃ saḥ || yaśobhir indviṣadais tathavāvivarkṣitaḥ | apūpurat sa sarvaśā vivekakusmair iva_. ‘He was manifestly [worthy of the name] Kṛtiśīva [Temple/Fame-Śīva]. For he [was a Śīva in as much as he] reduced the cities of his enemies to ashes [just as Śīva did to the cities of the three demons] even though his war chariot [unlike Śīva’s] was not the earth, the sun and moon were not its two wheels, its driver was not Brahmā, and his arrow was not Viṣṇu; and he filled all the directions with the moon-white temples that he had wrested from his
Kings rewarded their Gurus with the donation or construction of monasteries (maṭhah) and with grants of revenue from designated lands with which they themselves constructed and endowed such institutions. Thus in the first half of the ninth century the Rājaguru Purandara founded two monasteries in Gwalior, one at Mattamayūra and a second at Aranipadra, using the funds he had received from king Avantivarman as the daksinā for performing the king’s Śaiva initiation, for which purpose he had been persuaded to move to Mattamayūra, probably from Mālava. The wealth received is described in the inscription that records these events as “[the revenue of] the most valuable portion of his kingdom”. Similarly, when the Kalacuri Yuvarājadeva...
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I alias Keyūrarvāṣa (r.c. 915–945) induced Purandara’s spiritual descendant Prabhāvaśīva (/Sadbhāvaśīva) to move to his kingdom in Chattisgarh, he founded for him at huge expense the great monastery at Golaṅga, granting him by royal charter numerous villages and a whole well-populated town, which, since it is not named, was probably Golaṅga itself, or, according to the account of

district bore the name of Upendra, the first of the Paramāra kings according to the genealogy given by the poet Padmagupta in 11.76 of his Navasahasāṅkacarita.

In all secondary sources, including Sanderson 2007a (p. 274), the name of this monastery (mat.hah.) appears as Golaṅka-. That spelling is well attested, but only in manuscripts and inscriptions from the Dravidian South, where the scribes, speaking languages in which voiced and unvoiced consonants are not distinguished, are liable to substitute k for g. We also find kolaki there. I now correct to Golaṅga- because this is what I find in the earliest testimony, which comes from regions whose vernacular languages do distinguish these consonants, namely Nepalese palm-leaf manuscripts of the Kriyākāndakramāvalī and the Bāngar Prāsasti of the time of Nayapāla (r.c. 1027–1043) (Sircar 1983b, v. 6: golagyās sa mahāmathah). The name appears as Golaṅga- in the Chandrehe inscription (caraṇapūtagolagīkikā). I identify Golaṅga with modern Gurgi (244° 31’ N, 81° 27’ E), about 12 miles due east of Rewa Town, in the north of the Kalacuri kingdom. This is the site of once vast Śaiva ruins (Cunningham 1885, pp. 149–154; Meyer et al. 1908–1931, vol. 21, pp. 282–283; Banerji 1931, pp. 41–45). A full account of my reasons for proposing this location and for rejecting as groundless the widespread view that the monastery was in the south of the kingdom at Bheragāth on the Narmadā river, close to the Kalacuri capital Tripuri, must be set out elsewhere.

Chandrehe inscription, CII 4i:44, v.5: “tato madhumatipateh krtamahātapah-samcayah prabhāvaśīva ity ahūḥ sakalaśaivacūḍāmaniḥ | anekarpravanditaḥ sa yuvārajaḥdevena yas tapadhanapatiḥ kṛtaḥ caraṇapūtaś golagīkikā (my reading: golagnikā Mīrashi, Banerji [EI 21:23]) ‘Then after the abbot of Madhumati came that crest-jewel of all the Śaivas called Prabhāvaśīva, who had accumulated vast power through his asceticism and was revered by many kings. He purified Golaṅga- [Golaṅga] with his feet after being appointed by Yuvarāja-deva as overlord of the ascetics [of the monastery at that place]; and the Gurgi inscription, EI 22:21, vv.6–7: ‘His disciple was the glorious and learned ascetic Prabhāvaśīva, worthy of celebration throughout the three worlds, the pedestal beneath whose feet was honoured by the dense rays of the crest-jewels on the heads of all the kings who prostrated themselves before him. Yuvarāja-deva, the son of Mugdhatunga, skilled in policy, brought [him to his kingdom prompted] by an inborn predisposition and had him accept a monastery that he established [for him] with infinite wealth’. The damaged vv. 35–40 at the end of this inscription list the places that the king made over to Prabhāvaśīva: [sthānaḥ] . . . . . . ya kṛtaṇāya puṇyāvitiyā munaye svayam arcitāya | - nam ullikhiita/sāsana . . . - keyālavārjanpratiḥ [svayam ājahāra] || 36 pakk + . . . [tām?] tathā sārasaṇālakam | vākṣālaṇarajayauddhe ko + +{nă}sapundikā || 37 + + + + . . + + purām khatollikā | nakalābhiraṇali + + sarasvatī || 38 [etetam] dvādaśakaḥ ca kacacakṣetram eva ca | sāmantapātakaḥ caiva vaṭa + + . . + || 39 + + yā/tallapati[ḥ] sāsanaṃ [sa]tram iti api | sa + + bhad-dhacībrajā [kusu?]mvā ca ku/kkukiḍiḥ | 40 rajogrāmāviti[ṇ etān sā]sanatvena dat-
of the Malkāpuram inscription, gave him a vast reward which that ascetic, after he had himself founded the monastery, transferred to it as its endowment. In the next generation the Kalacuri Lakṣmanaṇarāja II (r. c. 945–970) brought in Hrdayaśiva and gave him the monasteries attached to the temples of Vaidyanātha and Nohaleśvara, the second of which Hrdayaśiva passed on to his disciple Aghoraśiva; and the Bāṅgarh Prāśasti reports, as we have seen, that

---

622 PANTULU 1930, vv. 25c–26: tasmai nihsprhacetase galacuriks. māpalac. ud. am. ir grāman. ud. yuvarajadevanpatir bhikśam trilaksīm dādau || 26 krivā sa saivamunir adbhutasilāmārtiḥ śrīgolakīmātham udāram udātacittaḥ | ītasyākarasya nrpadēkamanauktikānām vṛttīṁ ca kārā sakalām api tām trilaksīm. To that [ascetic] whose mind was free of all craving the king Yuvarājadeva, that crest-jewel among the Kalacuri monarchs, gave a 300,000 endowment of villages. That Saiva ascetic, the noble-minded embodiment of extraordinary good conduct, built the great Golagī monastery [there] and then made over the whole of that 300,000 living to that [monastery, which, ocean-like, has become] the source of [many] pearls in the form of Rājagurus’. MİRASHI (CII 4i, p. clviii) interprets the words grāman. ud. bhikśam trilaksīm ‘a 300,000 endowment of villages’ to mean that 300,000 villages were given to Prabhāvasaiva and points out that if the report is correct it indicates that “the king assigned to him one third of the total revenue of his home province of Dāhala, which, according to tradition, comprised nine lakhs of villages”. This would indeed be a vast endowment, so vast indeed that I find it hard to accept his interpretation. The Gurgi inscription mentions only about twenty villages and a town and the Malkāpuram inscription need mean only that the endowment [consisting of the revenue capacity of these places] was valued at 300,000 of some unspecified monetary unit. This alternative was already considered by PANTULU, the first editor of the Malkāpuram inscription. For though he proposed the interpretation later adopted by MİRASHI, he saw the difficulty it entails (1930, p. 52): “The founder of the monastery was one Sadbhāva Śambhu who obtained a gift of three lacks [sic] of villages (or was it a villages [sic] fetching an income of Nishkas coins?) from the Kalachuri king Yuvarājadeva and gave away those villages to the Matha as an endowment”. In favour of this more realistic reading is a parallel expression seen in an inscription of the sixth century from a site near Mrohaung in Arakan. There we learn of the gift to a Buddhist monastery of a trisāhasriko grāma (EI 37:13, l. 13: denguttanāmā ttrisāhasriko grāmo nisrsto), which can only mean ‘a village which has [a revenue yield of] 3000’. As the editor, D.C. SIRCAR points out (p. 63), this refers “apparently to the revenue income in the standard coin”.

623 Bilhāri inscription, EI 1:31, vv. 56–58: 56 kim stūyate ‘sau munipuṅgavo ‘thavā śrīcedicandro nrpatiḥ kṛtādaṁ  | sādurtādadaprahitaṁ upyaññaiḥ pradarśya bhaktim vīhinānīnāya yam || 57 śrīmallaṃkṣaraṇāro ‘pi tasmai sutapase svayam | matham śrīvaidyanāthasya bhaktiyuktah samārpayat || 58 svīkṛtyānu munir bhūyo matham śrīnauhaḷesvaram | aghoraśiṣṭasya sādhuraṇtassya dattavān ‘Or rather why should I praise that foremost among ascetics? [It suffices to report that] king Lakṣmanaṇarāja, the moon of the Cedi dynasty, brought him [to his kingdom] after earnestly showing his devotion to him through presents sent by virtuous envoys, and then out of his devotion freely bestowed on that [saint] of great austerity the monastery of Vaidyanātha. The ascetic also accepted the monastery of Nohaleśvara and then gave it to his virtuous disciple Aghoraśiva’.

---

622 PANTULU 1930, vv. 25c–26: tasmai nih. spr. hacetase galacuriks. māpalac. ud. am. ir grāman. ud. yuvarajadevanpatir bhiks. ud. trilaks. ūm. dadau krivā sa saivamunir adbhutasilāmārtiḥ śrīgolakīmātham udāram udātacittaḥ | ītasyākarasya nrpadēkamanauktikānām vṛttīṁ ca kārā sakalām apī tām trilaksīm. To that [ascetic] whose mind was free of all craving the king Yuvarājadeva, that crest-jewel among the Kalacuri monarchs, gave a 300,000 endowment of villages. That Saiva ascetic, the noble-minded embodiment of extraordinary good conduct, built the great Golagī monastery [there] and then made over the whole of that 300,000 living to that [monastery, which, ocean-like, has become] the source of [many] pearls in the form of Rājagurus’. MİRASHI (CII 4i, p. clviii) interprets the words grāman. ud. bhikśam trilaksīm ‘a 300,000 endowment of villages’ to mean that 300,000 villages were given to Prabhāvasaiva and points out that if the report is correct it indicates that “the king assigned to him one third of the total revenue of his home province of Dāhala, which, according to tradition, comprised nine lakhs of villages”. This would indeed be a vast endowment, so vast indeed that I find it hard to accept his interpretation. The Gurgi inscription mentions only about twenty villages and a town and the Malkāpuram inscription need mean only that the endowment [consisting of the revenue capacity of these places] was valued at 300,000 of some unspecified monetary unit. This alternative was already considered by PANTULU, the first editor of the Malkāpuram inscription. For though he proposed the interpretation later adopted by MİRASHI, he saw the difficulty it entails (1930, p. 52): “The founder of the monastery was one Sadbhāva Śambhu who obtained a gift of three lacks [sic] of villages (or was it a villages [sic] fetching an income of Nishkas coins?) from the Kalachuri king Yuvarājadeva and gave away those villages to the Matha as an endowment”. In favour of this more realistic reading is a parallel expression seen in an inscription of the sixth century from a site near Mrohaung in Arakan. There we learn of the gift to a Buddhist monastery of a trisāhasriko grāma (EI 37:13, l. 13: denguttanāmā ttrisāhasriko grāmo nisrsto), which can only mean ‘a village which has [a revenue yield of] 3000’. As the editor, D.C. SIRCAR points out (p. 63), this refers “apparently to the revenue income in the standard coin”.

623 Bilhāri inscription, EI 1:31, vv. 56–58: 56 kim stūyate ‘sau munipuṅgavo ‘thavā śrīcedicandro nrpatiḥ kṛtādaṁ  | sādurtādadaprahitaṁ upyaññaiḥ pradarśya bhaktim vīhinānīnāya yam || 57 śrīmallaṃkṣaraṇāro ‘pi tasmai sutapase svayam | matham śrīvaidyanāthasya bhaktiyuktah samārpayat || 58 svīkṛtyānu munir bhūyo matham śrīnauhaḷesvaram | aghoraśiṣṭasya sādhuraṇtassya dattavān ‘Or rather why should I praise that foremost among ascetics? [It suffices to report that] king Lakṣmanaṇarāja, the moon of the Cedi dynasty, brought him [to his kingdom] after earnestly showing his devotion to him through presents sent by virtuous envoys, and then out of his devotion freely bestowed on that [saint] of great austerity the monastery of Vaidyanātha. The ascetic also accepted the monastery of Nohaleśvara and then gave it to his virtuous disciple Aghoraśiva’.
the Pāla emperor Mahīpāla I (r. c. 977–1027) bestowed a lofty gilded monastery on the Guru Indrāśiva at Śivavāṭi near Koṭīvarṣa.\textsuperscript{624}

Moreover, we have several records of Gurus using their resources independently to establish further monasteries. Thus Prabhāvaśaśa’s disciple Praśāntaśiva built a monastery at Chandrehe for ascetics devoted to meditation\textsuperscript{625} and a hermitage on the banks of the Ganges at Benares.\textsuperscript{626} His disciple, the Rājaguru Prabodhaśiva, also built a monastery at Chandrehe;\textsuperscript{627}

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item Bāngarh inscription, SIRCAR 1983b, v. 9: śrīmān indrāśivah sphuṭam hariharaprayāṃ śivendrākṛtim bibhrad vamśavibhūṣanam samabhavac hisyo 'sya puṇyātmanah | yasmai kaṅcanapuñjamaṇḍaracitaprasādamerusupathkailāsābhamaṁ dādāv iha mahīpālo nṛpas tatuttavat ‘The disciple of that [Guru] devoted to piety was the illustrious Indrāśiva, an ornament of his lineage, who did indeed have an appearance [matching his name, in that it was one] that embodied both Śiva and Indra [=Upendra, i.e. Viśnū] as though it were an image of Harihara [in which Śiva is both himself and Viṣṇu in a single body]. To him king Mahīpāla, [once he had become through initiation] a knower of [ultimate] reality, gave in this place a monastery that resembled Mt. Kailāsa, radiant with its Meru-like towers beautifully wrought with much gold’.
\item Chandrehe inscription, CII 4i:44, vv. 6a, 7: prāśāntaśivacandrāmas tad anu tasya śiśyo 'bhava...7 sa śoṇanadasamgame bhramarasālamule 'tulaṃ priyāvavanaśamkule phalamprālakandāsanah | cakāra viditam janair munisaṅkah prāśāntaśramaṃ svapādānapaṅkhitibhiḥ paviḥbhūtalo yah kṛti ‘The successor of [Prabhāvaśaśa] was his disciple, the moon-like Prāśāntaśiva. . . . Eating [nothing but] fruits, lotus stems, and bulbs, that wise friend of ascetics built the famous hermitage with his name [the Prāśāntāśrama] at the foot, thick with a forest of Priyāla trees, of the Bhramara hill, at the confluence of the river Son, purifying the earth with the lines of his foot-prints’; and the Gurgi inscription, EI 22:21, v. 8 and 13: tasyāmalaṇa tapasā ca vivardhamāṇāvidyābalaṇa ca samastajagatpratiṭāḥ | śiśyā prakāmākamaniyagunaikadhāma śrīmatprāśāntāśivanāmamunir babhūva || 13 dāhotiṛnasuvarṇaṇāśasmitadrauvārthĀhatsrpaḥ śiddhaṇāṇām acikarat tad apiyam yah śoṇatiropari | yasmin yogājusah pravīṣya niyadhvaṉastāntarāyāḥdhayah śāntāḥ siddhasamādhiyayo ‘cchamatayo gacchānti mukteḥ padam ‘The disciple of this [Prabhāvaśaśa] was the ascetic Praśāntaśiva, who was known to all for his unblemished austerity and the power of his ever growing knowledge, the unique abode of the most desirable of qualities. . . . [13:] He, who quenched the desire of a multitude of people in need of funds with fire-refined gold, built another [monastery as] a seat of Siddhas on the bank of the river Son, where masters of Yoga enter, abolish the torment of [all] hindrances through their ascetic restraint, and, when they are at peace, having achieved perfect concentration, reach with pure awareness the goal of liberation’.
\item Gurgi inscription, EI 22:21, v. 14: tīrthasānyasaneṇaṣeṣanayadhiyam atyanvāśāntate yas tat kārayāṇ muniḥ surasārītire tapaḥsthānakam | yat samsyeyā mahēṣvarācārabhavāhā sāvānasūvinino manyante bhavasāgaruṁ gurum api ksīnāṁ yathā gospaṇdah ‘That ascetic had a hermitage built on the bank of the Ganges for the complete repose of those whose minds were devoted to the practice of bathing at its Tīrthas. By resorting to it those living in Benares who are devoted to the worship of Śiva consider the ocean of transmigratory existence, vast though it is, to have dwindled into a mere puddle’.
\item Chandrehe inscription, CII 4i:44, v. 16ab: gurukṛtaṣurya-gārād ārād anumāṇ mātham
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
Patanāgaśiva, a spiritual descendant of Purandara through another line, built a monastery in Gwalior at a site now unknown; and the Rājaguru Viśveśvaraśiva, after receiving a village in Andhra from the Kākatiya Queen Rudradevi, built a monastery there and renamed the village Viśveśvaragolakī after both himself and the original home of his preceptorial lineage in Chhattisgarh, dictating that only a Guru of this lineage, one consecrated by another Guru of the same (golakīvāmśyahyaktābhīṣekāh), should be allowed to preside over his foundation. According to the same source he also established monasteries in Kāliśvarapura, Mandrankūṭanagara (v. 82), and Īśvarapura (v. 85), no doubt under the same conditions.

In this way there developed a far-reaching network of interconnected seats of Saiddhāntika Śaiva learning. Figures at the summit of this clerical hierarchy thus came to exercise a transregional authority whose geographical extent could be greater than that of any contemporary king. Viśveśvaraśiva while holding office as the Rājaguru of the Kākatiya Gaṇapati is said also to have been the Guru of the Kalacuri king, the Cola king, and the king of Mālava, and praise of Śaiva
Gurus as venerated by a plurality of kings is common, even a commonplace. The wealth accumulated by these Gurus enabled them behave like royal patrons themselves, not only founding new monasteries but also bestowing land-grants on brahmins, rewarding poets, founding temples and new settlements, and providing the means of irrigation. The Badāun inscription reports that the Rājaguru Mūrtigaṇa “honoured brahmins in abundance with many gifts of land that he had received due to the devotion of his royal disciple”, the Malkāpuram inscription says concerning the Rājaguru Viśveśvaraśiva, a native of Gauda in eastern India: “Who can count the Gauda [brahmins] whose wishes he has granted, the ascetics who have received rich endowments [from him], the leading poets who have been delighted [with the rewards he has bestowed]?”, and the Bāngarh Praśasti relates that Sarvaśiva, the Rājaguru of the Pāla Nayapāla, gave [to brahmins] all the Great Gifts (mahādānāni) of the Purānic tradition, including the tulāpurusadānam in which the donor gives away his weight in gold, an activity that increasingly became emblematic of exemplary kings during the second half of the first millennium. His brother Mūrtiśiva, to

---

631 See, for example, in the colophonic verses of the Prāyascttasamuccaya of Hṛdayaśāva, concerning his Guru Īśvaraśiva (see SANDERSON 2001, p.3): āsīt tatasmtatau muniḥ śrī-īśvaraśiva iti | jagatipatiḥir nṛpaiḥ pūjāpādaṇākajāḥ; Chandrehe inscription (CII 4i:44), v.4b, concerning Purandara: yatra purandarakhṛtatajajñegurur bhūbhujām; v.5c, concerning Prabhāvaśiva: anekanṛpavanditaḥ; Bilhārī inscription (CII 4i:45), v.50b, concerning Dharmaśiva: bhūpālamaulimānikiṁtiḥir arcitāṅghriḥ; v.51bcd, concerning Sadāśiva: nṛpaiḥ | yat-paddadvayam vandyam arcitam ṣekharāṁśubhiḥ; v.54cd, concerning Hṛdayaśāva: nṛpamuktiṇihiṣṭār yasya māṇiye kacakra akrta caranāmalam kāntam ekāntavandyam; Gurgi inscription (CII 4i:46), v.6, concerning Prabhāvaśiva: tasyākhalikṣiti-patipraṇotottamāṅgucādāmāṇidyuticyārcitāpādāpiṭah | śisyoh bahūva bhuvanatrayayakirniyāḥ śrīmatprabhāvaśivanāmamunir manisī; and v.17cd, concerning Īśānasāiva: śrīśānasambhur akhilāvanipālāmaulimālaṁāṇidyutipāṅgitaṁ padāmaḥ.

632 Badāun inscription, EI 1:10, l.15: svāsīṣya varabhpālābhaṅktalabdhenā bhūriṇā | bhūmīdānena yo vīprān pājāyām āśa bhūrīṇā.


