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Part I

History and Sources
CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1 THE BRAHMAYĀMALATANTRA AND CULT OF YOGINĪS

On the eighth day of the waxing moon of the month of Māgha in the year 172, Nepāl-samvat—Sunday, 12 January, 1052 C.E.—a certain Jayākarajīva, who resided in the vicinity of Kathmandu’s Paśupatinātha temple, completed copying a Sanskrit text called, among other names, the Brahmayāmala. This endeavor had undoubtedly occupied him a long while, for the text fills three hundred and fifty-eight long, double-sided palm-leaf sheets (FIGURES 3.1–2). Fortunately, the product of his labors found its way into the manuscript collections of Nepalese royalty, and is today housed in the National Archives in Kathmandu. But for this, precious little knowledge of a vast and important pre ninth-century work would have been possible, a fate which has befallen all too many works of tantric literature. The other extant codices of the Brahmayāmala (hereafter BraYa), also of Nepalese provenance, all appear to descend from this eleventh-century manuscript. Although the scripture itself was not composed in Nepal, no complete manuscript appears today to survive outside of this

1 NAK accession no. 3-370. See the ms’s description in the introduction to the critical edition. Luciano Petech records the colophon and date of the manuscript as follows: “Ms. Brahmayāmala, National Archives, III.370. Colophon: samvat 100-50-2 Māgha-sukā cstamaṃ ādityadine R.-P.-śri-Baladeva-rājya śri-Paśupati nātha śri-Jayākarajīveśa Brahmayāmalaṃ nāma śāstram likhitam. Written at Paśupati Nāth. The date is verified for Sunday, January 12th, 1052.” Petech, Mediaeval History of Nepal (circa 750-1482), 2nd ed., 44. (Petech’s samvat 100-50-2 is a typographical error for samvat 100-70-2; the ms reads samvat a cā 2.)

2 The dating of the Brahmayāmala is addressed in chapter 4, section 3.

3 Manuscripts of the BraYa are described and discussed in the introduction to the critical edition.

4 The question of the provenance of the BraYa is taken up in chapter 4.
The BraYa designates itself a tantra: a treatise, ostensibly of divine origin, considered authoritative scripture within the cult of Śiva that is “based on the tantras” (tāntrika)—i.e. “Tantric Śaivism.” The most significant emic term for this tradition is “the Mantramārga” or “Way of Mantras.” It should not be inferred from the paucity of extant manuscripts that the BraYa was an unimportant or little-known work of tantric literature. A glimpse of the authority it once commanded may be had in the writing of the Kashmiri polymath Abhinavagupta (fl. circa 1000 C.E.), who cited the scripture often despite its degree of cultic and doctrinal remoteness. Somewhat like the Rudrayāmala, the actual text would largely be forgotten; yet its aura of authority would persist, on the basis of which there would emerge several new “Brahmayāmalas.” I am aware of five: a South Indian text connected with the cult of Bhadrakālli, in which some traces of the older BraYa are discernable; another South

---

5 On the term “Mantramārga” and its scope, see Alexis Sanderson, “Religion and the State: Śaiva Officials in the Territory of the King’s Brahmanical Chaplain,” 229 (n. 1). On the term tantra, see Sanderson, “Śaivism and the Tantric Traditions,” 661-62. It is noteworthy that in addition to “Mantramārga,” the BraYa in one instance uses the term “Tantramārga” in what appears to be a comparable sense. BraYa xcv.29cd-30ab:

\[
\text{prāpnuṣṭāḥ mahādevi siddhayo manaseṣṭitaḥ}
\]

“Ever repeating [the mantra] with the method established in the Way of Tantras, O Great Goddess, one would obtain the siddhis the mind desires.”

(prāpnuṣṭāḥ appears to represent the “correct” optative, prāpnuṣṭit, metri causa, while siddhayoh is nominative in form but accusative in sense—a common phenomenon in the BraYa.) Harunaga Isaacson (personal communication, September 2007) draws my attention to the fact that the Purascaryāvatara refers to Tantric Śaivism as the Way of Tantras as well, in i.149ab: ṛvedamārgam paritajya tantramārgaikata-tatparāḥ, “[those who,] abandoning the Way of the Vedas, are devoted exclusively to the Way of Tantras...”.

6 For a discussion of some of Abhinavagupta’s references to the BraYa, see chapter 4, section 3 (n. 57).

7 On the Rudrayāmala, of which no old version survives but which became “the foremost locus of ascription in Hindu Tantric literature,” see Goudriaan, Hindu Tantric and Śākta Literature, 47-48. It is possible that the old BraYa continued to have a place in Nepalese tradition into the early twentieth century: Haraprasād Sāstrī, who more than a century ago cataloged the oldest codex of the BraYa, reports on views of the text then current in Nepal: “in the opinion of the Pāṇḍits of Nepal the full texts of Brāhma Yāmala is a lakh and a quarter of slokas, and that it belongs to all the six schools of Tantra. The present work, extending over 1200 [sic; 12,000?] slokas, belongs, however, to the western school.” A Catalogue of Palm-leaf and Selected Paper Manuscripts Belonging to the Durbar Library Nepal, vol. ii, reprinted in Reinhold Grünendahl, A Concordance of H. P. Sāstrī’s Catalogue of the Durbar Library and the Microfilms of the Nepal-German Manuscript Preservation Project, 61.

8 This text is preserved, incomplete, in a Devanāgarī transcription in the collection of the Institut.
Figure 1.1: National Archives of Kathmandu MS 3-370, folios 3v-4r.

Figure 1.2: NAK 3-370, detail of folios 3v and 4r, left third.
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Indian "Brahmayāmala" related to this of which only a few chapters survive;² a short
text preserved in a Bengali manuscript expounding a series of ritual diagrams (cakras
or yantras), with no discernable relation to the older BraYa,¹⁰ a text of the cult of Tārā
by this name transmitted in an untraced Bengali manuscript, a section of which has
been published;¹¹ and a "Brahmayāmala" preserved in a single, fragmentary Nepalese
ms, which though eclectic, draws directly from the older BraYa.¹² Additionally, the
BraYa has been the locus of ascription for several hymns of praise (stotra),¹³ and

François de Pondichéry (manuscript T. 522), copied from a manuscript from Tirukkalukkunram in
Tamil Nadu. Very recently, this text has been discussed by Alexis Sanderson, who provides evidence
for its South Indian provenance and shows several respects in which it demonstrates continuity with
the older Brahmayāmala. Sanderson, "Arthavavedins in Tantric Territory: the Āṇgrasakalpa Texts of the
Oriya Paippalādins and their Connection with the Trika and the Kālikula. With critical editions of the
Parājapavādhi, the Parāmantravādhi, and the "Bhadrakālīntantravidhiprakārama," 277–78.

¹¹ Two chapters of this text were published as an appendix in Girisacandra Vedāntatīrtha (ed.),
Tārātantram. Śrīgīrīścandracintāmadīnanttirhitasākātān. With an Introduction by A. K. Maitra. By all appear­
ces from a much later period, this "Brahmayāmala" seems unrelated to the older text of the same
name. The ms on which the edition is based apparently comes from the collection of the Varen­
dra Research Museum Library. Maitra, introduction to ibid., 22. However, this might no longer be
available, for the archive’s relevant catalog of manuscripts makes no mention of it. Several "Brah­
mayāmala" manuscripts are described, but none appear likely to be the basis for the published text:
number 279 transmits the ŚrīŚrībrahmayāmala śākunāśiramvaiti sīrā śākunāśiramvaiti samātīram
(number 250, of sixteen folios, consists of a panegyric (passage from ff. 14r–14v has close parallels in
the subject of Mahakalā and the Mothers, and secret signs (chomma)
¹² Theodor Aufrecht makes reference to at least fifteen distinct works having the BraYa as locus of
ascription, mostly apotropaic hymns (the kavaca genre) and hymns of the "thousand names" genre of
panegyric (saḥsranāmamstotra). Aufrecht, Catalogus Catalogorum. An Alphabetical Register of Sanskrit Works
and Authors, vol. 1, 382; vol. 11, 87; and vol. 111, 81. See also n. 11 above. I have had no opportunity to

¹³ Theodor Aufrecht makes reference to at least fifteen distinct works having the BraYa as locus of
ascription, mostly apotropaic hymns (the kavaca genre) and hymns of the "thousand names" genre of
panegyric (saḥsranāmamstotra). Aufrecht, Catalogus Catalogorum. An Alphabetical Register of Sanskrit Works
and Authors, vol. 1, 382; vol. 11, 87; and vol. 111, 81. See also n. 11 above. I have had no opportunity to
possibly more literature that has not come to my attention.

Though surviving in just a handful of manuscripts, the old BraYa has in fact fared better than most early Šaiva scriptures. As Dominic Goodall shows, a relatively small number of the early tantras of the Šaivasiddhânta survives; furthermore, many of the texts listed in ancient descriptions of the tantric Šaiva canon exist only in versions of post eleventh-century, South Indian provenance.¹⁴ And little at all survives of the scriptures of the proto-tantric cults of the Šaiva Atimârga, “the Path Beyond,” which apparently formed the immediate background of the Šaiva Mantramârga.¹⁵

Tantric traditions have been characterized in popular culture and no small amount of scholarship as quintessentially concerned with goddesses and/or ritualized forms of sexual activity.¹⁶ But that there is no intrinsic connection with either, and that the two are not concomitant, should in fact be obvious; indeed, goddesses and ritual coitus have little or no place in several of the major, early tantric traditions. Tantric Buddhist practice systems based on the yogatantras and earlier literature infrequently accord high cultic status to female deities, while sexual ritual appears to have been a comparatively late development.¹⁷ Extant sources of the Vaiṣṇava tradition of the Pâñcarâtra appear to give no place to ritualized sexuality, while the Laksmitantra—a work of the early second millennium shown to have been influenced by nondual-

¹⁴ Goodall, introduction to Bhatta Râmakarâca's Commentary on the Kiranatantra. Vol. 1: Chapters 1-6, xxvi-li.


¹⁶ To catalog the varied guises in which such visions of the tantric traditions have and continue to surface is no small task; Hugh Urban’s recent monograph tracing the genealogy of modern understandings of “Tantra” provides a useful starting point: Tantra: Sex, Secrecy, Politics and Power in the Study of Religion.

¹⁷ Coitus and the ritual engagement with other varieties of ‘impurity’ appear to have their earliest attestation in the Sarvatattvatattvasamgraha. See Steven Weinberger, “The Significance of Yoga Tantra and the Compendium of Principles (Tattvasamgraha Tantra) within Tantric Buddhism in India and Tibet,” 197–200. These elements take on added importance in the Guhyasamâjatantra and related works, literature in some respects transitional between the yogatantras and yoginîtantras, and classified accordingly as mahâyogatantras. See Anthony Tribe, “Mantranava/Vajrayâna: tantric Buddhism in India,” 212–13. In the present thesis, chapter 3, section 4, discusses the emergence of goddess cults in Tantric Buddhism.
ist Šaivism—seems exceptional in according theological preeminence to the divine feminine. And in the early pan-Indian and living South Indian traditions of the Šaivasiddhānta, female deities have subsidiary roles, while sexual ritual is little attested. Arguably, these represent the predominant tantric traditions flourishing in South Asia and the lands of its cultural influence through much of the early medieval period. Yet tantric traditions did develop that centered upon goddesses, including ones which harnessed sexuality as an important element in a wide range of practices focused upon achieving occult powers (siddhi) and liberation (mukti, mokṣa).

The BraYa represents such a tradition. It in fact comprises one of the most consequential sources of evidence for early tantric Šaiva goddess cults, while sexuality has a significant presence in its systems of ritual.

In a model of the canon of Šaiva scripture advanced in chapter thirty-eight of

---

18 Alexis Sanderson argues for the influence of the Pratyabhijnahrdaya of the Kashmiri author Kṣemarāja, as well as other Šaiva works, on the Laksmltantra, in “History through Textual Criticism,” 35–36. On the Laksmltantra and the role of goddesses therein, see Sanjukta Gupta’s introduction to her translation, Laksml Tantra: A Panačāra Text. Translated with an Introduction and Notes.

19 On the comparative insignificance of goddesses in the Nīśesatattvasamhitā, an early siddhāntatantra, see chapter 3, section 2. Interestingly, sexual ritual does have limited attestation in some of the earliest siddhāntatantras, though even in these it appears marginal. See Sanderson, review of N. R. Bhatt, ed., Matahgapādramedhāgama (Kriyapāda, Yogapāda and Cāryapāda), avec le commentaire de Bhaṭṭa Ramakantha, and of Bhatt, ed., Kauravagama. Édition Critique, introduction et notes, 565; and also chapter 3, section 2, in the present thesis.

20 Nonetheless, much of the scholarly literature has assumed an artificial distinction that, at times, goes so far as to exclude the Vaiṣṇava Panačāra and/or Šaivasiddhānta from the category of “Tantra.” Note for instance David White’s recent remarks: “a number of works that closely resemble the Tantras in their ritual focus call themselves Āgamas or Samhitās. These are works belonging to the... Šaivasiddhānta and (Vaiṣṇava) Panačāra schools, respectively.” Kiss of the Yogini: “Tantric Sex” in its South Asian Contexts, 17. This view, which suggests that the Šaivasiddhānta and Panačāra are marginal to the study of tantric traditions proper, is based in part on what Dominic Goodall points out is an artificial distinction between tantras and āgamas: in fact, early Šaiva scriptural sources, whether siddhāntatantras or e.g. bhairavatantras, designate themselves by both these terms, and samhitā is attested as well. Goodall, introduction to Bhāṭṭa Rāmakṛṣṇa’t Commentary on the Kiranatantra. Vol. I: Chapters 1–6, xxxvi–xxix. That the Panačāra scriptures—which often do refer to themselves as samhitās—are also, by their own designation, “tantras,” requires little investigation; note, for instance, the text title “Laksmltantra” (see above), and e.g. Ahiroddhamsamhitā 1.62ab: panačāratantrantra mokṣaika-phalalaksanaṃ (“[Viṣṇu created] the Tantra called ‘Panačāra,’ characterized by having liberation as its sole aim”). Cf. Yāmunācāraya’s Āgama-binduṣṭī, which refers to “the status of the Panačāra tantras as authoritative scripture” (panačāratantraptaprāṇāyita) in the prose immediately following the introductory verses. Marginalization of the Panačāra and Šaivasiddhānta from the study of tantric traditions in effect reinforces the characterization, alluded to above, of “Tantra” as being intrinsically concerned with goddesses and/or sexuality, for the other most influential tantric traditions—Tantric Buddhism (in its latter phases), and non-Saiddhāntika tantric Šaivism—provide much greater attestation of goddess cults and transgressive ritual. See also n. 32 below.
the BraYa, tantras are organized into three primary scriptural “streams” (srotas): the siddhāntatantras of the “middle stream,” distinguished by their focus upon the deity Sadāśiva; the vāmatantras of the “leftward stream,” regarded as scriptural authorities for the cult of the Sisters of Tumburu; and the “rightward stream” of the bhairavatantras. The BraYa identifies itself with the latter—scriptures of the cult of Bhairava, Śiva’s manifestation as the archetypal skull-bearing ascetic or kapālin. Furthermore, an important early classification of the bhairavatantras attested in the BraYa subdivides these scriptures into four “seats” or “mounds” (pīṭha): those of ritual gestures or mudrās; of maṇḍalas, diagrammatic representations of the deities; of [male] mantras; and of vidyās, the “lores” or “[female] wisdom mantras.”21 Mantras are gendered, for they are divinities—not infrequently referred to as “mantra-deities” (manatredevata).22
This ontological identification of efficacious sonic formulae with divinities is distinctive to the tantric traditions. The division between the Mantrapīṭha and Vidyāpīṭha is in fact one between male mantra-deities and the female vidyā-goddesses. It is within the Vidyāpīṭha of the bhairava-stream of revelation that the BraYa situates itself, an acknowledgement of the preponderance of feminine divinities in the ritual systems it advances. While a variety of terms designate these goddesses, foremost are the synonyms yogini—the feminine equivalent of yogi, i.e. “yogi”—and yogesi/yogeśvari: “female master of yoga.”23

The cult of yoginiś is central to the BraYa. This scripture expounds a pantheon of mantra-deities headed by the bhairava known as “Kapāliśa” (“Lord of the Skull-bearers”) and the supreme Goddess, his consort, known primarily as Caṇḍā Kapālinī

21 On the BraYa’s model of the Śaiva canon, see chapter 5, sections 4 and 5; see also chapter 4, section 4 (especially tables 4.2–4). On the subdivision of the bhairavatantras into pīṭhas, see Sanderson, “Śaivism and the Tantric Traditions,” 668–71; and in the present thesis, chapter 3, sections 2 (in the discussion of the Svacchandatantra) and 3.

22 Note, e.g., BraYa XI.43ab, referring to the smaraga-mantra (on which see chapter 5, section 3): nīmena rahitaḥḥh deco siddhante mantraveṇāḥ, “without this [mantra], the mantra-deities do not bestow siddhi.” Cf. Kṣemarāja’s comments ad Svacchandatantra 1.76cd–77ab. The latter provides the mantra of Kapalesa[bhairava], ending with the statement, kapalesaḥ prakṛtītaḥah in 77b (“[this] is proclaimed to be Kapalesa”): Kṣemarāja remarks, ayam kapalesaḥ prakṛtītaḥ ah mantrān mantravatākālātmattvāt (“this is said to be Kapalesa, because of the fact that mantras and the mantra-deities are identical”).

23 Although not attested in the BraYa, yogisī also occurs in the literature in the same sense, e.g. Tantrālōka 1.322a.
("Grim Bearer of the Skull"), "Aghori" ("Not Terrible"), and "Bhairavi." Several sets of goddesses complete the primary deity mandala: the Four Goddesses (devī) or Guhyakās; the Four Attendants (kinkarī), also called the Consorts (dātī); the Six Yojiniś; and the Eight Mothers (māḷī), in descending order of status. Their names and mantric forms are delineated in chapter 5, section 3 (table 5.1). While possessing distinct identities and degrees of cultic importance, these goddesses belong to a common typology, discussed below—that of the yojinī or yogeśvarī. The latter terms are multivalent in the BraYā, referring, according to context, to female initiates, i.e. human "yojinīs,"24 to specific sets of deities—the Six Yojiniś of the primary mandala, most frequently;25 and to the nameless hordes of flying goddesses said to manifest before the practitioner and grant boons, in the culmination of the most arduous rites.26 And although in the BraYā the terms devī ("goddess"), devatā ("deity"), and śakti ("power") are preferred, related Śaiva sources frequently use yojinī and yogeśvarī as generic terms for the myriad goddesses who pervade the cosmos as expressions of Śiva’s power (śaktī).27 In addition, "Yogeśī" occurs as an epithet of the

24 A striking case is that of BraYā 1.12cd–13, for which see the critical edition and translation in part ii; this appears to refer to female practitioners as "yojinīs." The passage is echoed in the opening verses of BraYā xi v, quoted in chapter 2 (n. 200).

25 See, for instance, BraYā n.11–14ab (edited and translated in part ii).

26 References to the yojinīs granting their dārśan to the successful practitioner are profuse; cf., e.g., BraYā xvii (ℓ. 52r, line 1):

vidyacakram tu yo vetti yathāvaśa sādhukaottamataḥ |
acireṇaśā kālena yogeśyo dārśanam vajet |
"cakram " cakran By " vogeśyo vajet |
"The best of sādhukas who truly understands the Circle of Vidyās—after a brief while the yogeśīs become visible [to him]."

Here the optative singular vajet apparently has the sense of the plural; cf. BraYā iv.358c, devy[?]o pratiṣheśaṃ vajet.

27 Note, for instance, Tintrasadbhāva 16.47cd–48:

tatteenāṃ su yojinyo jñātavyaśa ca vivāmane || 47 ||
śveccānuvidhayāno manovegā mahābhālāḥ |
vicaranti samastiṣā ca brahmaśoṣyavindrahūṃsiṣa || 48 ||
"The Yojınīs should be known in the form of the reality levels (tattva), O fair woman.
Carrying out the volition of Śiva, as swift as thought and mighty, they all traverse the worlds of Brahma, Viṣṇu, and Indra."

Text as quoted by Ksemarāja commenting on Netratantra 19.71 (here numbered as per Mark Dyckowski’s collation of the ms). In contrast, the BraYā refers to goddesses of the tattvas by the term devī, in particular; in BraYā xxx, note for instance 93cd: tatte tatte sthītā devaḥ adhikārapadāmīgah, “The goddesses are present in each of the tattvas, adhering to their [respective] positions of authority.” Cf.
supreme Goddess, especially in her role as eighth of the Mother goddesses (mātṛ).28

"Yoginī" hence designates a spectrum of female sacred figures, many of which in different contexts bear distinct names. In the BraYā, "yoginī" most frequently refers to a subset of a broader class of goddesses, while tantric Buddhist traditions often give preference to the term "dākini" as the generic name for such deities.29 It does appear, however, that "yoginī" had the widest currency as the class name for the goddesses in question, and the term is adopted accordingly in the present study. This is an amorphous class of deities, all the more so owing to the use of the term "yoginī" in designating tantric adepts—female "yogis"—or even the Great Goddess (mahādevī) herself. It is nonetheless possible to identify characteristic attributes that are widely, but not uniformly, shared by this class of deities.

The possibility of a "polythetic" approach to classifying religious phenomena received serious treatment first, I believe, in an essay of Jonathan Z. Smith. In the polythetic mode, membership in a class is determined by possession of significant shared properties, no single one of which is necessarily held by all members of the class—in rejection of the essentialist “idea of perfect, unique, single differentia.”30 Such a polythetic approach has been applied in relation to the nebulous category of "Tantra," most notably by Douglas Brooks, who advances a polythetic definition "Hindu Tantricism."31 While one might disagree with some of the properties identified and their relative priority,32 this approach appears productive—and, further-

87cd: tattvarāpat[h] sthita dergo yogaisvārāt hy aninditā[h], “the goddesses take the form of the tattvas, possessing yogic mastery, and irreproachable.”

28 In the BraYā, “Yogesi” describes the supreme Goddess as eighth of the Mothers in XLV.32b and LXVII.56a. Cf., e.g., yogīśī in Mālinīvijayottaratantra 3.14d.

29 See chapter 2, section 2 (n. 46); and chapter 3, section 4.

30 Smith, "Fences and Neighbors: Some Contours of Early Judaism," chapter 2 in Imagining Religion: from Babylon to Jonestown, 4-5 (quote on p. 4).

31 Brooks, The Secret of Three Cities: An Introduction to Hindu Śākta Tantrism, 53-72. Similar in principle are the lists of defining criteria proposed by Sanjukta Gupta, et al, Hindu Tantrism, 7-9; and, in reference to Tantric Buddhism, Stephen Hodge, introduction to The Maha-Vairocana-Abhisambodhi Tantra: With Buddhaguhya’s Commentary, 4-5.

32 It must be objected that the ten defining criteria Brooks adduces for “Hindu Tantrism” privilege goddess-oriented or Śākta traditions, particularly in their late medieval varieties—one of which is the subject of his monograph, Secret of Three Cities. Note in particular that the third criterion—which begins, “Tantrics are at once theists and philosophical nondualists” (p. 58)—excludes from the category “Tantra” the Śaivasiddhānta and Vaisnava Pāniccarātra, which typically possess dualist the-
more, offers a useful approach to the category “yogini.” Below, I attempt a polythetic definition of the yogini, identifying what appear to be key shared properties characterizing this class of sacred figure. Undoubtedly, there is much scope for further refinement. This is not, moreover, the first such attempt: David White has offered an eight-part descriptive definition of the yogini, which I both draw upon and depart from.33

Multiplicity. Characteristic of yoginis is their occurrence in groups. From perhaps the tenth century, they became closely associated with configurations of sixty-four—an association that remains strong today. The multiplicity of the yoginis is monumentalized in the stone temples dedicated to them constructed from

ologies. Part of Brooks’ seventh criterion seems in fact to have little application outside of late medieval, Smārta tantric traditions. Asserting that “tantrism does not differ significantly from Puranic Hinduism in the ways it conceives the world and God,” Brooks makes the equally surprising claim that “Śāktā- and Saiva-oriented Tantrics assume the pantheon of classical Hindu deities;” he also utilizes Advaitavedantic terminology for explicating tantric theology. Ibid., 67–68. None of this appears applicable to early medieval Tantric Śaivism of any variety. Criterion nine associates Hindu Tantra with ritual use of “conventionally prohibited substances” and “antinomian practices.” Based upon such criteria, Brooks comes to the problematic conclusion that “Śākta forms of Tantrism are deemed to be Hindu Tantrism par excellence.” Ibid., 72; see also 230 (n. 51). Furthermore, missing from Brooks’ list is at least one important criterion: the ontological identity of mantras and deities, which is surely a defining characteristic of the Śaiva “Way of Mantras” (mantramārga).

33 The definition White offers is as follows:

The Yoginis whose cults were central to Kaula practice had the following features: (1) they were a group of powerful, sometimes martial, female divinities with whom human female “witches” were identified in ritual practice; (2) their power was intimately connected to the flow of blood, both their own sexual and menstrual emissions, and the blood of their animal (and human?) victims; (3) they were essential to Tantric initiation in which they initiated male practitioners through fluid transactions via their “mouths”; (4) they were possessed of the power of flight; (5) they took the form of humans, animals, or birds, and often inhabited trees; (6) they were often arrayed in circles; (7) their temples were generally located in isolated areas, on hilltops or prominences and were usually round and often hypaethral; and (8) they were never portrayed as practicing yoga for the simple reason that yoga as we know it had not yet been invented.

Kiss of the Yogini, 27. In point eight, White presumably has in mind hathayogic bodily disciplines, with which yoginis were little connected. Many of the themes White identifies are indeed significant to conceptions of yoginis, while points (2) and (3) seem problematic. There is undoubtedly a sanguinary dimension to the cult of yoginis, and to the powers attributed to their most dangerous varieties. But as for yoginis’ “sexual and menstrual emissions,” the supposed significance of these remains mysterious to me; while the fluids of female practitioners are certainly significant in some rituals, the women concerned are seldom referred to as “yoginis,” while references in primary sources to the fluids of yoginis, as goddesses, appear rare and ambiguous. Similarly, I am presently unaware of a Śaiva tradition in which yoginis—presumably White has in mind female ritual consorts—were “essential to Tantric initiation,” and certainly not one in which they transacted with initiands in the manner suggested. On these points, I expect to write in greater detail in the future, examining the evidence on which White bases such claims.
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the tenth century, enshrining configurations of forty-two and perhaps eighty-one, but especially sixty-four goddesses. In Vidyāpīṭha and tantric Buddhist sources, however, smaller pantheons are typical. Yoginīs are in fact characterized more by their multiplicity than their individual identities, for there exists remarkable fluidity in the composition of yoginī sets. No particular name or set of names—with the exception of the Seven or Eight Mother goddesses, as discussed below—becomes closely associated with these goddesses, and they are in fact frequently spoken of as an amorphous band or horde (vrnda, gana) that pervades the cosmos in innumerable forms and varieties. Even sources that place particular importance upon a group of sixty-four might mention numerous other yoginīs.