634 SIRCAR 1983b, v.11. The inscription lists prthividānam, merudānam, viśvacakra-dānam, [saptaj]śagaradānam, brahmāṇḍadānam, kalpavrksadānam, [hīranya]kāma-madhenudānam, bhavanadānam, grāmadānam, godānam, parvatānām dānam (the ten parvatadānāni of the Matsyapurāṇa, with Meru in the centre), sakalpa-drumabhadradhādanām, hīranyāsavarathajādanām, hīranyahastijrathajādanām, hīranyagarbhadānam, aśvadānam, tulāpurusadānam, and śrīnandīsvaradānam. For an exhaustive presentation of the prescriptions of the Purānic and other sources on the “Great Gifts” see especially the fifth Adhyāya of the Dānakhaṇḍa of the Caturvargacintāmani of Hemādri, written while he was a minister of Mahādeva, the Yādava king of DEVAGIRI (r. c. 1260–1270). The śrīnandīsvaradānam mentioned in this inscription is, I presume, the gift of a golden image of Nandikesvara that is to accompany the gift of a thousand cows (Caturvargacintāmani, vol.1, p.253). On
whom he handed over his office as Rājaguru is likewise praised in that inscription for his abundant donations to brahmns.\textsuperscript{635} Sarvaśiva’s disciple Rūpaśiva is also praised there for his generosity to supplicants,\textsuperscript{636} as is Īśānaśiva, the disciple of Praśāntaśiva, in the Gurgi inscription.\textsuperscript{637} The predecessors of the Rājaguru Vimalaśiva receive similar praise for their pious largesse in that Guru’s Jubbulpore inscription, and Vimalaśiva himself is commended there for the support he gave to the brahmanical order by bestowing gifts on brahmns, and adorning the land with gardens, water-tanks, charitable feeding-houses (sattrāṇi), temples, and houses for brahmns.\textsuperscript{638} In the Bāngarh Praśasti Vidyāśiva and Dharmāśiva are the drift away during our period from the sponsoring of Vedic (Śrauta) sacrifices to the bestowing of the Great Gifts such as the tulāpurusādānam see DIRKS 1976.

\textsuperscript{635} SIRCAR 1983b, v. 15cd: bhratā mūrtisīvāḥ sa mānyamahīno dānāmbisekай jagat pūtaṁ yah kṛtavān ... ‘His brother Mūrtiśiva, of venerable glory, washed the world clean with the water he poured when making donations’. The poet refers to the rite of pouring water on to the hand of the brahmin recipient, or, in his absence, on to the ground, that must accompany any formal act of donation (Caturvargacintāmani, vol. 1, p. 92); and by saying that he cleansed the world with these libations he suggests that his donations to brahmns were frequent, widespread, and very numerous.

\textsuperscript{636} SIRCAR 1983b, v. 28: śīṣyāḥ sarvaśivasya diptaśaṇaḥ sarvārthicintāmaṇīḥ ... śrimān rūpaśivāḥ babhūva ‘The disciple who succeeded Sarvaśiva, [that Guru] of blazing ascetic power, was the illustrious Rūpaśiva, who was a wishing-granting jewel for all supplicants’.

\textsuperscript{637} EI 22:21, v. 18ab: ... [sarvārthi]nāṁ yena śirr gamitopahapadavāṁ daurgatyaudhkkhacchedā ‘He caused [his] wealth to be enjoyed by all supplicants, thus ending the torment of their poverty’.

\textsuperscript{638} EI 25:33. The inscription precedes its account of the life of Vimalaśiva with some information about the predecessors in his Guru lineage. Unfortunately the section on his predecessors is lacunose because of damage to the stone, with the loss or partial loss of some of these Gurus’ names. The inscription yields the following succession: ... N > Vimalaśiva > Astraśiva—in ll. 5–6 I read ... (l. 6) vāstrasīvābhidhānāḥ where the editor, MIRASHI, reads ... (l. 6) vāstusīvābhidhānāḥ: Astraśiva is a Saiddhāntika initiation name but *Vāstusīva is not— > N? (if Astraśiva’s successor was covered in the lost v. 11) > N-śiva (the first part of the name has been lost: ... śīvah śīyāḥ in l. 6) ... N > Puruṣāśiva, Guru of Yaśāḥkarna (r. 1073–1123) > Śaktiśiva, Guru of Yaśāḥkarna’s successor Gayakarna (r. 1123–1153) Kṛitiśiva, Guru of Gayakarna’s successor Narasimha (r. A.D. 1153–1163) > Vimalaśiva, Guru of Narasimha’s successors Jayasimha (r. 1153–1188) and, on the evidence of EI 40:46, Vijayasimha (r. 1188–1210). Of N-śiva we are told (v. 11): + śīvah śīyāḥ purusārthāyāḥ sampadām | guṇānām ca dhanānām ca paropakṛtye param ‘[His] disciple N-śiva [employed] his abundant virtues only for the accomplishment of the goal of human existence and his abundant wealth only for the welfare of others’; and of his now nameless successor we learn ... (v. 15) pritiḥ pātre ratis tīrthe sthītāḥ pathi mate satām | bhaktis bhave bhavat tasya samasya ‘That ascetic’s only delight was in [giving to] worthy recipients, his only attachment was to holy sites, his only adherence was to the path approved by the good, and his only devotion was to Śiva’. Of Vimalaśiva we learn in v.34cd: [yacchālīyām vibudhagaṇo ’dhigamyā dhatte vaidhuryām na khalu [mahotsa]vodayēṣu ‘Enter-
praised for building temples, and the Rājaguru Mürtiśiva for building many and excavating numerous reservoirs. In the Gurgi inscription Praśantaśiva is said to have added a lofty temple of Śiva at Golagī to the north of one that had been established there by king Yuvarājadeva, and in the Chandrehe inscription his successor Prabodhaśiva is said to have provided that place not only with a monastery but also with a water reservoir and a well. The Gwalior Mu-

ing the shade [provided by the parasol] of this [patron] a multitude of brahmins was freed from the distress [of penury] on the splendid occasions of major festivals; in v.38: yasyārthīdiijarājadarśanaṇavaśād dānāmbu[bhir vardhate] śraddhā [rātridīvam] vareṇa vidhinā dharmasya *tantrīr (?): iva | yo dārśeṣu api sādāram dvījapatiṁ akiṃṣaśobhāhārāḥ ākṣo yojaye suvarṇavikasatasdhrinînāṁ sātaḥ. (SIRCAR 1983b, v.8ab: sīṣyo dharmāsiva taponidhir abhūt tasya vyaḥād yo 'dbhutam prāśadām bhagavatrilocanaguror vārānaṣibhūsanam 'His disciple, the ascetic Dharmaśiva, built a marvellous temple of the blessed three-eyed teacher [of the world] that beautified Benares'; SIRCAR 1983b, v.7cd: śrīvīḍāśiva ity asimacaritas satkīrtīśhāsataprājghārasthagिथमbaro munir abhūt tasmād yathārthaṃyayaḥ After him came Vidyāśiva, an ascetic of boundless virtuous conduct, in whom the lineage fulfilled its purpose, who concealed the sky with the mass of the countless branches of his fine temples'; vv.16–19.

643 SIRCAR 1983b, v.19: mahīyaśyaṁ na tathā mahī yathā tapasvinas tasya mahān ihāśayah | tathā hi bhūmih kila kirtibhir bhrāt gato na tasyāśaya eṣa vimsayāḥ 'This land though vast was not large enough for the ambition of this ascetic. The wonder is that it did not cease even when the earth was filled to capacity by his temples'.

642 Gurgi inscription, EI 22:21, v.11: yena śrīyuvarājākārtitalasatkīśaṃśrīpam-prāsādottarataḥ sumeruṣikharaspadhī prassiddhāṁ bhuvī | sadma sthāpitam īśvarasya *sakalatralayavismāpakaṁ (trailokya corr. MIRASHI:trailākya Ep.) yat swargam vajatas tādiyavasāsah sopānāmārgaye 'To the north of the temple built by Yuvarāja that resembled the shining peak of Mt. Meru he built his famous temple of Śiva. That [too] rivals the peak of Meru, causing wonder throughout the three worlds, a flight of steps, as it were, for his fame as it ascends to heaven'. The repetition of the comparison with Mt. Kailāsa seems lame, but its probable point is that the Guru's temple was no less impressive than the king's.

643 Chandrehe inscription, CII 4i:44, v.16cd: anugirām ato sindhubrakhyam tādāgam acikhanat pracurasalilam kūpam cātra prabodhaśivāṁ śamī Then here [after building the monastery] the ascetic Prabodhaśiva excavated an ocean-like reservoir
The Śaiva Age

seum inscription records that Pataṅgaśiva built a great temple of Śiva and excavated four huge reservoirs. The Jubbulpore inscription records that the Rājaguru Vimalaśiva built a temple of Śiva Kṛitiśvara in honour of his preceptor and predecessor, the Rājaguru Kṛitiśiva. A Kannad. a inscription recording the death in 931 of the Śaiva Guru Tribhuvanakartaradeva alias Kaliyugarudra tells us that during the forty years of his rule as the pontiff of Āvani in Noḷambavāḍi he built fifty temples and two large water reservoirs; and the Malkāpuram inscription records that the Rājaguru Viśveśvara founded temples to house Śivas bearing his own name in Viśveśvaragolakā, Mandrakūtanagara, Candravallinagara, Viśveśvaranagara, Kommūrgrāma, and Uttarasamośilā, and also that he founded a town with his own name (Viśveśvarapura) at Ānanda.

The exalted status and king-like behaviour of these Gurus is reflected in the fact that we have inscriptions in which they have been given royal, even imperial titles. This is so with Vāmadeva, also called Vāmaśambhu, the Rājaguru of a Kalacuri of Tripūrī who was probably Gāngeyadeva (r. c. 1015–1041), on whom that king is said to have transferred his status as the monarch (nijaratājalakṣmī) as payment for his service as his Guru (gurudakṣiṇā) when he set out on a cam-

near the [Bhramara] hill and a well with abundant water'.

644 MIRASHI 1962, v. 29: tenedam haramandiraṃ susikharam yat sarvataḥ sundaram bhaktyā kāritam indudhāmadhavalaṃ kailāsāśailopamam | ākalpaṃ sthiram astu tad bhūvi satāṃ ānandadam ārāṃ tad āsyavāmalaṃ āgamaṇ pariṇātanm prāśadāmūryā yaṣaḥ ‘Out of devotion he had this temple of Śiva built with its fine towers, altogether beautiful, white as the light of the moon, resembling Mt. Kailāsa. May it endure on earth to the end of the aeon, delighting the virtuous when they see it. His spotless fame has been transformed to take material form as [this] temple’.

645 MIRASHI 1962, vv. (30–)38: sutat. am. catus. t. ayam idam. ruciram. cirabhūsaṇaṃ mahīvadhvāḥ | vīkātaraṇātāgaṇāṃ aciκarac chripataṅgeśaḥ ‘Pataṅgaśiva made these four lovely and immense reservoirs with beautiful banks as an enduring ornament for the woman that is the earth’.

646 EI 25:33, vv. 45–46: jačiκarac candramauler mandiram ādārat | guror kṛitiśivasayaitat kirtaye suktāya ca || devāya kṛitiśivarsamarjñātīya prādād amuṣmai jayasiṃhadevaḥ | bibhrad bhave bhaktibhārāṃ gurau ca grāṃnān ravaḥ parvaṇī n + dāyān ‘He built out of reverence this temple of Śiva for the fame and religious merit of the Guru Kṛitiśiva. The god [installed in it] was named Kṛitiśvara; and King Jayasimha, having great devotion both to Śiva and [his] Guru, gave it [three] villages as * . . . (?) gifts on the sacred day of the sun[‘s eclipse?’].

647 EC 10, Mb:65: svasti śrīmad-āvanyada sthānamāṃ nālattu-varṣamanā ādya aya-ttu-dēgulaṃ mādī piṇiyav-ṛaṇu-kereya kaṭṭi śaka-varṣam enṭu-nūṛ-embatta-mūr ādand utkrānti geydu śrītrībhuvanakarttara-devaṃ kāli-yuga-rudrāṅka rudra-loka-prāptan ādam ‘Hail! After governing the sacred domain of Āvani for forty years and building fifty temples and two large reservoirs, in the Śaka year 853 [the soul of] Tribhuvanakartaradeva alias Kaliyugarudra has ascended [from his body] and reached the world of Rudra’.

648 PANTULU 1930, vv. 82–84, 88.
campaign of world conquest. Beginning with the inscriptions of his son and successor Karṇa (r.c. 1041–1071) the Kalacuri rulers of this kingdom are described as meditating on the feet of this Vāmadeva, to whose name are prefixed the imperial epithets paramabhaṭṭārakamahārājādhirājaparameśvara paramamāheśvararaśrī. A variant of these titles, samadhitapaṅca mahāsadaparamabhaṭṭārakamahārājādhirājaparameśvara, is found in Nolamvāḍi records attached to the names of two other Saiddhāntika Gurus, namely Brahmaśīva in an inscription of c.870 and Varuṇaśīva in one of 936. Similarly, but more modestly, an inscription of 1331 on a step-well in the vicinity of the Acalēśvara temple on Mt. Abu tells us that it was constructed during the victorious reign of the great ascetic rājaśrī-Sarveśvara during the victorious reign of the ruler rājaśrī-Tejaḥśimha of Candrāvāti.649

649 For these imperial and royal titles attached to the names of Śaiva Gurus see D.C. SIRCAR in EI 30:10, pp. 46–51. There he refutes the claims expressed by V.V. MIRASHI in EI 27:29. These are (1) that Vāmadeva is a king Vāmarājadeva [seen by him alone] in the Saugor inscription of Śankaragaṇa, which has been assigned on palaeographic grounds to the eighth century, (2) that this king should be assigned to the second half of the seventh century, and (3) that the references in inscriptions of the later Kalacuris to this king's devotion to [the memory] of Vāmadeva, should be referred to this much earlier monarch as the founder of their dynasty. SIRCAR removes Vāmadeva from the Saugor inscription, reading -vāvaraṇa- rather than -vāmarāja- and citing other examples of vāva- or bāva- in inscriptions, and then cites these examples of imperial or royal epithets bestowed on Śaiva Gurus to counter MIRASHI's argument that their being prefixed to the name of Vāmadeva proves that he was a king not a Guru. I side with SIRCAR. His view has the great strength that it accords (1) with the testimony of the Malkāpuram inscription of 1261/2, which, referring to Vāmaśambhu as the third Guru in succession after Sadbhāvāsambhu, the first pontiff of the Matḥa at Golagī, reports that the Kalacuri kings were being praised (praṇamsyante) [in their Praṇastis] up to the present as worshippers of his feet (PANTULU 1930, v.28: atha nrpaṣekharamālalālitapādo 'tra vāmɑśɑmbhur abhūḥ | adyāpi kalacurisā vacaraṇārādhakah praṇamsyante)—in the inscriptions of the Kalacuris of Tripurī from Karṇa onwards they are said to be -vāmadevapādānudhyāta—, (2) with the fact that there is no reference to a king Vāmadeva in any of the inscriptions of those kings, and (3) with the fact that the source which reports the Kalacuri king's bestowing his rājalakṣmī on Vāmadeva refers to the latter as an ascetic (sāhasikas tapasvine vāmadevanāmme nijarājałaḥṣmīm gurudakṣināyai dattvā sarvām bhūmim jeteṃ prasthitavān). SIRCAR convincingly identifies the Kalacuri king here called Sāhasika as Gāṅgeyadeva on the grounds that the latter was both an illustrious conqueror and known as Sāhasāṅka 'he who has the cognomen Sāhasa'. This source, cited by SIRCAR (EI 30:10, p.50), is a paraphrase in Jonarāja's commentary on the Prthivirājavijaya of Jayānaka of a verse of that work now lost in a lacuna.

The inscription referring to Brahmaśīva is EC 10, Śrīnīvāsapura taluk, no. 27 (p.346). SIRCAR (EI 30:10, p.49) wrongly gives the name as Bhrāmarāśīva and the page reference as 376. The relevant part of the inscription is: svasti samadhitapaṅcamahāsabda pallaṁvaya śrīprthivīvalla pallaṁvayākulaṭilakam śrīmat-noḷambādhirājar prthivirājya
Clearly the Śaiva Rājaguru had become a far grander figure than the king’s brahmanical chaplain, the Rājapurohita, who was tied to the service of a single king and was unambiguously his subordinate. Yet, it appears that the Śaivas did not rest with this but also sought to encroach on the territory of that lesser office. For the Netratantra shows the existence of a further class of Śaiva officiants who were to function in almost all the areas traditionally reserved for that officiant: the performance of the king’s recurrent duties to worship the various deities on the days assigned to them, to celebrate the major annual royal festivals of the Indrotsava and Mahānavami, to protect the royal family through rites to ward off ills, to restore them to health after illness, to ward off or counter the assaults of dangerous supernaturals, to empower through lustration (nīrājanam) the king’s elephants, horses and weapons of war, and to protect the king with apotropaic rites before he eats, sleeps, and engages in his regular practice of martial skills.\(^5\)

We see here one of several instances in which the Śaivas used their authority to colonize downwards, producing modifications of their ritual procedures for this purpose. These adaptations inevitably entailed loss of status for those that implemented them, but we should understand that this did not affect those at the summit of the clerical hierarchy, the king-like Rājagurus, but only the humbler clones that extended their authority into domains that those Gurus would not deign to enter.

---

\(^{5}\) The purpose, date, and provenance of the Netratrantra are the subject of SANDERSON 2005b.
The second element of the early medieval process to which I have drawn attention is the proliferation of land-owning temples. All but the most ephemeral sovereigns during this period, both in the subcontinent and in Southeast Asia, gave material form to the legitimacy and solidity of their power by building grand temples in which images of their chosen God were installed, animated, named after themselves (svanāṁnā), and endowed with land and officiants to support their cult. As we have seen, the great majority of these temples enshrined Śiva [in the form of a Liṅga].

The Śaivas of the Mantramārga provided specialized officiants and rituals to establish these Śivas, developing in course of time a secondary body of scriptural authorities, the Prātiṣṭhātantras, devoted exclusively to this domain, setting out the rituals of installation (prātiṣṭhā) and defining the norms for the form of the Liṅga, the iconography of ancillary images, and the architectural design of the various temple types.651 Moreover, they asserted the principle that the Śaiva Sthāpaka, the specialist who performs these rituals, is competent not only in the Śaiva domain but also on all the levels that the Śaivas ranked below it. Thus they claimed that he is empowered to officiate in the construction and consecration of non-Śaiva deities such as Viṣṇu following the Pañcarātra.652 This

---

651 None of the early works of this class have been published. Those known to learned authors before the end of the eleventh century and surviving in manuscripts are the Mayasamgraha, not to be confused with the published Mayamata, a later south-Indian work, the Piṅgalāma, the Mohacudottara, and the Devyāma, which declares itself the prātiṣṭhātantram of the Niśvāsa. Four other works of this type, not known to have survived, are cited by the Kashmirian Vidyākaṇṭha around the beginning of the eleventh century in his commentary on the Mayasamgraha: the Prātiṣṭhāpārameśvara, the Nandikeśvaramata, the Paitāmaha, and the Prātiṣṭhāsamuccaya, the last of which was probably a Paddhati rather than a scripture. On all these texts see SANDERSON 2005a, pp. 440–442.

652 See, e.g., Brhatkālottara, B f. 108v4: bauddhavaīṇavaṇacārthesaurokālamukhādiṣu | śaivaḥ sarvādhikārī syāṇ na śaive 'mi kathāṃcana 'The Śaiva [Guru] has competence that extends into all [religious systems], the Buddhist, Vaiṣṇava, Pañcārtha-[Pāśupata], Saura, Kālamukha, and others; but [Gurus of] those have absolutely no competence to act in the Śaiva [system]; Kāmika, Pūrvabhāga 1.121c–126, on the authority of the Śivabrāhmaṇas, the married Śaiva brahmins who alone were competent to officiate for others: śaivaḥ sarvādhikārī syāt svakīye ca parātra ca || 122 śaivaḥ sarvesu kurvanti ye grasthā dvijottamaḥ | yāmale mātrantre ca kāpāle pāñcarātrake || 123 bauddhe cārhamate caiva lākule vai-dike 'pi ca | anyēṣu api ca mārgesu tattacchāstraiḥ svāsāstrataḥ || 124 śaivaḥ ku-rvanti dikṣādyam tāllingasthāpaṇādikam | mukhyatvād iha śaivasya mukhamāhātmayo 'pi ca || 125 adhiḥkāro 'ṣṭy sarvatra nānyeṣuṃ śivadarsane | tasmāt parārtham atīmārtham sādhanatam yajanaṃ tathā || 126 śivaśipta kartavyam anyēṣaṃ svārtham eva hi | parārtham api kuryāc cel 'lobhena (em. : lopena Ed.) nrpates tathā | tadrāṣṭrasya ca nāṣaḥ syād acireṇa na saṁśayāḥ 'The Śaiva is competent in
universalization of their authority, which is backed by learned theory of the relation of the Śaiva with the other bodies of scriptural injunction, seems not have been merely theoretical. For the Śaiva Paddhati literature contains instructions for the consecration of Viṣṇu, as we have seen in the case of the Paddhati of Somaśambhu, and Vaishnava sources protest at this encroachment, insisting that images of Viṣṇu installed by Śaivas should be reconsecrated.

...all [systems], both his own and others. Married Śaivas, the foremost of brahmins, can officiate in all [the systems, namely] the Yāmala and Mātrītantra, the Kāpālika, the Pāñcarātra, the Buddhist, the Jaina, the Lākula, and yet others, using the scriptures of these systems in accordance with their own. [Such] Śaiva brahmīns perform initiations and the like, the installation of images, and so forth [in these other systems], because the teaching of Śiva is superior [to all others] and because the mouth [of Puruṣa] has been glorified [in the Puruṣasāktaka as the part of his body from which the brahmīns, as the highest caste-class, were created]. [The Śivabrāhmaṇa] is competent to act in all [systems], but not others in the teaching of Śiva. Therefore the Śivabrāhmaṇa [alone] may worship and install [images] both for others and himself. Others may act only for themselves. If out of greed [anyone other than a Śivabrāhmaṇa] performs rituals for the benefit of others, thus usurping the exclusive right of the Śivabrāhmaṇas, then without doubt both the king and his kingdom will swiftly be destroyed'.

See Somaśambhupaddhati vol. 4, pp. 294–311 (viṣṇusthāpanavidhiḥ).

In his Pāñcarātarākasā (pp. 26–27) Vedāntadeśika, the influential Śrīvaishnava of the fourteenth century (EI 13, p. 222), quotes a passage from the Śaiva Kāranaṭantra that is more or less identical with 1.121c–124 of the passage of the Kāmika, Purvabhāga cited above, and after asserting that it is inadmissible as evidence because all Śaiva Tantras are condemned by Vedic authorities quotes a passage from the south-Indian Pāñcarātrikā Pādmasanhitā (Caryāpāda 19.128b–130) to the effect that if a Viṣṇu has been installed with the system of the Śaivas it must be re-installed following the system of the Pāñcarātrikā and purified by bathing with a thousand vases. See also Viṣvaksenasanhitā 39.283–285: sthāpīte raudramārgena pāyjamāne dine dine | hitvā raudravidhānam tu sarvesaṁ hitakāmyāyā || grāmaurvadhikaram pūyam rājabhūsuvardhanam || tasmāt sarvaprayatnena hitvā raudram tu tatkaśāt || sthāpayaet sāttvatenātha vidhinā pājayed dharim || tasmāt sarvaprayatnena na kuryāt tantrasaṃkaram 'If [a Viṣṇu] has been installed following the Śaiva procedure and is in daily worship [following the same] then, desiring the welfare of all, one should abandon the Śaiva procedure immediately and scrupulously re-install the Viṣṇu with the Pāñcarātrikā ritual and worship it [with the same thereafter]. So one must take great care to avoid [this] contamination of the [Śaiva and Viṣṇava] systems of worship', 39.305–306: jātisamkaraṇenaiva jagac caṇḍālatām vrajet || tantrasaṃkaranenaiva rājaḥsuvardhanam vinasayati || rāṣṭraṁ sarīram rājās tu rājā jīvah sa ucyate || rāṣṭrakāneye ksaya rājāḥ rājāḥ rāsān ṛkṣyam dvayaṁ budhāḥ 'People become untouchables through the contamination of castes. Through the contamination of the systems of worship the king and kingdom are destroyed. [The scriptures] teach that the kingdom is the body and the king its soul. [So] when the kingdom is destroyed, so is the king. The wise, therefore, should guard both [by preventing the encroachment of the Śaivas into the Pāñcarātrikā domain]'. Śaiva ritual is called raudra- in the first of these passages
The involvement of the Śaivas of the Mantramārga in the temple cult covered in early Śaiva scriptural sources and all the early Paddhatis up to at least the twelfth century does not extend beyond the performing of the rituals necessary to initiate the cult by consecrating the images and the temples that house them. The texts are silent on the nature of the worship that would be performed before those images once the Śaiva Guru had completed his task. It would appear, therefore, that the temple worship was in the hands of officiants of a different kind. However, the texts lagged behind reality in this regard. For at some point, well before the Śaiva literature was prepared to register this fact, there were Śaivas of the Mantramārga working as the priests that performed the regular rituals in the Śaiva temples. The new practice is first attested in the Far South in the late seventh century. We learn from a grant of the Pallava Paramēśvaravarman I (r. c. 655–960) that a certain Ananta Śivacārya, whose name makes it very probable that he was an initiated Saiddhāntika officiant, was appointed as the priest with hereditary rights to perform the ritual of worship (devakarma) in the temple of Śiva Vidyāvinītapallavaparameśvara established with his name by the Pallava king Paramēśvaravarman I alias Vidyāvinīta.

The persistent disjunction during this period between what was prescribed for Śaivas and what was being done by some of them is due, I propose, to the fact that functioning as a priest in a temple, and therefore living off the endowment of the deity in return for one’s work, carried a loss of status with which the older tradition was unwilling to be associated. According to brahmanical sources any brahmin who persists in such work for three years is considered to

---

655 Saiddhāntika Śaiva initiated brahmins have initiation-names (dīkṣānāma) that end in -siva (with -sambhu or, less commonly, -iśvara/-iṣa or -śāṅkara as synonyms) as the second of their two components, and those of these who have consecrated to officiate by receiving the ācāryabhisekāḥ are referred to as N-sivacārya, a practice that has continued into modern times. Other Anantaśivacāryas are the author of the Siddhāntasārāvaliyākhyā, one of the Śivacāryas, probably 95 in all, among 108 12th-century labelled images at Dārurām in Tamilnādu (SRINIVASAN 1987, vol. 1:17, no. 60), and one mentioned in an inscription of 1571 at the Vaṭāranyēśvara temple at Tiruvālāndu (ARE 497 of 1906 [Appendix B: stone inscriptions copied in 1905]) as a disciple of Ponnambala Dharmaśivacārya and Guru of Immați Dharmaśivacārya.

656 The Kurum plates of Paramēśvaravarman I (r. c. 655–90): MAHALINGAM 1998:46, ll. 55–57 (Sanskrit) and ll. 84–88 (Tamil).
have lost his brahmin status and is then known as a Devalaka.\footnote{657} He is described as an upabrāhmaṇaḥ ‘a sub-brahmin’ or, even more disparagingly, as a brāhmaṇacāndalāḥ ‘a brahmin untouchable’;\footnote{658} and this loss of status is confirmed in modern times in the way that the Śmārtha brahmans, the dominant community in Tamilādu have viewed the Ādiśaiva community that provides the priests who after undergoing Saiddhāntika Śaiva initiation (dikṣā) and consecration as Ācāryas (ācāryabhisekāh) perform the worship in the Śiva temples of the region. They were forbidden to live in brahmin streets and the Śmārthas would not intermarry or interdine with them.\footnote{659} The Ādiśaivas, as one might expect, resisted this condemnation, arguing in their scriptural productions and in learned exegesis that it applies only to brahmans other than members of their endogamous community, more precisely that the three-year rule applies to Śaiva initiates other than themselves. Strengthening the brahmanical position they held that Śiva has ruled that ordinary, uninitiated brahmans who work as temple-priests will forfeit their status after only six months.\footnote{660} As modern practice

\footnote{657} Yāmuna, Āgamaśārā, pp. 15–16: tathā ca devaṁ “devakosopajāyī yah sa devaṁ ucyaṇe” iti | tathā “vṛtyartham pūjayed devaṁ trīṇi varṣāṇi yo dvijah | sa vai devaṁko nāma sarvakarmasu garhitah.” iti ‘And Devala (teaches): “One who lives off the wealth of a god is called a Devalaka”, and: “Any brahmin who does the worship of a god for his living for three years is called a Devalaka, and is condemned in all rites”. By ‘condemned in all rites’ the text means that such a brahmin must not be chosen as an officiant in any brahmanical ritual or invited as a participant in a Śrāddha.

\footnote{658} Atri cited in Āgamaśārā, p. 16: tathā ca viśadataram amisām evopabrāhmaṇyaṁ varṇayati atriḥ: “āhvāyakā devalakāḥ kalpadevalakā gaṇabhagodevalakā bhāgavataurtī iti caturthaḥ. etc upabrāhmaṇaḥ” iti ‘And Atri makes it absolutely clear that it is those that are sub-brahmins, when he says: “Couriers, Devalakas, Kalpadevalakas, Gaṇabhagodevalakas, and fourth, he who lives by being a Bhāgavata: these are sub-brahmins”; and Mahābhārata 12.77.8: āhvāyakā devalakā naksatragrāmaṇayājakah ete brāhmaṇacāndalāḥ mahāpathikapaṇcamāḥ ‘All the following are brahmin untouchables: couriers, temple-priests, those who perform worship to the asterisms, those who perform worship on behalf of a whole village, and, fifth, those who undertake long journeys’.

\footnote{659} See THURSTON 1909, p. 51, and FULLER 1984, pp. 49–71. The Dikshitars, the priests of Śiva at Cidambaram, rank above the Ādiśaivas, probably because they are the trustees of their temple; but they are still considered inferior to non-priestly brahmans; see FULLER 1984, p. 192, n. 3.

\footnote{660} Vedājñāna II, Ātmārtha-piṭaka A, p. 123 and B, p. 99, quoting the Viṣṇuṭantra and the Saṃtaṇatantra: viṣṇuṭantra “bhṛtyarthaṁ sarvadākālam ādīśāvaḥ śivam yajet | tac ca svadharminuśṭhānānaḥ na dosāya prakalpate || adikṣītaṁ caturvedi śiva-liṅgaṁ na sansprśet | dikṣītaṁ cāpi yo viśro bhṛtyarthaṁ tu na pūjayet || ātmārtha-piṭāṁ kuryat “pārthaṁ naiva (A: pārthaṁ caiva B) pūjayet” | samānāne “adikṣīto ‘pi yo viśraḥ śāṃsāmaḥ tu śivaṁ sṛṣṭeḥ | so ‘pi devalakah prakṣāh sa nārha deva-piṭāna | dikṣītaṁ cāpi yo viśro bhṛtyarthaṁ (em.: pratyaṛthaṁ A: bhṛtyaśced B) vatsaratra-yāt | pūjayet yadi deveśaṁ so ‘pi devalako bhaved” iti Viṣṇuṭantra: An Ādiśaiva may worship Śiva for a living permanently; and that, since it is his reli-
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reveals, this counterargument had no effect on the Smārtha majority; and, indeed, it is obvious that its real purpose was rather to defend their professional rights against encroachment by others, rights that they took care to write into their scriptures.\footnote{See, for example, the Kāmika cited here p. 274, the Vīra and Raurava cited in Brunner 1964, p. 468, n. 11, and the Yogaja, Cintya, Vīra, Saṃtāna, and other Āgamas cited by Vedajñānānaguru II in his Ātmārthapujāpaddhati A, pp. 121–123 and B, pp. 97–99.}

For, no doubt in consequence of the efflorescence of the Cālaka temple cult under the Cola emperors, we find a new wave of Śaiva scriptures appearing in the South, in which the ceremonial life of the temple and the duties and rights of its priests are regulated, and, indeed, form their principal subject matter. Citations from the majority of the scriptural texts of this kind do not appear before the works of Vedajñānānaguru II, composed during the second half

---

*gious duty, cannot be sinful* [for him]. An uninitiated [brahmin], [even if he is one] who knows [all] four Vedas, may not [even] touch the Līṅga of Śiva; and even a brahmin who has been initiated may not worship [it] for a living [unless he is an Ādiśaiva]. He should worship [Śiva] for his own benefit [as a private individual]. He may not also worship him for the benefit of others [as a priest in the temple].

**Saṃtāna:** If an uninitiated brahmin has physical contact with a Śiva [installed in a fixed Līṅga in a temple] for six months he is called a Devalaka and is disqualified from offering worship to [any] deity [thereafter]. Even an initiated brahmin becomes a Devalaka if he [is not an Ādiśaiva but] worships Śiva for a living, once three years [of his doing so] have passed; and Kachchapesvarasāvivācārya, Kriyākramadhyotikācyākhyā, p. 80, ll. 4–7, quoting the Vīratstraṇa: *adikṣiṣṭa caturvedī na sprśen nāpi cārcayaḥ | bhṛtyarthaḥ paramesānāṁ dīkṣāvirahita janaḥ | *śaṃmāśad yāṁti (em. : āśaṃmāśāvyānti Cod.) pātiyaṁ te ca devalakāḥ smṛtāḥ | trīṇi varṣāṇi bhṛtyarthaḥ sthiraliṅge *hi dīkṣitaḥ (em. : hy adikṣitah Cod.) | pūjayed yadi *vīpras (corr. : vīpras Cod.) tu sa vai devalako bhaved iti ‘An uninitiated [brahmin], [even if he is one] who knows [all] four Vedas, may not touch and worship Śiva for a living. The uninitiated fall from their caste after six months [if they do so]. It is they that are known as Devalakas. If an initiated brahmin [who is not an Ādiśaiva] performs the worship [of Śiva] in a fixed Līṅga for a living for three years, [that is to say, as a priest serving in a temple,] then he [too] will become a Devalaka’. In the older, north-Indian literature the Prāyasēttatapaṭalā of the Dvādaśasāhasra Suacchanda, quoted by Hrdayaśiva in his Prāyasēttasamuccaya, f. 92v3–4, defines Devalakas when considering the matter of contamination by them, as those who as priests (bhōjakāḥ) live off the Moon-god, Brahmā, the Sun-god, Śiva, the Goddess, or the Mothers: *somabrahmaraviskandaṃviṣṇuvevyāś ca mātaraḥ | upajīvantī ye devi pūjayitvā tu bhōjakāḥ | te vai devalakāḥ teśām prāyaścittam vādamy āham. *The omission of Śiva from this list implies that it is only the priests of other gods that fall from caste. Likewise, defending the Pāncarātrikā priests of Viṣṇu’s temples against the same consequence, Yāmuna argued, citing Vyāsa, that it is only those who earn their live off Rudra (i.e. Śiva) and Kāli by serving as their priests that become Devalakas (bhaved devalako yo vai rudrakālyupajīvakāḥ): Viṣṇu temple-priests do not become Devalakas, because they have been consecrated for their work by initiation. See Yāmuna, Āgama-prāmāṇya, pp. 15–17 (the accusation), and pp. 156–157 (the rebuttal).
of the sixteenth century.\textsuperscript{662} But some others are already being cited in the thirteenth, and one in the twelfth.\textsuperscript{663}

Here too, of course, the royal connection is maintained and carefully nurtured. Thus the ceremonial repertoire of these temples included special rituals for the king’s protection (rājarakṣā);\textsuperscript{664} and temple festivals (utsavaḥ) were often timed to coincide with the day of his natal asterism or of that of a member of his family.\textsuperscript{665} Indeed the texts place a great emphasis on the connection between the temple and the welfare of the ruler and his kingdom, warning repeatedly that while the proper maintenance of the temple and its ceremonies will benefit both, deviations or neglect will have dire consequences for them. This duty to maintain the status quo naturally included that of recognizing the exclusive hereditary rights of the members of this priestly community.\textsuperscript{666}

The Ādiśaivas are the only endogamous community of Saiddhāntika Šaiva temple-priests for which we have evidence and they seem not to have operated beyond south India. But it seems likely that there were parallel developments in other parts of the subcontinent, evidence of which has been lost or not yet come

\textsuperscript{662} These scriptures that first appear in the works of Vedajñanaguru are the Aṃśumat, the Ajita, the Kāśmiratrantra, the Cintyaviśva/Cintyaviśvasādākhya, the Dīpta, the Devikālottara, the Bhīma, the Makuṭa, the Mukhabimba, the Yogaja, the Raurava, the Vijaya (Vijayottara), the Vīḍeśana, the Vīra, the Saṃtiṇa, the Sahasra, the Siddha, the Sūkṣma, and the Skandakālottara. The works of Vedajñanaguru in which they are cited are the Atmārthaṉuṉuṕuṭaṉuṕadhaṭṭi, Dīkṣāṭāśva, and Śaivāgama-paribhāṣāśaṁajari. For his date see Dagens 1979, pp. 6–7.

\textsuperscript{663} The extant Kāmika is perhaps the first work of this kind to be cited in a dateable work. Substantial passages found in it are quoted without attribution in the Jñānaratnaṉulī of Jñāṇaśiva, a teacher of Trilocana śiva and therefore a near contemporary of Aghoraśiva, who completed his Kriyākramadyotikā in 1157. The next earliest known work in which there are citations from such scriptures is the Śivapūṇaśṭavaṉyākhya composed by a nameless author in the thirteenth century, probably in its second half. This date follows from the fact that he identifies himself as the great-great-grandson of the same Trilocanaśiva. He cites the Kāraṇa, the Acintya, the Suprabheda, the south-Indian Pauśkara, and the Vātulaśuddhākhya. I derive this information concerning the citations in the Śivapūṇaśṭavaṉyākhya and Jñāṇaśiva’s unattributed citations of the Kāmika from a lecture given by Dr. Dominic Goodall in the Early Tantra Workshop held in Kathmandu in September 2008. For the relationships between Aghoraśiva, Jñāṇaśiva, and Trilocanaśiva see Goodall 2000 and for confirmation of the date of Aghoraśiva’s Kriyākramadyotikā see Goodall 1998, pp. xiii–xvii, fn. 24. No Sanskrit Saiddhāntika works have yet been identified which can be dated within the period of three centuries between the author of the Śivapūṇaśṭavaṉyākhya and Vedajñanaguru II.

\textsuperscript{664} Chapters devoted to this protective temple ritual for the king are found in such south-Indian Śaiva texts as the Sūkṣmaṉa (pp. 290–297: rājarakṣāvidhiḥ), and the Dīptāṉa (pp. 211–215: rājarakṣāvidhipaṭalalal).

\textsuperscript{665} See Davis and Orr 2007, p. 91, for epigraphical evidence of such arrangements.

\textsuperscript{666} See, for example, the passage of the Kāmika cited above, p. 274.
The early Śaiva Pratiṣṭhātantras show that the authority of the Śaiva Sthāpaka was to extend to the creation of the palaces of their kings. Among the early Pratiṣṭhātantras the Mayasaṃgraha, Mohacūḍottara, and Pingalāmata,
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667 Against the view that the Ādiśaiva caste is peculiar to Tamil Nadu one might cite the fact that the Ādiśaivas are mentioned the Somaśambhupaddhati, a work composed in the eleventh century far to the north (at the end of the Paviṭrārohanavidhi): paṇcayojanasamsthete 'pi paviṭraṃ gurusamṇidhau kurviṭa vidhinānena labhate vāṃchitaṃ phalam | sarvaṃ vai tv ādiśaivānāṃ dikṣitānām śivoditam | paropakāraśīlēṇa śrīmatā somaśambhunā | kriyākāṇḍakramāvalyāṃ pavitrakavidhiḥ kṛtaḥ. However, the line is not in the edition based on Kashmirian manuscripts (see Karmakāṇḍakramāvalī vv. 494c–496b: paṇcayojanasamsthete 'pi paviṭraṃ gurusamṇidhau || kurviṭa vidhinānena labhate vāṃchitaṃ phalam | adhiśivasāśtreṇa kṛto 'yaṃ somaśambhunā || kriyākāṇḍakramāvalyāṃ pavitrakavidhiḥ śphutah) nor in the Nepalese transmission (see Kriyākāṇḍa-avalī f. 22v4–5: paṇcayojanasamstheto 'pi paviṭraṃ gurusamṇidhau || kurviṭa vidhinānena labhate vāṃchitaṃ phalam | paropakāraśīlēṇa śrīmatā somaśambhunā | kriyākāṇḍakramāvalyāṃ pavitrakavidhiḥ kṛtaḥ). It is found only in BRUNNER’s edition and the Devakoṭṭai edition, which her edition reproduces here. It rests, therefore, exclusively on the evidence of Grantha manuscripts from the south. Evidently, then, one must suspect that the line has been interpolated in Tamil Nadu by a redactor in the Ādiśaiva community. Its lack of intelligible connection with what precedes and follows strengthens this suspicion.

I have not seen the term Ādiśaiva in any inscription. There the officiants of the Śiva temples are always termed śivabrāhmaṇāḥ or śiṇadvijāḥ. That term first occurs to my knowledge c. A.D. 863 in an inscription of Pallava Nandivarman III, from Tiruvallam in North Arcot (MAHALINGAM 1988:132). Concerning a grant to the temple of Paramesvara at Tikkālivallam it specifies that 500 kādī of paddy are for the Śivabrāhmaṇās who offer worship and services in the sanctum (aṛṭādi[tt]-upāśarikām śiṇa[brāhmaṇar]kkum) (ll. 25–26). Thereafter the term is commonplace. But it is clear that it is the group known as the Ādiśaivas that is intended, because in these inscriptions when Śivabrāhmaṇās are named their Gotras are sometimes given and these are those of both the Ādiśaivas as attested both by their prescriptive texts and among their modern descendants, namely Kauśika, Kāśyapa, Bhāradvāja, Gautama, Ātreya, Āgastya, and Parāśara. See, e.g., SII 3:41 (Kāśyapa), 55 (Kauśika), 58 (Kauśika), 209 (Kauśika, Kāśyapa, Kauśika); SII 12:197 (Āgastya); SII 17:152 (Bhāradvāja), 157 (Bhāradvāja), 160 and 161 (Gautama), 162 and 163 (Bhāradvāja), 165 (Gautama, Parāśara), 203 (Ātreya, Bhāradvāja), and 730 (Kāśyapa); EC 3, Sr:44 (Gautama); EC 10, Kl:106a (Kauśika), 106d (Gautama), 107 (Kauśika), 187 (Kauśika, Kāśyapa); EC 10, Bp:29, 32, 35a, and 37a (all Gautama, Bhāradvāja). Six of the seven, minus Āgastya, are listed in the Saṃtāna as cited in the Ātmārthapūjāpaddhati A, p. 125. Five of them, lacking Ātreya and Parāśara, are listed in Śvayambhuva, p. 14 (Ācāryalakṣaṇapaṇṭala 94c–95b). This evidence accords with contemporary testimony. According to the data collected by FULLER (1984, p. 28) the Ādiśaiva priests of the Minākṣisundaresvara temple in Madurai belong to the Kāśyapa, Kauśika, Bhāradvāja, Gautama, and Ātreya Gotras.
all prescribe the layout of the royal palace in detail, the latter two distinguishing between different classes, the highest being that of a paramount sovereign or Mahārājādhirāja;\textsuperscript{668} and in the first two works the design prescribed includes a section of the palace reserved for teachers of the Śaiva Mantramārga (mantriṇah, mantramārgopadesinah).\textsuperscript{669} But the layout of the palace taught in these Pratiṣṭhātanaṇtras is only part of the layout for an urban settlement to be established by the king around the palace, complete with markets and segregated areas for the dwellings of the various castes and artisans, with instructions for the size and plan of these dwellings determined by caste status.\textsuperscript{670} The founding of such royal towns is not explicitly enjoined in the Śaivas’ ritual manuals. That is to say that no ritual of nagarapratiṣṭhā was envisaged. The Sthāpaka was engaged, it seems, only for the choice and consecration of the site (vāstupūjā) and his instructions followed for the layout of the buildings to be constructed upon it. Nonetheless, we see the Śaivas involving themselves in one aspect of the third of the elements of medieval process that I have listed, namely the creation of new urban settlements from above. The epigraphical record and Kalhana’s history of Kashmir demonstrate that any king of substance felt it encumbent on him to demonstrate his sovereignty not only by the building of temples but also by the creation of new urban settlements (puram), which, like the deities he established, were generally named after him.\textsuperscript{671}

One of the early Pratiṣṭhātanaṇtras, the Devyāmata, devotes its 66th chapter

---

\textsuperscript{668} The layout of the royal palace is prescribed in Mayasamgraha ff. 33v–34r (5.188–199), Mohacūdottara ff. 20v–22r (4.245c–281), and Piṅgalāmata ff. 74r–75v (10.126–180).