Figure 1.3: Śiva enshrined within a circle of sixty-four yoginīs. Yoginī temple, Rānīpur-Jharial, Orissa. AII S Photo Archive.

34 On the temples of yoginīs, see Vidya Dehejia, Yoginī Cult and Temples. A Tantric Tradition. In the present thesis, see chapter 2, section 4; concerning textual references to sixty-four yoginīs (primarily in Kaula sources), see there, as well as chapter 3, section 3. Ronald Davidson points out the existence of contemporary temples of sixty-four yoginīs in Banaras and Ujjain. Indian Esoteric Buddhism: A Social History of the Tantric Movement, 181-83.
Manifestation in/as mortal women. Yoginis blur the boundaries between goddesses and women, for through ritual perfection, a female tantric adept might become a yoginī. Men, however, may only seek to join the yoganis and partake of their powers. Taxonomies reflect this phenomenon by positing yoginis as a scale of beings, extending from powerful cult goddesses to the mortal yoganis who emulate and even embody the deities. Thus according to the Siddhayogesvarīmata, a Vidyāpītha scripture, yoganis are fundamentally of two types: kulajā or “born in clans,” called also mānuṣya, “human”; and devatāh, “deities/goddesses.”

More complex yoganī taxonomies add further layers of ambiguity. Female divinization hence lies at the heart of the image of the yoganī, and comprises one of the most historically significant facets of their cult.

Organization into clans. Yoginis, as both deities and female adepts, belong to clans (kula, gotra) which shape their natures and identities. Taxonomies of yoganis exhibit considerable variety; however, in Śaiva sources, their organization into clans of the Brahmanical goddesses called the Seven or Eight Mothers (mātrī) appears fundamental. According to this schema, yoganis partake in the natures and appearances of the Mother goddesses, of whom they are considered partial incarnations or manifestations (aṃśa, lit. “portion”). Practitioners too establish ‘kinship’ with the goddesses, becoming thus their aṃśas, for initiation

---

35 Siddhayogesvarīmata 22.5:

devīvidhā yoginīḥ proktāḥ kulajā devatās tathā
mānuṣyāḥ kulajāḥ proktāḥ te śām śṛṇu kulodgatim
devijāśatīrvatīdānukulopanāḥ tu nāyikāḥ

“Yoginis are taught to be divided into two groups: those born in a lineage[,] and deities. Those born in a lineage are taught to be human; listen to their family line. [These] Heroines are born in Brāhmaṇa, Kṣatriya, Vaiśya, or Śūdra families.”

Translation by Judit Tőrzsők, editor of the Siddhayogesvarīmata: “‘The Doctrine of Magic Female Spirits’: A Critical Edition of Selected Chapters of the Siddhayogesvarīmata(tantra) with Annotated Translation and Analysis,” 171 (Sanskrit text on p. 50). The passage following upon this one is lacunose. This passage has a parallel in Tantrasadbhāta 16, beginning with verse 129.

36 Illustrative of this is a taxonomy of yoganis elaborated in Kaulajñānānīmya 8; relevant passages are quoted and discussed in chapter 3, section 3.

37 Buddhist taxonomies of yoganis, as might be expected, seldom associate the deities with the Brahmanical Mothers. The Laghucaṅkāśāvyavatātantra, for instance, advances several classification schemas based upon clans headed by identifiably Buddhist deities, in chapters 16–19 and 23.
effects entry into the clans of the deities.\footnote{See chapter 2, section 1.} Sets of yoginīs, such as those enshrined in temples and listed in the purāṇas, frequently include the Mothers among them,\footnote{Dehejia, \textit{Yogini Cult and Temples}, appendix I (pp. 187–200).} while the term \textit{mātrī} ("Mother goddess") is occasionally applied to yoginīs.\footnote{Use of the term \textit{mātrī} in the sense of "yoginī" is attested in the Siyan inscription of Nayapāla, in Bengal; see chapter 2, section 4 (n. 299). Dehejia points out several other examples; \textit{Yogini Cult and Temples}, 31.} Classification of the clans of yoginīs forms an important theme in the literature of the Yoginī cult, an example of which is \textit{Bṛya} \textit{Lxxiii}, edited and translated in part II of the present thesis. The \textit{Bṛya}, moreover, places the Mothers within a broader hierarchy of goddess clans, extending from deities of the most pernicious sort—such as the dangerous \textit{dāmarī}—to the text’s highest maṇḍala deities.\footnote{\textit{Bṛya} \emph{LV.3-54}.}

\textit{Theriomorphism.} A hallmark of yoginīs is polymorphism, with theriomorphic forms being especially common. From horses and lions to birds and snakes, sculptural and textual representations of yoginīs attest a wide variety of animal elements. As a deity typology, a close parallel lies in Śiva’s ganas ("troops, horde"), an amorphous and diverse class of male deity, often theriomorphic, whose imagery ranges from the horrific, grotesque, and martial, to comic, exuberant, and musical. Another parallel lies in the multitudinous Mother goddesses described in the \textit{Mahābhārata}, deities with whom the genealogy yoginīs is closely linked.\footnote{See chapter 2, section 2 (on the \textit{Mahābhārata}).} In contrast to the ganas and Mothers, actual shapeshifting is closely associated with yoginīs, who are thought to take on the forms of female animals in particular. Tales of yoginīs also associate them with the power to transform others.\footnote{On the shapeshifting of the yogini, note \textit{Kadhajñananirnaya} 23, quoted and discussed in chapter 2, section 4 (the text of 23.1–12ab is given in n. 309). Stories of yoginīs from the \textit{Kathāsaritsāgara} are discussed in chapter 2, section 3 (subsection on the \textit{Brhaṭkathā} retellings).}

\textit{Kāpālika cult and iconography.} The yoginīs’ connection with the cult of Bhairava, the
archetypal mortuary ascetic (kapālin), finds representation in their kāpālīka or mortuary iconography, for they frequently bear skulls, bone ornaments, and skull-staves (khaṭvāṅga), as well as incorporate other elements of radical tantric iconography. Furthermore, yoginiṣīs have a strong association with cremation grounds: while a variety of liminal places are spoken of as their haunts, their primary locus is the charnal ground (śmaśāna), the preferred site for the radical practices advanced in Vidyāpīṭha tantras.

**Danger, impurity, and power.** Fundamental to conceptions of yoginiṣīs is their potency as sources of both danger and immense power. In this respect they inherit the ambivalence of early Indian Mother goddesses. While dangerous to non-initiates and fatal to apostates, the wild horde of yoginiṣīs becomes all-beneficient to the greatest of tantric “heroes” (vīra) who succeed in their arduous rituals of propitiation. It is to such rituals that much of the BraYā and similar sources is devoted, and the Yojini cult is distinguished by the aim of achieving blessings of these beings in direct, transactional encounters—called most frequently melāpa or melaka (“meeting, encounter, union”). Effecting and navigating encounters with yoginiṣīs thus become subjects to which the literature of the cult devotes much attention.⁴⁴

---

⁴⁴A passage from BraYā xiv provides a vivid account of the danger posed by yoginiṣīs in ritual:

> japet mantra mahāsattvo digvāsa daksināmukhaḥ |  
> saptarātena yoginīyo āgacchānti mahābhayāḥ || 214 ||  
> raudrāryāṇā lathāḥsudāḥ sakrodhā māraṇāmikāḥ || 215 ||  
> tad deśṭu tu na bhetādyām vīrasyattvena maṇtrinā || 215 ||  
> argham lāṃ bhradāryām praṇāpāte kṛte sati || 216 ||  
> tasyante nātra sandelāḥ sādāke sattvasamyuktē || 216 ||  
> kathayanti ca taṃ sprṣṭā yathārahanti ca subhāsubham || 217 ||  
> pramādād yadi kṣubhyeta sattvaḥ śānti-kālaḥ || 217 ||  
> taktṣaṇād devī bhādantī yoginiṃ yogadarpituḥ |  
> na taṃ naksayitum śaṅko rudro ‘pi svayam āgataḥ || 218 ||

214b "mukhaḥ | em.; "mukham Byā || 215a "rūpas | em.; "rūpa Byā "suddhā | corr.; "suddhā Byā || 215b "tmikāḥ | em.; "tmikā Byā || 216a pradātaryām | em.; pradātaryāḥ Byā || 217a taṃ | em.; ta Byā ||  
217c pramādā | em.; pramādā Byā || 218a "kṣanād | em.; "kṣanā Byā || 218c taṃ | em.; ta Byā

“The [śādhaka] of great spirit should recite the mantra, naked, facing south. After seven nights, the yoginiṣīs come—highly dangerous, with terrifying forms, impure, angry, and lethal. But seeing this, the mantrin of heroic spirit should not fear; after prostrating, he should give them the guest-offering. [They become] pleased towards the sādākṣa endowed with [heroic] spirit, without a doubt. And touching them, they tell truly the [prognostication
The danger and power of the yogini appear closely linked to engagement with impurity, an important dimension of which is her association with the cremation ground. They epitomize a culture of ritual ‘nondualism’ (advaita), in which the purity conventions of Brahmanical orthopraxis give way to “a visionary mysticism of fearless omnipotence, of unfettered super-agency,” in which the sādhaka seeks to assimilate the powers of the hordes of yoginis, primarily, “in occult manipulations of impurity.”

Transactional encounters with yoginis often revolve around conventionally impure substances: practitioners offer wine or their own blood in lieu of the guest-water offering (argha), burn incense of neem oil and garlic, make offerings of flesh in fire sacrifice, or even offer mixed male-female sexual fluids. Conversely, a yogini might offer impure ritual “gruel” (caru) to the disciple, the unhesitant acceptance and consumption of which becomes a medium for her bestowal of power.

Protection and transmission of esoteric teachings. Yoginis are ascribed the dual roles of protecting and in some cases disseminating esoteric tantric teachings. Often, their bestowal of power manifests in the transmission of secret lineage teachings (sampradāya), rather than direct transferece of power (siddhi). In some cases, works of tantric literature link their pedigree to transmission by yoginis.

---

45 Sanderson, “Purity and Power among the Brahmans of Kashmir,” 201.
46 On the offering of caru, note BraYa lxxv.13cd–14ab, quoted in chapter 3, section 5; and Kaulajñānamirīṣa 11.7cd–10, in the same section (n. 165).
47 On the notion of sampradāya as esoteric knowledge transmitted by yoginis, see the annotation to BraYa lxxiii.74. In some cases the teachings imparted by yoginis are referred to as jhāna—“wisdom,” which, though vague, can have textual connotations. Note BraYa xcvi.25–26ab:

mātr yoginikātyāni śākīnām kulānī tu
sīḥānanti śādhanakendrasya yogenaśvara suvrate || 25 ||
kathānti ca sādhanāt kulajñāṇa jñānam uttānam ||

“Through this yoga, O pious woman, the clans of the groups of Mothers and yoginis, [and] of sākinis, bestow siddhi on the sādhaka; and they speak the true essence—the highest scriptural wisdom (jhāna) arising from the Clans.”

48 A noteworthy case is that of the Mahārthamanjari of Maheśvarananda, a South Indian author writing around the beginning of the thirteenth century who attributes his composition to the inspiration...
According to the BraYā's revelation narrative, yoginīs are said to hide away the scripture at the end of the Kaliyuga, reflecting another aspect of their roles as guardians of the teachings. Furthermore, yoginīs wreak destruction upon violators of the tantras, including those who break the initiatory Pledges (samaya)—hapless individuals who risk becoming yoginī food.49

Flight. Yoginīs are consistently associated with the power of flight, foremost among the powers (siddhi) sought by their votaries. In this they inherit the mantle of the vidyādhara and vidyādhari, the semi-divine sorcerors of early Indic myth.50 Taxonomies of yoginīs suggest that aerial deities represent only one of their numerous varieties, alongside e.g. “terrestrial” (bhūcari) goddesses. However, the archetypal yogini is the autonomous Sky-traveller (khecarī), joining whose ranks represents the ultimate attainment for the siddhi-seeking practitioner—the sādhaka.

Discussion is warranted concerning the expression “Yogini cult,”51 for this renders no emic category used in the classification of the tantric traditions, and, furthermore, risks the exotic connotations of “cult” in its popular usage—connotations that deeper acquaintance with some aspects of the tradition might not immediately of a visionary encounter with a yogini. See Whitney Cox, “Making a Tantra in Medieval South India: the Mahārathaśiḥarī and the Textual Culture of Cōḷa Cidambaram,” 1–6. Cox draws attention to several similar traditions of inspiration by a yogini; ibid., 2–3.

49 Cf. Viṇṇākha 320cd–21ab:

sanyāṃgyhitamantrāś ca nāstikā vedanindakāḥ || 329 ||
sāmayaebhyah pariḥrasīs tathā tantraviditaśakāḥ ||
gurūnām viheṭhanapāriṣ tantrasāraviṇaḥpakāḥ || 320 ||
yoginiḥśadā bhrasīḥ kathyaṃ dharmalopaḥkāḥ |

“Those who take up mantras on their own, atheists, critics of the vedas, breakers of the Pledges, desecrators of the tantras, those intent on harming the gurus, and those who violate the essence of the tantras—those who violate Dharma are said ever to be ruined by the yoginis.”

On the threat of being eaten by yoginīs, see above (n. 44).

50 See chapter 2, section 3 (subsection on the Brhatkathā and its retellings).

51 The expression “Yogini cult” surfaces in the works of early twentieth-century authors, such as P. C. Bagchi. I have not yet identified nineteenth-century precedents, although these might exist in archeological reports on yogini temples. Contemporary scholars, such as Vidya Dehejia and Alexis Sanderson, have continued to use this terminology, although David White eschews the expression in Kiss of the Yogini: “Tantric Sex” in its South Asian Contexts.
discourage. “Cult” is nonetheless a productive, if not indispensable category for referring to tantric systems of worship. Though centered on specific deities and often possessing distinct authorizing scriptures, tantric worship systems or “cults” are not mutually exclusive—certainly not to the point of being distinct “sects.”

Yoginis, however, do not figure as cultic foci in the manner of most tantric divinities: their cult is integrated within those of the ‘high’ deity or deities who form the primary focus of a given ritual system. While the BraYa expounds the cult of Kapāliśabhairava and Aghoreśī or Canḍā Kāpālinī, ritual practices connected with yoginis register a constant presence. This is true of the other major extant Vidyāpīṭha tantras as well. It would nonetheless be problematic to identify the cult of yoginis with the Vidyāpīṭha, for the Yogini cult extends beyond its confines. Most of the surviving Śaiva literature closely connected with yoginis in fact belongs to the corpus of Kaula scripture, which appears to have roots in Vidyāpīṭha traditions. Moreover, the cult of yoginis is by no means restricted to Śaivism, for it characterizes Indian Tantric Buddhism in its latter phases, which saw the production of a corpus of scriptural literature frequently referred to as the yogini tantras, “Tantras of the Yoginis.” There is even evidence suggesting Jaina engagement in the cult of yoginis. The “Yogini cult” hence extends across both cultic and sectarian boundaries, identifying a complex of cognate tantric cults spanning several centuries which placed considerable emphasis upon a multiplicity of female divinities designated, most frequently, by the term yogini and its variants.

52 In the words of Alexis Sanderson, “Accessible from the main cults of the Vidyāpīṭha, and underlying them in a more or less constant form, is the more ancient cult of Rudra/Bhairava in association with female spirits (Yoginis).” “Saivism and the Tantric Traditions,” 671.

53 On the Kaula and Vidyāpīṭha distinction, see chapter 3, section 3.

54 Significantly, a class of Jaina goddesses appears to be modelled upon yoginis: that of the vidyādevīs or “Wisdom goddesses.” Occurring in groups usually sixteen in number, these goddesses find depiction in numerous temples, perhaps most notably in circular ceiling panels in the temples of Mt. Abu. On the Jaina vidyādevīs, see U. P. Shah, “Iconography of the Sixteen Jaina Mahavidyas;” Maruti Nandan Prasad Tiwari, “A Note on the Figures of Sixteen Jaina Goddesses on the Adinatha Temple at Khajuraho;” and John Cort, “Medieval Jaina Goddess Traditions.” A Jaina commentator upon the Yaśastilaka (on which see chapter 2, section 3) in fact explicitly identifies yoginis as vidyādevīs; elsewhere he describes them, drawing on a Jaina taxonomy of divinities, as mahāvyantarīdevīyaho; “great goddesses of the intermediate class.”
Several scholars have, to various degrees, connected the worship of yoginis with a sect supposedly called the “Yogini Kaula.” This designation is dubious, however, being in fact based on the erroneous interpretation of the expression yoginikaula as it occurs in the Kaulajñānanirnaya. A Kaula scripture, this tantra has been cited comparatively widely by virtue of having been published seventy-five years ago. The phrase yoginikaula occurs as a titular epithet in almost all colophons of the Kaulajñānanirnaya, and twice elsewhere in the text;\(^55\) this appears to mean “Kaula teaching of [=transmitted by?] the yoginis.” That “yoginikaula” refers to esoteric knowledge associated with or possessed by yoginis is suggested by the Mrgendrāgama, where this term describes one of eight sub-streams (anusrotas) of scriptural revelation—a tradition of secret wisdom maintained by the yoginis.\(^56\) However, Prabodh Candra Bagchi, the Kaulajñānanirnaya’s editor, interpreted the term as a sectarian designation; he concluded that “Matsyendra was the founder of a new sect of the Kaula school, called the Yogini-kaula.”\(^57\) In arriving at this he apparently misinterpreted a list of texts as a list of sects: the passage in question seems to list four texts, one of which—the Kaulajñānanirnaya—is described as “yoginikaula.” This appears entirely consistent with the colophons.\(^58\) The one other non-colophonical occurrence of the term yoginikaula is

---

\(^55\) Note for instance the colophon of chapter seven, which is typical: \textit{iti jñānanirnayaiyoginikaulam mahacchārtmacchādbhāpavatātāntarī candradhvarīvarīvarīgata saptañā pratāhaḥ, as reads Kṣṇā. The syntax is puzzling: presumably read \textit{yoginikaule.}

\(^56\) Mrgendrāgama, Caryapada 40cd-41ab:

\begin{quote}
\begin{align*}
\text{yogināṁ lebhīre jñānaṁ sadayogayāvābhāsakam} & \text{ \(\| 40\|\)} \\
\text{yena tad yoginikaulaṁ noṭṭīrṇaṁ tābhya eva tat } & \\
\end{align*}
\end{quote}

“The yoginis obtained scriptural wisdom that immediately makes [the power of] yoga manifest. For this reason, it is [called] yoginikaula (‘Kaula wisdom of the yoginis’). It has not [subsequently] emerged forth from them.”

Bhaṭṭa Nārāyaṇaṇaṭṭha remarks on this verse that the yoginis obtained scriptural wisdom (jñāna) from Śiva, which remains among them alone as a secret tradition (sadyah taksamam eva yogam avabhāsyati yat tathāvibhāgā jñānaṁ śvabhājitaṁ kākṣād yoginaya prāpyah | tānt eva sakṣād noṭṭīrṇaṁ nānyatra prastāntaṁ eva sampradāyataṁ sūhātaṁ ity arthaṁ \|.).

\(^57\) Bagchi, introduction to Kaulajñānanirnaya and Some Minor Texts of the School of Matsyendranātha, 35.

\(^58\) The passage in question is Kaulajñānanirnaya 16.47-49:

\begin{quote}
\begin{align*}
\text{mahākālaṁ siddhakaulaṁ siddhakaulaṁ matsodaram} & \text{ \(\| 47\|\)} \\
\text{caturyugavibhamṣena avatāram cāyam maya} & \text{ \(\| 47\|\)} \\
\text{jñānādau nirnītii kauḷaṁ devīte mahat saṃyātam} & \text{ \(\| 48\|\)} \\
\text{iṣṭe saṃyātaṁ nāma kalau matsodaram prīte} & \text{ \(\| 48\|\)} \\
\text{ye ekṣmān nirgatā devi varṇayasyāmi te ‘khillam} & \text{ \(\| 49\|\)} \\
\text{etasmād yoginikaule nāmā jñānaya nirnītii} & \text{ \(\| 49\|\)}
\end{align*}
\end{quote}
more problematic, perhaps referring to a specific technique.\textsuperscript{59} Abhinavagupta, incidentally, cites a text by the name Yoginikaula; yet this does not appear to be the Kaulajnananirnaya.\textsuperscript{60} Bagchi's problematic postulation of a sect called the "Yogini Kaula" has been repeated by V. W. Karambelkar, in an article entitled "Matsyendranātha and his Yogini Cult;"\textsuperscript{61} Devangana Desai, in a discussion of the Yoginī temple of Khaju-

\textsuperscript{47b} matsodaram \textsuperscript{KjN\textsuperscript{od}}; masādaram \textsuperscript{KjN\textsuperscript{od}} \textsuperscript{48a} nirnītiḥ \textsuperscript{KjN\textsuperscript{od}}; nirnītiḥ \textsuperscript{KjN\textsuperscript{od}} \textsuperscript{48d} matsodaram \textsuperscript{KjN\textsuperscript{od}}; matsyodaram \textsuperscript{KjN\textsuperscript{od}} \textsuperscript{49d} nirnītau \textsuperscript{KjN\textsuperscript{od}} (nirnītau \textsuperscript{KjN\textsuperscript{od}}) (unmetrical)

"From the Mahākaula comes the Siddhakaula; from the Siddhakaula the Matsyodara; I accomplish the 'descent' [of scriptural revelation] in accordance to the division of the four yugas.\textsuperscript{[47]} In the beginning (ādau) there is the scripture (jñāna) [called] Nirñīti kaula.\textsuperscript{[i.e.]} jñāna nirñīti kaula = Kaulajñanānirnītaya.\textsuperscript{[In the second]} [yuga], the one called Mahat \textsuperscript{[=Mahākaula]}. In the third, the one named Siddhāṃtrā = Siddhakaula. In the Kaliyuga, the Matsodara, my dear.\textsuperscript{[48] And I shall describe entirely those [scriptures?] which emerged from this, this yoginikaula—the jñāna nirñītī [i.e. Kaulajñanānirnītaya] by name."

The syntax and interpretation of 49 are especially problematic. It appears to me that the locative nirnitau must agree with the ablative etasāmad (49c)—a grammatical barbarism not beyond the language of this text, in which there is often little distinction between the oblique cases.

Bagchi arrived at a rather different interpretation of this passage, identifying matsodara (i.e. matsyodara) as a reference to the figure Matsyendranātha, and "Yoginikaula" as a sect. He remarks, "it appears from these slokas that Matsyodara belonged to the Siddha or Siddhamrta sect and was particularly connected with the Yogini-kaula, the doctrines of which are explained in the jñānasāra-nirnītī." Introduction to Kaulajñanā-nirnītaya, 35. White too refers to "a group called the Yogini Kaula," presumably having the same passage in mind. Kiss of the Yogini, 22. He interprets the passage above as listing "the sectarian groups" through which the Kaula gnosis "was transmitted, down to the 'Fish-Belly' in the present age" (Kiss of the Yogini, 103). He offers the following translation of verses 47-48:

From the Mahākaula [arose] the Siddha Kaula; from the Siddha Kaula the Fish-Belly. It was uttered by me upon each of the divisions of the four ages (yugas). In the first [age] the bringing forth (nirnitī) [was made] to the Kaula; in the second to the [Kaula] known as Mahat; in the third, to the [Kaula] named Siddhāṃtrā [and] in the Kali [age] to the Fish-Belly. (Kaulajñanānirnītaya 16:47-48)

Kiss of the Yogini, 25. His translation of verse 49 is given elsewhere (p. 103): "I will now discuss to thee, in their entirety, those [teachings] that were lost [in transmission], O Goddess! [The teaching known] by the name of [the Bringing Forth of the Kaula] Gnosis came through this Clan of the Yoginis"—i.e. the Yoginikaula. However, this and the others are most certainly texts, not sects. Note for instance that Kaulajñanānirnītaya 16:54a refers to "what was spoken in the Siddhamrta" (siddhamrte tu yat proktam); the Siddhamrta is moreover mentioned in a list of scriptures in Kaulajñanānirnītaya 21. According to Sanderson, the Siddhamrta is quoted by early Kashmiri exegetes, as was by the text name Matsyodari (cf. Matsyodara in Kaulajñanānirnītaya 16:48). "History through Textual Criticism," 4. In the same passage in Kaulajñanānirnītaya 21 are also listed the Mahākaula (21.5a) and the Siddhāṃtrā [kaula] (21.7a), the latter probably identical to the Siddhakaula mentioned in 16:47a. White in fact appears to contradict himself concerning the interpretation of Kaulajñanānirnītaya 21: he once refers to this as containing a list of "no less than nine 'clan scriptures' " (p. 105), but elsewhere an "expanded list of the various subclans of the Kaula" (p. 25).

\textsuperscript{99} Kaulajñanānirnītaya 14:59b.

\textsuperscript{60} Tantrāloka 7.40-41. Jayaratna too quotes from the Yoginikaula, commenting after Tantrāloka 7.19ab.

\textsuperscript{61} Karambelkar, "Matsyendranātha and his Yogini Cult," 365. This article has in turn been drawn upon, for instance, by R. K. Sharma, who on its authority associates the cult of yoginis and yogini temple tradition with the "Yogini Kaula" founded by Machchendranātha, adding that "the principal tenets of the Yogini Kaula mārga is [sic] revealed in the Kaulajñanānirnītaya ...". The Temple of Chaunsatha-yogini at Bheraghat. Cf. H. C. Das, Tantricism: A Study of the Yogini Cult, vii, 23.
raho;\textsuperscript{62} Nilima Chitgopekar, in an article examining yoginis from the perspective of gender;\textsuperscript{63} and David White, in his recent monograph on yoginis and Kaula sexual ritual.\textsuperscript{64}

It would appear that a Śaiva cult of yoginis flourished to the greatest extent in the period circa 700–1200 C.E., although its presence extends both before and beyond this period. From the tenth to perhaps thirteenth century, monumental stone temples enshrining yoginis were constructed spanning from one end of the subcontinent to another. Yet beyond this period, it becomes increasingly problematic to speak of a Śaiva Yogini cult, although tantric practices connected to yoginis, and certainly belief in them, find continued attestation. Latter medieval Kaula sources, such as the \textit{Kulārṇavatantra}, continue to attach significance to yoginis; yet their roles pale in comparison to those in earlier Kaula sources. The decline of the Śaiva cult of yoginis appears to have been gradual, and some indication of this trajectory may be gathered from its eclipse within the Nāṭh cult of the second millennium. While well-known medieval Sanskrit works of Nāṭh yoga place relatively little importance upon yoginis, there is reason to believe that the case was different in the thirteenth century; this is evident from the prominence of yoginis, alongside e.g. \textit{hathayoga}, in the lost \textit{Amṛta-kunda} or \textit{Kāmrūṣījākṣa}, a text translated into Persian (and subsequently Arabic) most probably in the thirteenth century.\textsuperscript{65}

\textsuperscript{62} Desai, \textit{The Religious Imagery of Khajuraho}, 92.