\textsuperscript{669} Mayasamgraha ff. 33v–34r (5.191–193b): \textit{vitathe mantriṇām dhāma sarvāśrāṇi ghrakṣate | antahpuram yamapade gandharve gāṛṣamsrayam || bhṛṇge senāpīṭhānam margaṇābhāyādikāṁ mṛge | paitre saucagṛham cātra tāmbulādivyapāśrayam || avarodhadhūṣṭhānam sugrīve tu tato nyaset;} Mohacīdottara 4.257c–258b: \textit{vitathe mantriṇām sthānam mantramārgopadesinām || śastram antahpuram gāṛ kastūri saucaveśma ca | tāmbulāsamgrahah strīṇām *pālakān (em.: pācakān Cod.) strīniyāmakān.}

\textsuperscript{670} Mayasamgraha ff. 34v–35r (5.209–216); Mohacīdottara f. 21v1–6 (4.270–275b); Piṅgalāmata ff. 75v–76r (10.181–194).

\textsuperscript{671} This practice was followed both throughout the subcontinent and in Southeast Asia, as the following examples demonstrate: in Kashmir Pravarasena II’s Pravarapura (Srīnagar), Durlabhaka-Pratāpādiya II’s Pratāpapura, Jayāpiḍa’s Jayapura, Lalitādiya’s Lalitapura, Avantivarman’s Avantipura, Śankaravarman’s Śankarapura, and Diddā’s Diddapura, in eastern India Rāmāvati (Rāmauti) (of Rāmapāla), Vijayapura of Vijayasena, and Laksmanāvati (Lakhnauti) (of Lakhṣaṇasena), in the south Gangaikondacolapura, Parakesaripura, Parantakapura, Rājakesari-pura, Rājarājapura, Rājādyapura, Rājāsrayapura, Rājendrapapura, and, among the Khmers Īsānapura, Bhavapura, Yasodharapura, Rājendrapura, and Jayendranagarī.
to the layout to be followed not only in new towns but also in new villages, with an emphasis on the positioning of the various deities within the plan and the directions in which they should face. The regulations imposed show us Šaiva officials on a purely civic level. There is nothing specifically Šaiva in the layout. The Devasmata’s chapter on iconography shows further evidence of the involvement of the Šaivas in both urban and rural planning. Differentiating various forms of Śiva in accordance with mood and number of arms it tells the Sthāpaka which are appropriate where.672 The same concern can be seen in the Pratiṣṭhā sections of the South-Indian Yāmalatantra texts with regard to the positioning and iconography of the images of Bṛhadraķāli whose installation and cult are their concern.673

ŚAIVISM AND IRRIGATION

The creation of new settlements and the concomitant extension of agriculture required the provision of the means of irrigation. Rituals for the consecration (pratiṣṭhā) of wells (kūpaḥ), step-wells (vāpi), and reservoirs (puṣkariṇī, taḍāgaḥ) were already provided by the brahmanical tradition. A Vaiḍik procedure of the Gṛhya type is outlined or touched upon in a number of sources,674 a more elaborate, Paurāṇika form of the ritual, taking five days and requiring twenty-four priests in addition to the Sthāpaka, is set out in the Matṣya-purāṇa (58.4–56),675 and the currency of this form is evident from the fact that it became the basis of further elaboration.676 There is no trace of irriga-

672 Devayāmata f.68r4: dvibhujo rājadhānyāṁ tu pattane tu caturbhujāḥ | tathā cāṣṭa
bhujō bhadre prāsastāḥ pattane sthitāḥ.
673 Thus in Brahmayāmala IFP 40.1–4b: ataḥ param pravaksyāmi pratimālakṣaṇanam param | navatālapramāṇaṇa pratīmām kārayed budhaḥ || 2 sīlaśmayām lohamayaṃ mṛṇmayaṃ vāpi kārayet | grāme cāṣṭabhujām vidyāṃ nagare ca caturbhujam || 3 vanāntare dvibhujaṃ vidyāt parvatāgre tu śoḍaśa | samudre dvādāsaṃ kuryāt 
*sandandya (?) ...sadbhujam || 4 taṭāke dasabhujāṃ kuryāt catuspathe caturbhujām; and Brahmayāmala Triv.3.3–8: grāme ca nagare caiva pattane rājadhāni ke | rakṣārthaṃ vāṣṭavasthānam pure vai khetakādiṣu || 4 sarvasādhhāraṇaṃ vidyād 
yathāvibhavavistaram | bahiḥ prakārataḥ kuryān mātrśhānaṃ tu vāṣṭavam || 5 śreṣṭhaṃ pūrvottare bhāge śatadaṇḍānta’nantare | tadardhe vātha tasyārdhe 
āsadaṇḍāntare ‘pi vā || 6 some svād vāṣṭavam brahamān mātrṇāṃ iha coditam | pūrve vā pāścime vāpi sthānam asya pṛāṣasyate || 7 yo me pūrvottare 
vāpi nāgaragraṃasobhitam | daksīṇe keṭakasyoṣkam anyeṣaṃ pāric pāścime || 8 āgneyanairṛtaś caiva trītyaṃ vāyugocaram | + + jñittham prāṣamsantī yāmale śivabhāṣite. On these south-Indian Yāmala texts, the cult they teach, and their non-brahmin priests see SANDERSON 2007b, pp. 277–278 with footnotes 140–143.
674 See EINOO 2002 for the details of these sources.
675 A procedure of the Paurāṇika type is also taught in Āśvalayāniyagrhyaparīśīta 4.9 and Hiranyakesīgrhyāṣeṣasūtra 1.7.1. (EINOO 2002, pp. 713–714).
676 We find procedures based on the prescriptions of the Mātsyapuruṣa in the rit-
tion rituals in the early Śaiva scriptures, including the Pratiṣṭhātantras. But in due course Śaiva officiants, seeking to add this important domain to their ritual repertoire, produced their own version. It first surfaces in our surviving evidence towards the end of the eleventh century, in the Paddhati of Somaśambhu, and from that source entered both later Paddhatis such as the Siddhāntasekhara and the Ātmārthapūjāpaddhati and the second wave of Śaiva scriptural literature produced in southern India. In spite of the Śaivized character of these new rituals the underlying model is still recognizably that of the brahmanical tradition. The Śaiva elements are little more than a veneer on what it essentially a brahmanical procedure, marked by such distinctive features as the erecting of a Nāga pole (nāgayāstih) at the centre of the excavation, the casting of metal images of aquatic creatures into the water, the crossing of the excavation by a cow followed by the patron of the rite, the making of offerings to Varuṇa, and the giving of the cow to the officiant. Nor is there any attempt to attribute to

---

677 See Somaśambhupaddhati, BRUNNER 1998, pp. 392–403 and pp. 406–411. The first passage sets out the ritual for the consecration of a puṣkariṇī, but adds at its end that it applies also for the consecration of a vāpi or tātākah. The second passage gives the ritual for the consecration of a kūpah. A kūpah is a simple well, whereas a vāpi is a step-well, a well with a flight of steps leading down to it on one of more sides (kūpo dvārako gar vitaśeṣah badhhasopānako 'yam vāpiti dvaitaniṁravyah: Raghnundana cited in KANE 2ii, p. 893). Such step-wells survive from the early medieval period, notably in Gujarat. The most splendid is no doubt the Rāṇī ki Vāv at Patan (Anahillapatattana), the old Caulukya capital. Both a puṣkariṇī and a tātākah (itadāgah) are water reservoirs. The difference appears to be one of scale alone, the latter being larger than the former. KANE (loc. cit.) reports the view expressed by Raghnundana in his Jalāsayotsargatattva that a puṣkariṇī is from 100 to 200 cubits in length, and a tādāgah is from 200 to 800, and the view of the Vasiṣṭhasamhitā as quoted by Raghunandana that a puṣkariṇī is up to 400 cubits in length and a tādāgah up to 2000.

678 See Siddhāntasekhara of Viśvanātha (13th century, Benares), pp. 565–568 (11.1–28b); Ātmārthapūjāpaddhati of Vedajñānaguru II (16th century, Cidambaram), A, pp. 621–629, citing from the scripture Cintyavisvāsādākhyā a passage obviously incorporated from the Somasambhupaddhati (see BRUNNER 1998, p. 392, fn. 1); ‘Kriyākramadyotikā’ MS transcript, pp. 344–346 (Kūpapratiṣṭhā); Virāgama, Patala 92. The section of the Somasambhupaddhati on the consecration of reservoirs is also included in the Kashmirian Vāpyādipratiṣṭhā (ff. 907v10–908r9).

679 See Somasambhupaddhati, BRUNNER 1998, pp. 397–403 (vv. 8–19). Śaiva elements: the officiant recites the Pāṣupatāstra Mantra as the patron crosses with the cow, makes oblations with the Aghora Mantra, instead of making an offering to the Vedic god Varuṇa may to do so to the Śaiva Vāmadeva, and after preparing a
the ceremony any specifically Śaiva purpose or meaning. A work of public utility (pūrtam) after all is just that.

That Śaiva officiants were engaged to perform the consecration of irrigation works undertaken by their royal patrons seems very likely. No inscription known to me records any such ritual, but then no inscription to my knowledge conveys information about any religious ceremonies that accompanied the inauguration of reservoirs and other such works. It is even more probable that the Śaiva version of the ritual would have been performed when Śaiva Gurus undertook such constructions in their own right. We have seen above that inscriptions record the creation of reservoirs by Vimalaśīva, Mūrtiśīva, Prabodhaśīva, Pañgaśīva, and Tribhuvanakartaradeva.

ŚAIVISM AND SOCIAL INTEGRATION

The fifth and last respect in which Śaivism can be seen to have played an active role is that of the assimilation of the communities that were caught up in the extension of the reach of the state that characterizes this period. For the Saiddhāntikas opened initiation to candidates from all four caste-classes, including the Śūdras or at least the Sačchūdras or ‘Pure Śūdras’, those, that is, who had already succumbed to the values of brahmanical society to the extent that they had abjured alcohol, a move that both promoted the penetration of these

porridge (caruh) with the Mantra of either makes the full oblation with the porridge using the Mantra of Śiva.

680 Vaktraśambhu, Mrgendrapaddhativyākhyā, p.188: śrīmatpauskare ‘pi: brāhmaṇāḥ ksatriyāḥ vaiśyāḥ śūdṛāḥ caiva striyās tathā | *jadāndhabadhirā (em.: jalānāndhatrako Cod.) mūkā dīkṣyāḥ *śaktipracoditaḥ (śakti em.: saktṭha Cod.) ‘And in the Pauskara-pārāmesvara: Brahmins, Kṣatriyas, Vaiśyas, Śūdras, women, imbeciles, the blind, the deaf, and the dumb: all should be initiated if they have been inspired by [Śiva’s] power’; and Raurava quoted by Bhaṭṭa Rāmakaṇṭha on Mataṅga-pārāmesvara, Kriyāpāda 5.93 in support of the view that candidates for initiation should be brought before the Mandala in the order of their castes: yad uktam śrīmadauravādau: brāhmaṇān ksatriyān vaiśyān śūdṛāṁ caiva striyās tathā ‘As has been taught in such scriptures as the Raurava: brahmins, Kṣatriyas, Vaiśyas, Śūdras, and women’.

681 Parākhyā cited by Trilocanaśīva in Prāyaścitāsamuccaya, p.141: yad uktam śrīmatparākhya: kāraṇāḥ dīkṣāpisarvāsma *tacchaktividhiyoginām (tacchakti corrs.: tacchaktir Cod.) | *vānānaṃ na tu śūdṛāntyajātisu | amadyāpās tu ye śūdṛāḥ saivaçarākriyādorāḥ (corrs.: adirāḥ Cod.) | śivabhaktās *ca (corrs.: cai Cod.) teṣāṃ sā dīkṣā *kāraṇyathā na hiti (em.: kāraṇyathānuhiti Cod.) ‘As has been taught in the Parākhyā: ‘Initiation should be done for all who have received the action of [the descent of] his power, for all three caste-classes but not for [ordinary] Śūdras and the lowest-born [below them]. One may initiate Śūdras, but only those who do not drink alcoholic liquor, who revere the disciplines and rites taught by Śiva, and are devoted to Śiva themselves’.
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values and enabled the integration of the landowning agriculturalists, classed as Sacchūdras, that were dominant in the countryside both within and beyond the core territories of these expanding states. It thus provided a means of articulating a social unity that transcended the rigid exclusions of the brahmanical social order. Nor did it allow non-brahmins only to be initiated. More crucially it sanctioned their appointment as Ācāryas, restricting this licence only by requiring that persons could officiate for persons of none but their own or inferior caste-classes. Thus a brahmin could teach, initiate, and perform ceremonies of installation only for brahmins, Kṣatriyas, Vaiśyas and Śūdras, a Kṣatriya only for Kṣatriyas, Vaiśyas and Śūdras, a Vaiśya only for Vaiśyas and Śūdras, and a Śūdra only for others of his caste-class. The key groups here appear to have been the first and the last. For there is little evidence of the presence of Vaiśya traders in Śaivism, and though, as we have seen, Kṣatriya rulers were commonly Śaiva initiates, their social status and function were obviously incompatible with pontifical office. The core social structure here is one of brahmin Gurus initiating other brahmins, Kṣatriyas rulers, and perhaps on occasion members of lower castes, and of Śūdra Gurus initiating both other Śūdras and the powerful in their communities, who though Kṣatriya-like in their local authority were nonetheless formally of the same caste-class as their initiators. The Śastraic formulation

\[682\] Kirāna f. [60]v2–3 (38.4–5): caturṇām api varnānām (em. : caturvarṇāpivarṇānāman Cod.) ācāryatam ihoditam | brāhmaṇādicaṭuṭkasya dvijo 'nugrahakṛd bhavet | kṣatriyāditriṣaṃ yac ca *kṣatriya *dīkṣita (corr. : dīkṣita Cod.) guruh | vaiśyādīveditayam vaiśyāḥ śūdrāḥ śūdrān tu dīkṣayet. In this [system] the office of Ācārya has been taught for all four caste-classes. A brahmin may initiate persons of the four beginning with his, an initiated Kṣatriya Guru the three beginning with his, and a Vaiśya the two beginning with his. A Śūdra may initiate [only] Śūdras'.

\[683\] Parākhyā quoted in Dīkṣādāraśa A, p. 26; B, p. 42: *amadyapāḥ (em. : amadyapa A : amādyapa B) *kūlināś (corr. : kūlināś A : kūlināṭ B) ca nityadharma*parāyaṇāḥ (em. : parāyaṇāḥ AB) | *śūdrāḥ (em. : śūdra AB) kṣatriyavaj jñeyāś śesa nindyā<ś>| tato bhrāṃ 'Those Śūdras who do not drink alcohol, who are of good family, and devoted to the obligatory religious duties should be looked upon as Kṣatriyas. All the rest are completely to be condemned'. Cf. Pārameśvara f. 3v2–3: *amadyapās (em. : amedhyapās Cod.) tu ye śūdrāḥ> sau[cā]cārāsamanvitāḥ | rudrabhaktās tu tesāṁ tu bhojyam annam prakṛtītām ‘One is permitted to accept food from those Śūdras who do not drink alcohol, who observe the rules of purity, and are devotees of Śiva’; Trilocanaśiva, Somaśambhupaddhatiśākhyāḥ, p. 84: tad uktam brahmaṃbhāśabhbhāphatatau “brahmaṃksatryāviśāṃ bhikṣām *abhāṣāṣṭādvarjītām (em. : abhiṣāṣṭādvarjītām Cod.) | amadyapās tu ye śūdrāḥ sau[cā]cārāsamanvitāḥ | tesāṁ eva cared bhikṣā nānayeśām tu kadācana” iti “That has been taught in the Paddhati of Brahmasambhu in the following: ‘One may gather alms only from brahmins, Kṣatriyas, and Vaiśyas, provided it is not from someone who been condemned [for some sin] or [permanently excluded from his caste], and also from such Śūdras as do not drink alcohol and observe the rules of purity. One may never accept alms from others’.”
of the full set of possibilities, in which members of any caste-class are said to be able to initiate only their equals and inferiors, serves, I suggest, not as a record that all these possibilities were enacted but rather as an abstraction that adds authority to the more restricted common practice by presenting it as following a universally valid principle upheld in the brahmanical social system, seen, for example in the rule that a man may marry a woman born of parents of his own caste or one below it but never a woman from a community ranked above him. Indeed Saidhāntika texts that discuss who may receive initiation and consecration and who may not include the offspring of such forbidden marriages in the latter category.

Evidence of the existence of such self-contained Śūdra Saidhāntika lineages is abundant in the Tamil country at the end of our period and after it down to modern times. There members of the Sacchūdra Veḷḷāla community such as Meykanṭār, and Naṇacakampanatar played a significant part in the development of the canon of the Tamil Śaiva Siddhānta, and a good number of powerful Maṭhas emerged, such as those at Tarumapuram (Dharmapuram) and Tiruvāduturai, in which the presiding ascetics were and have continued to be members of this upwardly mobile Sacchūdra caste.

684 See, e.g., Yājñavalkyasmrī, Ācārādhyāya 57, 91–95.
685 Dīkṣādarśa A, p. 23; B, p. 25: atrādhikāri*tvanirūpaṇavidhir (corr. : nirūpaṇatvavidhir Codd.) ucye | nirūpaṇatvavidhir | tathā cintyaviśīve “vīprādiśu caturṣv evam anulomādiśu śatsu ca | etesām dasajātīnām ācāryatvam vidhiyete” | tathā kāmike “catvāro brāhmaṇādyāś ca anulomāś ca ye matāḥ” ‘I shall [now] explain how one determines who is competent for this [office]. Ten, beginning with the brahmin, can be Gurus. Thus in the Cintyaviśā: “It is ruled that these ten castes may be Ācāryas: the four beginning with brahmin, and the six Anulomas”. And in the Kāmika: “The four beginning with the brahmin and the [six] Anulomas”. The term Anuloma here is a synonym of anulomajāh ‘born of a union that is in the natural direction’, that is to say, hypergamous. The six Anulomas are (1) from a brahmin man and Kṣatriya woman (Mūrdhāvasikta), (2) from a brahmin man and Vaiśya woman (Ambāṣṭha), (3) from a brahmin man and Śūdra woman (Pārāśava); (4) from a Kṣatriya man and a Vaiśya woman (Māhiṣya/Madgu), (5) from a Kṣatriya man and a Śūdra woman (Ugra), and (6) from a Vaiśya man and a Śūdra woman (Karaṇa). See, e.g., Yājñavalkyasmrī, Ācārādhyāya 91–92. The -ādi-in anulomādiśu śatsu ca in the passage cited from the Cintyaviśā is redundant and may be corrupt (perhaps for anulomātmasu).
686 ARE 1909, p. 105; STEIN 1994, pp. 235–241; GHOSE 1996, pp. 222, 253–282. STEIN hypothesizes (1994, pp. 237–239) that this rise of the Veḷḷālas was the cause of the fact that from the thirteenth century onwards independent shrines of the Goddess (kāmakoṣṭham) began to be built in the Tamil area alongside those of Śiva and to be enclosed with the latter in a single architectural complex. He takes this to be evidence of “the assimilation of folk conceptions of deity”. See also GHOSE 1996, pp. 221–222. There is certainly widespread evidence of Śāktization in the later south-Indian Śaiva literature. In the south-Indian Saidhāntika scriptures Raurava, Cintya, Makuṭa, and Sūkṣma all the male deities in the circuits surrounding
It might be suspected that this is an isolated development peculiar to the Far South; and I must say that I am not yet aware of historical evidence of parallel developments elsewhere in India at this time or before it. However, it is extremely improbable that we would have found unambiguous statements in early texts that are very unlikely to have emanated from that region to the effect that Śudras may receive consecration as Ācāryas, initiate others of their caste and pass on their office within it, if this was not indeed a widespread practice. This is all the more certain in the light of the fact that the same early corpus provides specific instructions on how such initiates should be named, how they should dress their hair, mark themselves with ash, and the like.

Śiva in temple worship, from the first of the Brahmas to the last of the Weapons have been provided with a personal Śakti; see Raurava, Kriyāpāda, Paṭala 59, and N.R. Bhatt's introduction to his edition of the Śārdhatriśatikālottara, pp. xviii–xix (Cintya and Makuta) and pp. lxviii–lxix (Cintya, Makuta, and Śūkṣma). There is striking evidence of a related development in the Tamil Śaiva literature in the Tirumantiram of Tirumālar. That text has been assigned to the fifth, sixth, and seventh centuries. But it weaves together the Tamil Śaiva Siddhānta, the Vedānta, a Śaṅkta tradition that features kundaliniyogah and the cult of Tripurā, and the cult of Naṭarāja. This is a combination which is unlikely to predate the twelfth century (see also Goodall 2004, pp. xxix–xxx). In Sanskrit the same amalgam appears in such works as the scripture Jñānasiddhyāgama and the Siddhāntapaddhati of a Jñānaśīva.

Śaiva Age

The Śaiva Age

A brahmin's bath with ashes should be from foot to head. A Kṣatriya's has been taught to be from the navel up and with reddish ash. A Vaiśya may have only a broad band [of ash] on his forehead. A Śūdra may make the Tripundra marks with ash on the various prescribed points on the body in the [prescribed] order. In each the bath should be done] with ash empowered by the [five] Brahma[mantras]. A brahmin's braids should be narrow and [of the round variety,] called 'thorn apples' (kanakāh). A Kṣatriya's should be twice as thick *. . . (?). A Vaiśya should have only one braid, on the crown of his head. It should be short, smooth, with a Rudrākṣa bead attached. The same applies to a Śūdra ascetic, *O you of controlled senses (?) The sacred thread should always have five strands for a brahmin, three for a Kṣatriya, two for a Vaiśya, and one for an observant Śūdra. The last, however, may wear it only when doing Pūjā, making offerings into the sacrificial fire, and during the periods of the junctures of the day; Kirāna f. [60]r3–4 (37.10, 12–13): upavītam *bhaved (corr. : bhaved Cod.) evam kṣatriyādītrayasya tu | trisaram dvisaram vāpi kārya ekasaram kramat || 12 pūjātmanmātrakaṃ kālaṃ nordhvāṃ

---

687 [The reference to Sarvatānottara is not provided in the text.]

[The footnotes and references are not transcribed here.]
As for those below the Pure Śūdras, that is to say, members of Śudra castes not considered pure and, below even them, members of the various more or less untouchable communities defined as the lowest-born (antyajāh), these too were drawn by the Saiddhāntikas within the reach of the religion. Texts of this tradition declare that a Guru is forbidden to give them initiation in the full sacrificial form (hautri dīkṣā). But if he sees that they are inspired by sincere devotion to Śiva he is required to perform for them a simplified form of initiation that avoids direct contact. This is to be accomplished mentally (mānasī dīkṣā) or in the form of a gaze believed to transmit Śiva’s liberating power (cākṣuṣi dīkṣā), or by allowing them to drink the water with which his feet have been washed, an extension of the common devotional practice of drinking the water that gathers at the foot of an image in the course of its worship.

688 Kīrana f. [60]v3–4 (38.6c–7): yathāsthitena bhāvena *mantrāḥ (em.: mantra Cod.)
kuvanty anugraham || yatas tato *ntyajasyāyāpi (conj.: ntyajasyāyāsyā Cod.)
dīkṣā *kim tv atra (em.: kintatra Cod.) mānasī | kārukānām tu saṃsārā<
*na tu hautrīm (em.: nughrautri Cod.) prakalpayet ‘Since Mantras grant initiation in consideration [only] of the state of [a person’s] mentality he may give initiation even to an untouchable. But [the initiation] in this case [must be only] through the medium of the mind. It the case of workmen [it should be] by touching them. He must not do the initiation involving fire-sacrifice [for either]’; Kāmika quoted in the Dīkṣādarśa A, p. 27 and B, p. 43: antyajānām na hauri syāt kim tu dīkṣā tu cākṣuṣi ‘Untouchables may not receive initiation through fire-sacrifice. But they can receive ocular initiation’; Vāyasyasamhitā quoted in the Dīkṣādarśa A, p. 26 and B, p. 41: asacchudrantyajātīnām patitānām viśeṣataḥ | tathā saṃkara jātīnām nādhvauṣuddhir vidhiyate | te ’py akrtrimabhāvās cec chive paramakāraṇe | pādodakapradānādyrth kuryāt *pāsviṣodhanam (A : pāduvīṣodhanam B) | atranulomajāṭa ye *yuktā ye (em.: yuktye AB) *vā (A : va B) dvijāṭisau | teṣām adhvaṣuddhyādi *kāryam atra (em.: kāryamātra AB) *kuloctam (A : kulojītam B) The elimination of the paths [of the universe through oblations in the sacrificial fire] is not permitted for Impure Śūdras, untouchables (antyajāṭi-), and, above all, for outcastes (patīta-), nor for those of the mixed castes (saṃkara jāṭī-). If, however, they have genuine devotion to Śiva, the highest cause,
Orthodox brahmanical practice denied all Śūdras access through Upānayana to the Veda and the rituals that are animated by its Mantras and excluded even more radically the various groups it ranked below these as ‘the lowest born’ (antyajāh, antyajātīh). The texts of the Śaivas justified their liberating inroads into the mass of humanity beyond these brahmanical boundaries by boldly declaring that the system of the separation of the castes (jātibhedah) is a fabrication without basis in reality, a cultural epiphenomenon rather than a deep fact of nature, pointing to its absence among human beings outside of India. Only mentality matters; and consequently all devotees of Śiva form a single community regardless of birth, one whose only true internal

he should eliminate their bonds by such means as giving them the water from his feet. As for those who are born of inter-caste marriages in which the father’s caste is higher or if they are connected with brahmins (?) he may do [for them the full ritual procedure] that begins with the elimination of the paths as appropriate to the [caste of the] family [in which they have been born]. The term sanmārajātīh, which I have translated literally as ‘of the mixed castes’ refers to offspring of such unions as that between a Māhīśya (born of a Kṣatriya man and Vaiśya woman) and Karaṇa woman (born of a Vaiśya man and Śūdra woman; see, e.g., Mitākṣarā on Yājñavalkyasūtra, Acāratīya 95.

Pauskaropāramesvara quoted in Nityādisamgraha f. 62v12–13: manusyajātīr ekaiva ‘There is only one caste, that of human beings’; f. 63r4-5: na jātīr vihitā tatra varnam vāpi sitādikam | yonilodabhadvāh sarve jīva ekah sāmah sīhitā | tatra sarvagato devo drśyate jñānacaksuṣu | ajñāna*dhvastacittānāṁ (conj. : pāpa-cittānāṁ Cod.) kuśāstra*vivaśatmanāṁ (conj. : vihitātmanāṁ Cod.) | vākpralāpāḥ sthitas tēsām yadi jātīḥ prayojanam ‘No caste has been enjoined with respect to them, nor colour such as white. All are born from sexual union and the souls [of all] are equal. With the eye of knowledge Śiva is seen pervading all of them. If [they declare that] caste is relevant then this is the prattling of men whose understanding is destroyed by ignorance, who are under the sway of false teachings’; Kulasāra f. 72r2: ekabṛjaprasūtam hi sarvam. jāte idam priye | tasmāj jātivīcēram tu bhrāntipūrvaruṇaṃ idām kṛtam ‘This whole world, my beloved, has been born from a single seed. So this concern for caste that people have springs from an error’; Tantrāloka 15.595c–601b.

Cintyaviśvāsadākhya quoted in Dīkṣādarśa of Vedajñānaguru II, A, p. 24; B, p. 38: navakhandaṇeṣu sarvesu bhāratoṣu *mayena ca (B : ca yena ca A) | jātibhedam idām kalpyam anyadeṣeṣu nāṣṭi tat | tasmāt tat kalpanāmātraṃ jātibhedam *iti kramam (?) ‘Maya [the Guru of the Asuras] created this division of the castes throughout the nine divisions of the continent of Bharata. It does not exist in other countries. Therefore it is nothing but a fabrication/fiction.’


---
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hierarchy is that created by the four levels of empowerment through initiation and consecration.\textsuperscript{692}

However, it should not be imagined that because they insisted that the divisions of the castes are ultimately groundless when explaining the inclusiveness of their recruitment they rejected these divisions in practice. It is one thing to extend one’s recruitment into lower social strata and quite another to reject the divisions between them in practice. Thus in spite of their rhetoric of the underlying unity of man they required that caste divisions be respected not only in relations between initiates and the wider society in matters such as marriage but also in relations between fellow-initiates. As we have seen, they denied impure Śūdras and untouchables the full ceremonial form of initiation, they refused to transmit the office of Ācārya to the offspring of unions between a man of a lower caste and a women of a higher, and they would not countenance an Ācārya’s initiating his caste superior, in effect a Śūdra’s initiating a brahmin. They also required, for example, that when initiates of different caste-classes gathered they should sit apart, each in a separate line;\textsuperscript{693} the penances (prāyaścittam) that they pre-

\textsuperscript{692} Nītīadīsamgraha f. 63r11–12: tapotibaddho yair atmā brāhmaṇāṁ tāṁ vidur jānāḥ | paśupāśavidhānaṁjāṁ śivajñānaṁsarāṁ | te hi devādevasya pujākarmani kirtitāḥ | ity uktam candrahāsākhye mukutādyāgamasya ca samayādiviśeṣeṇa jātir ekaiva kirtitā ‘People judge as [true] brahmans those who have controlled themselves through austerity, who know the bound soul, the bonds, and the rites [of initiation], and who follow the teachings of Śiva. For it is these that have been declared [fit to officiate] in the rites of the worship of the Supreme Deity. This has been taught in the [scripture] Candrahāsa’; and in such texts as the Mukutā we are told that there is only one ‘caste’ [for Śaivas] with differentiation [by status] only into Samayins, Putrakas, Śadhakas, and [Ācāyas].'

\textsuperscript{693} Somāsambhu, Brunner 1961, p. 301 (v. 8cd.): savarṇair ekāya panktyā bhuvijītiśaṁtanmānunī ‘One should eat in silence with concentrate mind in a single line with others of the same caste-class’; Trilocanaśiva, Prāyaścittasamuccaya, p. 25: ekāpanktih sadā varjyā bhajane bhinnajātibhiḥ ‘When eating one must always avoid sitting in a single line with persons of other castes’. Note the distaste expressed by the brahmin Saṃkarsaṇa in the Āgamaadambara (p. 56) when, in a Kashmirian monastery, he notices that Buddhist monks do not form separate lines according to caste when they eat together: catvāro varṇā varnaśaṅkarā api vā sarva evaikasyāṁ panktau bhuvjate ‘Persons of all the four caste-classes and even
scribed for initiates contaminated by an accidental or wilful contact with a person in a state of impurity were calibrated in severity according the degree of distance in caste-status between the persons contaminating and contaminated, and they assigned compound initiation-names such as Aghora-śiva and Aghora-gaṇa whose second member indicated the caste-status of the bearer, marking out brahmins from non-brahmins, non-Śūdras from Śūdras, or each of the four caste-classes from each other.

694 See Trilocana śiva, Prāyaścittasamuccaya p. 25. Similar differentiation according to caste applies to the penances for eating the leavings of another’s food (ucchīṣṭabhojanam), illicit sexual intercourse, and the taking of human life; see ibid., pp. 32, 35, 48, and 52–53. How the hierarchy of caste was perceived in relation to that between the initiated and the uninitiated can be seen in the rules for the penances needed to restore purity if one’s food has been contaminated through contact with an uccīṣṭaḥ, a person who has eaten but has not yet purified himself. The rules for initiated brahmins will suffice to illustrate this. If a brahmin initiate’s food is contaminated by another brahmin initiate the penance is 100 repetitions of the Tatpuruṣa, the Mantra that is the Lord of his Caste (jātiśaḥ). It is doubled if the contaminator is an uninitiated brahmin or an initiated Kṣatriya. One day of fasting is added to the repetitions if the contaminator is an uninitiated Kṣatriya, two if the contaminator is an initiated Vaiśya, three if an initiated Śūdra, four if an uninitiated Vaiśya, and six if an uninitiated Śūdra (ibid., p. 31). Here we see traces of a view that the status bestowed by Śaiva initiation should prevail over that of caste. In its pure form this would entail that a Śaiva brahmin should consider contamination by an initiated Śūdra one degree less severe than that by an uninitiated brahmin, two degrees less severe than that by an uninitiated Kṣatriya, and so on. But the Saiddhāntikas have preferred to limit the application of this view to the lowest two castes, where it was of least consequence, allowing an initiated Śūdra to be less contaminating than an uninitiated Vaiśya, but not a initiated Vaiśya to outrank an uninitiated Kṣatriya or an initiated Kṣatriya an ordinary brahmin. In other words the primary distinctions here are (1) that between brahmins and Kṣatriyas on the one hand and Vaiśyas and Śūdras on the other, and (2) that between brahmins and Kṣatriyas. So while a Śūdra will be purer than a Vaiśya if he has been initiated, a Kṣatriya, in effect the king or a member of his family, will never be less pure than a Vaiśya, nor a brahmin less pure than a non-brahmin. In this regard the benefit of initiation in the case of the Kṣatriya is limited to an acceptance that he is no more contaminating than an uninitiated brahmin. But this is already a major concession in terms of caste and articulates the view seen elsewhere in the literature that the prosperity of society requires an alliance between the brahmins led by the Śaivas and a monarch who has received initiation from the Śaiva Guru.

This view is underlined by the fact that penance is without fasting in the case of contamination by brahmins or an initiated Kṣatriya but with fasting in all other cases.

695 I am aware of five different rulings in this matter. (1) names in -śiva, etc. for brahmins only, in -gaṇa for Kṣatriyas, Vaiśyas, and Śūdras, and in -sakti for women; see Kirana 37.11–12b: kṣatriyādityrayasyoktam <m>antranāma gaṇānkitam || 12 viprānām *mantrapūrvam (conj. : mātpūrvvan Cod) tu sagotrāntam bhaved iha ‘In the case of the three [castes] beginning with the Kṣatriya it should be the name of one of the Mantras distinguished by [the addition of] -gaṇa. In the case of brahmins
However, the non-Saiddhântika traditions of the worship of Bhairava and the Goddess in the Mantrapitha and Vidyapitha have shown themselves much less willing to tolerate such compromises, seeing them as a contamination of the true Śaiva tradition and appropriate only for those, namely the Saiddhântikas, whose degree of illumination by Śiva is insufficient to enable them to appreciate and enact his higher teachings. Distinction on the basis of caste is generally it should begin with a Mantra and end with the Gotra name [-śiva, etc.]; Mrgendra, Kriyāpāda 8.60c–61: srajaṁ vimocayan nāma dikṣitānām tadādīkaṁ || śivāntakaṁ dvijendrānām itaresām gaṇāntakam 'He should throw the garland. The names of initiated brahmans should begin with [the name of] that [on which it lands] and end in -śiva. For all others it should end in -gaṇa; 'and Vidyāpurāṇa, a Saiddhântika scripture in the course of its title, quoted in Nityādisamgraha f. 63v12–64r13: śivo jyotiḥ śikhā caiva sāvitraś ceti gocaraḥ | ... etāḥ samjñā dvijagryānām rājādīnām gaṇāntītāḥ | śaktisaṁjñās tu *vai (em: vā) strīnām sarvāṁ parīkṣītītāḥ 'The gocaras are Śiva, Jyoti, Śikhā and Sāvitra. ... These names [ending in -śiva, -jyotis etc.] are proper to brahmans. The names of Kṣatriyas, Vaiśyas) and Śūdras are distinguished by the [ending] -gaṇa, while all women are required to have names [ending] in -śakti'; (2) a Kashmirian tradition in which names in -śiva are for the three higher caste-classes, with names in -gaṇa for Śūdras only, and names in -śakti for women; see Bhaṭṭa Nārājaṇaṇtha on Mrgendra, Kriyāpāda 8.60c–61 cited above, taking dvijendraṃ there to mean not brahmans but brahmans, Kṣatriyas, and Vaiśyas; Jayaratha, Tantrālokaviveka on 4.265ab (adding names in -śakti for women); Manoda, Kalādiṣkāpadhāti A ff. 96v16–97r9: tatpātavasare śivānāmānkitam śisyam vidhāya strīyam ca śaktināmānkitam vidhāya ... śudraviśaye tu ayam amukagana āgataḥ iti prayojyam 'When that [flower] falls he should name a male disciple -śiva and a woman -śakti. ... In the case of a Śūdra he should formulate [the Mantra] as follows: This man, N-gaṇa, has come [before you, O Lord]; (3) names in -śiva for brahmans, and in -gaṇa and -deva for Kṣatriyas and Vaiśyas; see Brahmaśambhu, Naimittikakarmāṇusādhaṇa f. 38v4–5 (2.180): tatpātāsūcītasthānāpūrvaṁ śivādopaddhate | nāmāvadhārya viprasya gaṇadevaṃ tanyayaḥ 'Having determined the [initiation] name, whose first part should be the * ... (?) indicated by the fall of the [flower] and whose second part should be the word -śiva in the case of a brahmin, but which should end in -gaṇa and -deva in the case of the other two [castes]; Arntēsādīṣvādīḍhī f. 16r6–7: śisyasya nāmakaranam śivāmaragāntakam; (4) names in -śiva for brahmans, and in -deva, -gaṇa, and -muni for Kṣatriyas, Vaiśyas, and Śūdras; see Isanaśīnavurudevapaddhati, Kriyāpāda 146 (16.67–68b): śivāntam brāhmaṇasya syād devaganāntam anyayoḥ | śudrasya munisabhāntam nāma kuryād 'The name of a brahman should end in -śiva and those of the next two [castes, Kṣatriya and Vaiśya] in -gaṇa and -deva. He should give a Śūdra a name that ends in -muni'; and (5) names in -śiva for brahmans, -kavaca for Kṣatriyas, -deva for Vaiśyas, and -gaṇa for Śūdras; see Brhatkālottara A, f. 91v3–4: śivasamjñā dvijasyaiva kavacākhyānī nprasya ca | vaiśiyānām devasamjñā ca śudrānām ca *ganāntakam (em. : gaṇāntikam Cod.) | puspaśāṇasuraṇa samjñā *tatpātato (conj. : tatpātrato Cod.) hitā 'The [initiation] name should be -śiva for a brahman, -kavaca for a Kṣatriya, -deva for Vaiśya, and ending in -gaṇa for Śūdras. The [first half of the] name should be in accordance with the throwing of the flower [on to a Maṇḍala], being determined by [segment of] the [Maṇḍala] in which it lands'.

696 Tantrāloka 15.517: ata evārthasattattvades śivayaṁ na diṣyate | rahasyāsāstre jātyādisamācāra hi śambhava 'In this esoteric [Śākta/Kaula] Śiva system, since
allowed to intrude only at the point of entry, to determine the length of the period during which a Guru should examine a candidate to determine his or her fitness for initiation, or in the Mahālakṣmīmata that ends the fourth Śatka of the Jayadrathayāmala to enable a Guru to select the impure substance that the candidate will be given to swallow without inhibition before receiving consecration (abhiṣekāḥ).\textsuperscript{697}

Although there is no division of castes in this great Tantra, it is found nonetheless, O beautiful-eyed, in the commencement of initiation. [For only] when people have gone through initiation do they have no caste at all. [Or rather only then] do they become members of the one ‘caste’ of Śiva. For this reason, in the Viṣeṣadikṣā [the Ācārya] must do what I shall now explain. Slender-waisted one, he should initiate brahmans by making them drink wine, Kṣatriyas by [making them drink] urine, Vaiśyas by making them drink semen, Śūdras by [making them swallow] faeces, and women by making them embrace the body of an initiate.

We find accordingly a stronger rejection of caste in ceremonial contexts, a conviction that pride of caste is one of the factors that hold souls in bondage, and prohibitions against ever mentioning the birth-caste of a fellow initiate. Thus in the Svacchandatantra of the Mantrapīṭha we read:\textsuperscript{698}

\begin{quote}
O fair-faced one, all those who have been initiated by this ritual are of equal nature, whether they be brahmans, Kṣatriyas, Vaiśyas, Śūdras, or others [of lower castes]. [For] they have been brought into a state of fusion with the nature of Śiva. All are said to be [Śivas,] wearers of [his] braids, their bodies dusted [like his] with ash. All Samayins should sit in a single row. Putrakas, Sādhakas,
\end{quote}

\textit{it teaches the nature of the ultimately real, observance of such [distinctions] as [those of] caste is not taught’}.\textsuperscript{699}

\textit{This passage is related to Niśvāsakārikā 12.161–167 cited above, p. 289.}

\footnotesize
\textsuperscript{697}Jayadrathayāmala, Śatka, f. 230v4–6: \textit{yady apy asmin mahātante jātibhedo na vidyte || 33 tathāpi dīkṣāprārambhe bhavaty eva sulocane | dīkṣitānām na jātiḥ syād ekā jātis tu caiva tviṣeṣadikṣāyām *vakṣyamāṇām} (corr. : \textit{vakṣyamāṇām} Cod.) \textit{samācāret | brāhmaṇā<ṃ>ś cālipānena (em. : cālipātena Cod.)} \textit{ksatriyaṃś} (em. : ksatriyaś Cod.) \textit{civāmbunā} || 34 tasmād viṣeṣadikṣāyām (corr. : \textit{vaks. yamāṇ.} Cod.) \textit{samācāre} || \textit{ksatriyaṃś} (em. : \textit{ksatriyaś} Cod.) \textit{civāmbunā} || 35 vaiśyā<ṃ>ś \textit{candapanānena śudrā<n> vai viśvabhasmanā} \textit{striyo virāṅgasamsparsā<d>} \textit{dīkṣayeta sumadhyme}.