\textsuperscript{63} Citing the \textit{Kaulajñānanirnaya}, Chitgopekar claims that “the name Yogini-Kaula refers to a religious system which is orally transmitted by a line of female ascetics, the Yoginis.” “The Unfettered Yoginis,” 93.

\textsuperscript{64} See above (n. 58).

\textsuperscript{65} Referring to the Persian redaction, which he believes to represent the earliest Islamic version, Carl Ernst remarks, “This eclectic Persian text contained breath control practices relating to magic and divination, rites of the yogini temple cult associated with Kaula tantrism, and the teaching of hatha yoga according to the tradition of the Nath yogis… All of this was placed in a context of the supremacy of the goddess Kamakhya ….” “The Islamization of Yoga in the \textit{Amṛta-kunda} Translations,” 204. Incidentally, Ernst sees the association this text makes between a series of yoginis and the planets as “a deliberate attempt by the translator to familiarise the subject, in this case by likening the summoning of Indian goddesses to well-known Middle Eastern occult practices involving planetary spirits.” Ibid., 219. However, this interpretation probably overlooks medieval Indian astrological conceptions of yoginis; the predictive technique known as \textit{yoginiḍasa} is based upon conceiving of eight planetary bodies as yoginis. Manuscripts on the subject of \textit{yoginiḍasa} are listed in the catalogs of several collections; I have for instance examined one by this title, attributed to the \textit{Rudrayāmala}, in the Van Pelt Library, Philadelphia; Collection of Indic Manuscripts no. 390, item 714. That the system of \textit{yoginiḍasa} remains in practice
The present study is concerned with yogini traditions of the first millennium. Its principal objective is to advance understanding of the content and contexts of an unpublished and little-studied tantric Śaiva scripture—the BraYā. The thesis has two parts: the first consists of studies—two chapters of which concern the cult of yoginis broadly, and two of which focus upon the BraYā—while part II presents a critical edition and annotated translation of selected chapters of the BraYā. Following a review of scholarship on the subject of the BraYā, below, chapter two embarks upon an examination of the early literary, epigraphic, and sculptural evidence for the cult of yoginis. This is intended to be comprehensive with respect to pre tenth-century material, while later sources are discussed selectively. Excluded from consideration is tantric literature proper; this instead forms the subject of chapter three, which traces the background and formation of the yogini cult in early Śaiva and Buddhist textual sources. Although the scope of chapters two and three is broad, the BraYā remains a constant point of reference. In chapter four, focus shifts to examination of the form, content, and structure of the BraYā; this chapter also addresses the question of the text's dating and provenance. The fifth chapter focuses on interpreting the identity the BraYā articulates for itself within its model of scriptural revelation and the Śaiva canon, based upon investigation of its various titles and epithets.

The source materials for this thesis are to a large degree unedited and unpublished texts, and the difficulties inherent in working with these have dictated an approach that is text-critical in emphasis. Chapter two involves examination of epigraphic and material evidence as well, particularly religious images. As will become apparent from the critical edition of part II, considerable philological scrutiny is required to yield sense from the BraYā in a great number of cases, and even then, the interpretation often remains provisional. This situation is not exceptional in the corpus of tantric Śaiva texts, the study of which remains at an early stage. In the absence of unambiguous data concerning the BraYā's provenance, dating, and authorship, the

is suggested by modern astrological manuals such as Rajeev Jhanji and N. K. Sharma, Applications of Yogini Dasha for Brilliant Predictions.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
approach has been to situate the BraYa in relation to the available materials—texts, inscriptions, and sculpture—and to probe the text's self-presentation for clues concerning the agents and circumstances involved in its production.

Chapters of the BraYa included in the critical edition and translation—part II—were selected on the basis of their relevance to the studies in part I. BraYa i and II are important sources for chapter five, along with BraYa xxxviii, the inclusion of which was prevented by time constraints. The other chapters edited concern subject matters central to the cult of yoginis: yoginilakṣaṇa or “the characteristics of yoginiś;” chomnā, the “secret signs” used for communication with the deities and other initiates; and yoginimelāpa, “encounters with yoginiś.” Further relevant material from the BraYa on the subject of the clans of yoginiś could not be included, unfortunately.

1.2 THE BRAHMAKĀMALA IN SCHOLARSHIP

Although acknowledged as important, the BraYa has received relatively little scholarly attention. Its oldest manuscript was described more than a century ago by Haraprasād Śastri, in his partial catalog of the collection of the former Durbar Library, Nepal.Śastri says little concerning the BraYaś content, but provides an incomplete list of chapter colophons. Decades later, Prabodh Candra Bagchi penned several pages concerning the BraYa in an appendix to his 1939 book, Studies in the Tantras. In this, he summarizes chapters one and thirty-eight, providing also the text of several passages. I am not aware of further scholarship substantively addressing the BraYa in the decades which followed. After a gap of half a century, Teun Goudriaan wrote on the BraYa in his history of the literature of Hindu Tantra—an

---

67 Following the colophonal numbering in the ms, Bagchi labels the latter chapter “thirty-nine.”
68 Studies in the Tantras, Part I, 102–5 (appendix: “Detailed Notices on Manuscripts”). This book is a compilation of articles Bagchi published in the early 1930s, and I do not believe a second part ever appeared. His accounts of the BraYa are frequently inaccurate. Note, for example, that Bagchi refers to BraYa 1, the ‘sambandhapatala’, as having the title Aksaravidhana; this he presumably pulls from the text’s epithet Navāksaravidhana. He would also have Īśvara rather than Bhairava teaching the tantra to the Goddess.
ambitious undertaking considering how little of the early material had been studied carefully. After making some preliminary observations on the BraYā and the yāmala-tantras as a genre, Goudriaan provides a precis of the text's subject matters, as well as an excerpt from chapter xxiv in translation.⁶⁹ Although offering little insight into the historical position and significance of the text,⁷⁰ he noted that "a closer study of the Picumata, although certainly not an easy task on account of its cryptic ways of expression, rambling style and bad grammar, is necessary for better insight into early Hindu Tantrism."⁷¹

The first attempt at more detailed study of the BraYā was made by the late S. N. Ghoshal Sastri of Viśvabhāratī University. Sastri drew heavily upon the BraYā in his ambitious multi-volume series, Elements of Indian Aesthetics. Unfortunately, he had at his disposal only a single incomplete MS of the work containing chapters four through seven, which I refer to as the "Viśvabhāratī MS," and a transcription of chapter xliv from an unknown MS. Based upon the limited evidence available to him, Sastri believed the Picumata—an epithet of the BraYā—to be a section of the BraYā, much as he considered the Pingalāmata to be a section of the Jayadrathayāmala; incomplete MSS of both the latter texts were also available to him in the Viśvabhāratī collection.⁷²

Sastri’s primary interest in the BraYā was its material culture and “arts,” for he saw in its maṇḍalas, iconometry, iconography, ritual, and ritual paraphernalia evidence for “primitive” Indian arts and crafts. He considered the Tantric tradition one of the principal streams of ancient Indian aesthetics, alongside the Vedic, and saw the BraYā, perhaps correctly, as a uniquely important source for study of early Tantra.⁷³ Based upon connections of a most tenuous nature, Sastri claimed that the

---

⁶⁹ Hindu Tantric and Śākta Literature, 40-44.
⁷⁰ Cf. for instance Goudriaan’s rather bland remark that “the Picumata is a typical representative of the Bhairava current in Śaiva Tantrism.” Ibid., 43.
⁷¹ Ibid., 44.
⁷² See the discussion of MSS in the introduction to the critical edition in part ii. These manuscripts were all apparently of Nepalese provenance, gifted by the monarch of Nepal to Rabindranath Tagore.
⁷³ Sastri, Elements of Indian Aesthetics, vol. ii, part 1, chapter xi.
BraYa represents the cultural legacy of Indo-Tibetan tribal peoples of the northeastern regions of the subcontinent—specifically, the Gāro tribe of Meghālaya, a region in which a district headquarters bears the name “Tūra.” This he connected with the word tūra for skull, used often in the BraYa, which appears to have been his only evidence linking the BraYa to the Gāro tribe. In addition, he considered the BraYa improbably ancient.

The distinction of first publishing a complete chapter of the BraYa is Sastri’s, the only chapter to have appeared in print prior to the present dissertation. Sastri considered this forty-second chapter of the BraYa, the mudrāpatala or “Chapter on Mudrā,” to be one of the most ancient treatises of “Indian Gesturology.” He published his edition on the basis of Haradās Mitra’s transcription of a manuscript believed to have once been in the Viśvabharati collection. I suspect that the manuscript in question transmitted BraYa xlii independently, whether alone or in a composite manuscript. It is possible but by no means certain that its readings reflect a transmission distinct from that of the oldest Nepalese ms, NAK 3-370. Sastri’s edition reproduces this transcription with several proposed emendations, providing also an English rendering which, at times implausible and at times incomprehensible, con-

---

74 Elements of Indian Aesthetics, vol. ii, part 4, 41.

75 In ibid., vol. ii, part 1 (p. 98), Sastri opines for a date of the third century or earlier on the basis of a dubious relative chronology of the Natyasastra, Kalidāsa’s Meghaduta, the BraYa and Pingalāmata, and Matsyaapurāṇa. Yet in vol. ii, part 4 (p. 3), he claims the BraYa was composed between the third and fifth centuries, for which he refers the reader back to the above discussion in vol. ii, part 1.

76 Elements of Indian Aesthetics, vol. ii, part 3, 297–305. Note that the edition’s title page misleadingly refers to this as the first chapter in the BraYa/Picumata’s “Caturtha-śatka (4th Part of the 6th unit).” The BraYa might possess two “śatkas—see chapter 4, section 2—but this chapter is the first of neither. The expression caturthasaśatka means in fact “the fourth division of six-thousand verses.” Apparently Sastri confuses the BraYa with the Jayadrathayāmala, the latter of which is divided into four śatkas.

77 Following the colophon, Sastri refers to this as chapter forty-three; but it is forty-second in order of occurrence. The numbering in the ms goes awry from chapter xix until xxx.

78 Sastri remarks,

We find no other earliest extant evidence of Aesthetic Gesturology than the Natyaśāstra. On the other hand, no earliest Tantra and Purāṇa than the Brahma-yāmala-tantra is yet known to us. On the above postulation, the Mudrādhikaraṇa of the Picumata and the Pingalāmata, may be considered the prime documentary source of Indian Gesturology and to that end in the original texts of two Mudrādhikaraṇas are annexed to the Part iii of the present volume. [sic]


79 See the introduction to part ii.
tributes relatively little to the interpretation of the text.\textsuperscript{80}

Mark Dyczkowski makes more meaningful use of the \textit{BraYā} in his 1988 monograph on the Śaiva scriptural canon.\textsuperscript{81} Reading from its oldest Nepalese ms, he cites passages from the \textit{BraYā} as supporting evidence on a variety of subjects. In particular, Dyczkowski draws upon \textit{BraYā} xxxviii’s account of Śaiva revelation—the very chapter which had interested Bagchi. Making several useful observations,\textsuperscript{82} he does not however attempt a detailed analysis of the \textit{BraYā} or advance a hypothesis on its historical position.\textsuperscript{83}

As with so much of tantric Śaiva literature, significant strides in the study of the \textit{BraYā} commenced with the works of Alexis Sanderson. In “Śaivism and the Tantric Traditions,” his monumental 1988 essay mapping the cults and canon of Tantric Śaivism, Sanderson advanced a compelling hypothesis concerning the position of the \textit{BraYā} within Śaiva traditions. He notes several significant ways in which the text appears archaic. Seeing within the Bhairava-stream of esoteric Śaivism an historical

\begin{footnotesize}
\footnote{Note for example his text and translation of the opening verse, \textit{BraYā} xvii.1:

\begin{verbatim}
atahparam pravakṣadmi karaṇamskāra-sodhanam |
mudrānām lakṣaṇān caiva sarvekāmārthaśadhanam || 1 ||
\end{verbatim}

"Let me now tell how we could sanctify and purify our hands. What is the definition of the mudra (Gesture) and which are their common characteristics. These mudrās may lead to the way of success all noble works and fulfill all desires of a man."

\textit{Elements of Indian Aesthetics}, vol. 11, part 3, 297.}

\footnote{The Canon of the Saivagama and the Kubjika Tantras of the Western Kaula Tradition, especially 36–53.}

\footnote{Note for example the following remark:

The BY makes use of this [four-\textit{piṭha}] system of [scriptural] classification, integrating it somewhat awkwardly with a division of the scriptures into Left, Right and Middle currents. The BY’s account of the \textit{piṭhas} is sketchy and unsystematic—a sign that this system of classification is still at an early stage of development.

\textit{Canon of the Saivagama}, 51. While the \textit{BraYā}’s \textit{piṭha} system does seem undeveloped, its juxtaposition with a system of streams is not however awkward: the four \textit{piṭhas} are divisions of a single stream, the \textit{daksināsrotas} of bhairavatantras. I provide an edition of the relevant passages from \textit{BraYā} xxxviii in chapter five.}

\footnote{On one important historical matter Dyczkowski’s remarks warrant reconsideration: he suggests that the \textit{BraYĀ} must be younger than the \textit{Nityāsodaśikārṇava}, on account of the \textit{BraYā} listing the \textit{Yoginihrdaya} in its description of the canon; \textit{Yoginihrdaya} is a name of the \textit{Nityāsodaśikārṇava}. \textit{Canon of the Saivagama}, 47–48. While it is true that the \textit{BraYā} lists a text called \textit{Yoginihrdaya}, it is improbable that it refers to the same Kaula scripture of the cult of Tripurasundari which survives by this name—a text which, as Dyczkowski points out, mentions several other Kaula scriptures, including the rather late \textit{Kūbihikāmata}. (On the date of the \textit{Kūbihikāmata}, see Sanderson, “Remarks on the Text of the \textit{Kūbihikāmata},” 1–3.) Abhinavagupta makes no reference to a scripture called \textit{Yoginihrdaya}, and according to Sanderson, the extant \textit{Yoginihrdaya} displays substantial influence from the nondualist Kashmiri exegetical tradition. See “The Visualization of the Deities of the Trika,” 37.}
\end{footnotesize}
trajectory towards increasing emphasis on goddesses, he finds in the BraYa an early window into this process. Ostensibly a text teaching the cult of a bipolar Godhead, a yāmala or god-goddess pair, in the BraYa, the goddess Aghoreśvari in fact transcends Bhairava, for her vidyā-mantra contains within its nine syllables the entire māṇḍala of mantra-deities. And in the ritual practices of the BraYa, Sanderson identified the radical mortuary (kāpālika) and exorcistic rites forming the earliest stratum of the Yogini cult, which would undergo transformation as the Kaula movement came to permeate most cults of the bhairavatantras. Sanderson makes a number of other contributions to the study of the BraYa as well. Perhaps most noteworthy are his reconstruction of its nine-syllable vidyā-mantra, and demonstration that the BraYa is one of several Śaiva sources redacted into the Buddhist Laghucaśamvaratantra. In addition, he first identified the reference to the BraYa in the old Skandapurāṇa, discussed in chapter two, confirming the likelihood of the text’s early period of composition.

Several other contemporary scholars have begun to draw on the BraYa. In introducing her fine critical edition of chapters from the Siddhayogesvarimata, one of the few other surviving scriptures of the early Vidyāpīṭha, Judit Törzsöök makes reference to the BraYa and provides a transcription of a portion of chapter xxxviii (xxxix according to its colophon) from its oldest ms. Somadeva Vasudeva also makes limited use of the BraYa in his significant monograph on Śaiva yoga and the Mālinīvyājayottaratantra. He moreover has made available electronic transcriptions from the oldest ms of two chapters of the text: chapter nine, called 'laksyabheda', and forty-two, the same chapter published by S. N. Ghoshal Sastri.

A somewhat different case is that of David Gordon White’s Kiss of the Yogi:

---

85 Ibid., 672; and Sanderson, “History through Textual Criticism,” 41–46. On the relationship between the BraYa and Laghuśamvara, see also chapter 3, section 5 in the present thesis.
87 On this complex and interesting subject see Vasudeva, Yoga of the Mālinīvyājayottaratantra, 253–92. Vasudeva’s references to the BraYa occur in this context.
88 Along with much other interesting Indological material, these transcriptions are presently available on his website, http://homepage.mac.com/somadevah/index.html (accessed August, 2006).
"Tantric Sex" in its South Asian Contexts, one of the most recent works drawing upon the BraYā. White summarizes and partially translates two passages from BraYā lxiv,9 material outlining radical ritual practices that involve sexual intercourse. His accounts of these two sections are however highly problematic.90

While the BraYā is not of central importance in the work of these authors, their references attest the wide range of subjects it could potentially illuminate. It is hoped

---

90 Kiss of the Yogini, 248–50. White also makes reference to the BraYā on pp. 17, 23, 101, 163, and 322.
90 White states that he reads from the oldest Nepalese codex, NAK 3-370 (see Kiss of the Yogini, 332, n. 171), yet his bibliography confusingly lists instead a late, corrupt, Devanāgarī-script ms: "Brahmayāmala. Nepal National Archives. mss no. 1-743. Nepal-German Manuscript Preservation Project reel 166/1. 439 folios." Ibid., 337. The folio numbers provided (260b-65b—"b" apparently meaning "verso") do not match the text he cites from chapter forty-four in NAK 3-370 (which I report as "By"), but rather the Devanāgarī-script ms (reported as "Bv" in my critical edition).

The shorter of the two passages White cites is from BraYā xliv (numbered xlv in its colophon). After arguing, quite implausibly, that mudrā can have the meaning "vulva," White remarks,

... The term mudrā can, however, denote a substance to be eaten, rather than the vulva as "seal." So, for example, a verse in chapter xlv of the Brahmayāmala reads:

"tvaśaktyāśādhaḥ nityāṃ yathāvibhavasambhavāṃ | mudrāṃ caitavo yathāhāyānam madhy_an caiva
pradāpayet" ("But the practitioner who is without a consort [should] constantly [offer] according to what is possible for him. One should also offer mudrā, according to the rule, as well as liquor.")

Kiss of the Yogini, 82, 295 (n. 87). It is virtually impossible that an odd-numbered verse-quarter would begin with the enclitic particle tu; White moreover prints mādhyā ("middle") while apparently reading mādyā ("wine"), and prints and translates asaktyāśādhaḥ as though it could be a compound (an aluksamāsa?). He has in fact been misled by his choice of (the least reliable) manuscript—By—which reads tvaśaktyā śādhaḥ nityāṃ yathāvibhavasamabhāvāṃ || mudrāṃ caiva yathāhāyānamagbhāṇ caiva pradāpayet. The text of By, which appears original, is as follows:

\[\text{ sangatya} \text{ śādhaḥ nityāṃ yathāvibhavasamabhāvāṃ | mudrāṃ caitavo yathāhāyānam arghāṇ caiva pradāpayet || 648} ||

"Having worshipped the pantheon (yaṅg) as is befitting, the śādhaḥ, together with his consort (sṛṣṭī), should always make the food offerings to the extent of his capacity; and he should offer both mudrāḥ, as is befitting, and the guest water."

BraYā xlv 648cd-49. Substantial internal evidence in the BraYā clarifies that the expression mudrāṃ pradāpayet ("one should offer the mudrā") means "one should bind/display the mudrā," mudrā here having its, normal sense of "gesture," rather than something consumed. The ritual sequence of first binding a mudrā and then offering argha occurs repeatedly, and the phrasing usually leaves no ambiguity. Cf., e.g., xxxii.168cd (mudrāṃ badhitaḥ tato devi arghāṇ taṣṭāḥ pradāpayet), xxxiii.132ab (mudrāṃ badhitaḥ yathāhāyānam arghāṇ caiva pradāpayet), and xvii (mudrāṃ bandhaṇāṃ tataḥ kṛtvā arghaḥ caiva pradāpayet, exposure 951). The more ambiguous expression mudrāṃ [... ] pradāpayet occurs thrice in BraYā xii, and twice elsewhere in chapter forty-four.

Due to its length, I will not here reproduce and discuss in full the passage from BraYā xlv that White summarizes and partially translates (Kiss of the Yogini, 249–50). Suffice it to say that his account of this ritual of "viewing one's [past] births" (svayonidarsana) has numerous problems. Note for example White's rendering of xlv 691ab: "He becomes a Virile Hero, surrounded by yonis." Kiss of the Yogini, 250. This implies the Sanskrit vīro bhavati so devi yoniparīcāra, presumably White's emendation of By's reading (f. 265v): vīro bhavati sā devi yoniparīcāraḥ. This is of course unmetrical, and By is surely correct in transmitting vīro bhavati so devi yoniparīcāraḥ: "He becomes a hero, O goddess, surrounded by yoginis."
that the critical editions provided in the present dissertation and planned for future publication will facilitate more extensive use of the text.

1.3 A NOTE ON CONVENTIONS

In most instances, I provide the text and a translation of primary sources cited; some exceptions are made for readily accessible texts, especially if the passage is long, not especially problematic, and of no special consequence. When the length of a passage appears disproportionate to its relevance, I sometimes provide the text but forgo translation, especially if the source is well-known; also omitted are translations of some short passages that I paraphrase in the course of discussion. This approach, which I hope has helped curb the volume of annotation, has undoubtedly led to a number of inconsistencies.

Sources edited from manuscript appear with a critical apparatus; a list of the abbreviations used has been provided after the table of contents. Part 1 of this thesis quotes substantially from the BraYā. In most cases, the quoted text is constituted based only on the readings of the oldest codex, National Archives of Kathmandu no. 3-370 (reported as “BYā”; see the introduction to part II for a discussion of the manuscripts). I usually resist the temptation to comment upon the (sometime considerable) linguistic peculiarities of the passages cited, and upon some of the problems of interpretation. Such matters are, however, addressed in detail in the critical edition (part II). Passages quoted from the BraYā are cited by verse number rather than folio, while appendix A provides a concordance of the text’s chapters and the folio numbers in the oldest codex (BYā). Verse numbers from chapters not included in the critical edition are generally determined by mechanical division of the text into verses of four quarters (pāda), and it is likely that the numbering will change slightly in future editions. In very short quotations from the BraYā, an orthographic normalization (especially the correction of ś to s and vice versa), a minor emendation (e.g. ā for o or vice versa), or the addition of an anusvāra (m) or visarga (h), is indicated by en-
closing the character in question in square brackets. A critical apparatus is provided for longer passages, and in cases where more significant emendations or conjectures are proposed.

Translations are the present author's unless indicated otherwise. One undeniably quirky convention adopted is the use of a pair of question marks, in parentheses, to mark the beginning and end of a translated passage in which I consider the degree of uncertainty concerning the text or its interpretation particularly high. The first of the pair is inverted—i.e. "(?)". In quotations from commentaries, words from the text commented upon are set in bold typeface. Text citations are always from the edition or manuscript listed in the bibliography. In cases in which more than one edition or manuscript is listed, the source is specified. The Tantrasadbhāva, referred to frequently, is cited on the basis of the manuscript collation and draft edition generously made available in electronic form by Mark Dyzkowski;91 in the few cases that I have consulted the manuscripts myself and differed in their interpretation, this is indicated.

CHAPTER 2

EARLY EVIDENCE FOR THE CULT OF YOGINĪS: THE LITERARY, SCULPTURAL, AND EPIGRAPHIC SOURCES

2.1 INTRODUCTION: YOGINĪS AND MOTHER GODDESSES

A variety of evidence documents what I have described as the Śaiva Yoginī cult in the early eighth century C.E. It had moreover almost certainly developed earlier; but there are difficulties in determining exactly when, for much of early tantric Śaiva literature has been lost, and little has been dated with precision. For establishing a plausible chronological framework, other types of data are thus crucial. In the present chapter, I review the early evidence available in non-tantric literary sources, and the epigraphic and art historical records. The emphasis is upon pre tenth-century sources, but important evidence from the tenth century and beyond is also reviewed—particularly the temples of yoginīs, with which this chapter ends. In the subsequent chapter, the discussion will turn to tantric texts proper, both Śaiva and Buddhist, reviewing the background of the Yoginī cult in early tantric literature as well as actual tantras connected with yoginīs. It will be seen that the balance of evidence points toward the existence of Śaiva yoginī traditions in the seventh century—certainly in the eighth—and suggests that some of the extant Tantric literature was in circulation then as well, including the Brahmāyaṁala (hereafter BraYā), although not necessarily in the form we have it today. Reaching back into the sixth and then fifth centuries, the evidence becomes increasingly tenuous, but nonetheless remains substantive.
Significant elements of the Yogini cult considerably predate its development. It has been widely acknowledged that yoginis have roots in early traditions of Mother goddesses, mātrīs or mātrkās, whose qualities they inherit in no small measure. In seeking a genealogy of the cult of yoginis, the present chapter hence delves in some detail into the historical development of cults of Mother goddesses. A number of art historians and historians of religion have analyzed the textual, archeological, and epigraphic evidence for Indian Mother goddesses, including J. N. Tiwari, N. P. Joshi, Michael Meister, Katherine Harper, Shivaji Panikkar, and others. The present chapter reviews much of the same material, but also brings to bear upon the subject some of the rich evidence available in early tantric literature and the old Skandapurāṇa, much of which has only recently become available or remains unpublished. The specific aim is to identify with greater precision the relationship of

1 Authors of studies on the Mother goddesses have generally preferred the term mātrkā, for reasons unclear to me, possibly following contemporary usage or the usage of later Purānic literature. Although both terms occur, 'mātrī' is far more common in the early sources and in tantric Śaiva literature, and preferred accordingly in this study. I frequently use the English translation "Mother" or "Mother goddess" in precisely the same sense.

2 Other feminine deities feed into the image of the yogini as well; noteworthy are the yakṣī or yakṣinī, vidyādhāri, and to some extent the apsaras. Perhaps even more significant are Śiva's gānas: a horde or male deities whose theriomorphic or otherwise bizarre forms, multiplicity, variety, and engagement in activities such as warfare are highly suggestive of yoginis. The most detailed attempt to trace the early roots of conceptions of yoginis is that of David G. White, Kiss of the Yogini: "Tantric Sex" in its South Asian Contexts, 27-66. I discuss the role of the vidyādhāri and to some extent yakṣī later in this chapter, in the section on the Bhaktārti tradition, but do not otherwise delve in detail into this question; my concern is with the actual emergence of a tantric Yogini cult, rather than a genealogy of all concepts that went into forming the image of the yogini.