\textsuperscript{698}Svacchanda 4.539c–545: \textit{anenaiva vidhānena dīkṣitā ye varānane || 540 brāhmaṇāḥ ksatriyaḥ vaiśyaḥ śudrāḥ cānye t'havā práye | sarve te samadharmānāḥ śivaḥdharme nityōjāḥ || 541 sarve jañātharāḥ prākṛta bhāsmoddhūlītavigrāhāḥ | ekapāntikbhujaḥ sarve samayinas tu varānane || 542 putrakānām bhaved ekā sādhakānām tathā bhavet | cumbakanām bhaved ekā na prājātīvibhedatah || 543 ekaiva sā smṛta jātir bhairavīyā śivāvyayā | tantram etat samāśristya prājātīm na hy udrayet || 544 putrakaṇām sādhakānām tathā samayinām api | prājātīyudānād devi práyascitī bhaven naraḥ || 545 dinatrayam tu rudrasya pañcāhām keśavasya ca | pitāmahasya pāṣaikām naraṁ pacyate tu sah || 545 aviveki bhavet tasmād yadicched uttamām siddhim | avivekena devēsi siddhir muk-tir dhruvaṃ bhavet.}
\end{footnotesize}
and Cumbakas [Ācāryas] should do the same. They may not sit according to the divisions of their former castes. [For] they are said to form but a single caste of Bhairava, auspicious and eternal. Once a person has taken up this Tantric system he may never mention his former caste. If any [initiate] mentions the former caste of any Putraka, Sādhaka, or Samayin he will have sinned and will be roasted in hell for three days of the life of Rudra, five of the life of Viṣṇu, and fifteen of the life of Brahmā. So, if he aspires to the highest Siddhi he must make no [such] discriminatory distinctions. O Empress of the Gods, it is [only] through [this] freedom from discrimination that one will certainly attain both Siddhi and liberation.

Rituals involving the participation of people of all castes, especially those considered untouchable, is a marked feature here, and while the Saiddhāntikas were

---

699 See, for example, Sanderson 2007a, pp. 282–287 for a detailed account of the orgiastic cakrākridā/vīrāmelāpah given in the vīratāṇādavavidhipatatalḥ of the Jayadrathayāmala’s fourth Saṭṭha and by Vimalaprabodha in his Kālikulakramārccana. The participation of women of the following castes/professions, in addition to those of the four Varnas, is prescribed in those sources: Pukkasa, liquor-seller (dhvajini), Anyajaya, potter (cakrinī), dyer (chippinī), butcher (saunakī), Māṭanga, Tanner (carmakārī), fisherman (dīvāri), prostitute (veṣyā), washerman (dāvāki), and dancer (nartakī). The Mādhavakula (Jayadrathayāmala, Saṭṭha 4, f. 128r7 [A]; paraphrased in Tantrāloka 29.66 and quoted by Jayaratha thereon [B]) lists nine such women in this context. They are the wives of a Māṭanga, a Domba, a butcher, a confectioner (kandukāh) (kamukā B), a Tanner, a liquor-seller, a cremation-ground worker (kāpālikāh), a fisherman, and a potter. The words kāpālikāḥ and kandukāḥ have not been registered in our dictionaries in the meanings attested here. The use of the former in the meaning ‘cremation-ground worker’—see also Narmamālā 2.24cd, Rājatarangini 7.44ab and 8.995, and Lokapraκāśa, p. 6, l. 3 (kāpālakahā in a list of serving castes)—survives in the Kashmiri derivative kāwuj/kāwuj (Griffin 1915 and 1932, p. 495b41–46). For kandukāḥ in the meaning ‘confectioner’ see Prakrit kandu- and kandaviya-. Such caste-promiscuous orgiastic rites are also attested by Kashmirian critics of Tantric practice. Kṣemendra attacks them in Daśāvatāraracita 10.26 as a symptom of the degeneration of society that will herald the descent of Kalkin, Viṣṇu’s tenth Avatāra: cakrasthitau rajakavāyakacarmakārakāpālikapramukhaśilpibhir ekapatre | pānena muktim avikalparatotsavena vṛttena cotsavavatā guruvo vadanti [At that time] the Gurus teach that liberation is attained in a Cakra gathering by drinking [wine] from a single vessel with dyers of cloth, weavers, tanners, cremation-ground attendants, and other such persons of the service-castes (śilpibhiḥ), and through ecstatic orgies of indiscriminate love-making; and he gives a vivid description of such a Śākta ritual in Narmamālā 3.1–85 (84cd: nirvibhāgo bhavat teśam raticakramahotsavaḥ). A Tanner, a butcher, a potter, a fisherman, and a weaver are mentioned among the participants in 3.13–14. The Kashmirian historian Kalhana tells us that king Kalaśa (r. 1063–1089) fell under the corrupting influence of various Tantric teachers, one of whom describes as a merchant who had become a Guru of dyers and other workers (Rājatarangini 7.283: rajakādināṃ śilpināṃ guratām agāt) and was giving initiation to Bhairava-worshiping Śākta brahmins (bhāṭtapādāḥ) (7.283). Evidently the term śilpi used in this context by Kṣemendra has a wider sense than that of ‘artisan’
in general prepared to descend in the giving of full initiation only as far as members of those communities classed as Sacchidra, the Śākta Śaivas had no such reservations, opening such initiation even to those that brahmanism considered untouchable. As evidence that such initiations were not merely prescribed, for such prescriptions might be more rhetorical than intended to support actual common practice, we have the testimony of Bhaṭṭa Rāmakanṭha in his commentary on the Saiddhāntika Sārdhatri śaivalottara, addressing a verse in that scripture that might but for his learned intervention be taken to mean that Saiddhāntikas like himself are wrong to draw the line at the Sacchidras. Indeed his Śākta Śaiva near-contemporary and fellow Kashmirian Abhinavagupta cites this verse as compelling evidence that Śiva has allowed elements of the non-dualistic, caste-transcending view of the Śaktas to shine through even in this dualistic stratum of his revelation:700

It is for this reason that even in these [dualistic scriptures] the Kaula doctrine is present for those who have perceived the [highest state of] resorption, as exemplified in such [texts] as the Kālapāda [in the statement] “He may initiate even untouchables”.

The passage to which Abhinavagupta refers is this:701

The [transcendent] Śāntyatī [Kālā] is the supreme, inactive, eternal void. When [a Guru] has gained knowledge of that, Skanda, he may initiate even untouchables.

Bhaṭṭa Rāmakanṭha argues, as one would expect, that it is purely rhetorical in intention, but he introduces into his argument a report that the Śaktas were citing it in support of their practice of actually initiating such persons. Saiddhāntikas, he insists, must not follow their example.702

700 Malinīvijayavārttika 1.196c–197b: ata evāsti saṃhāradṛśāṃ kauliky apiha drk || yathoktaṃ kālapādādau dikṣayec chvapacān iti.
701 Sārdhatri śaivalottara 8.7: śāntyatī bhaved vyoma tat paraṃ śāntam avayam | taṃ viditvā maḥāsena śvapacān api dikṣayet. In the other recensions of this scripture the same expression appears in the Trayodasaśatikā-Kālottara (f. 23r5, Dīksāpaṭala v.6: śāntyatītaṃ param vyoma sarvagam pāśamocakam | taṃ viditvā maḥāsena śvapacāṃ api dikṣayeta). But ‘plants’ take the place of ‘untouchables’ in the versions of the Dviśatikā-Kālottara (f. 2v7, 5.5) (D) and Saptasatikā-Kālottara (f. 5v1–2, 8.7c–8b) (S): *śāntyatītaṃ (D:śāntīàiitaṃ S) paraṃ vyoma tat paraṃ *śāntam (D:paraṃ S) avayam | taṃ viditvā maḥāsena *sthāvarāṃ api (D:sthāvarāṇy anu S) dikṣayeta.
702 Sārdhatri śaivalottaravṛtti, p.65, ll.6–10: śvapacāṃ api dikṣayed ity atiśayārtho piśādopahitasya bhāvārthasya “api parvataṃ śirasaḥ bhīndyād” ityādāv iva “parātiṣayapratīpaḍāṇārhatvena (em. : pare ‘tiṣayapratīpaḍāṇanārhatvena Ed.) vi-dhīviṣayatvāśamḥvād iti śirasaḥ parvatabhedavan mlecchasvapacādidīkṣaṇam atrāpi *mantavyam (conj.:kartavyam Ed.) eveti yuktāṃ vyākhyaṭum. na tu
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Examples of the initiation of untouchables, indeed of anyone other than brahmins and kings, are naturally hard to find. Nonetheless they are not entirely absent. Thus the Picumata, when giving an account of its own redactional history in its opening chapter, lists fourteen disciples of a certain Padmabhairava of Orissa, stating their castes, in most cases their places of birth, and, for those who were brahmins, also their Veda and, in the case of Yajurvedins, their Śākhā. They include two untouchables.\(^703\) The account lacks the artificiality that might

\[ kulācāryair iva balāt kartavyam iti \] The words śvapaćān api diśsayet convey the superiority [of such Gurus rhetorically]. For there is no possibility of [this optative’s] being injunctive, because [Pāṇini’s rule Aśṭādhyāyī 3.3.154 teaches us that] when a verb [in the optative] is qualified by api [before it] the intention is [only] to express the superior capacity [of the agent], as in [the standard example of the grammarians] api parvataṁ śīrasā bhīndyāt “He will be able, I fancy, to break a mountain with his head”. So it is right to explain that in this case likewise [the reference to] the initiating of foreigners, untouchables, and the like *is to be understood (conj.) in the manner the breaking of a mountain with the head [in that example] and should not be forced to mean, as it is by the Kaula Gurus, that these persons should actually be initiated’. Bhaṭṭa Rāmakaṇṭha is basing his analysis of api diśsayet on Aśṭādhyāyī 3.3.154 (sambhāvane lam iti cet siddhāprāyoge). The example api parvataṁ śīrasā bhīndyāt is given in the Kāśikāvärtti thereon. The crucial point in this rule for Rāmakaṇṭha is that an optative can be used to express the supposition that someone has the ability to do something, provided that the action envisaged does not actually take place (siddhāprāyoge). His interpretation is forced, because api is more naturally taken with the noun that precedes it than with the verb that follows.

\(^703\) The fourteen comprise eight brahmins: four Atharvavedins, of whom three are from Madhyadeśa and one from Sindhu, one Śamavedin from Kashmir, one Vājasaneyin Yajurvedin from Lampā, one Ṛgvedin of Kāši, and an Āpastamba-Tātītiṇya Yajurvedin from Odḍiyāna. The remaining six are two Kṣatriya princes from Sindhu, two Śūdras of Saurāśtra, and the two untouchables (Mātṛkās), whose place of birth is not recorded. See Picumata f. 2v4–6, 3r4–5 (1.1.54–62, 76–81): odraḍeśe tu jātasya devadattasya samjñayā | caranā bhṛucaṣayāṭha (em.: bhṛucaṣayāṭha Cod.) ādēṣena na samśayāḥ || 55 asidduḥas tu eva deveśi padmahairavasamjñākah (corr.: kāh Cod.) | catuvṛṁśatisāhasraṁ grantham dvādasabhiḥ punah || 56 samghāram tu sahasraṁ tu kariṣyati śīvecchayaḥ | anenaiva tu *tāntreṇa (conjug.: māntreṇa Cod.) tataḥ siddhim pravṛṣyaṁti (conjug.: si Cod.) || 57 etat tantram asidduḥsyā sakāśāt *tata (conjug.: tava Cod.) eva hi | śrūnaṭiṣyānti mahābhāgē śisyāś caiva caturdāṣa (conjug.: caturṛdaśa Cod.) || 58 raktabhairavako nāmnā juvalabhairavako ’parah | helābhairavakaś caiva trayo ’py ete mahāyaśe || 59 madhyadeśasamutpanṇā *caṇānātharvanāḥ (conjug.: Aśīṣa = caṇānād atharvanās; cf. 1.52c and 1.62c): caṇānām-tharuṇaṁ Cod.) tathā | vāmabhairavako devi vijayabhairavako ’parah || 60 sauraśtrāyāṁ *samutpannaḥ sudraḥ jaṭāy prakīrtitaṁ (conjug.: samutpannaḥ śudrā jaṭāyā prakīrtitaṁ Cod.) | bibhatsabhairavo devi gajakarṇas tu bhairavah || 1.61 caṇḍabhairavo kāḥ (conjug.: kāś Cod.) caiva sindhuṣiṣayasambha ’vāḥ (conjug.: vāḥ Cod.) | bibhatsabhairavo devi gajakarṇabhairavo ’pi ca || 1.62 kṣatriyaṁ (conjug.: yau Cod.) | rajaputraḥ tu caṇḍabhairavo kāḥ (conjug.: kāś Cod.) punah | brāhmaṇo ’tharvano devi caranēna na samśayāḥ || ... 76 karālabhairavo nāma tathā ucchusmabhairavah | mātṛangajātisambhātau (conjug.: to Cod.) padma-bhairavasasyaṁ | 77 yumabhairavo kāś cānayaḥ (conjug.: kāś Cod.)
suggest that it is a pure fabrication, and even if it were fabricated it would nonetheless reveal that this tradition wished to signal to its followers that the initiation of untouchables has a venerable precedent. Similar evidence is to be found in the literature of the Śaiva cult of the goddess Kubjikā in its accounts of the nine and sixteen Nāthas that initiates include in their worship. Among these too are untouchables.704

Nor is it the case that all Gurus of the Siddhānta would have agreed with Bhatṭa Rāmakanṭha that the statement in the Kālottara is merely rhetorical. This may be inferred from the passage of the Guhyasiddhi of Padmavajra cited above.705 For that tells the Buddhist adept to acquire a girl for his observance from a family of untouchables as payment for his giving them Saiddhāntika Maṇḍala initiation, which reveals not only that an intimate knowledge of the rituals of the Siddhānta could be taken for granted among these Tantric Buddhists, but also that to give Śaiva initiation to such people was not out of the question.

The names, castes, and birthplaces of these twenty-five Gurus are given in the Nityānhikatilaka, ff. 17v5–24r2. Only twelve are brahmīns. The other thirteen are five Kśatriyas, three Vaiśyas, four Śudras, and one untouchable, a maker and seller of alcoholic liquor (kalyapālaḥ) from Kundapura in Odāḍeśa. He is venerated as the ninth in the series of the nine Nāthas. See ff. 19v4–20r1: oḍḍadvisaye kundapurarapattane janma jātikalyapālo māhilio nāma | caryānāma śrikuharākhyadevah | pūjānāma śriktṣṇanandanāthah | śrikitināma gauś chaliṅktā tadā śrigaucharaliśadevah | khambah khalitaṁ tadā śrikhambhādityanāthah | kapilah prabodhitas ādā śrikapilaprabodhānandadevah | asyaiva śaktīn śriktṣṇapingalāmamba pā pū | 9 ॥ A variant listing of the nine and sixteen Nāthas is found in the Ciṅcinikaulāṃga guruṇaṭatiḥ. There the ninth of the nine is an untouchable (mātaṅgaḥ) called Kaṇjiṅka from Elāpura (modern Ellora): śri-elāpure mahāsthāne janma mātamaṅgah *śrikanjīko (corr.: śrikanjīko C) nāma caryānuprasiddhah śrivalmaḷaṅānāthah | pūjaya śriktṣṇanandadevah | gopyah śrikhogānandadevah | tenapi kṛtāṅ kṛtāṅ sāḷavane *sāḷastambho ‘nugrhitah (corr.: sāḷastambhaṅugrhitah C) || 9 ॥. Among the sixteen the seventh is Jayadeva, a karavālaḥ, probably a liquor-maker (cf. Bihāri, Nepāli kalvār ‘a maker and seller of liquor’ [Skt. kalyapālaḥ]), from Vahapura, and the twelfth is a mātamaṅgah from Śaubhāra called Lo: śrivahapure karavālaḥ śrijaṇadevanāmasuprasiddhah | *śrijaṅgadevah (corr.: sīrjaṅgadevah C) | pūjaya bhairavānandadevah (corr.: sīrjaṅgadevah C) | sīrjavānandadevah | gopya śrimehānandadevah || 7 || śriśaṅghāranagure janma mātamaṅga lo nāma caryāsu prasiddhah śrihaṅgānandadevah | pūjaya śrībālānandadevah | ratnānandadevah | tṛṣṭikānandadevah | gopya viśrukānandadevah || 12 ॥.

---

704 The names, castes, and birthplaces of these twenty-five Gurus are given in the Nityānhikatilaka, ff. 17v5–24r2. Only twelve are brahmīns. The other thirteen are five Kśatriyas, three Vaiśyas, four Śudras, and one untouchable, a maker and seller of alcoholic liquor (kalyapālaḥ) from Kundapura in Odāḍeśa. He is venerated as the ninth in the series of the nine Nāthas. See ff. 19v4–20r1: oḍḍadvisaye kundapurarapattane janma jātikalyapālo māhilio nāma | caryānāma śrikuharākhyadevah | pūjānāma śriktṣṇanandanāthah | śrikitināma gauś chaliṅktā tadā śrigaucharaliśadevah | khambah khalitaṁ tadā śrikhambhādityanāthah | kapilah prabodhitas ādā śrikapilaprabodhānandadevah | asyaiva śaktīn śriktṣṇapingalāmamba pā pū | 9 ॥. A variant listing of the nine and sixteen Nāthas is found in the Ciṅcinikaulāṃga guruṇaṭatiḥ. There the ninth of the nine is an untouchable (mātaṅgaḥ) called Kaṇjiṅka from Elāpura (modern Ellora): śri-elāpure mahāsthāne janma mātamaṅgah *śrikanjīko (corr.: śrikanjīko C) nāma caryānuprasiddhah śrivalmaḷaṅānāthah | pūjaya śriktṣṇanandadevah | gopyah śrikhogānandadevah | tenapi kṛtāṅ kṛtāṅ sāḷavane *sāḷastambho ‘nugrhitah (corr.: sāḷastambhaṅugrhitah C) || 9 ॥. Among the sixteen the seventh is Jayadeva, a karavālaḥ, probably a liquor-maker (cf. Bihāri, Nepāli kalvār ‘a maker and seller of liquor’ [Skt. kalyapālaḥ]), from Vahapura, and the twelfth is a mātamaṅgah from Śaubhāra called Lo: śrivahapure karavālaḥ śrijaṇadevanāmasuprasiddhah | *śrijaṅgadevah (corr.: sīrjaṅgadevah C) | pūjaya bhairavānandadevah (corr.: sīrjaṅgadevah C) | sīrjavānandadevah | gopya śrimehānandadevah || 7 || śriśaṅghāranagure janma mātamaṅga lo nāma caryāsu prasiddhah śrihaṅgānandadevah | pūjaya śrībālānandadevah | ratnānandadevah | tṛṣṭikānandadevah | gopya viśrukānandadevah || 12 ॥.

705 See here p. 144.
For if it had been, this Buddhist strategy could not have been recommended.

Our sources reveal, then, that the Śaivas extended their recruitment beyond the high-caste circles from which most of our evidence of the religion derives. But, of course, they do not readily reveal the extent to which it was adopted outside these élites. The epigraphical evidence is almost entirely restricted in this regard to records of the pious activities of rulers and brahmins, and the Śaiva sources, being largely prescriptive in their concerns, tell us much about what should or could be done by or for various categories of person but give us no sense of how widely these prescribed activities were adopted or supported. One of the tasks of future research, then, should be to gather data that will improve our ability to address this question. At present I have little to offer in this direction. But I can at least point to evidence that the fortunes of Śaivism were not as dependent on the favour of ruling dynasties as most of the data presented here might lead one to assume, enjoying at least in some regions such widespread acceptance that changes in the allegiance of a dynasty had little effect on its popularity. Research into recorded temple construction in the period 450–1050 in South and North Karnatak, that is to say, in the Tuṅghabhadrā-Kāverī and Tuṅghabhadrā-Bhīmā zones, has counted 164 Śaiva temples as against 30 Vaiṣṇava in the former and 199 Śaiva as against 32 Vaiṣṇava in the latter. This great preponderance of Śaiva foundations might be attributed solely to the predilection of the region’s kings, were it not for the evidence of the next three centuries, when the region passed under the rule of the Hoysalas (c. 1047–c. 1345), who favoured Vaiṣṇavism over Śaivism. For we see a far smaller shift in the preponderance of Śaiva temples than the theory of dependence on royal patronage would lead us to expect. 293 Vaiṣṇava temples were established. But the total of new Śaiva foundations remains very high, at about 1,030. For immediately after the demise of that

706 For all these data see SETTAR 1992, p. 43 and 54. I have added to the Śaiva totals those of the much less numerous Śākta temples.