3 Tiwari assembles much textual and other material concerning Mother goddesses in his commendable monograph, Goddess Cults in Ancient India: With Special Reference to the First Seven Centuries A.D.

4 Mātrkās: Mothers in Kuṣāṇa Art. Joshi's monograph offers a comprehensive evaluation of the Kuṣāṇa-period Mother-goddess statuary.

5 "Regional Variation in Mātrakā Conventions." This important article analyses regional patterns in the development of Mother-goddess iconography in central and northwestern India, tracing the depiction of the Mothers from their early shrines to the static temple door panels of the ninth century and beyond.

6 Iconography of the Saptamātrikas: Seven Hindu Goddesses of Spiritual Transformation. An art historian, Harper provides a comprehensive study of temples of the Brahmanical Seven Mothers through the seventh century, primarily.

7 Saptamāṭrīka Worship and Sculptures: An Iconological Interpretation of Conflicts and Resolutions in the Storied Brahmanical Icons. Panikkar's work, published in 1997, carries forward scholarship such as Harper's on the Brahmanical cult of Mothers.

8 Two works not specifically focused on Mother goddesses but nonetheless highly relevant, particularly concerning the early period, are the dissertations of Yuko Yokochi ("The Rise of the Warrior Goddess in Ancient India. A Study of the Myth Cycle of Kauśikī-Vindhyavāsī in the Skandapurāṇa") and Richard Mann ("The Early Cult of Skanda in North India: From Demon to Divine Son").
the cult of Mothers to Tantric Śaivism and emergent traditions of yoginis.

While Mother goddesses are of considerable antiquity in India and undoubtedly had non-elite, probably non-Āryan roots, the Yoginī cult appears to presuppose the crystallization of their “classical” Gupta-era form: a set of goddesses called the “Seven Mothers” (saptamātrī), six of whom are named after and iconographically mirror important Brahmanical gods, joined by a seventh, Cāmunḍā—the independent goddess who is “leader of the Mothers” (mātrāyīyikā). The six normally consist of Brahmāṇī, Māheśvarī, Kaumārī, Vaiṣṇavī, Vārāhī or Yāmī,9 and Indrāṇī, female counterparts of Brahmā, Śiva, Skanda, Viṣṇu, Varāha or Yama, and Indra. Their numbers are however sometimes augmented by an eighth goddess, particularly Mahālakṣmī, while in tantric Śaiva sources, they often are joined instead by the supreme goddess herself, Bhairavī, who thus usurps Cāmunḍā’s position.10

Early Śaiva treatises on “the characteristics of yoginis” (yoginīlakṣāṇa)11 classify these goddesses according to clans (kula, gotra) that have the Seven or Eight Mothers as matriarchs, clan mothers in whose natures the yoginiṣ partake as anāsas, “portions” or “partial manifestations.” Tantric practitioners too establish kinship with the Mothers, leaving behind their conventional clan and caste identities and entering during initiation into what I refer to as ‘initiatory kinship’ with the deities.12 It is possible that the most fundamental initiation maṇḍala of the Yoginī cult comprised

9 Probably the most common variation in sets of the Seven Mothers, as described in texts, is the alternation between Yāmī/Yāmīṣa and Vārāhī, the former a counterpart of the death-god Yama, and the latter of Varāha, avatāra of Viṣṇu. Vārāhī dominates, however, in sculpted sets of the Mothers. Further research is needed to determine the significance of these variations. In the BraYa, Yāmīṣa (also called Vaivasvati) features in all cases of ritual or doctrinal importance, Vārāhī being mentioned only in sections of the text which might represent a later stratum. See the discussion on the BraYa’s structure in chapter 4, and the annotation on BraYa 11.16. In contrast, sets of eight mātrīs show more variation, both in text and image; see the section in this chapter on post-Gupta era mātrī shrines.

10 See the discussion of post-Gupta era Mother-goddess shrines later in this chapter. On the Mothers in tantric literature, see also chapter 3.

11 These include Siddhaṅgaṅgeśvarīmāṇa 29, BraYa 1xxiii (edited and translated in the present dissertation), and Tantrasadbhava, tantra 16.

12 A yogini of the clan of Brāhmī/Brahmāṇī is said to be brāhmāṇyamsā, “an anās of Brahmāṇī.” Cf., e.g., Tantrasadbhava 16.253cd. An initiate too is said to be “connected to” or “possess” (yuktā) an anās of a Mother goddess; cf., e.g., BraYa 1xxii.47cd, brahmāṇīklauṣa devis sādhārasiddhipradayikā (“[She is] a yogini of the clan of Brahmāṇī, O Goddess, who bestows siddhi upon those [sādhakas] of her own [Mother-goddess] anās”).
Bhairava in a circle of the Eight Mothers. Note for instance that in the BraYā, while the Four Devīs and Four Dūtīs form the primary manḍala's inner circuit (āvarana) of goddesses,\(^{13}\) surrounding Bhairava and Bhairavī/Aghoreśī, the initiatory clans remain nonetheless those of Bhairava and the Eight Mothers. A concordance in BraYā rv provides the Mother-clan names associated with each of the eight Devīs and Dūtīs, as though mapping the manḍala positions of the Mother goddesses they supplant.\(^{14}\) Initiatory kinship with the Mothers links male practitioners to the yoginis, their initiatory sisters, seeking visionary, transactional encounters (melāpa) with whom they undertake powerful and radical rituals. Guided by knowledge of "the characteristics of yoginīs" (yoginiākṣaṇa), as described in Śaiva scriptural sources, they might also seek out clan sisters living among ordinary folk, looking out for behaviors and appearances associated with the Mother goddesses yoginīs embody:

A woman dark and malodorous, who has a long neck and fingers, [whose] teeth have a very beautiful shine and whose eyes are very round, always fond of red clothing, draping a garment from her shoulders, always fond of scents and flowers... These are the characteristics of [yoginīs] born in the clan of [the Mother goddess] Indrāṇī. After six months of worship,

---

\(^{13}\) On the basic pantheon of the BraYā, see the section discussing the epithet navākṣaravidhāna in chapter 4.

\(^{14}\) See BraYā iv.888-98, especially 89cd–894ab:

\[ raktāyās tu yadā pāto gotraṃ māheśvarām hitam || 890 || \]
\[ kañcāyā yadā pāto brāhmagotraḥ sa ucyaite || \]
\[ karālāyā yadā pāto vaisnavavgotraḥ ki salī || 891 || \]
\[ danturāyā yadā pātaḥ kaumārīgotraṃ sambhavā || \]
\[ caṇḍākṣaryā yadā pāto vaisnavavikutulabhairavī || 892 || \]
\[ bhūmavaktraṃpīṭhena māheś简历 gotraṃ ucyaite || \]
\[ mahocchusmṛṣtrapāte tu caṇḍāgotraṃ ki salī || 893 || \]
\[ mahābalā yadā pāṭaḥ pūraṇīgotra ucyaite || \]

891b "gotraṃ" corr.; "gotras By\(^{a}\) 892c caṇḍākṣaryā || ev.; caṇḍākṣaryā By\(^{a}\) 893b māheśvarā gotram || conj.; māheśvaragotra (unmetrical) By\(^{a}\) "

"When the [flower cast into the mandala during initiation] lands on Rakta, the clan of Śiva [i.e. Māheśvarī] is enjoined. When it lands upon Karālī, he is said to be of the brahma-clan [i.e. the clan of Brahmanī]. When it lands on Danturā, she is born of the clan of Kaumārī. When it lands on Caṇḍākṣī, she is born of the clan of Vaivasvati [i.e. Yāmī]. By landing on Bhūmavaktra, the clan of the great Indra [i.e. the clan of Indrāṇī] is enjoined. If it lands on Mahocchusmā, he has the clan of Carcīkā [i.e. Cāmuṇḍā]. If its fall [indicates] Mahābalā, the clan of The One Who Completes [the Mothers] is enjoined [i.e. the clan of Bhairavī]."

The gender shift with the feminine °sambhava in 892b and 892b is suspect; most probably read °sambhata. Subsequent verses give a concordance of the Mother-clans and the Six Yoginis of the manḍala as well.
Chapters from the BraYā concerning the classification of and encounters with yoginīs are included in the critical edition, part II of the present dissertation.

That Mother goddesses lie in the background of the Yogiṇī cult is evidenced in a variety of other ways as well. Historical continuity is readily apparent through comparing textual and sculptural representations, beginning, in the case of the Mothers, with the Mahābhārata and sculpture from the early centuries C.E. The present chapter begins with this early level of evidence, and then shifts to Gupta-era and early post-Gupta era sources. There we find our first glimpses of a tantric cult of Mothers and the emergence of yoginīs as sacred figures. Their mutual association is close: for instance, the old Skandapurāṇa, a text probably of the sixth or early seventh century (see below), speaks of “Tantras of the Mother Goddesses” (māṭṭa-tantras) and identifies these with a list of Śaiva yāmalatantras that includes the extant BraYā, a fundamental text of the yoginī cult. Examination of period sources helps establish an historical framework for discussion of the Yogiṇī cult in early tantric literature, the subject of chapter three.

2.2 EARLY SOURCES

THE MAHĀBHĀRATA, KUŚĀṆA-PERIOD STATUARY, AND THE EARLY CULT OF MOTHER GODDESSES

Sources for study of the pre-Gupta period Mother goddesses are multiple and rich. Among texts, the most important is undoubtedly the Mahābhārata, which is supplemented by a substantial body of statuary preserved from the Kuśāṇa-period Mathurā region (circa 1–3rd centuries C.E.). Typologies of Mother goddesses in the Mahābhārata match well to the sculptural evidence surviving from Mathurā. In both instances, as well as in early medical literature, there are strong associations between the Mother

---

15 Brahmāyāmala LXXII.67-71. For the text, and problems concerning its constitution and interpretation, see the critical edition and translation in Part III.
godesses and the deity Skanda, in the context of whose myths the Mothers appear in the *Mahābhārata*.

*Mahābhārata* accounts of the mythology of Skanda and his retinue of *grahas* ("seizers")¹⁶ and Mother goddesses are many and highly layered, no doubt the products of a long development.¹⁷ This is illustrated by the complex claims made concerning Skanda’s parentage, as related in the *Āranyakaparvan*, chapters 215–21. Most directly, he is the child of Agni and Svāhā. Agni, who lusted after the wives of the Seven Sages, was seduced by Svāhā, who approached him taking on in turn the guises of six of the *rṣis’* wives, sparing from scandal only the devoted and powerful Arundhatī. Yet Skanda is also the child of Śiva and Pārvatī, who entered into Agni and Svāhā, respectively, and used them as proxies for producing a son. Skanda is, in addition, the child of the Krūttikās, the six stars of the Pleiades, which are in this version of the story identified with the six wives of the sages. Skanda’s birth as narrated in *Salyaparvan* 43–45 adds the river-goddess Gaṅgā to the mix: into Agni fell Śiva’s seed, and finding it difficult to bear, he sought succour by entering the holy river. She too found the luminous embryo difficult to suffer, and placed it on a mountain peak. There it was spotted and nurtured by the Krūttikās. In these basic details, the latter account agrees with that of *Anuśānaparvan* 84 and 86. Alongside much that is undoubtedly ancient, such as Skanda’s association with the Krūttikās, these layered myths appear to preserve conflicting sectarian claims: a legend asserting Skanda’s origins from Agni

¹⁶ A variety of terms are used in fact to speak of the entourage of Skanda, with *gana* ("member of the group") and *graha* ("seizer") the most encompassing. *Āranyakaparvan* 219.42 categorizes both the Mothers and male retinue of Skanda under the category *skandagraha*, "Skanda’s seizers":

```
ye ca mātrgyanād prakāṭāh puruṣās caiva ye grahāh 
| sarve skandagrahā nāma jīteṣā nityāni sarvābhīḥ || 42 ||
```

These are a diverse lot, including male and female deities and spirits of every conceivable shape and hue. Theriomorphism is common, much as the six-headed Skanda himself is said to sport the head of a goat.

¹⁷ The most comprehensive discussion of *Mahābhārata* passages describing Skanda and the Mother goddesses is that of Mann, “Early Cult of Skanda.” Mann devotes a chapter each to the three *Mahābhārata* sections on the mythology of Skanda. See also his article, “Parthian and Hellenistic Influences on the Development of Skanda’s Cult in North India: Evidence from Kusāna-Era Art and Coins,” *Bulletin of the Asia Institute* 15 (2001): 111–28. Mann argues that Skanda has origins as the leader of inauspicious *grahas*, including the Mothers, only later becoming transformed into the son of Śiva and warrior god of Hindu mythology, for which both Brahmanical and royal Greco-Persian influences are responsible.
and the wives of the sages, which brings him within the orbit of Vaidika orthodoxy; and a Śaiva layer asserting Skanda’s parentage from Śiva and Umā. By the time of Kālidāsa’s Kumārasambhava, an epic poem on Skanda’s birth probably of the fifth century, the Śaiva identity of Skanda as son of Śiva and Pārvatī would dominate; and in the somewhat later Skandapurāṇa, the cult of the warrior-child and the Mother goddesses is fully assimilated into Śaivism.

In the Mahābhārata, there is no evidence of a Mother goddess cult tantric in character, and there is indeed no reason to believe that Śaivism of the type attested in the earliest surviving Tantras had developed. In one description, worship of Skanda, the Mothers, and other deities of his retinue has attainment of longevity and vitality for its impetus, and involves bathing [the deity images], offering incense, ointments, food (bali, perhaps non-vegetarian), and other offerings (upahāra—possibly in the sense of “sacrifice”), and performing Skanda’s “worship” (ijyā). Taken together, these suggest a shrine or temple image-worship context.18 The ‘high’ deities mentioned in association with the cult—Rudra, Agni, Umā, and Svāhā—are said to be worshipped by those desiring progeny, an important theme in later accounts of the Mother cult.19 There is in general a strong apotropaeic dimension, which comes through most clearly in the early medical literature,20 as well as Āranyakaparvan 218. Skanda and his subsidiary deities afflict children with disease if not propitiated, and the Mothers are

18 Āranyakaparvan 219.43–44:

\[
\begin{align*}
tēṣām praśamanam kāryam śnānam dhūpam athāṁjanam & \\
bālikarmopahāraś ca skandasyajñā viñātaḥ & || 43 || \\
evam ete 'ṛcitaḥ sarve prayacchanti sūbhām nṛṇām & \\
āyur vīryam ca vājendra samyakprīṇānamaskṛtāḥ & || 44 ||
\end{align*}
\]

“For them [the Mothers and Skanda’s other grahas] must be performed ritual pacification: bathing, incense, ointment, the rite of offering bali and gifts [or sacrifice], and particularly the worship (ijyā) of Skanda. All of them [the grahas], thus worshipped, bestow good luck, longevity, and vitality to people, when paid respects with due reverence, O lord of kings.”

This description of the constituents of worship bears comparison with the temple cult of Mothers described in the Bāgh copper plate inscriptions of the late fourth century C.E., discussed in the next section. Although little is known of the eras of composition of individual sections of the epic, it is possible that relatively little time separates this portion of the text from the Bāgh copper plates.

19 Note, for example, in Brahma 1 the brief narrative of Deikā (verses 81–84), who worships the Mothers desiring to have a child.

20 On the “graha cult” in medical literature, see Mann, “Parthian and Hellenistic Influences,” 5–7.
hence intimately associated with fertility and disease, with life and death.

Sculptural evidence from the environs of Kuṣāṇa-era Mathurā largely supports the picture of the Mother-goddess cult that emerges from the Mahābhārata. A significant body of statuary survives from a variety of architectural contexts, not all Brahmanical. The Mathurā Mother goddesses are diverse, comprising small-scale images both anthropomorphic and theriomorphic whose common iconographic features include carrying infants, displaying the gesture of deliverance from danger (abhaya-mudrā), and occurrence in groups of variable size alongside a male guardian figure, such as the spear-bearing Skanda (see figs. 2.1-2.5). There is however a discrepancy in one significant respect: while the Mahābhārata links the Mothers almost exclusively with Skanda, the extant statuary preserves an association with Kubera as well, god of wealth and lord of the yaksas (cf. figure 2.3). This parallel and possibly more archaic convention illustrates the Mothers’ close links to the yaksā and

---

21 N. P. Joshi notes evidence for Mother sculptures recovered from both Buddhist and Jaina sites in th Mathurā area. Mātrkās: Mothers in Kuṣāṇa Art, 110–15.
22 Joshi surveys the iconography of the extant statuary, classifying the images into thirteen categories. The most common type depicts a row of seated Mother goddesses holding infants. Ibid., 103–28.
23 According to Joshi’s iconographic survey, images of the Mothers with Kubera are in fact more than twice as common as those with Skanda. See ibid. Interestingly, Meister describes a saptamātrkā panel at Kekind (Nilakanṭhesvara temple, mid-tenth century) in which Kubera’s association with the Mothers surprisingly resurfaces: flanking the Seven Mothers are Ganeśa and Kubera. Meister however interprets this as the overlapping of two conventions: “Ganeśa as head of a Mātrkā set and Ganeśa paired with Kubera as good-luck charms. One set of images containing Ganeśa has suggested the other; there is no other reason for Kubera, lord of wealth, to join the Mātrkās.” “Regional Variations,” 245, and fig. 5.
yakṣī, popular non-Brahmanical deities connected to the natural world, who, like the Mothers, are well represented in pre-Gupta era myth and sculpture.

Figure 2.2: Skanda (left) and five mātr̥s. Kusāna-era Mathurā. State museum, Mathurā. AIIS Photo Archive.

Two significant continuities have been insufficiently emphasized between early Mother goddesses and the Brahmanical Seven Mothers of the Gupta-period. These bear directly upon the question of the emergence of the Yogini cult. First, as several scholars have noted, the number seven has strong precedent:24 Mahābhārata, Āranyaka-parvan 217, lists by name a heptad of goddesses known as the śīsumāt̥rs, “Mothers of the Infant[s].” These comprise Kākī, Halimā, Rudrā, Bhralī, Āryā, Palālā, and Mitrā.25 It seems possible that the Brahmanical Mothers directly supplant the śīsumāt̥rs, who might well have been popular deities of the pre-Gupta period. Note also the Śalyaparvan’s reference to saptamātr̥gaṇāh, an ambiguous compound perhaps


25 Aranyaka-parvan 217.9:

kākī ca halimā caiva rudrātha bhralī tathā  
ārya palālā vai mitrā saptaitdh śīsumāt̥rah  || 9 ||
Figure 2.3: Kubera and two mats. Kuśāṇa-era Mathurā. AIIS Photo Archive.

Figure 2.4: Seven mats, with Skanda (left). Kuśāṇa-era Mathurā. State museum, Mathurā. AIIS Photo Archive.
meaning "the groups of Seven Mothers," the plural suggesting multiple groups of seven.26 Furthermore, from the Kuṣāṇa-era (circa 1–3rd centuries C.E.) Mathurā environs survives what appears to be a set of seven Mothers with Skanda (Figure 2.4); but this unique panel is broken on the right and might hence have contained additional images.27

Second, although there is no clear evidence in the Mahābhārata for the Gupta-era, "classical" set of Seven Mothers, the classification of Mother goddesses into groups corresponding to Brahmanical deities is attested in the Śalyaparvan. This is of considerable consequence, illuminating the roots of the Brahmanical Seven Mothers and suggesting an ancient precedent for the Yoginī cult’s organization of female deities into clans having each of the Seven or Eight Mothers as matriarch. Śalyaparvan 45 presents a rich account of the diverse Mother goddesses, in the course of which it describes them variously as yāmyāh, raudrāh, saumyāh, kauberyāh, vārunyāh, māḥendryāh, āgneyyāh, vāyavyāh, kaumāryāh, and brāhmyāh.28 These are abstract nouns formed from the names of the male deities Yama, Rudra, Soma, Kubera, Varuṇa, Mahendra/Indra, Agni, Vāyu, Kumāra/Skanda, and Brahmā, the passage hence providing strong evidence for organization of the Mothers according to deities of the Brahmanical pantheon.

It must be emphasized just how much yoginīs as a deity typology inherit from the Mothers, as described in this Śalyaparvan passage. Among the Mothers, some have long claws, fangs, or beaks; some are youthful maidens, while others are fleshless or pot-bellied. Having various hues, changing shape at will, and speaking many languages, the Mothers rival the apsaras in beauty, Indra in power, Agni in radi-

---

26 Śalyaparvan 43.26a-b: saptamātryājnās caiva samājaगमुर vīśāṁ pata. Mātryājnāḥ might however be a karmadhāraya compound, meaning "the gaṇas who are the [Seven] Mothers," or even a dvanda, "the [Seven] Mothers and the gaṇas." The context is a list of divinities who come to see Skanda.

27 J. Bautze claims in fact that all Kuṣāṇa-era seated matr-goddess panels so far published are fragments, broken at one end or both. "A Note on Two Mātrkā Panels," 25.

28 Not accepted in the critical edition are, in addition, the epithets vaiśnavyāh, sauryāh, and vārāhyāh, in a verse that would follow 45.36a-b. This might have been interpolated to harmonize the passage with later conceptions of the Mothers; the absence of Vaśnavī and Vārāhī, in particular, might have been inexplicable to a Gupta-era or later audience. Yokochi quotes and discusses this Mahābhārata passage in "Rise of the Warrior Goddess," 101.
ance, and so forth. They dwell in liminal places such as crossroads and cremation grounds—the same environs enjoined for performing the radical rituals of the Yogiñī cult, one of the primary aims of which was to effect direct encounters with goddesses. The yogini's theriomorphism, shapeshifting, multiplicity, extraordinarily variegated appearances, bellicosity, independence, and simultaneous beauty and danger all find precedent in these early Mother goddesses. This continuity is readily visible in sculpture. While taking on the powerful iconography of tantric deities, the yoginis reflect in visual terms clear continuity with the Kuśāṇa-era Mother goddess typology (cf. figures 2.5 and 2.6).  

Much as there is continuity between yoginis and the early mātrīs, dangerous and powerful female deities whom, as Michael Meister suggests, the Brahmanical cult of
Seven Mothers sought to contain, the early Skanda, though successfully transformed into a benevolent warrior god, resurfaces in the figure of Bhairava, lord of yoginis, who takes on much of the ancient imagery of Rudra as well. For although a playful, handsome young warrior dominates the later image of Skanda, in the Mahābhārata mythology lie clear traces of an ambiguous and potentially dangerous deity, in this respect resembling the mātris he heads. Richard Mann argues that this Skanda has in fact historical primacy.

---

31 Meister, "Regional Variations," 244-45.
32 Mann, "Early Cult of Skanda," passim. It is possible however that Mann goes too far in reading historical layers into the Skanda myth. Specifically, I see little reason why the Mothers and Skanda could not have been, even in their earliest conceptions, simultaneously auspicious and inauspicious, connected with both fertility and disease, life and death. In other respects, his argument for historical transformation seems entirely plausible.
Several fourth- and fifth-century, Gupta-era inscriptions make reference to Mother goddesses, while the earliest remains of Mother shrines appear to date to the beginning of the fifth century. In this period, we find evidence for the emergence of the Brahmanical saptamātrīs, “Seven Mothers,” female counterparts to a series of major Brahmanical deities headed by an independent goddess, Cāmunḍā. There is apparent, moreover, a transformation by which Śiva usurps Skanda’s position as leader of the Mothers, to the extent that Skanda rarely finds place in the iconographic programs of post fifth-century Mother shrines. The goddess Cāmunḍā is normatively depicted as an emaciated and powerful hag whose iconography includes mortuary (kāpālīka) cult objects such as the skull and skull-staff (khatvāṅga). This variety of iconography is characteristic of tantric deities of the bhairavatantras and early Yoginī cult, and it is possible that Cāmunḍā was, from her obscure beginning, a tantric deity. That is to say, the emergence of Cāmunḍā could in itself be an indicator of the existence of a tantric goddess cult, perhaps even some form of the Yoginī cult, although this is not at all certain.33

In the elite traditions represented in sculpture and inscriptions of the Gupta and early post-Gupta period, the Seven Mothers appear to eclipse the more diverse Mothers popular in the Kuśāṇa era. Inscriptions associate the Udayagiri Śaiva cave complex of the early fifth century with the emperor Candragupta II, a site having multiple sets of the Seven Mothers.34 Another royal Gupta inscription, that of the mid fifth-century Bihar Stone Pillar erected by Skandagupta, also appears to include a

33 It is conceivable that the mātratantras (“Tantras of the Mother Goddesses”) mentioned in some Śaiva sources were connected with a tantric cult of Cāmunḍā and the Mothers. However, perhaps the earliest source to mention these—the old Skandapurāṇa—identifies them with the yamalatantras of the Śaiva Yoginī cult. On the Skandapurāṇa, see the subsequent section. One possible preservation from an early tantric cult of Cāmunḍā is the love magic of Indian erotic literature (kāmaśāstra); see Gyula Wojtilla, “Vaśikarana Texts in Sanskrit Kāmaśāstra Literature,” in Teun Goudriaan, ed., The Sanskrit Tradition and Tantrism, 109–16.

34 The two inscriptions associated with the Udayagiri cave temples are published as nos. 7 and 11 in Corpus Inscriptionum Indicarum, vol. III, as well as in D. C. Sircar’s Select Inscriptions. The dated inscription ends with a profession of devotion to Śiva (bhaktyā bhagavatā śanibhor gṛhātm etatm akārtyaḥ, “He had this cave [temple] made out of devotion to Lord Śiva”).

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
profession of devotion to the Mothers and Skanda. Later, the Cālukya monarchs would claim descent from the ancient Mother goddess Hārīti, claiming also to have been “made prosperous by the Seven Mothers, who are the mothers of the seven worlds,” and to have enjoyed the protection of Skanda. Such royal patronage of the cult of the Mothers finds attestation in the numerous cave shrines and stone temples which survive from the fifth century and beyond. Alongside these, however, must have persisted more humble forms of Mother-goddess worship; tantric literature speaks of Mother shrines in isolated places as though, like the crossroads, jungles, and cremation grounds they are mentioned alongside, they were an integral part of the landscape.

Perhaps the earliest unambiguous evidence for a temple cult of the Mothers, as well as their association with Śaivism, comes from Gupta-period inscribed copper plates recovered from Bāgh, M.P. Two plates from the second half of the fourth century mention endowments made in favor of Mother goddess temples. One records the gift of revenue from two villages and a plot of land for maintaining the worship of the Mothers at Navataṭāka, installed by the same royal patron. Recording a landgrant made “for the support of a shrine of the Mothers established by a Pāśupata Ācārya Lokodadhi,” the second is dated a few years later to the year 375/76 or 376/77 C.E. The endowment makes provisions for funding ongoing worship of the Mothers, described as involving bali and caru (both normally consisting of food offerings), the ambiguous sa[t]tra, “sacrifice,” and offerings of incense, scents, and flow-

35 Published as inscription 49 in Corpus Inscriptionum Indicarum, vol. III, 72-78.
36 From the Navsari plates of Yuvarāja Śrīśrayaśīlāditya, found in the Surat district of modern Gujarat: karttikeyapariraksanapraptakalyanaparamparanam... calikyanam... Corpus Inscriptionum Indicarum, vol. IV. A number of other Cālukya inscriptions invoking the Mothers were published by John F. Fleet in Indian Antiquary, vols. VI-VII.
37 See the discussion of mātrs in the Nisvāsatattvasamhitā in chapter 3.
38 The relevant plates are numbers 11 and x in the collection published by K. V. Ramesh and S. P. Tewari, A Copper-plate Hoard of the Gupta Period from Bagh, Madhya Pradesh, 4-6, 21-23. Scholars who have discussed these include Sanderson, “Religion and the State: Initiating the Monarch in Śaivism and the Buddhist Way of Mantras” (forthcoming); Yokochi, “Rise of the Warrior Goddess,” 110 (n. 83); and B. D. Chattopadhyay, “Reappearance of the Goddess or the Brahmanical Mode of Appropriation: Some Early Epigraphic Evidence Bearing Upon Goddess Cults,” 257-58.
ers. Neither inscription indicates whether the temples housed the Seven Mothers or a more archaic configuration. However, the latter temple’s Pāṣupata affiliation suggests the possibility of a Śaiva iconic program, such as comes into sculptural evidence in the fifth century. At Udayagiri, in the Vidiśā district of Madhya Pradesh, two Śaiva cave temples dating to the turn of the fifth century incorporate niche-shrines of the Seven Mothers, and one of the sets might have been headed by an image of Skanda; another temple (cave no. 3) does house Skanda as its cult image. This site appears transitional, maintaining the Mothers’ old associations with Skanda, but within the context of the worship of Śiva. Later in the same century, a cliff-cut shrine between Badoh and Pathari, also in modern-day Madhya Pradesh, would eschew all associations with Skanda and Kuśāṇa-era guardian figures, containing images of the Seven Mothers in the company of a seated, ārdhavareta Śiva alone. In Kālidāsa’s Kumārasambhava, probably also of the fifth century, the Mothers feature in the retinue of Śiva with no special connection to Skanda.

Among the early inscriptions, the most significant for the history of the Yogini cult is the well-known Gaṅgdhār inscription of the vikrama-year 480, that is, 423/24 or 424/25 C.E. This records the construction of a Viṣṇu temple, a temple of the Mothers (mātrāṇī veśman), and a drinking well by Mayūrakṣaka, a minister of the monarch Viśvavarman, at the central Indian cite of Gaṅgdhār in western Mālwa district. The inscription describes the temple as “extremely terrible” and “filled with

---

According to lines 3-6 of plate x, the land grant in question is to provide “for revenue (bhogāya) to be used (upajeyya) for bali, caru, satra, incense, scented pastes, flowers, and garlands” for the Mothers of the temple of Pīṭchikānaka village, “established by the revered Pāṣupata teacher Lokodadhī” (bhogavalo kartikeyanapatiśīlpatapiśchikāna akṣamātānā daksinacalasa ... deva-āgrāhāramātrānām bali-caru-satra-dhivagandhahupasamānyopajyajabh Kagāya; “pujya” is the editors’ emendation of “pujra”). Ramesh and Tewari, A Copper-plate Hoard, 22.

It is noteworthy that the nātris, mentioned in canto vii (30–31, 38) as part of the wedding entourage of Śiva, are a group of unspecified number. They are followed in the entourage by Kālī, “whose ornaments are skulls” (kapālakaranā, 36b).

This inscription was first published by John F. Fleet, Corpus Inscriptionum Indicarum, vol. i, inscription 17 (pp. 72–78). D. C. Sircar published a subsequent edition in Select Inscriptions Bearing on Indian History and Civilization, vol. i, 399–405.
dākinīs,” while depicting the Mothers as “they who make the oceans tumultuous through powerful winds arising from tantrās” (tantrodhūtaṭa). 44 This inscription thus associates the Mothers simultaneously with hordes of female spirits (dākinīs), magical powers, and a temple cult, also providing early and significant occurrences of the terms dākinī and tantra in the context of Mother-goddess worship.

Dākinī, probably connected with the Sanskrit verbal root √dī, “to fly,”45 and the basis of the modern North Indian term dāin, “witch,” denotes a class of female spirits prominent in taxonomies of yoginīs. While tantric Śaiva sources generally speak of the dākinī as a pernicious being, the term is often perfectly synonymous with yoginī, especially in the yoginitantras of later Tantric Buddhism.46 As for the inscription’s use of the word tantra, this is probably, as D. C. Sircar recognized,47 in the well-attested sense of “spell,” such as in the expression tantramātrāntra.48 It seems improbable that the word could refer here to Tantric scripture—potentially mātratantras or dākinītantras49—for “powerful winds” (prabalapavaṇa) would not in normal usage be described as having arisen (udbhūta) from texts.50

44 Verse 23 (on lines 35-37):

mātrāṇā ca [pramudāḍitāghaṇṭiṣṭītāḥañbhāṁdirānīnaṁ
 tantrodhūtāprabalapavāṇavardhīṁ añbhāṁdirānīnaṁ ||
 - - - - - gatam idaṁ dākinīsampannakarṇaṁ
 veśmātyugram nṛpatīcavoc dhāraṇya punyahetoh || 23 ||

45 Adelheid Herrmann-Pfandt discusses the derivation of the word in Dākinīs: zur Stellung und Symbolik des Weiblichen im tantrischen Buddhismus, 115-16. The etymological link to the root √dī or √dai is traditional; for example, Bhavabhāṣṭa and Jayabhāṣṭra, commentators on the Buddhist Laghusaṃvaratantra, both connect the word dākinī to √dai. See Bhavabhāṣṭra ad Laghusaṃvara 1.2, Sarnath edition, p. 6; and also Jayabhāṣṭra commenting on the same verse, p. 107 in Sugiki’s edition of the Cakrasaṃvaraṇarasaṭajjā.48

46 For descriptions of the dākinī as a dangerous variety of female spirit, cf., e.g., BraYa lV (12, 43-44), xcVIII (38-39), and xcIX (10-12), and the definition Kṣemarāja quotes of the radraḍākintī from the Sarvaśratantra, ad Netratantra 2.16. See also chapter 3 of this thesis, n. 29. On the general synonymity of yoginī and dākinī in Tantric Buddhism, note for example that the scriptural class often referred to as yoginitantras has as one of its earliest and most authoritative texts the Sarvabuddhasaṃyogadākinīgīla-saṃvara, dākinījāla referring to the matrix of female deities. Cf. Prapancayoginījāla and Yoginījāla, titles of lost Śaivas texts mentioned in BraYa xxxVIII.39cd. The expression yoginījālasaṃvara, incidentally, occurs several times in BraYa lVIII, while BraYa lVI teaches an observance (vrata) by the same name.

47 Sircar, Select Inscriptions, vol. 1, 405.

48 Cf., e.g., Mīladatmādhaeav.52, quoted later in this chapter in the discussion of this work.

49 On mātratantras, see the subsequent section on the Skandaśrīṇa, and chapter 5, in the section discussing the title “Brahmaṇyamala”. Dharmakīrtī makes reference to dākinītantras, on which subject see Sanderson, “History through Textual Criticism,” 11-12; and chapter 3 of this thesis.

50 My interpretation of this passage undoubtedly has been influenced by Isaacson’s remarks on the subject, in a lecture given at the University of Pennsylvania in January 2003.
The Gaṅgdhār inscription does not provide unambiguous evidence for a tantric cult of goddesses; for this, we would need indication of the ritual practices associated with the Mother-goddess temple, or period textual evidence intimating tantric connections. Nonetheless, the inscription remains highly suggestive. Dākinīs, as a variety of goddess or spirit, are in later literature closely associated with Tantra, and the description of the Mothers themselves uses imagery suggestive of powerful, “unfettered” tantric goddesses, not at all in the image of the protective World Mothers (loka mātrā) mentioned in other Gupta-era inscriptions. It is accordingly possible that the Gaṅgdhār inscription records the existence of a tantric goddess cult in the fifth century, perhaps even a Yoginī cult similar to that attested in Tantras such as the BraYā. At the least, it shows that characteristic elements of the conceptions of female divinities prominent in the Yoginī cult had come together by the early fifth century. Unfortunately, the Gaṅgdhār inscription is exceptional: we have no other firmly dated evidence for a cult of Mother goddesses in the company of female spirits in the fifth century, which makes the inscription difficult to contextualize. The iconic program suggested, featuring Mothers and a host of minor goddesses, does not come into evidence again in temple contexts for many centuries. It is unclear whether the temple housed the Brahmanical Seven Mothers, while its possible association with a Viṣṇu temple could suggest a non-Śaiva cultic context.

THE SKANDAPURĀṆA: YĀMALATANTRAS, YOGEŚVARĪS, AND THE MOTHER GODDESSES OF KOTĪVARSA

The significance of the early Skandapurāṇa for the history of Śaivism and early medieval Indian religion can hardly be overstated, as the recent studies of Hans Bakker

---

52 The “early” or “old” Skandapurāṇa should not be confused with the better-known published text by this name; the latter was in fact somewhat artificially assembled by pandits in the colonial period from various medieval tracts having the Skandapurāṇa as locus of ascription. See Rob Adriaensen, et al., in introducing vol. 1 of the critical edition of the early Skandapurāṇa.
and Harunaga Isaacson,53 Yuko Yokochi,54 and Peter Bisschop illustrate.55 Preserved in manuscripts that include a Nepalese codex of 810 C.E., scholars working on this text appear at present to concur on the probability of a sixth- or early seventh-century C.E. date.56 Its material is oriented toward an audience of Śaiva laity, the māheśvaras, perhaps communities connected with Paśupata ascetics.57 While not hence specifically concerned with tantric forms of Śaivism, the Skandapurāṇa nonetheless provides important early evidence for the Mantramārga, including the cult of yoginīs. Significantly, it attests the existence of yāmalatantras, described as “Tantras of the Mother Goddesses” (mātrītantras), and lists the BraYā among them. This constitutes highly significant evidence concerning the dating of the BraYā, discussed in chapter four, as well as significant early evidence for the Yoginī cult.

The historical importance of the Skandapurāṇa’s reference to yāmalatantras was discussed first by Sanderson, in correspondence quoted by R. Adriaensen et al. in introducing the Skandapurāṇa critical edition.58 In a subsequent article, Sanderson added further reflections on the passage in the course of reviewing early evidence for the Śaiva Mantramārga, i.e. Tantric Śaivism.59 A fuller discussion nonetheless seems worthwhile, specifically examining its relevance to the cults of Mother goddesses and yoginīs. It is in the second half of Chapter 171 that the relevant material occurs,

53 See especially the study of the Skandapurāṇa’s Varāṇasimāhātyma, in vol. 2 of the Skandapurāṇa critical edition, Bakker and Isaacson, eds. For Bakker’s several other contributions, see the bibliography.
54 Yokochi’s doctoral thesis, “Rise of the Warrior Goddess,” focuses upon the formation of the Hindu “Warrior Goddess” on the basis of material from the Skandapurāṇa, of which she also edits several chapters. See also Yokochi, “Mahiṣāsura-mardini Myth and Icon. Studies in the Skandapurāṇa 11.”
55 Early Śaivism and the Skandapurāṇa: Sects and Centers.
56 Announcing the Skandapurāṇa editorial project, Adriaensen, Bakker, and Isaacson had proposed a tentative date of the 7th-8th centuries. “Towards a Critical Edition of the Skandapurāṇa,” 328. In the first volume of the critical edition, however, the editorial team suggested the 6th-8th centuries as the most plausible range of dates. Skandapurāṇa, vol. 1, 4. Yokochi, as will be discussed, on the basis of the iconographic type of the Warrior Goddess in the Skandapurāṇa, subsequently argued for the 6th-7th centuries as the most plausible period of composition. “Mahiṣāsura-mardini Myth and Icon,” 68–75. Taking into account Yokochi’s assessment, and on the basis of their own studies on the Skandapurāṇa’s Varāṇasimāhātyma material, Bakker and Isaacson have more recently suggested the probability of the sixth or early seventh centuries. Skandapurāṇa, vol. 11, 48.
57 R. Adriaensen et al, Skandapurāṇa, vol. 1, 4. Concerning provenance, Bakker and Isaacson remark that “it has a certain probability per se that the Skandapurāṇa was composed either in Varāṇasī, or in a (Paśupata) centre that had close contacts with this city.” Skandapurāṇa, vol. 11, 48.
58 Skandapurāṇa, vol. 1, 7.
59 “History through Textual Criticism,” 11.
within a māhātya-narrative on the sacred site Koṭivarga, identified by Sanderson as being in the West Dinajpur District of Bengal and identical to Devikoṭa. This chapter picks up on several themes from the Mahābhārata, beginning with Skanda’s enmity with Indra, whose place as foremost of warrior gods the divine youth usurps. Present also is the tale of Skanda’s violent assault upon the mountain Krauṇca, this being perhaps an accretion from the mythology of the famous mountain-splitter Indra. Another continuity is the motif of enemies of the gods becoming powerful by the boon of Brahmā, necessitating unusual means for their defeat. But perhaps most notable in the Skandapurāṇa’s narrative is the fact that Skanda himself disappears halfway, as the narrative of Koṭivarga commences, much as he disappears from the iconic program of Mother goddess shrines by the sixth century.

The chapter begins with the story of Skanda’s rivalry with Indra and his decapitation of the mountain Krauṇca, which turns out to be an act of fratricide. The first of its two sections ends with Śiva and Pārvatī returning home to Mt. Meru accompanied by Skanda, who is described as “leader of the horde of Mother goddesses” (māṭṛṇām gaṇanāyakah, 73d). Yet the next section opens with the sage Vyāsa asking how Śiva, not Skanda, became “leader of the Mothers” (māṭṛṇām nāyakah, 78b); in the subsequent narrative, Skanda makes no appearance. Below I summarize the episode, Skandapurāṇa 171.78–137, translating in full the most relevant section:61

Vyāsa asks the sage Sanatkumāra to narrate how Śiva came to be leader of the Mother goddesses; how, why, and by whom the Mothers were created; what powers they possess; and what their locus is. [78–79] Sanatkumāra narrates how Brahmā once came upon a pleasant locale on the banks of the Eastern Ocean (pūrvaṃahodadhī) and performed his sandhyā-prayers there for ten-million years. [80–83] Admiring the surroundings, he decided to create a beautiful, gilded city there, to whose fortunate residents he guaranteed immortality and power. [84–91] The city is named Koṭivarga since Brahmā, best of the gods, showers (vaṃśati) a crore (koṭi) of desired wishes (iṣṭānām kāmundē) upon its happy population. [92–93ab]

60 According to Sanderson, other names for this site include Devikoṭa, Śrīpītha, Śrīkota, and Śoṅita-pura, this being located “on the bank of the Punarbhava river.” Its association with Śiva as Hetuka or Hetukēśvara is attested in several sources, including Brahma 3. “History through Textual Criticism,” 7. Cf. Yokochi’s discussion of the location of the site in “Rise of the Warrior Goddess,” 106–7 (n. 79).

61 Compare with Yokochi’s summary of verses 100cd–16ab, in “Rise of the Warrior Goddess,” 107.
He then returns to his heavenly court, after which the city is overrun by Asuras, led by Asukrodha, who thus became unintended beneficiaries of Brahmā’s blessing. [93cd–97] Learning of what the Asuras were doing, all the gods convened to inform Brahmā. Brahmā pleaded inability, and they proceeded thence to approach Śiva at the Himalayan forest where Pārvatī had performed penance. [98–100]

When the gods entered there, led by Brahmā, they suddenly became women “by the power of Pārvatī’s penance.”62 Śiva asks why they have come, in response to which they tell of the torment inflicted by the Asuras. They also plead to be rid of the “miserable condition of being women” (kṛcchram striḥāvam). [101–4ab] Śiva however tells them to approach the Asuras as they are, for the proud demons may be slain only by women. Afterwards, the auspicious Mothers will return to their prior forms. [104cd–6] The gods then bow to Śiva and request that he too join them as a woman, with whom they would slay the demons. Śiva then created the auspicious goddess Rudrāṇī, as well as an ugly Mother called Bahumāṁśā (“Very Fleshy”), the embodiment of universal destruction (jagatsamḥārārūpinī).

[107–9] Brahmā, Śiva, Skanda, Viṣṇu, and Indra create the Mother goddesses Brahmī, Rudrāṇī, Kaumārī, Vaśnavī and Vārāhī, and Indrāṇī, respectively, with Śiva’s Bahumāṁśā their leader, “the Great Vidyā-mantra.”63 And from all the other gods too emerged Mothers, possessing their natures and power, slayers of demons: Vāyavī, Vāruṇī, Yāmyā, Kauberī, Mahākālī, Āgneyī,64 and others by the thousands. [110–14] The Mothers proceed to the beautiful city and render it free of demons.

When the demons had been slain, Śiva came to the city to grant boons to the Mothers. Pleased, he told them,65 ‘Having become Mother goddesses,
you shall be the Mothers of the world. Those who will be devoted to you, whether the best of men or fortunate women, pernicious spirits will not harm; and after death, they shall become my ageless, immortal ga-

[115-19ab] This place of yours shall become world-famous, known as 'Koṭivaśa', which frees one of all sin. And since I am your cause (hetu), because you were created by me, I will remain here by the name 'Hetuкеśvara', granting boons. I shall dwell with you as your leader. [119cd–22] One who will worship you properly, together with me, shall, free of all sin, attain to the highest heavenly destination. Since the dānava were slain with a spear (śīla) by Bahumāṃsa, this sacred ford (tīrtha) shall be known by the name śīlakunda (“Pool of the Spear”). And that best of men who drinks here from the Pool of the Spear and prostrates before Bahumāṃsa shall be unassailable by all harmful spirits. The beautiful river Mandākiṇī shall be known here as Pratikūlā (“River Contrary”); she will always be brimming with blood for you.66 [123–26]

bhavatīnām idāṁ sīhānaṁ koṭivaśaṁ iti śrutam || 120 ||

bhaviṣyati jagatāyati sarvajñapapramocanam | bha

[225x108] The interpretation of bhavatīnām (“yours”) in 126d is not certain. 126cd might alternatively be understood to mean “brimming with blood, she [the river] will always here belong to you.” Isaacson,
'Myself, Brahmā, Viṣṇu, and sages rich in penance shall create holy Mother Tantras through which you shall receive the highest worship, the rites of sacrifice to the Mothers (mātryajñavidhi): the Brahmāyamala, Svāyambhuva-yāmala, Kumārayāmala, Sārvasvatayāmala, Gāndhārayāmala, Iśānayāmala, and Nandiyāmala—these Tantras of yours, and others too by the thousands, through which men shall worship you with devotion.67 [127–29ab] You shall grant boons to the men worshipping. You shall become goddesses who bestow divine siddhi, possessing divine yoga. Those women who always worship you, secretly, shall become yogesvaris, lovely women of divine valour. [129cd–31] And my gaṇa-lords, Chagala (“the Goat”) and Kumbhakarna (“Pitcher-ears”), shall by my command remain with you as door guardians. This excellent place, Koṭiśvara, dear to the Mothers, shall become the chief (pravara), divine cremation ground, which gives happiness. [132–34ab] Having obtained these boons, the Mother goddesses, Mothers of the worlds, prostrated before the Lord of the Gods and rejoiced, extremely excited. From that point on, all of them dwelt in Koṭiśvara together with Śiva, granting freedom from danger to the entire world. Thus did the divine lord Śaṅkara become leader of the hordes of Mothers, O Vyāsa, which is what you had asked me’. [134cd–36]

Skandapurāṇa 171 appears to present a transitional picture in several respects. In cultic terms, it juxtaposes a tantric Mother cult with an older, non-Mantramārga cult, illustrating also how they coexisted with shared cultic centers such as Koṭiśvara. From the eighth century, the non-tantric Mother cult would wane, while tantric goddess cults flourished.68 On the level of myth, the Skandapurāṇa provides a transitional link between the cycles of Skanda and the Mothers in the Mahābhārata, and myths of the Mothers inscribed in later texts such as the Devimāhātmya of the Mārkandeyapurāṇa.

67 On the interpretation of this passage, Sanderson remarks, “I propose that yāmalam in 128d is to be understood with all (sarasvēṣṭaḥ), so that the titles indicated are Brahmāyamala, Svāyambhuva-yāmala, Kumārayāmala (=Skandayamala), Gāndhārayāmala, Iśānayāmala and Nandiyāmala. For of these seven all but the Svāyambhuva-yāmala and the Gāndhārayāmala are found in the scriptural lists of yāmalatantras known to me ... ”. “History through Textual Criticism,” 7 (n. 4). I consider this proposal all but certain. In ibid., 7, Sanderson presents the seven lists of yāmalatantras which had come to his attention in Śaiva literature.

68 As Meister discusses, shrines of the Mothers become increasingly rare, while on the other hand static doorway panels of the Seven Mothers become integral to temple iconography in central India, appearing first in the eighth century. “Regional Variations in Mātrik Conventions,” 241–43. However, quite different is the case of Orissa; according to Thomas Donaldson, temples of the Mothers are attested from the seventh century, become common in the tenth century, and continue to be constructed even in the thirteenth. “Orissan Images of Vārāhi, Oddiyāna Mārici, and Related Sow-Faced Goddesses,” 170.
As Yokochi points out, the *Skandapurāṇa* preserves the older, Kuśāṇa-era and *Mahābhārata* conception of countless diverse Mother goddesses alongside the “Hinduized” Gupta-era Seven Mothers. In the *Skandapurāṇa*, the latter in fact appear only in this account of Koṭivarṣa.70 This *Skandapurāṇa* chapter also provides clear links between the cult of Mothers and cult of Yoginīs, which otherwise appear lacking in early non-tantric literature. There is moreover some evidence suggestive of a transitional iconic program for the Mother goddess shrine of Koṭivarṣa.

Described in verses 118–26 is the *laukika*, i.e. non-tantric cult of the Mothers, the rituals associated with which involve pilgrimage, worship of the images of the Mothers and Śiva-Hetukeśvara, partaking of the sacred waters, and perhaps animal sacrifice (suggested by the reference to the river brimming with blood). The aims are correspondingly of the variety advanced in Śaiva *purāṇas*: deliverance from harmful spirits, going to heaven, and joining Śiva’s entourage of *gaṇas* after death. Verses 127–34ab describe, however, a Mantramārga cult of the Mothers. Its rituals are those taught in the *mātr- *or *yāmalatantras*, and its aim, for men, magical powers or *siddhi*. For women, the secret rites promise more: the possibility of becoming yoginīs, powerful and beautiful Mistresses of Yoga (*yogesvarīs*). In the tantric cult, the goddess Bahumāṃśa is the “Great Vidyā-mantra” (*mahāvidyā*). And for adepts of the Mother Tantras, Koṭivarṣa is not merely an holy ford and place of pilgrimage, but the best of cremation grounds, suggesting a possible *kāpālika* orientation to the tantric Mother cult.

Koṭivarṣa’s Mothers appear in the standard group of seven attested from the fifth century or a little earlier,71 with Bahumāṃśa, apparently the cultic focus, represent-

---

69 On the dating and significance of the *Devīmāhitmya*, see the section on post Gupta-era Mother shrines below.

70 Yokochi, “Rise of the Warrior Goddess,” 99–113, especially 110–11. Although not strong evidence in isolation, this fact might suggest that the seventh century would be too late a date for the *Skandapurāṇa*. Even in the sixth century, the paucity of references to the Seven Mothers is surprising in a Śaiva *purāṇa*.

71 Viz., Brahmāṇī, Rudrāṇī, Kaumārī, Vaiśṇavī, Varāhi, Indrāṇī, and Bahumāṃśa. *Skandapurāṇa* 171.110cd–12:

\[
\begin{align*}
abhiḥt \ pita\mbox{mahatḥ} \ brahmaḥ \ saro\mbox{ṇi} \ sa\mbox{ṅkara}d \ api & || 110 || \\
kaumārī \ ṣaad\mbox{mukhāc} \ cāpi \ vi\mbox{ṣyor} \ api \ ca \ va\mbox{iṣṣavād} |
\end{align*}
\]
ing Cāmunda, leader of the Mothers (mātrāṇīyikā). While Cāmunda is most commonly depicted as a gaunt, ferocious hag, in this case the name Bahumāṃśā suggests corpulence. There are in fact early representations of Cāmunda as a full-bodied woman (cf. Figure 2.7), although I am not presently aware of a corpulent example. In the present case, Bahumāṃśā might have been a goddess of local importance subsequently incorporated into the Mother cult and identified with Cāmunda. The Skandapurāṇa does in fact attest a process by which important local goddesses were given Śaiva identities through incorporation as Mothers. Chapters sixty-four and sixty-eight enumerate the names and locales assigned to the numerous Mother goddesses who emanate from the goddess Kauśikī, linking the Mothers with an emergent

As Yokochi points out, this sequence shows clearly that the “standard” set of Seven mātrs is intended, for the mātrīs had already been enumerated out of sequence in 108cd–110ab. “Rise of the Warrior Goddess,” 107–8.

Cf. the goddess Brhodarl (i.e. brhadudari, “She of the Big Belly”) mentioned in Brāh. 1.60–62. Not specifically identified with Cāmunda, she appears to fulfill the dual functions of tutelary goddess of her namesake village, and tantric deity, bestowing the vidya-mantra upon Yajnasoma’s son. Yokochi suggests that bahumāṃśa is a euphemism and reinforces the goddess’s identity as the emaciated Cāmunda. Although speculative, this too might be possible. “Rise of the Warrior Goddess,” 108–9.

Clear cases of early (pre eighth-century) images of Cāmunda as a full-bodied woman include those of the mātrīs of the Śiva cave temple at Aihole, that of the Aurangabad Buddhist caves, and the two early Ellora cave shrines (Rāmaśvara and Rāvan-kā Kāi).

In Ellora’s Rāvan-kā Kāi cave mātrī shrine, the full-bodied Cāmunda at the right end of the row of seven mātrīs is clearly distinguished by her owl-vīthana. In this shrine, a skeletal divine couple of problematic identity (discussed subsequently) occur to the right of Ganeśa along the main wall. On the left wall is installed a four-armed Vīnahāra with a bull vīthana. In the Rāmaśvara cave at Ellora (cave 21), an elaborate dancing Śiva is instead enshrined on the left wall, while the Vīnahāra begins the set of mātrīs on the left of the main wall. On the right wall are a skeletal pair of male and female divinities. The female figure is unlikely to be Cāmunda, for Cāmunda appears to be among the full-bodied mātrīs along the main wall.