707 For knowledge of non-Buddhist religious foundations in Kashmir during the centuries before the advent of the Kārkota dynasty we depend almost entirely on the account of Kalhana’s Rājatarangini. It is highly unreliable for this period, being wildly inaccurate in its chronology, and, in the case of the Hunnic Hephthalite kings that reigned from the time of Mihirakula to the advent of the Kārkotās, that is to
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dynasty it burst forth into its golden age. The humbler religious landscape of small-scale religious devotion tells the same story. For among the very numerous pilgrimage sites of the region those sacred to Śiva, Bhairavas, and Śaiva goddesses are overwhelmingly in the majority. We see this in an abundant local literature of Māhātmyas, texts in Sanskrit promoting these sites; and we see it in what survives in manuscript of the Kāśmiratīrthasamgraha, a collection of abstracts of materials gathered without sectarian bias by the local Sanskrit scholar Sāhibrām (d. 1872) with the help of a staff of Panḍits for an extensive

say, c. 530–626, it is evident from numismatic data that it also disordered. But it is significant nonetheless that almost all the early foundations that Kalhaṇa records other than Buddhist monasteries and brahmin settlements (Agrahāras) are Śaiva. Aśoka, evidently the emperor Aśoka of Buddhist fame, erects a stone enclosure for the national Śiva Vijayēśvara and two Aśokeśvaras within that enclosure (1.105–106). His son Jalauka establishes Jyeśtharudra in the capital (1.124), and builds a stone temple for Bhūtēśvara at the Nandikṣetra (1.148). His wife Iśānadevi establishes circles of the Mothers (mātraçakram) at the points of access to the valley (1.122). Rāvana worships Vateśvara, builds a Matha around it, and dedicates the country to its maintenance (1.195–196). The Hephthalite Huns, with whom his chronicle reaches kings known to us from other sources, are reported to have established Śivas, and, given that they were of Central Asian origin, this no doubt reflects the fact that Śaivism was the dominant tradition of their new subjects, though the Vaiṣṇavism that would come to the fore under the Kārkotās begins to overlap the Śaiva substrate during and after the interregnum of the non-Kashmirian Mātṛgupta. Mihirakula establishes a Mihireśvara in the capital (1.306). Baka establishes a Bakeśvara (1.329), Gopāditya a Jyeśtheśvara (1.341), and Khinnhila Narendraditya shrines of Bhūtēśvara (1.347). Tuņjīna I, son of Jalaukas (probably this is the Jalauka, founder of Jyeśtharudra, whom Kalhaṇa makes the son of Aśoka), establishes a Tungēśvara (2.14) and Sandhimat founds a Sandhīśvara, an Iśeśvara with the name of his Śiva Guru Iśāna, and many other Lingas (2.131–134). Tuņjīna Pravarasena I builds the temple of his Śiva Pravaraśvara together with a circle of the Mothers (3.97). The short-reigned non-Kashmirian Mātṛgupta establishes a Viṣṇu Mātṛguptasvāmin (3.263). Pravarasena II (probably the successor of Mihirakula, and identical with Pravarasena I), represented by Kalhaṇa as a supremely devout Śaiva, intends accordingly to install a Pravaraśvara in the capital that he has founded with his name (Pravaraṇa), but a Viṣṇu miraculously takes its place, which the king names Jayasvāmin after the architect of the temple (3.350–351). But he installs Sādhāvāsīri and four other [Śaiva] goddesses (3.353) in the capital. Laṅkaṇa Narendraditya, identified by STEIN (1900, vol. 1, p. 106) with the Laṅkaṇa Udayāditya whose name appears on a Kashmirian silver coin, establishes Viṣṇu Narendrasvāmin (3.383). His brother Tuņjīna Raṇaditya prepares to install two Raṇeśvaras in two new temples but Viṣṇu Raṇasvāmin miraculously takes the place of one through the influence of his wife Raṇārāmbhā (3.439–455). The couple establish a Viṣṇu Raṇārāmbhavāmin, a Śiva Raṇārāmbhēśvara, and a Maṭha for Pāṣupatas (3.460). The king establishes the Sun-God Raṇapuravāmin (3.462), and Amṛṭaprabhā, another wife of his, an Amṛteśvara (3.463). His son Vikramāditya establishes a Vikramaśvara (3.474) and his wife Bimbā a Bimbeśvara (3.482). On the later Hephthalites in Kashmir see DANI 1996.

descriptive survey of these sites and their traditions commissioned by Mahärāja Ranbir Singh (r. 1868–1885).709 We also see it in the information on the sacred sites of Kashmir, probably compiled around the seventh century, that is found in the Kashmirian Nīlamatapurāṇa,710 and in the list of the major shrines of the valley given by Kalhaṇa in the twelfth century in the preamble of his history of the country.711

Relevant evidence of another kind is available for Andhra and the Far South, since there, where culturally hostile invaders made fewer and less damaging inroads, there remains intact a much larger body of epigraphical evidence recording pious donations, engraved on the walls of the temples of the deities to which they were made. A survey of temple building and donation in Andhra during the thirteenth century under the Kākatiyas of Warangal has shown that the great majority of endowed deities mentioned in the epigraphical corpus were Śaiva. 247 Śiva temples constitute 67 per cent of the total and Vaiṣṇava temples only 19 per cent, and the latter are mostly south of the Krishna river, increasing in frequency the further south they are, no doubt under the influence of the resurgence of Vaiṣṇavism in the Tamil region after Rāmānuja (d. 1137). From the record of those who made donations to these Śaiva temples, particularly to long-established, major temples such as those of Drākṣārāma and Tripurāntaka, we can see that they were far from being restricted to the circles of royalty or the landed gentry. A high proportion of the donations are from herders, women, and traders.712 Likewise in the Tamil country we find in Cola times (850–1279) a number of records of donations to Śiva temples made by members of the Sacchudra Veḷḷāla caste, the dominant cultivators of the region.713

710 See TOKUNAGA 1994.
711 Rājatarangini 1.29–38. Here he mentions the following as the principal deities of the region: Gaurī in the form of the river Vitastā, the Nāgas “Śāṅkha, Padma, and others”, Pāpasūdana (the Śiva Kapaṭeśvara), the goddess Saṃdhīyā (Saṃdhīyābhaṭṭārikā), Svayambhū (a Śiva), Bheḍādevī, [the Śivas of the] Nandikṣetra (Bhūteśvara and Jyeṣṭheśvara), Śāradādevī, Cakradhara (Viṣṇu), and Vijayēśvara (Śiva).
712 This evidence is derived from the work of TALBOT (2001, pp. 87–125), who provides detailed statistics and on their basis presents a cogent analysis of the patterns of temple patronage in this region and period.
713 For Veḷḷālas who gave to Śiva temples, most commonly cattle or cash to provide an income to fund a perpetual lamp, see, e.g., SII 3:17 of A.D. 1014; SII 3:116 of A.D. 991; SII 13:34 (ARE 312 of 1906) of A.D. 941; SII 13:44 (ARE 227 of 1911); SII 13:56 (ARE 542 of 1920); SII 13:62 (ARE 618 of 1920); SII 13:66 (ARE 238 of 1923); SII 13:112 (ARE 126 of 1914); SII 13:189 (ARE 332 of 1927); SII 13:300 (ARE 5 of 1907) of A.D. 871-907; SII 13:47 (ARE 216 of 1932-1933); SII 14:47 (ARE 216 of 1932-33); SII 14:131 (ARE 213 of 1932-33); SII 14:135 (ARE 416 of 1929-30); SII
There is another manner in which Śaivism is likely to have played a significant part in the process of social integration during this period, one which I wish to touch on only briefly and tentatively at this stage. This was in the incorporation of the many local deity-cults of the regions being drawn into the orbit of the state and its patronage of religion. In this it seems that it was the non-SAIDDHĀNTIKA traditions of the worship of Bhairavas, goddesses, and YOGINĪs, with their indifference to caste-status and brahmanical criteria of purity and their cults of possession that are likely to have provided the avenue of assimilation. It seems likely, though difficult to prove, that much of the character of these traditions resulted from this process of incorporation on the frontier between the brahmanical and the not yet Brahmanized.

THE ŚAIVA-BRAHMANICAL ORDER

While extending its influence far beyond the confines of the orthodox brahmanical world the Śaivism of the Mantramārga sought to guard itself against dissociation from that world. It elaborated an inclusivist model of revelation that ranked other religious systems as stages of an ascent to liberation in Śaivism,}

---

14:140 (ARE 76 of 1907); SII 14:155 (ARE 77 of 1907); SII 14:202 (ARE 394 of 1929-30); SII 14:246 (ARE 108 of 1908); SII 17:197 (ARE 176 of 1904) of A.D. 1018-19; SII 17: 204 (ARE 183 of 1904); SII 17:238 (ARE 216 of 1904) of A.D. 1006/7 (with a Valangai Vēlakkārār soldier); SII 17:471 (ARE 440 of 1904) of A.D. 990/991; SII 2:95 (a merchant [vyāparin]); SII 17:315 (ARE 286 of 1904) (a Valangai Vēlakkārār soldier) of A.D. 1016. See also GHOSE 1996, pp. 277–282 on the predominance of the upper strata of non-brahmin society in temple patronage in recent times.


See, e.g., Svacchanda 11.69-74 (Buddhists > Jainas > Vaidikas > Śāmkhyas > Yogasthas > Pāśupatas > Mausulas and Kārukas > Vaimalas and Lākulas > Śaivas); Sarvajñānottara A f. 37r1–3, B p. 96 (Lingoddhārādiparakaraṇa v. 3): jñānacaryānvito bauddho buddhitattvam avāpnyāt | tāmasaṁ jinabhaktas tu pauruṣaṁ brahmavedinaṁ || 4 kevalārthavidāḥ kālam prāpnuvanti jītendriyāḥ | vaidyeśavāreśvare tattve somasiddhāntavedināḥ (A : A : jinabhaktānām prāpnuvanti + + + + B); Āgama quoted by Bhaṭṭa Rāmakanṭha in Nareśvaraparīkṣākāśa, p. 207: buddhitattve sthitā bauddhā guneṣu tu ārhatāḥ sthitāḥ / gunamūrdhān śāṁkhyā avyakte pāñcarātrakāḥ; Śomaśambhu, BRUNNER 1977, p. 553 (vv. 7–8): buddhitattve sthitā bauddhā jainās tu guṇamastake | vedāntajñās tu tad-śārdayaḥ bhaṅgavanuṅkahāḥ | pāśupatas tu māyāyāh vidyāyāṁ tu mahāvṛtāḥ. bauddhādīligināṁ esam muktiśhānāṁ anukramāt; Trilocanāśiva, Siddhāntasamuccaya, pp. 73–87; Kṣemarāja, Praṭyabhījnāhṛdaya on Sūtra 8 (tadbūhikāḥ sarvadarsanasasthitayaḥ ‘The positions of all doctrines are its stages’); and here p. 47 (Manthānabhairava).
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the religion of the king manifest in his initiation, his consecration, and his royal temples, thus mirroring and validating the incorporative structure of the state’s power. But though it thereby asserted, especially in its Śākta forms, the limited nature of the brahmanical observance that formed the lowest level and broad base of this hierarchy, it was careful to insist not only that the brahmanical scriptures that govern this observance are exclusively valid in their own domain but also that their injunctions are as binding on Śaivas after their initiation as they were before it if they remained in that domain as active members of society. Śaiva ascetics were allowed a degree of choice in this matter, at least in theory, but householders were not.\footnote{716} The religion of the Śaivas, then, was not Śaivism alone but rather Śaivism and Brahmanism, a fact born out not only by their literature but also by biographical data and the epigraphic record of the activities of Śaiva kings.

Moreover, the determination of the Śaivism of the Mantramārga to be fully embedded in the brahmanical tradition is manifest not only in this rule that initiates should maintain their brahmanical obligations but also in the fact that they extended their own ritual repertoire in order to bring it into greater congruence with the brahmanical. To this end they created a Śaiva ritual of cremation and a series of rituals to mirror the numerous brahmanical postmortuary rituals in which the deceased receives offerings first as a hungry ghost (pretakriyā) and then in Śrāddha rituals as an ancestor, after his incorporation with the immediate ascendants of his patriline (sapiṇḍikaraṇam). It is clear that the creators of these additions were motivated by nothing but the desire to be seen to conform to the norms of brahmanical society once the Śaivas had moved to extend recruitment beyond the inevitably restricted circle of ascetics into the more numerous ranks of married householders. For these rituals and especially the Śrāddhas make no sense in strictly Śaiva terms, since initiates are held to attain liberation as soon as they leave their bodies and therefore should require no ceremonies designed to ensure their well-being after death.\footnote{717} This accommodation of Brah-

\footnote{716}{The Śaivas’ doctrines of the relationship between their scriptures and those of the brahmanical tradition with respect both to householders and ascetics are examined in detail together with epigraphical evidence in SANDERSON forthcoming b.}

\footnote{717}{For a more detailed examination of the Śaiva postmortuary rituals and their rationale see SANDERSON 1995a, pp. 31–38. They are not found in the preceding Pāṣupata tradition of the Atimārga, in which the dead were buried, nor indeed in the earliest stage of the Mantramārga represented by the substantial Niśvāsa corpus, which in this and numerous other respects remained close to its Atimārgic antecedents, appearing only in the Dīkṣottara, which was added to that corpus at a later date, and in several other later scriptures of the Siddhānta, most notably in the Kirana, whose treatment of the Śrāddha rituals became the basis for that found in the Paddhati of Somaśambhu and the later Paddhatis that followed its}
manism no doubt gave Śaivism a distinct advantage over those religions that denied outright the authority of the brahmanical scriptures and there can be little doubt that this would greatly have increased its acceptability in the eyes of kings, who could thus draw on the power of the new religion to sanctify their rule and enhance their might—the former predominantly through the Siddhānta, the latter predominantly through the Śākta Śaiva systems—while at the same time maintaining their legitimacy in their ancient role as the protectors of the brahmanical social order.

As Śaivism advanced by developing the strategies explored in this study it achieved a transregional organization and a consequent standardization of its rituals and doctrines; and this transregional uniformity, I propose, would have heightened its appeal to kings by enabling it more easily to be perceived as a transcendent means of legitimation, empowerment, and the integration of regional traditions, as an essential part of a pan-Indian socio-religious order that each kingdom sought to exemplify. It was by virtue of its great success in attracting royal patronage that it came to exert such a pervasive influence on the religions around it; and it was also on the basis of this success that it could construct the impressive edifice of a literature that is almost entirely silent about these vital but less elevated aspects of its life.

lead. An intermediate stage in this development is probably to be recognized in the Sarvajñānottara and the Svāyambhuvasūtrasamgraha, which teach a cremation ritual for initiates but make no mention of Śrāddha rituals. I say that the Śrāddhas make less sense in strictly Śaiva terms, because some attempt was made to justify cremation. To create their cremation ritual the Śaivas adapted their ritual of initiation. The soul of the deceased is to be drawn back into the corpse before it is burned on the pyre in order to undergo initiation, just as it did in life. Since the function of initiation is to liberate the soul by destroying all that impedes its liberation this re-initiation of the deceased was justified as a means of eliminating any obstacles that might still be present as a result of the initiate’s failure to expiate breaches of discipline that had not been expiated during his lifetime.
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Pauṣkarabhāṣya: The Jñānapāda of the Pauṣkarāgama with the commentary (bhāṣya) of Umāpatiśivācārya, ed. Ambalavanālajñānasambandhapatra-śaktisvāmi. Cidambaram, 1925.


Buddhakapālatantra. ULC MS Or. 158: palm-leaf; Kuṭila script; fragmentary; A.D. 1162. In the upper left corner of 1r: om vajrāmrṭatantra || vajrāralitantra || buddhakapālatantra. Contains parts of the Buddhakapālatantra and Vajrāmrṭatantra.

Bṛhatkālottara. A = NAK MS 1-89, NGMPP B24/59: palm-leaf; Newari script; undated; B = NAK MS 4-131, NGMPP A43/1: palm-leaf; Pāla script; A.D. 1169.


Brahmayāmala IFP. IFP MS Transcript 522 (‘Brahmayāmalākhyaṃ mātrpratiṣṭhātantram’). Incomplete: contains Paṭalas 1–51.1–29b.

Brahmayāmala Triv. Trivandrum University Library, MS 1982 (‘Brahma-
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*yāmalapratīṣṭhātantram*': Devanāgarī transcript; incomplete, contains Adhyāyas 1–5.71b.

*Bhagavatyāmānāyānusārinī*. See *bCom ldan ’das ma’i man ngag gi rjes su ’brung ba zhes bya ba’i rnam par bshad pa* under Tibetan Texts.

Bhavabhāṭṭa. See *Cakrāsamvarapaṇḍikā*.

Bhavyakirti. See *’Khor lo sdom pa’i dka’ ’grel dpa’ bo’i yid du ’ong bzhes bya ba* under Tibetan Texts.


*Māṇḍalopāyikā* of Padmaśrīmitra. TUL MS 280 (New), 499 (Old): palm-leaf; Newari script; undated.


*Matasāra*. NAK MS 3-379, NGMPP B28/16 (*Śrīvidyāpiṭhamatasāra*): palm-leaf; Pāla script; no date


*Manthānabhairava, Kumārikhaṇḍa*. NAK MS 5-4630, NGMPP A171/11: paper; Newari script.

*Manthānabhairava, Siddhakhaṇḍa*. Scans courtesy of Sam Fogg Rare Books & Manuscripts, London: palm-leaf; Pāla script; probably penned in the 12th century.

*Mayaśaṃgraha*. NAK MS 1-1537, NGMPP A31/18: palm-leaf; Newari script; incomplete.


*Mahābhārata*. For the first time critically edited by V. S. Sukthankar, with the cooperation of S. K. Belvalkar, A. B. Gajendragadkar, V. Kane, R. D. Kar-

**Mahāmanivipulavimānasupraṭiṣṭhitaguhyparamarakhāsyakalpadhāraṇī.**

*Gilgit Manuscript Facsimiles*, 1724–1733: birch-bark; proto-Śāradā; incomplete (ff. 53–57 only); undated; probably mid-6th century. Transcription: MATSUMURA Hisashi, *Mikkyō Zuzō* [Journal of Buddhist Iconography] 2, 1984, pp. 71–78. See also Nor bu chen po rgyas pa'i gzhal med med khang shin tu rab tu gnas pa gsang ba'i dam pa'i gsang ba'i cho ga zhib mo'i rgyal po zhes bya ba'i gzungs under Tibetan Texts.

**Mahāmāyaṭīkā: Mahāmāyatāntra** with the commentary (-ṭīkā) *Guṇavatī* of Ratnākaraśānti, ed. Samdhong Rinpoche and Vajravallabh Dwivedi. Rare Buddhist Text Series 10. Sarnath: Central Institute of Higher Tibetan Studies, 1992.

**Mahāmudrātilāka.** Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin - Preussischer Kulturbesitz, Hs or 8711 (uncatalogued): paper; Newari script; A.D. 1823/4.

**Mahāvaśrāṇābhīṣaṃbodhitantra.** See rNam par snang m标准化 chen po mngon par byang chub pa'i rgyud under Tibetan Texts.

**Mādhavakula.** = Jayadrathayāmala, *Ṣaṭṭka* 4, ff. 117v5–135v2.

**Mālinīvijayavārtika.** HANNEDE 1998.

**Mālinīvijayottara,** ed. Madhusūdana Kaula Śastrī. KSTS 37. Srinagar, 1922.


**Mūlasarvāstivādavinaya.** *Gilgit Manuscripts*, vol. 3, 3 parts.


**Mrgendrapaddhativyākhyā** of Vaktraśambhu. IFP MS Transcript 1021.

**Mrṣasugatiniyojana** of Śūnyasamādhivajra, pupil of Bhadrapāda. TUL MS 307 (New), 306 (Old), ff. 1v1–9r: palm-leaf; Newari script; dated in A.D. 1269. For the Tibetan translation see Tha ma'i mchod pa'i cho ga under Tibetan Texts.


**Mohacūḍottara.** NAK MS 5-1977, NGMPP A182/2: paper; Devanāgarī script;
copied from a palm-leaf manuscript of [Valabhi era, year] 806 (= A.D. 1125/6).

Yājñavalkyasmṛti with the commentary (nibandha) of the Śilāhāra king Aparāditya of Konkaṇa, ed. Hari Nārāyaṇa Āpte. Ānandaśramasamśkrta-granthāvaliḥ 46. Poona: Ānandāśrama, 1903.

Yājñavalkyasmṛti with the commentary (Mitākṣarā) of Vijñāneśvara, ed. Wāsudev Laxmaṇ Śāstri Paṇḍiṣṭar. Bombay: Paṇḍurang Jāwaji, 1926.

*Yoganiruttaratatrārthāvatārasamgraha of Śraddhākaravarman. See rNal 'byor bla na med pa'i rgyud kyi don la ’jug s pa bs dus pa under Tibetan Texts.


Yoginījāla. NAK MS 3-667, NGMPP A141/5 (Yoginījālāmahātantrarāja): paper; Nepalese Devanāgarī.


Yoginīśaṅcāra: the Śaiva Yoginīśaṅcārapraṇakaraṇa incorporated in the third Śaṭka of the Jayadrathayāmala.


Rājānakavamsapraśaṃsā. BLO MS Stein Or. e. 17: paper; Śāradā script; A.D. 1894.


Rauravasūtrasamgraha. Published in volume 1 of Rauravāgama.