In the Aihole Mother shrine of the Śiva cave temple, on both the left and right walls stand three mātrīs, with two more flanking a central, ten-armed dancing Śiva along the main wall. A diminutive Ganeśa stands on the viewer’s left between Śiva and the Mother goddess, with a damaged figure of a diminutive two-armed male in the corresponding position on the right—perhaps the gana Virabhadra, whom one might expect to complement Ganeśa, although Meister suggests Skanda. “Regional Conventions,” 240. Closing the set at the end of the right wall is a full-bodied Cāmunda.

Although the Brāh. and many other early sources describe Cāmunda as emaciated, there is at least one textual description of a full-bodied Cāmunda: that of the Kashmiri Brhatkalottara, in which Yogest, eighth of the Mothers, is visualized as emaciated and Cāmunda as full-figured. Alexis Sanderson, “Religion and the State: Śaiva Officiants in the Territory of the King’s Brahmical chaplain,” 267 (n. 92).

theology of the Great Goddess as source of all goddesses. This rhetoric of emanation and localization appears almost as a precursor to the theology of śakti, as adapted with great success from Tantric Śaivism, through which any and all goddesses and their sacred sites, declared śaktipīthas ("seats of śakti/power"), would be subsumed within the identity of the one Goddess.

The iconic type described for the Mothers of Koṭivarsa might suggest a pre sixth-century date. Śiva as Hetekeśvara joins Bahumāṃsā in heading the Mothers, while he appoints his ganas Chagala ("the Goat") and Kumbhakarna ("Pitcher-ears") as door-guardians (dvārapāla). This suggests that cult images of Śiva and the Seven Mothers alone appeared in the central shrine (garbhagrha), with the ganas Chagala and Kumbhakarna installed as guardians at the base of the vertical panels on either side of the entry door. Śaiva Tantras refer to the installation of such ganśa-lords as door guardians. For instance, in the Svacchandatantra's description of ritual entry into the yāgagṛha ("worship shrine"), one first offers homage to the directional Mothers (diṁmātr̥ṣ) outside the shrine, then

---

75 Skandapurāṇa 64 narrates the emergence of manifold goddesses from Kauśikī's limbs. In Skanda-purāṇa 68, Kauśikī assigns the various Mother goddesses which emerged from her to locales, including Bahumāṃsā to Koṭivarsa. See Yokochi's discussion in ibid., 99–100, 111–12.

76 See below in the brief discussion of the Devināhātṛṣṇa.

77 Although not impossible, it seems highly unlikely that the text would mention dvārapālas yet omit reference to other cult images in the garbhagrha.
to Gaṇeśa and Śrī[laṅkṣmī] on the overhead door lintel; one then worships Śiva’s gaṇa-lord Nandin on the left of the outer door frame, together with the river goddess Gaṅgā, and on the right, Mahākāla with Yamunā. Netratantra 3 corroborates this procedure, its commentary mentioning also the gaṇas Meṣānana (“Ram Face”) and Chāgānana (“Goat Face”) as door guardians.

What appears archaic about this iconic program is the placement and identity of the male deities. In Kuṣāṇa-era mātr sculpture, the Mothers were often depicted with images of the young, spear-bearing Skanda (figure 2.2, 2.4) or the robust yakṣa-lord Kubera (figure 2.3), usually positioned to their side. However, from the Gupta era Śiva himself often features as leader of the Mothers, particularly in the form of Na-ṭeṣa, “Lord of Dancers.” As head of the Brahmanical heptad of Mothers, Śiva thus

---

78 Sevacchandatantra 2.22-25:

sakalkrtadahs tu pusanādhyā suvratā
dīrṇāṁtāḥbhya namaśktāya doṭram samprakṣya yatraṃataḥ || 22 ||
sivāṁmabhāṣṭramantṛṣa vyāhnapraccatanaṃ bhuvet |
dvārāśāhkhordhvaro davam ganeśam ca śriṃm tathā || 23 ||
sampūjya gandhānapāpyāīr dhūpādhībhīr anurakmād |
arghāyādpyahādrās ca tato dhūraṣya cottare || 24 ||
nandigāne samabhāyārya mahākālaṁ ca daksīne |
kālindin caiva sampūjya yathānukramayogatāḥ || 22 ||

“O pious woman, with one’s body transformed into [the mantra-body of] manifest (sakala) Śiva, one should take up the flower, bow to the directional Mother goddesses, and sprinkle the door, carefully. Through the śiva-water empowered by the weapon-mantra, obstructing forces would be driven away. After worshipping Lord Gaṇeśa and Śrī[laṅkṣmī] [on the lintel] above the double-doors with scents, flowers, incense, etc., in sequence, to the left of the door one should worship Nandin and Gaṅgā with the guest-water, water for washing the feet, and the offerings, and also Mahākāla and Yamunā on the right, in the correct sequence.

79 Netratantra 3.9:

āśāmātṛṛ gaṇaṁ laṅkṣmīṁ nandigrāge ca pūjyaṁ |
mahākālam tu yamunāṁ deḥaltaṁ pūjyaṁ tatāḥ || 9 ||

According to Kṣemarāja’s comments on this verse, in the system of the vāma-stream of revelation, i.e. the cult of the Four Sisters of Tumburu expounded in the archaic vāmatantras, Meṣānana (“Ram Face”) and Chāgānana (“Goat Face”) serve as additional (aḍhīka) dōrāpalas in shrine contexts, a fact perhaps relevant given the Skandapurāṇa’s reference to “The Goat” as a door guardian at Kotivāraśa. He remarks, bahīr dīnātṛṛ, doṭrādriḥ ganeśapatiḥkṣayau, pārśvadveṣye nandigrāge mahākālayāmune, vāme deḥaltaḥ pra-
navacaturthīmahākītaḥvyāpoṇa pūjyaṁ | aṣṭa navayeṣu sarvaśrutam evaśaśtri śīlāntatāraṇā daksīne daksīne pūjyaṁ, mahākālayāmune vāme | vāmārāgaṇeṣ evam mesāsyachātāḥgīyau tu adhikau daksīnāvataṁcaḥ | bhūraśpratā evaṃ manaḥpradānāva pūjyaṁ | ṣaṭārdhe tu vīśvahatāravu adhikau || 9 ||

90 Joshi, Mātrikās: Mothers in Kuṭṭha Art, 103-28.
81 See the tables Meister provides for the iconic programs of Gupta and early post-Gupta mātr sets, as well as later sets from central and western India. “Regional Variations,” charts a and b.

---
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replaces Skanda and Kubera. Yet in only one extant Mother shrine does Śiva alone appear in the Mothers’ company: that of the fifth-century cliff shrine between Badoh and Pathari, in present-day Madhya Pradesh. In this case, an image which appears to be Śiva flanks the Mothers—a two-armed, ārdhvoaretas yogin complemented by Cāmunḍā at the other end (figure 2.8). Kōṭivarṣa’s iconic program might hence have resembled that of Badoh-Pathari, the cult images being those of Śiva, Bahumāṃsā, and six other mātrās, with Chagala and Kumbhakarṇa placed outside the central shrine as door-guardians.

With the exception of the early Badoh-Pathari shrine, the Seven Mothers are normally depicted in the company of multiple gana-lords, or with Śiva and a gana-lord. Most common as flanking figures are the elephant-headed Vināyaka or Gaṇeśa, and one of two anthropomorphic male figures usually identified as Virabhadrā (“Auspicious Hero”) and Viṇādhara (“Bearer of the Viṇā”). Problematically, both of the latter are often described as forms of Śiva. Virabhadrā, however, is in Śiva textual sources of the period considered a gana or gana-lord (gaṇeśa, gaṇeśvara, etc.) of Śiva, or else a prominent rudra. Hence, one common saptāmātrī iconic program pairs the gana-lord Virabhadrā with another gana-lord, Vināyaka, frequently flanking the Mothers on either side (figure 2.9). While Virabhadrā was undoubtedly included

---

82 For example, Meister remarks, “Śiva sits as Virabhadrā or Viṇādhara at the head of the Matrākā set ... or dances as Naṭeṣa in their midst.” “Regional Variations,” 241.

83 In some early sources, Virabhadrā is a prominent rudra; note e.g. Sadyojyotis, in the Moksakārikā, referring to the hundred rudras as “headed by Virabhadrā” ([maheṣāno ‘nugṛhṇāti] iṣcayaḥ śatarudrāṇām ca virabhadrāpurnāḥṣarāṇ, 79b). In cosmology, Virabhadrā presides as a bhucanās over the highest of the ascending series of bhucanās (planets or worlds). Cf., e.g., Abhinavagupta’s Tantrasāra, 8.2: yat tu kātipaṭākātipaṭāhāduṇāgaṇāṃ rūpam tat tattvam yathā prthivī nāma dyutikāthāsthānyasthaṃdikāḥ kālāgniṃprabhātiśriyabhadrāṇābhuṃsāsadhiṣṭhitasamāpahmāṇānānugatā. The Matangapārāmeśvara, which refers to Virabhadrā as one of the lokanāyakas, “world lords” (vīrabhadrāṇāyasa caiva brahmāntā lokanāyakaḥ, 23.26cd), also describes the gana as “led by Virabhadrā” (vīrabhadrāpuraḥṣaraṇa, 23.47b). His role as a gana-lord is prominent in the early Skandapurāṇa. And in the BraYā and other sources, Virabhadrā is credited with revealing the Vīrabhadrataṇtra. BraYā xxxviii.61cd–62:
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**Figure 2.8:** Śiva and the Seven Mother goddesses (detail). Saptāṁśa cliff shrine between Badoh and Pathari, Madhya Pradesh. *AIIS Photo Archive.*

**Figure 2.9:** Saptāṁśa Panel, with Virabhadra (left) and Gaṇeśa (right). State Museum, Ashapurī, Madhya Pradesh. *AIIS Photo Archive.*
among the Mothers as a gana-lord, originally, I am less confident about the early identity of the Viṇādhara image type; no gana by this description is mentioned in connection to mātrs in period textual sources known to me. This probably points towards him being a form of Śiva, who is indeed associated with the viṇā.\textsuperscript{84} In any case, a shift in the perception of both, from gana-lords to forms of Śiva, might at some point have transpired, much as Ganeśa undergoes a shift in identity from gana-lord to child of Śiva and Pārvati.

It appears that the Mother shrine at Koṭivāra predates the association of the Mothers with Viṇabhadra or the Viṇādhara, and the elephantine Viṇāyaka, all unmistakably Śaiva sacred figures whose images accompany the goddesses in post-fifth-century shrines. In Koṭivāra’s iconic program, the ganas Chagala and Kumbhakarna appear instead, stationed outside the shrine proper, with Śiva himself joining the Mothers in the sanctum. This pantheon suggests a transitional picture, for although described in the Skandapurāṇa as ganaś of Śiva, Chagala and Kumbhakarna have clear ties with the older cult of Skanda. Perhaps not uncoincidentally, they moreover resemble Skanda and Kubera, respectively, the primary deities depicted in connection with the Mother goddesses in early, Kuśāna-era statuary.

Chagala, “the Goat,” is in all probability a name of Naigamėsa, a goat-headed deity prominent in the mythology and cult of Skanda, with whom Skanda is sometimes even identified.\textsuperscript{85} Such theriomorphic figures are attested in this period as

\footnotesize
\begin{quote}
\textit{esa virōṣṭakah prōktah skandamātrgaśodharah}||
\textit{chāgavkṛtāṃ sahiḥ narevah pariśvānate} || 11 ||
\textit{saśṭham chāgavāyantām raktram skandagayini viddhi tat}||
\textit{ṣaśīro 'bhiyantarām rājan nityan mātrgenācitarum} || 12 ||
\textit{saṃśaya tu pravaram tasya śīrśānām iha śabdāyate}||
\end{quote}

In another passage, Śalyaparvan 43.37-40ab, Skanda makes himself fourfold, becoming Skanda, Śākha,
door-guardians; cf. figure 2.11. Kumbhakarna, apparently a yaksa-type, is less readily identified. A rākṣasa by this name features in the Rāmāyaṇa as Rāvana's brother, a deadly warrior and voracious eater and sleeper. I suspect that in the Skandapurāṇa, Kumbhakarna ("Pitcher-ears") is an alias of Ghanṭākarna, "Bell Ears," the name of a gana of Śiva mentioned in the Skandapurāṇa and in other sources. It is also possible that in Koṭivarṣa, an assimilation has been made between a local yakṣa and a gana of Śiva. As a set, the Koṭivarṣa Mothers and their two gana-guardians appear to replace the group of Nine Heroes mentioned in the Mahābhārata, Āranyakaparvan 217: the seven śīṣumāṭrīs ("Mothers of the Infant[ś]"), their ferocious son, perhaps named Lohitākṣa, and Chāgavaktra. In the Skandapurāṇa account of Koṭivarṣa, Chagala or Chāgavaktra is carried over from the older śīṣumāṭrī set, while Śiva's gana Kumbhakarna replaces Lohitākṣa, both apparently fierce yakṣa-types. Pitcher- or bell-shaped ears suggest the massive earrings commonly depicted on yakṣas; cf. figure 2.10, and compare also the bust of a fanged, large-eared yakṣa (5th–6th century) found at Pawaya, M.P., near to Gwalior (figure 2.12). Continuity is thus apparent between the Mahābhārata's "Nine Heroes" and the Koṭivarṣa Mothers and their guardians, Chagala and Kumbhakarna, the new set of nine presided over by Śiva instead of Skanda.

Viśākha, and Naigameṣa.

86 Cf., e.g., Skandapurāṇa 164.61, quoted in the next note. Śatsāhasramahītā 4.136a lists Ghanṭākarna in a series of pālakas, "guardians," a list which includes gana-lords such as Gajanana (136b).

87 The name of the son of the śīṣumāṭrī is not unambiguous: he is described as "endowed with vitality," "very terrible," "born by the grace of Skanda," "having red eyes," "terrifying," and a "little child:" Aranyaparvan 3.10–11:

\begin{verbatim}
etasāṁ vṛṣṇaṃpomanaḥ śīṣur nāmaśādāraṇāḥ
skandaprasādājaḥ putro lohitākṣo bhayānkarah  \| 10  \|
esa vṛṇāṣṭakaḥ praktya skandamātrayaṇodbhatoḥ
chāgavaktryaḥ sahito navakalya purikṛtyate  \| 11  \|
\end{verbatim}

Here nāma probably has an emphatic sense, for it seems probable that the proper name of the gana is Lohitākṣa. Salyaparvan 45.22 lists the latter among four attendants (anucara) of Skanda:

\begin{verbatim}
nandisenaṃ lohitākṣan ghanṭākarnam ca sammatam
caṭurtham asayānucaran khyātāṃ kumudārīlīnām  \| 22  \|
\end{verbatim}

Cf. Skandapurāṇa 164.61, in a chapter closely parallel to and drawing upon Salyaparvan 45:

\begin{verbatim}
ghanṭākarnam suraktākṣan nandisenaṃ ca durjayaṃ
caṭurtham balināṃ śreśṭham khyātāṃ kumudārīlīnām  \| 62  \|
\end{verbatim}

On this passage's dependence upon the Mahābhārata, see Yokochi, "Rise of the Warrior Goddess," 100. Note in these lists the presence of Ghanṭākarna, whom I suggested above could be identical to Kumbhakarna at Koṭivarṣa.
At Koṭiṣvara, the emphasis on Chagala/Naigameśa and Kumbhakarna instead of Gaṇeśa and Virabhadra thus appears archaic, and could suggest transitional iconography of the fifth century or somewhat earlier. The possibility of unknown regional variations must however be taken into account, especially given that Koṭiṣvara lies in a peripheral zone of Brahmanical culture. Moreover, what appears in the textual description as archaic could simply be a continuity of narrative, the effort to link contemporary cult and revered myth. That is, the Skandapurāṇa might not represent the iconic program at Koṭiṣvara “accurately.” The possibility is nonetheless significant that the site possessed a comparatively ancient shrine of the Mothers. While the Skandapurāṇa, composed somewhat later, cannot be taken as a reliable indicator of the earliest cultic practices at Koṭiṣvara, it does at least indicate that in the sixth or
early seventh century, if not earlier, a Yogini cult had developed possessing close ties to the cult of Mother goddesses at important Śaiva temples and pilgrimage spots.

The Skandapurāṇa’s description of the deities of Koṭīvarṣa finds some corroboration in tantric literature. Koṭīvarṣa features in the BraYā’s sacred geography as one of eight cremation grounds (śmaśaṇa), and in the elaborate initiation maṇḍala described in BraYā iii, these are represented in the eight directions around the maṇḍala perimeter, with Koṭīvarṣa in the northeast. Its depiction includes the Pool of the Spear, but not Bahumāṇśā and Mother goddesses. Hetuksēvara however presides in a circle of eight rudras, beyond whom lie six yoginis headed by Hetukī. In the outer deity circuit are four rākṣasas, and three of Śiva’s gaṇas: Nandin, Chagala, and Kumbhakarna. The Tantrasadhāvā, a text probably postdating the BraYā, also mentions Kumbhakarna as the kṣetrapāla (“sacred field guardian”) of Puṇḍravardhana, the very region of Bengal where Koṭīvarṣa is situated. At Koṭīvarṣa itself (koṭākhya) preside the goddess Karnamoṭi and “the field-guardian Hetuka.” Although not confirming the importance of Mother

---

88 BraYā LXXXIV.81:

prayāgī varunā kollā attahāsan jayantika

attahāsā ] em.; haṭṭahāsā Bra

Sanderson discusses the probable locations of these sites in “History through Textual Criticism,” 7 (n. 4). Tantrasadhāvā 15.21 is identical to this verse, offering as substantive variants attahāsā (adopted above) and the corrupt caritrekāṁbukam (81c; mss as reported by Dyczkowski).

89 BraYā III.120–27.

See chapter 4, section 3.

90 Tantrasadhāvā 19.32–33: 19.57–58. On the location of Koṭīvarṣa, see Sanderson, “History through Textual Criticism,” 7, and Yokochi, “Rise of the Warrior Goddess,” 106–7. Yokochi reports that Koṭīvarṣa “is referred to as a Visaya of the Puṇḍravardhana Bhukti in a grant of Mahāpāla 1, issued on his ninth regnal year, which was discovered among some ruins called Bangari in the West Dinajpur district, Bengal.” Note however that Tantrāloka 15.87–88 lists Devikoṭṭha and Puṇḍravardhana as separate pīṭhas.

91 Tantrasadhāvā 19.32–33:
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goddesses at Koṭivarsa, these scriptures of the Yoganī cult do associate the site with tantric practice, linking it moreover to some of the same deities as Skandapurāṇa 171.

Elsewhere in the Skandapurāṇa, evidence for the Yoganī cult appears meager. Chapter 155 mentions a class of female beings called yogēsvarīṇī, a synonym of yogīṇī, in the context of the never-ending battle of sura and asura. From drops of the blood of Andhaka, impaled by Śiva, sprang warriors who rout Śiva’s gaṇas. Śiva then, it seems, creates the Mistresses of Yoga (yogēsvarīṇī), and orders them to slay and “eat the great asuras who were born from drops of blood.” They oblige. Noteworthy here is that as a class of beings, the yogēsvarīṇīs take on the martial role which had been the domain of Skanda’s demon-slaying māṭyas and other gaṇas in the Mahābhārata, illustrating through myth an important historical continuity.94 Note also chapter seventy, which contains the māhātya-narrative of the sacred mountain Śrīparvata or Śrīgiri, a site early tantric Śaiva texts mention as an important sacred site (piṭha).95 Its close association with the Yoganī cult is attested in an early eighth-century drama, the Malatimādhava of Bhavabhūti, as discussed subsequently. However, in the Skandapurāṇa account, the description of religious practices at Śrīparvata appears largely to reflect Pāśupata Śaivism, with liberation the goal and yoga the means; mentioned also are pilgrimage practices of the Śaiva laity.96 This accords in general with the

---

93 In this section, 10a–13b, there is loss of about four verse quarters in the editio princeps, including the object of [mahādeva] ‘srjat (“Śiva created ...”). The beings he creates are however identified as yogēsvarīṇī in 15b.

94 The bellicosity of the early Mothers is illustrated for example in Aranyakaparvan 215 (16–22).

95 Cf., e.g., Svacchandatantra 9.37a.

96 Note Skandapurāṇa 167, which describes Śrīparvata as a siddhiksetra (“a sacred field for attainment”) with hundreds of śivalihgams, where Brahmins devoted to the practice of yoga attain spiritual success (siddhi). This Śaiva, Brahmin sect of yogins is surely the Pasupatas. Skandapurāṇa 167.103–07:

---
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sectarian orientation of the *Skandapurana*. Yet the text might make allusion to the Mantramārga as well, telling the tale of how Pārvatī became a “great perfected yogini” (*siddhā mahāyogesvari*) by doing penance on Śrīparvata.97 This terminology is suggestive of the Yoginī cult, particularly in association with Śrīparvata.

Thus while the Śaiva Yoginī cult does not appear prominent in the *Skandapurana*, chapter 171 provides unambiguous evidence for its existence in the eighth century, fairly secure evidence for it in the seventh century, and a significant possibility for the sixth, depending upon the dating of the *Skandapurana* itself. Vague reference

---

97 After Sanatkumāra tells the tale of the asura Hiranyakāśipū's penance and defeat of the gods, Vyāsa asks him about the mountain, Śrīparvata, where he practiced his austerities. The Devī, while sporting with Śiva on the mountain, had noticed powerful yogins there circumambulating [an image or *lihgam* of] Śiva, perfected through austerities and possessed of great yoga. She questions the lord about the yogins, and he describes them as “great ones perfected in yoga, abiding in the Pasupata yoga” (70.48ab). The Devī too desires this attainment, and performs penance there; as boon, Śiva declares that she will become the Great Perfected Mistress of Yoga (*siddhā mahāyogesvari*), knowing the highest doctrine or meaning (*parārtha*) of the “entire adhyatmatantra [spiritual treatise?]” taught by Śiva. The mountain upon which she performed penance will be given the name “Śrīparvata.” *Skandapurana* 70.42-59, Bhāṭṭārāti edition:

"hiranyakaśipūryaiyata tepetepaharu || 43 ||
girau tasmin mahāpūrye devadėvo vrṣadhvajah ||
unayā sahito devyā rely niyam mahādyutih || 44 ||
tiṣṭhatas tatra devasya deva giriratmanah ||
tapasyāsvādamahāyogāh jyotisārdhavacalah || 45 ||
kṛtā pradaśeṣānāṁ sāmbhoḥ saśrājanamahāmune ||
gacchates tātu mahur drṣṭvā papracchā bhuranaśevaram || 46 ||
ke ete deva samsiddḥa yogāśād tvām prānemire ||
tato devaḥ prahayaśānām svacca paramañvāraḥ || 47 ||
yogasiddhā mahātmano yoge pāsūpate sthitah ||
yaḥ śārdūyā maṁ devī jahuk prānśān narottamāḥ || 48 ||
ta ete siddhadehārtāḥ svacchandaḥgacchātānāḥ ||
mosaśādheḥ purāṇa niṣṭhāḥ gantarāḥ paramam padam || 49 ||
atha śaṃcintyā suṣuṣṭa viṣaṃgacchātānāḥ ||
devaḥ pradeha śaṃcintyā vacah paraṃpārantiḥ || 50 ||
yathāhuṃ api devas prāṇamāntāṁ sādhuḥ tāṁśini ||
karuṣamāṃ tathā yātnām esa cāśiṃ gatā vibhū || 51 ||
tataḥ kṛtā śrīyā rupam devi paramśrayāh ||
maḥat tatra tapas tepe sahasram pariotsarāva || 52 ||
devaḥ cāṣāyā sarvam prādādāl tah śaṃcintyā mahādyutih ||
krīṇasadhuḥyāmanāṃprāṣṭaḥ maṇḍap prakṣya bhāmī || 53 ||
maḥāyogesvari siddhā parābhājāḥ bhavishyati ||
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to "Tantras by the thousands" suggests that even at this early date there may have existed a large and perhaps developed corpus of Mantramārga literature. This textual situation finds mutual corroboration in the BraYā, one of the scriptures the Skanda-purāṇa lists, which as I shall discuss in chapter three describes a sizeable body of Śaiva scripture in its account of the canon. It is significant, moreover, that the Skanda-purāṇa places the Yoginī cult in close association with the cult and shrines of Mother goddesses, for in this period, monumental shrines of the Mothers such as may have existed at Koṭivarṣa were constructed in considerable numbers. It is to more of this evidence that we turn next.

POST-GUPTA ERA TEMPLES OF THE MOTHERS

A large number of Mother-goddess shrines survive from the sixth and seventh centuries,98 and the circa mid sixth-century Brhatsamhitā of Varāhamihira speaks of the temple cult of Mothers alongside major sectarian denominations of the period, including Buddhism, Jainism, and the Vaiṣṇava Bhāgavatas.99 Nonetheless, the surviving Mother shrines have clear Śaiva orientations, occuring primarily in association with Śiva temple complexes. While these hence attest the existence of a widespread

98 See Katherine Harper, Iconography of the Saptamatrikas, 101-49.
99 Brhatsamhitā 59.19:
viṣṇoḥ bhūgataḥ pānāṁ ca savitarāḥ śambhoḥ sabhasmadvidāṁ
mātṛṇāṁ api mandaḷakramavidavo viprān vidur brahmaṇāḥ |
sākyān sarvaditasya śāntamanaśe nāgāṁ jināṁ viḍur
ye yam decaṁ upaśiṛtāḥ svaviśeṣāṁ tais ītya kāryā kṛitya 19

Edition of A. V. Tripathi. The Śaiva "brahmīns with ashes" (sabhasmadvidāṁ) are in all likelihood Pāṣupatins. While this passage does not specify the Mothers' identities, elsewhere the text speaks of constructing the images of Mothers in accordance with the appearances of the deities they are named after (mātṛgacchā kartavyāḥ svavādevaśuvaśvapakṣacīnāḥ, 57.56ab). It therefore seems likely that Varāhamihira knows of and refers to the Brahmanical Seven Mothers. His terminology for describing specialists in the cult of Mothers, "knowers of the mandala-sequence" (mandaḷakramavidāḥ) or "knowers of the Mother-mandala" (mandaḷapradāvadāḥ, edition of H. Kern), has been taken by Harper as an indication of a tantric cultic orientation. Iconography of the Saptamātrikas, 122. However, the mere occurrence of the term mandala does not warrant this; here it probably means "the group/set [of Mothers]." Note the same terminology in the inscription of the contemporaneous saptamātrik śrine at Deogarh, which in its benedictory verse refers to the enshrined deities as the mandala of Mothers:

x x x x x x
sthitam jagadākṣaraṁścamaṁ
mandaḷaṁ lokamālīṁ(t)ḥnāṁ manḍalam bhūtaye (Istu vah 1)

Epigraphia Indica xxx.15 (pp. 125-27).
Śaiva temple cult of the Mothers, they bear an unclear relationship to developments in tantric forms of Śaivism. That the two were in some contexts linked is suggested by the Skandapurāṇa account of Koṭiṣvarṣa. In the present section are discussed two facets of Mother shrines that could provide insight into this connection: cases of an eighth goddess in some sculpted sets of the Mothers, and the presence of kāpālika deities and iconography.

Tantric Śaiva sources of the Yoginī cult sometimes speak of Mother goddesses as an octad, rather than the earlier and more widely attested Brahmanical heptad, even when affirming their identity as “the Seven Mothers.” In tantric literature, the eighth, additional Mother is sometimes Mahālakṣṭī, or else the supreme Goddess of the bhairavatantras herself, often by the name Yogeśī (=Yoginī). Hence in the BraYā, Bhairavī or Aghoresī is called “the one who completes the Mothers” (māṭṛpāraṇī).

Purāṇic accounts evidence more variety; the Devīmāhāṭmya of the Mārkandeyapurāṇa, for instance—a text which marks the entry of tantric Śaiva notions of śakti into the purāṇic theology of goddesses—adds Nārasimhī to the Mothers, the embodiment

---

100 Thus chapter 1 of the Svacchāntrānta, in the published Kashmirī recension, distributes the phonemes of the alphabet in vargas connected with eight Mothers—the usual heptad plus Mahālakṣṭī—after enumerating whom the text states, “these are the seven Great Mothers, situated in the seven worlds” (etdh sapta mahāmārṣṭī saptaakāravasthitāḥ, 36cd). Sanderson points out that this reference to the Mothers is absent from the recension of the Svacchāntrānta preserved in Nepalese manuscripts (personal communication, January 2007).

101 For Yogeśī as the name of the eighth Mother, cf., e.g., BraYā xxxv.32, Tantrasadbhava 14.155b, Tantraloka 29.52d, and the Brhatkalottara, mentioned previously (n. 73).

102 E.g., BraYā ii.18b.

103 The Devīmāhāṭmya is frequently spoken of as a text foundational to the formation of Hindu goddess traditions, providing, for instance, an early example of the textual depiction of the Mothers. Note e.g. Harper, who assumes a circa 400-600 C.E. dating of the text. Iconography of the Saptamātrikas, 91, citing R. C. Hazra, Studies in the Purāṇic Records on Hindu Rites and Customs, 10-12. Cf. Thomas Coburn, who accepts a fifth- or sixth-century dating of the Devīmāhāṭmya, citing D. R. Bhandarkar, “Epigraphic Notes and Questions,” Journal of the Bombay Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society xxiii (1909): 73-74; he also refers to V. V. Mirashi, “A Lower Limit for the Date of the Devī-Māhāṭmya,” Purāṇa vi 1 (Jan. 1964): 183-84. Coburn, Devī-Māhāṭmya: The Crystalization of the Goddess Tradition, 1, 63 (n. 204). However, the Devīmāhāṭmya is probably not as old as has been supposed: Yuko Yokochi questions on strong grounds the minimal evidence adduced in support of a sixth-century (or earlier) dating. She instead proposes the second half of the eighth century, primarily on the basis of the iconic type described for the Warrior Goddess. Rise of the Warrior Goddess, 21-23 (n. 42).

Yokochi notes that the Devīmāhāṭmya is the first source of its type to draw upon the tantric Śaiva conception of śakti in relation to the nature of goddesses more generally. She points out that Skanda-purāṇa 171 does not describe the Mother-goddesses emitted by male gods as their sāktis, in contrast to the Devīmāhāṭmya. Ibid., 15 (n. 31.). Her revised dating of the Devīmāhāṭmya fits well with the emerging picture of the chronology of tantric Śaiva literature, for the tantric Śaiva goddess cults that might have
of the feminine "power" (śakti) of Viṣṇu's Man-lion avatāra. Sculpted sets of Mother goddesses do not adopt equivalent iconographic schemes, although several add an eighth goddess. The mid sixth-century shrine in the Śaiva cave temple at Aihol, mentioned earlier (n. 73), depicts eight Mothers and might include Mahālakṣmī in place of Vaiṣṇavī, adding Pārvatī to the heptad as well.104 Meister mentions two other cases of an eighth goddess among the Mothers: the late sixth-century Elephanta cave east of the main shrine, and the eighth-century Vaitāl Deul temple of Bhuvaṇeśvar, Orissa.105 In both cases, the iconographically ambiguous eighth goddess appears subordinate to Cāmunḍā, rather than transcending her in the manner of Aghoreśī/Bhairavī in the Śaiva Yogini cult.106 The eighth goddess at Vaitāl Deul bears a trident in one of her two arms, suggesting an association with Śiva, but has no vahana marking her identity; Thomas Donaldson suggests Mahālakṣmī, but on unclear grounds.107

Another case of an eighth goddess joining the heptad of Mothers is the mātrī shrine of the little-studied Aurangabad Buddhist cave complex, perhaps of the sixth century.108 This small cave temple presages textual evidence of the seventh century inspired the theology of śakti alluded to in the Devīmahatmya seem likely to have been widespread by the eighth century.

104 The central wall of this shrine features two goddesses framing a dancing Śiva, with diminutive images of Ganeśa and either Virabhadra or Skanda standing below them. Meister identifies the goddesses as Pārvatī and Śrī (i.e. Srilakṣmī or Mahālakṣmī). "Regional Variations," 240. The latter deity holds a lotus, and could instead be (an unusual) Vaiṣṇavī, while the image identified as Pārvatī possesses a crescent moon upon her headdress, like Māheśvarī on the wall to the viewer’s left. This set could thus include both Mahālakṣmī and the supreme Śaiva goddess, the two most common additions to the heptad in tantric accounts of the Mother goddesses—or else it simply adds Pārvatī to the usual heptad.

105 Ibid., 237-38.

106 While I follow Meister in identifying the emaciated image adjacent to Ganeśa, on the left, as Cāmunḍā, Harper identifies the image as Kāla, a male deity, in which case the standard heptad of Mother-goddesses is present. Iconography of the Saptamātrikas, 113. This would to some extent bear comparison with the Rāvan-Kāśī shrine at Ellora; there, however Mahākāla is depicted to the right of Ganeśa, rather than within the row of Mothers, and is accompanied by a smaller, emaciated goddess—presumably Kāli.

107 Donaldson, Tantra and Śakti Art of Orissa, vol. 1, 109 (figure 211). Perhaps Yogeśī/Bhairavī?

108 This is the so-called "Brahmanical cave," located near to cave six. See Carmel Berkson, The Caves at Aurangabad. Early Buddhist Tantric Art in India, 217, 225-28. Katherine Harper suggests a close stylistic relationship between the Aurangabad Mothers and the mātrī sets of Elephanta and Ellora, Rāmeśvara cave, hence situating the shrine in the sixth century. Harper, Iconography of the Saptamātrikas, 114. My description of the temple is based upon personal observation, as well as the images published by Berkson, ibid., passim.
pointing toward limited incorporation of the Mother-goddesses in Tantric Buddhism, discussed in chapter 4. Along its left wall are situated a row of six standing Mothers, flanked near the entrance by a four-armed male guardian figure, presumably Virabhadra. On the central wall, opposite the entrance, is situated an imposing seated Ganeśa, flanked on either side by goddesses: the seventh Mother, Cāmunḍā, to the viewer’s left, and a four-armed goddess on the right who bears a triśūla, sword, bell, and pitcher, possibly with a lion as vāhanā—Durgā, it has been suggested.109 Along with the case of Aihole, this points toward a convention of representing the spouse-goddess of Śiva as eighth of the Mothers, in this case in the guise of the “Warrior Goddess” facet that rose to great prominence in the period, eulogized in the early seventh-century Cāṇḍiśataka of Bāṇa.110 On the right wall are present two nondescript seated Buddhas (one badly damaged) with attendant figures, displacing Śiva and providing a Buddhist identity to the Mothers.

Kāpālīka deities and iconography figure in representations of the Mothers from as early as the mid-sixth century. This development appears first, it seems, in the Mother shrines of the Rāmeśvara and Rāvaṇ-kaśi cave temples of Ellora, of the mid- or late-sixth centuries; these depart from earlier models by the addition of a skeletal divine couple adjacent to the Mothers (figure 2.13). The identity of these deities is problematic: art-historians have suggested Kāla (i.e. Mahākāla) and Kālī, which is plausible.111 As discussed subsequently, early seventh-century literature evidences the existence of a tantric cult of Mahākāla, whose association with the Mother goddesses is described in chapter fifty-four of the BraYā. Inclusion of Mahākāla in the iconographic programs of Ellora’s sixth-century Mother shrines hence suggests a degree of congruence with period texts. The identity of the female deity seems less certain; Bāṇa speaks of Mahākāla as the consort of Cāṇḍikā, a deity whose identity

109 Berkson attributes this identification to Ramesh Gupte. Caves at Aurangabad, 227.
110 It should be pointed out, however, that this eighth goddess is not contiguous with the other seven, for the image of Ganeśa intervenes; she might therefore not have been considered one of the Mothers, per se.
may subsume any number of fierce Śaiva goddesses, especially Durgā and Cāmuṇḍā. As consort of Mahākāla, this fierce goddess could be viewed as an eighth Mother, completing a pantheon akin to that described in BraYa līv—the Seven Mothers headed by Mahākāla (identified with Bhairava) and Bhairavī or Yogēṣvarī.

It does not seem possible to situate with precision the Mothers, as represented in sixth-century sculpture, with the goddesses as described in extant Śaiva yogini literature; the latter might indeed belong to a somewhat later period. However, the evidence for a convention of including an eighth goddess and the presence of Mahākāla in particular suggest possible correlations with developments in Tantric Śaivism. On the other hand, it seems highly likely that the kāpālika iconic program of the Vaitāl Deul temple of late eighth-century Orissa is informed by contemporaneous tantric pantheons and iconography, a period and region in which tantric Śaiva goddess cults were undoubtedly prominent.

This extraordinary temple enshrines a cult image of Cāmuṇḍā in a program that includes seven other Mother goddesses and seven male deities. Here we find the Mothers in a cultic context that is clearly sākta—Cāmuṇḍā, rather than Śiva, presides as supreme deity—and manifestly kāpālika in iconography. Besides Virabhadra and Gaṇeśa, who normally accompany the Mothers, the male deities include Kubera, Varāha (who holds a skull-bowl), a seated yogin with a canopy of hooded serpents identified as “Nāgarāja” (“King of Serpents”), and two Śaiva, kāpālika deities: a skeletal (“Atiriktāṅga”) Bhairava holding a skull-cup and knife, astride a corpse; and a skeletal, ithyphallic deity seated in yogāsana on a corpse, whom Donaldson identifies as Gajasamhāramūrti: Śiva as “Slayer of the Elephant demon” (Figure 2.14). An Orissan-provenance text refers to the presiding Cāmuṇḍā of the temple as “Kāpālinī” (“Skull-bearer”), suggestive of the principle epithet of Bhairavī in the BraYa: Cāṇḍā

112 On Bāṇa, see the subsequent section. In the BraYa, the name Cāṇḍikā occurs as a synonym of Cāmuṇḍā; cf. BraYa 11.16d.
113 While the outer structure contains an inscription of the thirteenth or fourteenth century, the core shrine has a short inscription apparently dating to the late eighth century, on paleographic grounds. Krishna Chandra Panigrahi, Archaeological Remains at Bhuvaneswar, 32–33.
Kāpālinī, "Grim Bearer of the Skull." Significantly, the temple's decorative reliefs include carvings of male Śaiva ascetics bearing skull-staves (khatvāṅga) and engaging in erotic activities, while there is evidence of sacrificial cultus as well—both sug-

115 Svapāḍrimahodāya, cited by Panigrahi, Archaeological Remains at Bhubaneswar, 233. Cf. Tantrasadbhava 21, which provides a vīḍāya-mantra addressing Aghorī as "Cāmunḍā Kāpālinī." Tantrasadbhava 21.154cd–56ab:

siddhacāmunda kalpadam kathitam sarvakāmadam || 154 ||
ataḥ parataram ca kṣaye aghoryā bhūnavikramā |
cāmunḍe l'īs padam ādau kāpālinī atāḥ param || 155 ||
svāhāntaṁ pranavādūṣyāṁ ca mālaṃtram idaṃ śūbhām |

"vikramā | conj.; "vikramām mss kāpālinī | en.; kāpālinī mss"

"This kalpa of Siddhacāmunda, which grants all wishes, has been spoken. Next, I shall teach something further: [the kalpa] of Aghorī, the fierce indomitable one. The word CĀMUNDE at the beginning, then KĀPĀLINĪ, ending with SVĀHĀ and beginning with OM [i.e. OM CĀMUNDE KĀPĀLINĪ SVĀHĀ]: this is the auspicious root mantra."

As I mention in chapter 4, this mantra appears modelled upon the nine-syllable vīḍāya-mantra of Aghoresī in the Brahma [OM] HŪM CANDE KĀPĀLINĪ SVĀHĀ.
gestive of a Vidyāpīṭha ritual context. The Tantrasadbhāva, a Vidyāpīṭha scripture perhaps also of the eighth century, describes tantric ritual centered upon Cāmunḍā and performed in temples of the Mothers (mātrgr̥ha), in one case with the aim of encountering yoginis.

---

116 Donaldson publishes a relief from Vaital Deul of three kāpalikas engaged in amorous activities; Tantra and Sākta Art, vol. 3, fig. 627. Panigrahi notes remains of a stone sacrificial altar (yūpa) outside of the temple. Archaeological Remains at Bhubaneswar, 234.

117 On the Tantrasadbhāva, see chapter 3, section 3, and chapter 5, section 3.

118 Both of the references identified belong to Tantrasadbhāva 21, referred to above (n. 115); one has as its context the vidyā-mantra and worship of “Red Cāmunḍā” and the other, those of Cāmunḍā as Aghoresī or Cānda Kāpalini—supreme goddess of the Brahmā. In the latter case, the ritual is said to bring about direct encounter with the yoginis. Tantrasadbhāva 21.211cd–13ab:
2.3 THE LATER LITERARY EVIDENCE

WORKS OF BĀṆA: THE KĀDAMBARĪ AND HARSĀCARITA

In Bāṇa’s Kādambarī and Harsācarita, prose works of the first half of the seventh century composed by a contemporary of king Harṣa (r. 606–4719), we find evidence for tantric Śaiva ritualists and practices characteristic of the bhairavatantras.120 However, while the divinities and varieties of ritual Bāṇa depicts are in no small measure consistent with the Śaiva Yogini cult, yoginis themselves find no mention.

In the Kādambarī, a love tale in ornate prose, the hero Candrāpiḍa happens upon a jungle temple of the goddess Caṇḍikā while journeying to the city of Ujjainī. Officiating over her worship is an elderly “Dravidian” ascetic (jaraddraviḍadhārmika), whose grotesque appearance and dubious magical practices are described in some detail. The Harsācarita too, Bāṇa’s chronicle of the early life of King Harṣa, provides substantial evidence for the Tantric Śaivism of the bhairavatantras. As with the Kādambarī, this work features in its third chapter a tantric ritualist: a “Southerner” (dākṣiṇātya) and “great Śaiva” by the name Bhairavācārya, in this case an exhausted and powerful guru rather than macabre magician. The association between Bhairavācārya and Harṣa’s ancestor, the king Puṣpabhūti, culminates in the king serving as an assistant in vetālasadhana—the “zombie rite” by which Bhairavācārya ascends to the skies as a semi-divine wizard (vidyādhara).

| mātrgrham praviṣṭaṁ tu pājāyitvaṁ tu maṅdalam || 211 ||
| japed yogesvarim devin supatīs tadgateśanah |
| bhramanānam ivakāse tato tam nadate grham || 212 ||
| āgacchanti tato devyō yoginyo vikṛtānāḥ |

“After entering a temple of the Mothers and worshipping [their] mandala, one should incant the [Vidyā-mantra of the] goddess Yogeśvari, (1) having a good cloth, one’s gaze fixed on that—up until the temple resounds, as though roaming through the sky? Afterwards come the goddesses, yoginis of grotesque visage.”

The interpretation of 212bcd is somewhat uncertain; is the temple supposed to ascend into the sky? For supatīs, perhaps read svapatīs (“one’s ritual cloth”), referring to a cloth inscribed with a ritual diagram.


120 Bāṇa’s accounts of Śaivism have been discussed by Lorenzen, Kāpālikas and Kālāmukhas, 16–23; and briefly but with much substance by Sanderson, “History through Textual Criticism,” 11, 13 (n. 11). The latter’s remarks are referred to below.
The activities of the Dravidian ascetic in the Kādambarī are highly suggestive of the power-seeking practices of the sādhaka taught in bhairavatantras. These include the use of magical ointments (siddhāhjana),121 powders (cūrṇa),122 minerals (dhātu),123 herbal salvages (auṣadhāhjana),124 bindis or forehead dots (tilaka),125 and mustard seed (siddhārthaka);126 alchemy (rasāyana);127 the effort to find hidden treasures and to enter the netherworlds;128 practice of mantra-propitiation (mantrasādhanā) for attaining invisibility;129 and seeking power over yakṣa maidens.130 While these and similar magical practices are not restricted to the bhairavatantras, they receive their greatest elaboration in the latter scriptures.131 In addition, Bāna’s Dravidian ascetic is said to

121 He is referred to as having one eye rupture “because of a magical eye-ointment given by a quack” (kṣaṇādātīsamādhāntaḥ jvaprabhaḥ viśnuḥ taḥkālaḥ ṛgacacayataḥ 

122 anyadeMgatositasu jaratpravrajitasu bahukrtvah samprayuktastnvasTkaranacurnena (“one who had often employed powder for controlling women on elderly nuns, who were staying [in the Caṇḍikā temple precincts] after arriving from another land”).

123 samjatadhatuvadavayuna (“one in whom the wind-humour disease (vayu) of belief in [magical] pigments/metal had arisen”).

124 ihgudikosakrtausadhahjanasamgrahena (“one having a collection of herbal salvages made from the bark of the Ingudl”).

125 duhsiksitasramanadistatilakabaddhavibhavapratyasena (“one whose hope for power is bound to a [magical] tilaka taught [him] by a poorly tutored ascetic”).

126 asakrdabhimantritasiddhārthakapradhavitaih pīṭacṛṣitahkālāh karatalatadhanacipīṭikṛtaḥsānuputena (“one the inside of whose ears have been flattened by slaps of the palms of those possessed by goblins, who had been chased away by [his] blows of sesame seeds enchanted by mantras no few times”).

127 asmyakkṛttarasayananltakalajvarena (“one who has an untimely fever brought on by improperly performed alchemy”).

128 avirbhutanid.hivadavyad.hina (“one in whom the disease of belief in hidden treasure was manifest”), and lagndsuravivarapravesapisacena (“one whom the ‘goblin’ of [desiring] entry to the netherworlds of the Asuras has latched onto”).

129 vardhitantardhanamantrasādhanasamgrahena (“one whose collection of rites of mantra-propitiation for [achieving] invisibility had grown large”).

130 Note for example BraYa xv.15.13-14, which contains a typical enumeration of magical attainments: adhuna sampravaksyami mahavetalasadhanam 

131 This list includes three of the “fruits” sought by the Dravidian ascetic: the ability to enter the netherworlds, invisibility (antardhana), and magic ointment (ahjana). Uddāmareśvaraṇatra 14.10 links the latter two, mentioning a siddhāhjana having invisibility as its purpose. Siddhāhjana is also mentioned as a magical attainment in BraYa xxix.71cd (gudikākhadgaṇiśalasiḥ siddhatanarastai tu). The BraYa has a chapter ostensibly devoted to the subject of ahjana: the ahjanayogapātala, number lxvii. Regarding magical
be versed in “thousands of wonder-tales of Śrīparvata,” a mountain closely associated with potteries or Šaivism, and not to waver in his “self-identification with Śiva” (śaivābhimāna). Although hence a Šaiva, his devotion to Caṇḍikā suggests engage-

“powders” (cūrṇa), BraYā lxxx.80cd mentions a recipe for one that, as is the case in Bāna’s description, is used for bringing another person under one’s power (cūrṇena śripurūpaṇaṃ tāpya yateśīvauṃ vaśam nayet). Concerning the magical dhāttus mentioned in connection with Bāna’s Dravidian, note for instance the mineral pigments haritāla (yellow orpiment) and manahsīlā (red arsenic) in a list of siddhis in BraYā xlv.58–59ab:

padukau rocana caiva haritālaṃ manachilāṃ |
 yogājjanarasā devī khadaṃ cintāmanis tathā | 58 ||
 upatiṣantī ini taṣya śīlakṣya tu śīlakṣyaḥ | 58a padukau | em.: padukā Bv# 58c “rasa” | em.: “rasaṃ Bv# 58d “manis” | em.: “manin Bv#

As with cūrṇa, añjana, oscadhis (“herbs”), etc., dhāttus are substances used in ritual, which, it appears, are also thought to manifest in siddhi-bestowing varieties as fruits of ritual. Rasaṃyana, which appears to refer to the potent material product of alchemical processes, is listed alongside these as a siddhi-inducing substance, manifesting as the fruit of ritual. See for example Tantrasadbhava 20:

ksabhyantī purvāsinyāḥ śīlakahāṃ tu tato ‘naghe || 317 ||
prarthayaṃ praveśantī dādantī manαespitām ||
rasaṃ rasṛyanāṃ dītyaṃ ausādhiya baladarpitā || 318 ||
anjanam pādaḷaṇaṃ ca pāduko ‘tha manahsīlā ||
gudīkā sāstramālā vā yad anyaṃ siddhiākṣaraṃ || 319 ||
319a añjanaṃ | em.: añjana TsªTsªTsª 319c gudīkā | Tsª gudīkā TsªTsªTsª

“The women of the city get aroused; then, O sinless woman, [they] beseech the sadhaka, give him entry, [and] proud of their power, grant him what his mind sought: divine elixir or rasāyana, herbs, ointment, foot balm, sandals, red arsenic, pills, a set of weapons (sāstramālā), or else another cause of siddhi.“

(mss as reported by Dyczkowski.) Forehead marks or tilakas comprise a related category. Chapter five of the BraYā, for example, provides recipes for preparing tilaka compounds that bestow siddhi when enchanted by mantra and applied in ritual. On the other hand, siddhārtharksa or white mustard seeds do not as far as I know appear to manifest as a “fruit” of ritual, although they are certainly used in magical rites.

Bāna’s reference to nidhivāda apparently refers to seeking hidden treasure by magical means. Compare for instance chapter nine of the Udānamahesvararatnā, which makes several references to obtaining wealth or hidden treasures as the result of ritual. For more detailed accounts, see the Buddhist Mahāsmrī-nilākalpa, e.g. chapter 55. As for what Bāna refers to as apravīrvarapravasā, “entry into the netherworlds of the Asuras,” tantric sources commonly call this padaḷasiddhi, “power [to enter] the netherworlds,” or simply pāṭāla. Cf. xv.13-14 above. Regarding the yaksā-maidens the Dravidian is said to lust after, these (yaksakanyā, yaksīnti, etc.) are frequently mentioned among the various females a sadhaka might seek erotic power over. On such yaksīnti, see chapter 5 of the present dissertation. Note also the practice of yaksinśādhanā, rites specifically aimed at gaining the control of a yaksini, and not simply for erotic, but also magical ends. Cf., e.g., borī ms no. 503 of 1895–98, “Yaksinśādhanā.” In the BraYā, an entire chapter is devoted to this subject: lxiv (labelled lx), the yaksinśādhanapatala. Bāna’s list of magical powers and substances bears comparison with that of the Buddhist Subhūtaparipṛcchā, discussed by Ronald Davidson, Indian Esoteric Buddhism, 200–01.

Śrīparvataśācarayarāttārasāharaḥbhijñena (“One well-versed in thousands of wonder tales of Śrīparvata”).

Although this phrase might mean “pride in being a Šaiva,” abhimāna also has in tantric literature the technical sense of “meditative identification” with a deity. Note that the expression śaivābhimāna occurs with this meaning in Tantrāloka 13.252a, where Abhinavagupta quotes or paraphrases the Nandīśkhīṭatnā.
ment in a tantric goddess cult, which is wholly consistent with the bhairavatantras of the Vidyāpitha.\textsuperscript{134}

Although the Harṣacarita’s Bhairavācārya is not referred to as such, his ritual practices too are those of the siddhi-seeking specialist or sādhaka of the bhairavatantras, and Bāna utilizes the technical terminology of tantric ritual. Bhairavācārya’s practice of pūrvaśeṇa, preliminary worship of a mantra-deity, is described in some detail.\textsuperscript{135} Additionally, the vetālasādhanvelopā Bhairavācārya undertakes bears affinity in several respects with this ritual as described in BraYā xv, a chapter devoted to the subject. This rite marks the culmination of his propitiation of the heart-mantra of Mahākāla.\textsuperscript{136} On the fourteenth night of the waning moon, the king, duly initiated,\textsuperscript{137} joins three other disciples in taking up positions as guardians of the quarters in an ash-drawn mandala in a deserted temple near the cremation ground.\textsuperscript{138} In the center sits Bhairavācārya, upon a corpse. He performs fire sacrifice (homa) with black sesame seeds using a fire lit in the very mouth of the body. As he performs homa, incanting mantras, spirits attempt to disrupt him, until finally a powerful nāga emerges from a fissure in the earth near the mandala. Angered at not being made bali offerings, the nāga attacks, but suffers defeat at the hands of the king, who nonetheless spares the snake lord’s life on spotting his sacred thread. At this point the ritual comes to fruition: won over by the pious king, Lāksṇī herself manifests in his enchanted sword, attāhāsa.

\textsuperscript{134} Besides presiding over a temple of Candikā, note that he is described as patṭikātākīhitadurgastotrena ("one who by whom a eulogy-hymn of Durga has been copied onto a small cloth"), and jārāṁ gateṇāpi daksīṇapalabhādiḥtṛiṇyavaraṁprāthihaṅkalakārthāhitadurgena ("despite having grown old, he afflicts Durga with prayers for the boon of overlordship of the Deccan").

\textsuperscript{135} Bhairavācārya states, in Sanderson’s translation, “I have completed the preliminary service (pūrvaśeṇa) of the great Mantra called the Heart of Mahākāla by muttering it ten million times in a great cremation ground while wearing a garland of black flowers, a black robe and black unguent, with all the adornments prescribed in the Kalpa” (bhagavato mahākālaḥṛdayadvayam maḥāmantramāya kṛṣṇasragambāruḥśravenākalipena kalpakathītena maḥāṣmaśāne ṣaṇakṣenī kṛṣṇapūrvaśevo’smī). “History through Textual Criticism,” 13 (n. 11).