Laghuśaṃvaratantra, also known as Cakrasaṃvaratantra, Laghvabhidhānatantra, and Herukabhīdhiṇātattana. Baroda, Maharaja Sayajirao University, Oriental Institute, MS Acc. 13290 (‘Herukavidhiṇātattana’): palm-leaf; Kuṭila script; incomplete; undated. Also accessible are two paper manuscripts; but these are merely apographs of this, reproducing its lacunae. For commentaries see under Cakrasaṃvaraṭīkā, Cakrasaṃvarapaṇijīkā, Cakrasaṃvaravṛtti, and Laghutantraṭīkā.


Vajrajvālodaya nāma śrīherukasādhanopayikā of Ānandagarbha. Nieder-
sächsische Staats- und Universitätsbibliothek, Göttingen, MS Xc 14/39 (a copy of the negatives of photographs taken of the codex that contains this work by Rāhula Sāṅkrtyāyana when it was in the Ngor monastery in Tibet), f. 170r6–186r5: palm-leaf; Newari script; 14th century (?).

Vajradākamahātantra. TUL MS 342 (New), 326 (Old): palm-leaf: Newari script; undated.

Vajravārāhikalpa. NAK MS 3-235, NGMPP E138/10: paper; Nepalese Devanāgarī; A.D. 1894.

Vajrāmṛtatatantra. ULC MS Or. 158 (uncatalogued): palm-leaf; Newari script; A.D. 1162. Uncatalogued. In the upper left corner of f. 1r is the following note: om vajrāmṛtatatantra || *vajrāralitantra (vajrārali corr. : vajrārani Cod.) || buddhakapālatantra. As it survives the codex contains only parts of the Vajrāmṛtatatantra and the Buddhakapālatantra.

Vajrārali. See rDo rje ā ra li under Tibetan Texts.

Vajrāvali A: Vajrāvali nāma maṇḍalopāyikā of Mahāpaṇḍita Abhayākaragupta.
NAK MS 5-841, NGMPP B31/14: palm-leaf; Māgadha script; pre-1200; some replacement folios in Newari script and Devanāgarī.


Vanaratanastotrasaptaka of Āditya. HAHN 1996.

*Vāpyādipratiṣṭhā. Folios 893r14–908r9 and 929v7–931v23 of an untitled and undated paper manuscript in the Śaradā script containing the Paddhatis for various mostly non-Śaiva ritual procedures, predominantly Śāntis, Vratas, Pratiṣṭhās, and Dānas. SORL MS 2B15, folios numbered from 785 to 1089.


Viravajra. See Yon tan ma lus pa’i gnas zhes bya ba’i ’grel pa under Tibetan Texts.

Virāgama. IFP MS Transcript 30.


Vṛddhasvacchanda. SORL MS 1514: paper; Śaradā script. This is the manuscript used by Pandey for his edition of the text.


Śāśvatavajra. See De kho na nyid mkhas pa under Tibetan Texts


Sampūṭodbhava. ASB, MS G 4854: palm-leaf; Māgadha script; perhaps 12th century.

Saṃvarodaya. TSUDA 1974.

Saṃvarodayā: Saṃvarodayā nāma maṇḍalopāyikā of Bhūvācārya of Ratnagiri. TUL MS 450 (New), 296 (Old): palm-leaf; Newari script; A.D. 1056.


Saṃpāṭaśatīka-Kālottara. See Kālottaratāntra.

Saṃvaṭaṅkāottara. A = NAK MS 1–1692, NGMPP A43/12: palm-leaf; Licchavi script; incomplete; B = IFP MS Transcript 334.

Saṃvataṭhāgatattvasaṃgraha. HÖRUCHI 1997 and 1983.
The Śaiva Age

Sarvadurgatiparīśodhanatantra. SKORUPSKI 1983.

Sarvabuddhasamāyoga/Sarvabuddhasamāyoga-ākūtinījālaśaṃvara. See Sangs rgyas thams cad mnyam par sbyor ba under Tibetan Texts.


Sādhanaṇidhi of Kambalapāda, a commentary (pañjikā) on the Herukābhidhāna (Cakrasaṃvaratantra). NAK MS 4-122, NGMPP B31/20: palm-leaf; Newari script; undated.


Siddhāntapaddhati of Jñānaśiva. IFP MS Transcript 507, pp. 374–394.


Siddhāntasamuccaya of Trilokeśaśiva. IFP MS Transcript 206, pp. 56–111.
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Subhāṣitasamgraha: Subhāṣita-Samgraha. An Anthology of Extracts from Buddhist Works Compiled by an Unknown Author to Illustrate the Doctrines of Scholastic and of Mystic (Tāntrik) Buddhism, ed. Cecil Bendall. Le Muséeon 4, 1903, pp. 373–403 (Part 1), and 4, 1904, pp. 5–46 (Part 2).

Sūkṣmāgama. IFP MS Transcript 1003.

Sekanirdesapaññikā of Rāmapāla. ULC MS Or. 149: palm-leaf; Pāla script.
A critical edition of the text is being prepared for publication by Professors Harunaga Isaacson and Francesco Sferra, which they have kindly allowed me to consult.


Somasambhupaddhativākhyā of Trilocanaśiva. IFP MS Transcripts 457 and 170.


Sthitisamāsa of Sahajavajra. NAK MS 5-139, NGMPP B24/4 (Kośakārikā): palm-leaf; 14 folios; incomplete, lacking folios 3, 9, 13, 15, and 19; Newari script; perhaps 13th century. Mantranaya section: ff. 11r3–18v5.


—. IFP MS Transcript 507, pp. 1–356.

Svāyambhuva. IFP MS Transcript 133.


Svāyambhuvasūtrasamgrahaḥ: śrīśaivāgame svāyambhuvasūtrasaṃgrahaḥ (sva-
yambhuvā maharṣibhya uddiṣṭaḥ), ed. Veṅkaṭasubrahmanyaśāstrī, Mysore, 1937.


Haracaritacintāmaṇi of Rājānaka Jayadratha. A = SORL MS 1547: paper: Śāradā script and Devānāgārī; B = SORL MS 1510: paper: Śāradā; C = SORL MS 599: paper: Kashmirian Devānāgarī.


Herukasādhana of Kalyāṇagarbha. Sādhanaṃala, no. 242.

Herukasādhana of Hūmkāravajra. See He ru ka'i grub pa'i thabs under Tibetan Texts.

Herukābhyudaya. See Khrag ’thung mgon par ’byung ba under Tibetan Texts.

Herukābhyudayapañjikā (Katipayākṣarā) of Kumāracandra, ed. in Dhīh 27, pp. 148–170.

Herukābhyudayapañjikā (Katipayākṣarā) of Kumāracandra. KLK MS 229, NGMPP C26/2 (’Herukābhyudayamahāyogīnītantra’): palm-leaf; proto-Bengali script.

Hevajratantra. SNELLGROVE 1959.

Hevajratantrapiṇḍārthaṭikā of Vajragarbha. KLK MS 128, NGMPP C14/6: palm-leaf; Māgadha script; copied in Vikramaśilamahāvihāra, therefore before c. 1200.

**JAVANESE TEXTS**


Deśawarṇaṇa. = Nāgarakṛtāgama.


Wrhaspatitattwa. Sanskrit with an Old Javanese commentary. SINGHAL 1957.
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**TIBETAN TEXTS**

*Khrag 'thung mngon par 'byung ba*. DK, Rgyud 'bum, vol. ga, ff. 1v–33v. Translation by Advayavajra and Chings yon tan 'bar of the *Herukāhyodayamahā-yoginītantra*.

*mKha’ ‘gro ma’i dra ba’i rdo rje gur rgyud*. DK, Rgyud 'bum, vol. nga, ff. 30r–65v (D); sTog Palace Kanjur, Rgyud 'bum, vol. ca, ff. 148v–202r 94, p. 369, ll. 5–6 (T). Translation by Gayadhara and Śā kya ye šes ('Brog mi) of the *Ḍākinīvajra-pañjaratāntara*.

*Khor lo sdom pa’i dka’ ‘grel dpa’ bo’i yid du ‘ong bzhes bya ba*. DT, Rgyud ‘grel, vol. ma, ff. 1v-41r. Translation by Dharmaśrībhadra and Rin chen bzang po of Bhavyakārtti’s commentary (*Viramanoramā) on the Laghuśaṃvaratāntara*.


*Grub thob brgyad bcu rtsa bzhi’i lo rgyus*. Peking Tenjur, Rgyud ‘grel, vol. lu, 1v–68r (A); *Grub thob brgyad bcu rtsa bzhi’i chos skor*, New Delhi: Chopel Legdan, 1973, reprinted in Robinson 1979, pp. 312–391 (B). Biographies of the Eight-four Siddhas, which the Tangut monk Smön grub shes rab claims to have heard from an Indian Guru of Tsam pa rṇa (B : tsam pa ra A [Champaran in N-W Bihar]) named Mi ’jigs sbyin pa dpal (Abhayadatta śrī) and then rendered into Tibetan.


*rGyud spyi*. LESSING and WAYMAN 1980.


*bCom ldan ’das ma’i man ngag gi rjes su ’brung ba zhes bya ba’i rnam par bshad pa*. DT, Mdo, vol. ba, ff. 1v-320r. Translation by Alaṅkakadeva and Tshul khrims ’byung gnas sbas (early 12th century) of the *Bhagavatyāmāyānusārini nāma vyākhyaḥ, a commentary on the Aṣṭasāhasriṇā*
Prajñāpāramitā composed during the reign of Rāmapāla (c. 1072–1126) by an author who identifies himself only as a resident of the Rājajagaddala monastery (rgyal po dza ga ta la gnas pa).


De kho na nyid mkhas pa. DT, Rgyud 'grel, vol. ma ff. 253r–352r. Translation by Rin chen grub of the *Tattvaviśāradā, Śāśvatavajra's commentary (-vr̥tti) on the Laghuśaṃvara. The Skt. title given at the beginning of the translation is śrītattvaviśādā nāma śrīsamvaravr̥tti.

De kho na nyid grub pa. De kho na nyid grub pa zhes bya ba'i rab tu byed pa. DT, Rgyud 'grel, vol. tsu ff. 26v–39r. Translation by Dipākaraśrījñāna and Rin chen bzang po, revised by Kumārakalaśa and Śākya 'od, of the Tattvasiddhi (Tattvasiddhināma prakaraṇam) of Śāntarakṣita.

bDe mchog nyung ngu. DK, Rgyud 'bum, vol. ka, ff. 213r–246v. Translation by Padmākara and Rin chen bzang po, revised by Prajñākirti and Mar pa Chos kyi grags pa, of the Laghusamvaratantra.

rDo rje ā ra li: rDo rje ā ra li zhes bya ba'i rgyud kyi rgyal po chen po. DK, Rgyud 'bum, vol. nga, ff. 171r–176r. Translation by Gayadhara and Śā kya ye shes ('Brog mi) of the Vajrālīmahaśāntarāja.

rDo rje mkha' 'gro: rgyud kyi rgyal po chen po dpal rdo rje mkha' 'gro. DK, Rgyud 'bum, vol. kha, ff.1r-125r. Translation by Gayadhara and Gos lhas btsas of the Vajradākamahāśāntarājā.


rDo rje phreng ba: rNal 'byor chen po'i rgyud dpal rdo rje phreng ba mngon par brjod pa rgyud thams cad kyi snying po gsang ba rnam par phyé ba. DK, Rgyud 'bum, vol. ca, ff. 208r–277v. Translation by Sujanaśrījñāna and Zhi ba 'od of the Vajramālāmahāyogatantra.

Nor bu chen po rgyas pa'i gzhal med med khang shin tu rab tu gnas pa gsang ba'i dam pa'i gsang ba'i cho ga zhib mo'i rgyal po zhes bya ba'i gzungs. DK, Rgyud 'bum, vol. da, ff. 286v–309r. Translation by Vidyākaraśrībhava and dPal gyi lhun po, revised by Vidyākaraprābhava and dPal brtsegs, of the Mahāmaṇi-vipulavimānasupraṭishthitaguhyparamarahaśyakalpadhāraṃ.

rNam par snying mdkad chen po mngon par byang chub pa'i rgyud: rnam par snying mdkad chen po mngon par rdzogs par byang chub pa rnam par sprul pa byin gyis rlob pa shin tu rgyas pa mdo sde'i dbang po'i rgyal po zhes bya ba'i chos kyi rnam grangs. DK, Rgyud 'bum, vol. tha, ff. 151v–260r. Translation
by Śilendrabodhi and Dpal brtsegs of the Mahāvairocanābhisambodhitantra (*Mahāvairocanābhisambodhivikurvitādhiṣṭānavaipaulyasūtrendrarājanāmadharmaparyāyā).

_rNam par snang mdzad chen po mngon par byang chub pa'i rgyud chen po'i 'grel_ of Sangs rgyas gsang ba (*Buddhaguhya). DT, Rgyud 'grel, vol. _nju_, f. 65r–Tu, f. 116r. Revised translation by Gzhon nu dpal of Buddhaguhya’s commentary on the Mahāvairocanābhisambodhitantra.

_rNal 'byor bla na med pa'i rgyud kyi don la 'jugs pa bsdus pa._ DT, Rgyud 'grel, vol. _tsu_, ff. 104v–115r. Translation by Śraddhākaravarman and Rin chen bzang po of the former’s *Yoganiruttaratantarārāthvātārasamgraha_.

_rNal 'byor ma bzh'i'i kha sbyor rgyud._ DK, Rgyud 'bum, vol. _kha_, ff. 44v–52v. Translation by Chings yon tan of the Caturyoginīsāṃpuṭatantra.

Byang chub lam gyi sgron ma'i dka’'grel of Dipaṅkaraśrīnā. SHERBURRE 2003.

_Tshul gsum gyi sgron ma._ DT, Rgyud 'grel, vol. _tsu_, ff. 6v–26v. Translation by Padmākaravarman and Rin chen bzang po of the *Nayatrayapradīpa_ of Tripiṭakamala (Tripiṭakamalla?).

_Yon tan ma lus pa'i gnas zhes bya ba'i 'grel pa._ DT, Rgyud 'grel, vol. _ma_, ff. 156v–207r. Translation by Chos skyong and Rin chen grags of Viravajra’s commentary on the _Laghuśaṃvara_.


_Rin po che'i tshogs zhes bya ba dka’'grel._ DT, Rgyud 'grel, vol. _ba_, ff. 246v–315r. Translation by Tāraklaśu (sic; Tārakalaśa?) and the Tibetan Guṇaśrī of Durjayacandra’s commentary on the _Laghuśaṃvara_.


_Sangs rgyas thams cad mnyam par sbyor ba: dpal sangs rgyas thams cad mnyam par sbyor ba mkha’'gro ma sgyu ma bde mchog ces bya ba'i rgyud phyi ma._ DK, Rgyud 'bum, vol. _ka_, ff. 151r–193r. Translation of the Sarvabuddhasamāyogā (Sarvabuddhasamāyogaḍākinījālaśaṃvaranāmottaratantra). No translators recorded, but said to be the work of the Tibetan Lha rin po che; cf. Tōh. 1659, 1664–1669, 1671–1672, 1674, and 1677.

_gSang ba 'dus pa'i dka’'grel._ DT, Rgyud 'grel, vol. _bi_, ff. 1v–81r. Translation by Vijayaśrīdhara and Rin chen bzang po, revised by Śraddhākaravarman, of the commentary by Ānandagarbha on the _Guhyasamāja_ (*Guhyasamājapaññikā_).

_He ru ka'i sgrub pa'i thabs._ DT, Rgyud 'grel, vol. _la_, ff. 200r–208r. Translation by Vidyākaraśrīma and Lha rin po che of the _Herukasādhana_ of Hum mdzad rdo rje (Hūṃkāravajra).
SOUTH AND SOUTHEAST ASIAN INSCRIPTIONS


Epigraphia Carnatica. 1885–1965. Mysore Archaeological Department, Madras/Bangalore/Mysore.

Epigraphia Indica. Archaeological Survey of India. Calcutta/Delhi, 1892–.


HULTZSCH, E. 1885. The Sārnāth Inscription of Mahīpāla. IA 14, pp. 139–140.


RAJAGURU, Satyanarayan. 1962. Jayarampur Copper-Plate Inscription of the
The Śaiva Age


**Studies and Translations**
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Prolegomena and English Synopsis. Groningen: Egbert Forsten.
American Institute of Indian Studies Photograph Library: http://dsal.uchicago.edu/images/aiis/
BEAL, Samuel. 1884. Si-yu-ki. Buddhist Records of the Western World. London: Trübner. A translation of the first five chapters of the Da Tang Xiyu ji ‘Memoir of the Western Region during the Great Tang’, an account of Xuanzang’s journey to India (629), his long sojourn there (630–644), and his return to China (645), compiled by Xuanzang’s assistants under his supervision in 646.
—. 1914. The Life of Hiuen-tsiang by the Shaman Hwui Li. Popular Edition. London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner & Co. First published in 1911. A translation of the Da Tang Da Ciensi sanzang fashi zhuan ‘Biography of Tripitaka, Master of the Dharma, of the Great Monastery of the Compassionate Benefaction during the Great Tang’, the account of the life and travels of Xuanzang (602–664) completed by his disciple Huili in 649 and covering his life up to his return from India to China. The remaining five chapters (6–10), covering his life in China after his return from India, were completed by Xuanzang’s disciple Yancong in A.D. 688.
—. 1902. Catalogue of the Sanskrit Manuscripts in the British Museum. Lon-
don: Gilbert and Rivington.


CHAMPAKALAKSHMI, R. 1986. Urbanization in Early Medieval Tamilnadu. In *Situating Indian History*, edited by Sabyasachi Bhattacharya and Romila Tha-
par (Delhi: Oxford University Press), pp. 34–105. Reprinted as chapter 4 (‘De-
velopments Within: Urban Processes in the Early Medieval Period A.D. 600 to
c. 1300’) of her Trade, Ideology, and Urbanization. South India 300 BC to A.D.
1300 (Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1996).

Delhi: Oxford University Press.

CHAULEY, G. C. 2000. Excavated Remains at Lalitagiri, a Buddhist Site in
Orissa. In Archaeology of Orissa, 2 volumes, edited by Kishor K. Basa and
Pradeep Mohanty, Delhi, Pratibha Prakashan, pp. 441–455.

CHIMPA, Lama and Alaka CHATTOPADHYAYA. 1990. Tārānātha’s History of
Study). Tibetan title of the original: rGya gar chos ’byung.

COHEN, Andrew L. 1998. Temple Architecture and Sculpture of the Noḷambas
(Ninth-Tenth Centuries). New Delhi: Manohar.

Blackwell Companion to Hinduism, edited by Gavin Flood (Oxford: Blackwell),
pp. 229–270.


CUNNINGHAM, Sir Alexander. 1885. Reports of a Tour in Bundelkhand and
Rewa in 1883–84 and of a Tour in Rewa, Bundelkhand, Malwa, and Gwalior,
in 1884–85. ASI Reports, Vol. 21, Parts 1 and 2. Calcutta: Superintendent of
Government Printing, India.

In History of civilizations of Central Asia. Volume III: The crossroads of civi-

DAGENS, Bruno. 1979. La florilège de la doctrine śivaïte, Śaivāgamaparibhāṣā-
mañjarī de Vedajñāna. Édition critique, traduction et notes. Publications de
l’IFI 60. Pondicherry: IFI.


DATTA, Swati. 1989. Migrant Brahmaṇas in Northern India. Their Settlement
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CONVENTIONS IN THE FOOTNOTES

Where I have rejected the reading of a text-edition, inscription, or manuscript, I have substituted my proposed reading and marked the point at which it begins with a superscript asterisk. Its end is indicated by the beginning of the parenthesis that follows. In that I first state whether I judge the proposed reading to be a simple correction (corr.), an emendment (em.), a conjecture (conj.), or, in one case, a diagnostic conjecture (diagn. conj.). By the last I mean a conjecture that restores what I take to be the intended meaning of the author while recognizing that an alternative wording is possible. I maintain no clear-cut distinction between corrections, emendations, and conjectures. I intend thereby only to distinguish approximately between three levels of decreasing obviousness. Where the reading adopted is my own proposal no further information is added. Where it has been proposed by another I have given the surname of the proposer after the abbreviation (e.g. em. MIRASHI). These abbreviations, or abbreviations followed by a name, are followed by a single space, a colon, and a single space, after which I have given the reading that I have rejected. That is followed by an
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abbreviation that indicates whether the source is the edition of the text (Ed.) or inscription (Ep.) listed in the bibliography, or the manuscript (Cod.) listed in the same. Where more than one manuscript has been cited, they are distinguished by the sigla assigned in the same. When I have given a translation of a passage in which I have rejected a reading or readings I indicate this in the translation only in the case of what I have classified as conjectures, e.g. ‘‘Vidyeśvaras on the northern altar (conj.)’. Any testimonium is given in square brackets after the reading that it supports. In a few cases in which I have judged a word to have been lost I have inserted it between angle brackets (e.g. <ca>) and where I have judged that insertion to be less than certain I have followed it with a question mark (e.g. <svadharma?>). In my translations I have marked the corresponding words in the same way. Where I can offer no cure but judge that the intended meaning can be deduced from the context I have given that meaning in my translation enclosed between a superscript asterisk and a question mark in parenthesis. Where I judge a reading to be corrupt but can offer no cure even on the level of meaning alone I have marked the beginning of the reading with a superscript asterisk followed by a question mark in parenthesis, and marked the corresponding place in my translation with a superscript asterisk followed by three dots and a question mark in parentheses. In general I have standardized the Sandhi and orthography of the Sanskrit in all citations, whether from texts or inscriptions. All translations of the text-passages that I have cited are my own.
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