\textsuperscript{136} It is possible that the king takes samayāṅkalikā, the initiation of the samayin or “pledge holder,” by which he becomes a Śaiva neophyte. This is suggested by Bāna’s terminology, in which niyamavan (“possessing/observing the rules”) might be synonymous with samayin: athātikranteṣvahahsu prāptikām ca tasyām eva kṛṣṇacaturdasyam saivena vidhiṁ dīkṣitoḥ pūrvaśeṇa niyamavan abhút (“Then, when the days had past and that very [designated] fourteenth of the dark fortnight arrived, the King, initiated by Śaiva procedure, became niyamavan”).

\textsuperscript{137} mahāṣmaśātesamipabhādhyā śaṇatkhetane.
Granted boons, he requests only siddhi for his guru, Bhairavācārya, who thereupon joins the ranks of the vidyādharas—flying, semi-divine wizards. Of her own accord, the goddess grants that Puspabhūti shall become progenitor of a line of great kings.

Bāṇa’s description of vetālasādhanā matches in basic details with the more elaborate account of BraYa xv. In the BraYa’s description, the ritual takes place in a cremation ground on the fourteenth or tenth night of the waning moon, with the aid of assistants. The basic sequence of action is identical: the sādhaka, seated on the chest of the ritually prepared corpse, performs the fire sacrifice in its mouth, during the course of which various obstructing forces (vighnas) and spirits appear to distract or frighten him. Among the eight siddhis promised is “the state of being a vidyādharas” (vidyādharapada), Bhairavācārya’s aim in undertaking the ritual. In both descriptions, the successful ritual ends with the sādhaka flying off into the sky.

Both the Kādambarī and Harṣacarita make reference to tantric manuscripts and Śaiva texts. Bhairavācārya’s lips droop slightly, as though laden with the weight of the entire Śaiva canon “on the tip of his tongue.” For his part, the Kādambarī’s Dravidian ascetic possesses a collection of manuscripts that include a stotra of Durgā copied onto a cloth (pattika), and palm-leaf manuscripts with red-lac lettering con-

---

139 This chapter contains, to the best of my knowledge, the most detailed account of such a practice in tantric literature. Its description of vetālasādhanā begins with verse 13.

140 See BraYa xv.13-14, quoted above. Those seeking only “petty” (ksudra) or “middling” (madhyama) siddhis discontinue the ritual when the sought attainments are achieved.

141 In the BraYa, one attains a magical sword and becomes “lord of emperors,” with mastery over a crore of aerial vehicles. BraYa xv.63cd–64:

yātadv ihaste bhavet tasya tāvat khadgaṃ mahāprabhāṃ |
*tatas tam gṛhya mantriṣṭhō utpate gaganāṅgane || 63 ||
uttīṭhati vinānāstha vinānāthaḥ parivārītaḥ |
tatāτrāhi mahādhiśriṣ cakravartītīśvaro bhavet |
kotya caīca vinānāthāṃ ādiḥpapatyām avāpyat || 64 ||
63b tāvat | en.; tātav B7a 63d gaganā | en.; gaganā B7a 64a uttīṭhati | cor.; uttīṭhati
B7a  vīmānāsthā | en.; vīmānāsthām B7a 64b parivārītaḥ | en.; parivārītaṃ B7a 64d
“Isvaro | cor.; “Isvaro B7a 64d vīmānānām | cor.; vīmānānām B7a

“At that time, there would appear in his hand a sword of great brilliance. Then, grasping this, the knower of mantras would fly up into the vault of the sky. He rises up in an aerial vehicle, surrounded by aerial vehicles. Mounting that, he, very wise, he would become the lord of emperors, and would obtain mastery over aerial vehicles, by the crore.”

142 jihvagrasthiṣaśravasāhitasamhitāḥbhareṇeva manākpralambitaṣṭham.

143 As mentioned previously, he is described as paṭṭikālīkhītadurgāstotreṇa, “One who by whom a stotra
taining “bogus spells and mantras.” A text he possesses is moreover identified by name: Mahakalamata, the “Doctrine of Mahakala,” copied according to the instructions of an elderly Pasupata ascetic (mahapasupata). Similarly, Bhairavacarya is said to have performed purvasevā (“preliminary service”) of “the great heart-mantra of Mahakala” according to the instructions laid down in its kalpa. It is possible that the Mahakalamata mentioned in the Kadambari is the same kalpa of Mahakala followed by Bhairavacarya, a kalpa being “the manuscript of a text setting out the procedure for the propitiation of a Mantra.” Sanderson remarks that “neither the [mahakalaharṣdaya] mantra nor its kalpa can be identified now but the details of the procedure given by Bana tally closely with what is laid down in Tantric Saiva sources.” Providing parallels, Sanderson also points out that chapter fifty-four of the Brāhya is a kalpa of Mahakala. It should be mentioned, furthermore, that one of this chapter’s titles is in fact Mahakalamata, although this is not necessarily the same Mahakalamata Bana appears to have known of.

Bana associates what we might consider tantric ritual proper with a variety of other exoticized practices. This nexus is particularly apparent in descriptions of the rites and penances undertaken by those seeking to avert the death of prince Harśa’s of Durgā has been copied onto a small cloth.”

144 dhāmaratīklākaṇakaśatālāpatrakuhakatālamtrapatmantrapustikāsaṁgrahinī (“One having a collection of small manuscripts of bogus (kuhaka) spells (tantra) and mantras on palm leaves with letters in smokey red lac”). It might be possible that kuhaka is here a noun rather than adjective, in the sense of “quack”—the source of the manuscripts of tantras and mantras. The term occurs in a different sense in Ne-tratāntra 18.89b, where Ksemaraja glosses it as yantrakṛtyādi, “rites involving yantras, etc.” However, in the Svacchandodysseyata, he instead glosses, kuhakam tisnapakaṇaṇī (nuṭṛyāṣṭrapāṇīya) kārāvindraśādāprāyaṃ (“kuhaka means something astonishing which causes faith in those of limited awareness—virtually magical trickery”).

145 Sntrzymaćasūlupadeśālikhitamahākālalatana, “One by whom the Mahakalamata had been copied, as instructed by an old Mahāpasupata.”


147 “History through Textual Criticism,” 13.

148 Ibid. Following the colophon, Sanderson refers to this as chapter 52.

149 Although the colophon of BraYā provides as the chapter title mudrāpīthādikārā (“the Seat of Mudrās chapter”), verse 110d gives its title as Mahakalamata (mahākālāmatam ab etad yat suruṣṭ)[purīṣṭitam]. Kalpas outlining the propitiation of a specific mantra-deity probably circulated in multiple versions. Nothing in this chapter specifically matches Bana’s description of the purvasevā of Mahakala, although vetalasādhanā is mentioned in 194c as one of the applications of the mandala of Mahakala and the Mothers. As I discuss in chapter 4, some of the kalpa texts included as chapters of the BraYā, such as the Mahakalamata, bear tenuous relationships to the text as a whole and could conceivably have been independent in origin.
ailing sire, and, in the Kādambarī, in the practices Queen Vilāsavati of Ujjayinī engaged in hoping to conceive a son. In the former case, for instance, the king’s relatives fast indefinitely while laying in the presence of the deity Ahirbudhan, noblemen propitiate the Mother goddesses by burning themselves with lamps, a “Dravidian” prepares to offer his head to the god Āmardaka, a native of Āndhra prays to the goddess Caṇḍikā keeping his “rampart-like arms” (bāhuvaṇṇa) uplifted, servants propitiate Mahākāla by burning incense resin upon their heads, intimates of the king offer slices of their own flesh in fire sacrifice, and princes openly perform “barter in human flesh.” While mantra-practice and other distinctive characteristics of tantric ritual do not figure in this account, Bāṇa associates both Tantra and these austerities with the same deities—Mahākāla, Caṇḍikā, and the Mother goddesses. In addition, he links both with South Indians and tribal peoples. For her part, Queen Vilāsavati of the Kādambarī engages in a wide range of orthodox and

---

150 The royal skandhāvaṇṇa, “military camp”—the capital, according to E.B. Cowell and F.W. Thomas (p. 135)—is thus described: kṣoṣitī pratiṣṭhitaṃśuṇḍhabhāṅgahavāṅkaṃdrādhyāyanābhirbuddham (“in which, in one place, Ahirbudhan is being worshipped by close relatives [undertaking the vow of indefinite] laying before the deity”). Ahirbudhan or Ahirbudhnya, a minor and archaic Vedic divinity, is listed in Mahābhārata 1.60.2–3 among the eleven rudras who are “mind-born sons” (mānasāḥ putrah) of Śiva (śītāyug).

151 kṣaṣaś dīvaḥ pāvahāṃ sakalaputraḥ aṃprastāyaḥ pāṃtāṃ yaḥ mānāṃ tācācālaṃ (“[where,] in one place, the group of Mothers is being appeased by sons of good families being burnt by lamps”).

152 kṛṣṇāḥ mundaḥ pāvahāṃ saṃpravāraḥ pīrītāyamānām āmdāyām (“Lorenzen, following the translation of Cowell and Thomas, interprets this line as referring to “a Dravidian ready to solicit the Vampire [Vetala] with the offering of a skull.” Kāpālikas and Kālāmukhas, 17. In all likelihood, this is however a reference to a śreṣṭha preparing to offer a head to the deity Āmardaka—perhaps his own, as would fit the context of extreme self-mortification. Śaiva sources speak of Āmardaka or Āmardakabhairava as a deity, but mention also a class of spirits called āmardakas. For example, Brahma LXXII.19 lists āmardakas alongside the semi-divine siddhas, gandharvas, veśās, and kīndāras, while Brahma LXXIII is a Kalpa-manual of Mahāmardaka-bhairava (cf. Brahma LXXII.2cd: mahāmardakadacāvasya kalpaṃ vāsyaṃ tattvāṭī—“I shall now teach the kalpa of lord Mahāmardaka, as it truly is”). Āmardaka is, furthermore, one of eight Bhairavas mentioned in Svacchanda-tantra 2.”

153 kṣaṣaś aṃbhāradyāyam mānāṃ tāṃtāṃ vyāpāyaḥ mānāṃ tāṃtāṃ (“where elsewhere Mahākāla is being worshipped by a man of Āndhra holding up his rampart-like arms”).

154 anyatra śiśrutīdīvāryaḥ pārvatīyarṣiyāḥ suvaṇnāmānāmaḥ pīrītāyamānām (“where elsewhere Mahākāla is being propitiated by young attendants deformed by the melting incense resin held on the head”).

155 aparātā niṣitāśrīnīṣaṃ sūkṣmaṃ ṣabhaṁ prasaktātāpavargam (“where elsewhere intimates of the king are engaged in offering homa of their own flesh cut off by sharp knives”).

156 aparātā prakāṣānāraṇapattikāmārakASYāyamānāṃtāṃtāṃ sāvitrī śaiva pāvahāṃ (“where elsewhere the process of bartering human flesh is being performed by the king’s princes, openly”). On mahāmāṇsāvitrīśaiva, see the subsequent discussion of the Mahāmāṇḍalaṃ.

157 On the connection with tribals, note for instance the Kādambarī’s mention of Śābara women applying tīlaka of red powder (śindātra) to the image of Caṇḍī (p. 225, lines ines 21–22). The introduction draws similar connections between Śābara tribesmen and the fierce goddess.
unorthodox practices in her quest to conceive a child. These include numerous austerities and worship of Caṇḍikā and the Mothers, among other deities. Some of her practices involve maṇḍala and mantra.\textsuperscript{158}

In Bāna’s works we thus find abundant evidence for characteristic ritual systems of the bhairavatantras. Absent, however, is reference to the sacred figure of the yogini or yoģeśvarī. An association between tantric ritual and goddesses is nonetheless evident: the Dravidian ascetic of the Kādambarī, for instance, officiates as priest of a Caṇḍikā temple, and his engagement in tantric practices appears linked to devotion to the Goddess. This might suggest tantric Śaivism as known to Bāna was in a stage where ritual forms characteristic of the bhairavatantras and a tantric cult of Caṇḍikā had developed, but in which focus upon the yogini was not yet central or well-known.

In period literature, especially Bāna’s Caṇḍīsataka and the Devīmahātmya of the Mārkaṇḍeyapurāṇa, the terrible warrior goddess Caṇḍī or Caṇḍikā becomes one of the principle ciphers for emergent conceptions of a singular Mahādevī, whose identity subsumes the myriad manifestations of feminine divinity. Although thus linked to all goddesses, Caṇḍī might in this period have been identified in particular with Cāmuṇḍā, leader of the Mothers, one indication being the synonymy of these names in the BraYā.\textsuperscript{159} The Harsacarita links Caṇḍikā to the god Mahākāla as consort,\textsuperscript{160} forming a divine couple whose cult is not however well-represented in surviving tantric literature. One detailed and early treatment of the tantric cult of Mahākāla

\textsuperscript{158} The description begins, \textit{yad yac ca kincit kutāś cīc cuśrāvā garbhatṛṣṇatā tat tat sarvaṃ cakātā (“And she did everything she heard from anywhere out of her yearning for [conceiving] a fetus”). Note for instance that she “engaged in lustration and auspicious rites in the crossroads on many fourteenth nights [of the lunar fortnight], standing in the middle of a maṇḍala drawn by the great king [i.e. her husband], through which the deities of the directions were gratified by gifts of various food offerings” (mahānarendra śakti manḍala madhyāvatārinī virādhaśalidānamāndadigdevātāni bahu-lapaścaturdaśanīrīśasu ca tuspathe sa-prapana maṇḍalādhi bheję). It is also said that she “bore bamboo mantra-caskets containing birch-bark written on with yellow pigment,” and that she “fastened [on herself] strands of herbs having protective cords” (goro-carṇikātibhūrjapataragarbhatān mantrakaranḍakān uṣadhā | raksāpratīcetasopetāny oṣadhiśitrāni babandha).

\textsuperscript{159} In the BraYā, the seventh Mother is variously called Caṇḍikā, Carcikā, and Cāmuṇḍā. On this matter, see my annotation on BraYā II.16.

\textsuperscript{160} Caṇḍikā is described as mahākālabhisārīkātesavibhiramam bibhiratiṇī, “exhibiting coquetry with the guise of a women on a night rendezvous with Mahākāla.”
is BraYā liv, the Mahākālamata. This describes worship of the deity in a maṇḍala of the eight Mothers, a configuration unusual in the BraYā and probably archaic. In addition, two late sixth-century shrines of Ellora depict a skeletal divine couple in the company of the Seven Mothers, a couple who have been, with a degree of plausibility, identified as Mahākāla and Kāli.\textsuperscript{161} The seventh-century tantric cults of Mahākāla and Cāndī might therefore have emphasized Mother goddesses; but Bāna does not intimate this association, nor does he make clear reference to a tantric cult of Mothers. These goddesses are nonetheless mentioned: Bhairavācārya, for instance, is said to dwell near a deserted temple of the Mothers, the queen Vilāsavatī visits Mother shrines, and reference is made to forest temples of Cāmunḍā.\textsuperscript{162}

Taken as a whole, Bāna’s works attest the existence of characteristic rituals and deities of the bhairavatantras, as well as the emergence of goddess-centered tantric practice. It is noteworthy that Bāna associates tāntrikas with the Deccan and South India. While I am hesitant to place excessive value upon this regional association, it at least suggests Tantric Śaivism was associated with areas and peoples marginal to the North-central heartland of Brahmanical culture, the “Middle Country” (madhyadeśa).

It is not clear whether tantric cults of the Mothers were yet widespread, nor whether the yoginī had emerged as a sacred figure. Hence, while Bāna’s early seventh-century references to Tantra are by no means incompatible with the Śaiva yoginī cult, they could instead imply a phase of Śaivism that predates its development. There might, in addition, be historical significance to the divergent characterizations of Bāna’s two tāntrikas: while Bhairavācārya is presented as a respected and powerful figure, the Dravidian ascetic is described as an exotic, morally ambivalent, and rather inept sorcerer. It is tempting to read into this distinction an emergent divide between a

\textsuperscript{161} See the discussion in the previous section.

\textsuperscript{162} In Harṣacarita 11, when the king asks the whereabouts of Bhairavācārya, he is told, asya jīrṇānāmātṛgrhāsottaryaya bhūvāttikām adhyāśīte (“he sits in a grove of bilva trees to the north of a decrepit Mother-goddess temple”). Chapter seven makes reference to forested areas having temples of Cāmunḍā erected in dense groves (gahanatarusand añāmirnītacāmunḍānapair vanārdeśāt). Cf. Yokochi, “Rise of the Warrior Goddess,” 108 (n. 81). In the Kādambari, Queen Vilāsavatī “went to temples of the Mothers in the vicinity, where faith is displayed [or perhaps, ‘where portents/signs are shown’]” (darśita-pratayānān samīdhaṇamātṛbhaṇavanāni jagāma).
well-established tantric Śaiva cult of Bhairava, on the one hand, and newer, marginal, and more esoteric goddess cults. It is within the latter that the roots of the Yōginī cult would lie.

**THE GAUDAVAHO OF VĀKPATI**

In the *Gauldavaho*, a Prakrit poetic work composed by Vākpatirāja, a contemporary of Bāna, there occurs a reference to “Kaula women” (*katilanārīḥ*) in a hymn to the goddess Vindhyavāsinī, “She Who Dwells in the Vindhya Mountains.” Travelling through the Vindhya range of central India, the king Yaśovarman approaches a jungle cave temple and offers eulogy, making vivid allusion to the sanguinary cult of the presiding Goddess. The hymn links her identity with that of the singular “Warrior Goddess” who is at once Durgā, Kālī, Caṇḍikā, and so forth, as well as the pacific Pārvatī—primary locus of conceptions of the one Mahādevī.163 As does Bāna, Vākpati associates worship of the fierce goddess with exotic, macabre practices and peoples marginal to the civilized “Middle Country” (*madhyadeśa*)—in this case forest-dwelling *śabara* tribals.164 Significantly, the description of the Goddess’s cult suggests a tantric, *kāpālika* ritual dimension, and makes reference to a human sacrifice viewed eagerly by throngs of female practitioners, described as “kaula women.”165

This seems to be the earliest use of the word *kaula* in literary works to describe a Śaiva sect or its members; the reference is, furthermore, somewhat surprising given that the term is not employed in this sense in Vidyāpīṭha texts such as the *BraYā* and *Siddhayogesvarīmata*—the earliest Śaiva literature connected with yoginis.166 “Kaula”

---


165 The *kāpāliaka* ritual context is suggested by reference to the temple environs as a cremation ground (*masañca*), at which “heroes” (*vīra*) sell human flesh, in verse 327. This is briefly discussed by Yokochi, ibid., 147. On the reference to Kaula women, see Sanderson, “History through Textual Criticism,” 11 (n. 9). He translates the relevant passage as follows: “The Kaula women seem to form a shrine in the air as they clamber over each other in their eagerness to watch a victim of human sacrifice being carved up” (visājitamāntamahāpasudamsvaśuṣambhatamaparaparāvādāḥ | gayane eciya gamdhasaṁdhi kumānti kaḷiṇvārī). 166 On this distinction of “Kaula” and “Vidyāpīṭha,” see chapter 3.
could in this case have the sense of "[women] of/belonging to the Mother-goddess clans," referring to female tantric initiates, but not necessarily implying the ritual systems known from extant Kaula scriptures. Nonetheless, the context of corporate worship by women belonging to clans of the Mothers does suggest the existence of a Yogini cult connected with the fierce Goddess. This might, conceivably, be an historical development related to identification of the Warrior Goddess with Cāmuṇḍā, "leader of the Mothers," with whom Skandapurāṇa 171 connects the cult of yoginīs. Though vague, the Gaiḍavaho's reference to female practitioners thus provides a valuable addition to the evidence from Bāṇa, who in other respects provides more detailed accounts of Tantric Śaivism.

THE DAṢĀKUMĀRACARITA OF DĀṆḌIN

A narrative probably of the late seventh or early eighth century, Dāṇḍin's Daṣākumārācarita has an episode of passing significance to the yoginī cult. A young rogue, Kālahakaṇṭaka, plots to entrap the beautiful, faithful wife of a merchant by having her accused of witchcraft. He claims before the merchants' guild to have seen her at night in the cremation ground dragging a corpse from a funeral pyre; upon seeing his contrived evidence for this, the townspeople believe her to be a sākini—a dreadful female being described in Śaiva typologies of yoginīs. Abandoned by her husband, she falls into the hands of the rogue.

Despite the ironic and undoubtedly false etymological connection to sāka ("leafy greens"), it requires little imagination to guess what business the decidedly non-vegetarian sākini might have with a half-roasted human corpse. Kṣemarāja quotes the following definition from the Tantrasadbhāva:

A female who, for the purpose of shapeshifting, ever drinks the fluids of

---

167 Dāṇḍin has been linked with the Pallava court of the late seventh and early eighth centuries; Walter Smith provides a brief bibliography on this matter in "The Viṣṇu Image in the Shore Temple at Māmallapuram," Artibus Asiae 56 (1996): 22. Isabelle Onians suggests the period of 690-725 for Daṇḍin, placing Daṣākumārācarita within the earlier part. Onians, trans., introduction to What Ten Young Men Did, 25.

168 Daṣākumārācarita, chapter 11. I have consulted the text and translation given in Onians, ibid., 440-49.
living beings, after drawing them close by artifice, and who after obtaining [that fluid] slays the creatures—she should be known as a śākinī, ever delighting in dreadful places.169

The Daśakumārcarita’s reference is the earliest I am aware of to the śākinī in non-tantric literature, occurring in the context of an episode similar in nature to accounts of śākinīs and dākinīs in the much later Kathāsaritsāgara. Yet here the description so lacks in detail and context as to be unclear whether it reflects influence from a tantric cult of yoginīs; belief in “witches” and female cremation-ground spirits are undoubtedly older phenomena. However, the period and terminology in question suggest the possibility that this śākinī tale is directly inspired by tantric typologies of female spirits and contemporary perceptions of cremation-ground ritual.

THE MĀLATĪMĀDHAVA OF BHAVABHUTI

Substantial evidence for the Śaiva Mantramārga, and more particularly the Yoginī cult of the bhairavatantras, emerges in Bhavabhūti’s Mālatīmādhava, an early eighth-century play.170 While not referring to specific texts,171 it portrays ritual practices which reflect the cultic milieu of the Vidyāpīṭha bhairavatantras. This drama revolves around the clever efforts of a Buddhist nun, Kāmandakī, to bring about the marriage of Mādhava and Mālatī, despite the latter having been promised to a favorite of the king. Events take a dramatic turn when Mālatī is abducted in the night by a fierce Śaiva sādhaka named Aghoraghaṇṭa, and his female attendant, a yoginī named Kapālakunḍalā, who are intent on offering her in sacrifice to the goddess Cāmun-

169 Netroddyota, quoted in the commentary on Netra tantra 2.71:

chalaṁkṛṣya pibati kuś德拉 prāṇipayah sadā |
rupaparītvanārthaṁ labhām pātaṇaṁ puṣṭān |
śākinī sā tu viśvēryā nāudraśtanāratala saḍā |

With minor variants and corruptions, this corresponds to 16.163cd-64 in Dyczkowski’s draft edition of the Tantrasadbhava.

170 On the dates of Bhavabhūti, see V.V. Mirashi, Bhavabhūti, 1–11.

171 Śiva is, however, described as nigamaniḍhi, the “repository of scripture.” Act 9, verse 4. It seems probable that nigama refers to the Śaiva Āgamas/Tantras, for no other large body of scripture assigns its origin to him.
This turn of events forms the subject of the *Malatimādhopurā*’s fifth act, set in the environs of a large cremation ground (*śmaśānavātā*) in the city, near to which stands a temple of Karālā, a local Cāmuṇḍā. Distressed at the prospect of Mālati’s imminent marriage, Mādhava sees no recourse but to adopt the desperate measure of “selling human flesh” (*mahāmāṃsasya vikraiyah*) at night to the spirits of the cremation ground, in return for his cherished boon.173 A sword in the right hand and hunk of flesh in the left, Mādhava sets out for the cremation ground. Simultaneously, Aghoraghaṇṭa, a skull-bearing *sādhaka* from the sacred mountain Śrīparvata who dwells now in a nearby forest,174 also avails himself of the fourteenth night of the waning moon to fulfill his pledge to sacrifice a “jewel of a woman” to the goddess.175 While he proceeds to abduct the sleeping Mālati, the yogini Kapālakūṇḍalā flies off to the cremation ground to gather there items needed for the ritual. Mālati is then led before the goddess adorned in the red garments and garlands of a sacrificial victim, while Aghoraghaṇṭa and Kapālakūṇḍalā offer worship. Hearing his beloved’s piteous adieu to the world, Mādhava rushes to the temple and slays Aghoraghaṇṭa, rescuing Mālati but incurring the wrath of Kapālakūṇḍalā.

---

172 David Lorenzen has discussed the *Malatimādhopurā* with the aim of highlighting evidence for a “lost Śaivite sect” called the *kapālikas*, of which he assumes Aghoraghaṇṭa to be a representative. *The Kapālikas and Kālāmukhas. Two Lost Śaivite Sects*, 53–57. The limitation of this perspective is that the term *kapālika*, assuming a Śaiva sect by this name in fact existed, can also be applied as a descriptive term to any and all carrying out mortuary observances—whether Atimarga Śaivas, Tantric Śaivas, or Buddhist *tantrikas*. Caution is called for in reading more than this into the term in any particular instance. Lorenzen, whose work was first published in 1972, was then unaware of the existence of a large body of tantric Śaiva scripture attesting *kapālika* practices, although he addresses this in a cursory fashion in an appendix to the second edition.

173 In Act Four, Mādhava says to himself, *hantu sarvathā sansārayajanaśampāhāyaṃ sanvṛttato ‘smi tat kim idāṁ kartavyam | na khalu mahāmāṃsavikraityaṁ anyām upāyaṁ paśyāmi | (“Alas, my life’s fulfillment has become completely jeopardized. What should I hence do now? I see no recourse at all other than the sale of human flesh”).* Prose preceding verse 8. Sanskrit text as printed in François Grimal, ed., *Harivaravindaca Malatimādhavaśīta*.

174 In Act One, Kāṃḍākā’s disciple Avalokitā describes him thus: “a *sādhaka* named Aghoragaṇṭa who has come from Śrīparvata, who roams at night, dwelling in the forest not far away and bearing a skull” (*... siriparvadāda ādāsayā rattivādrīno niḍāḍāḍārāgaṇvāsino sākāssā muṇḍadhārino aghoraghaṇṭina-nāmaṇḍhāssos...*).

175 Kapālakūṇḍalā remarks to herself, *kathīyaṃ ca me guruṇiḥ caite kapalakūṇḍale adya bhagavatīyaḥ karālūgāḥ prāg upaścārinī śrīnātām upahārtavyaḥ* (’And my guru said to me, ‘my dear Kapālakūṇḍalā, today the jewel of a woman previously promised to the goddess Karālā is to be sacrificed’ ’). Act Five, prose following verse 4. Cf. verse 25.
The vengenance of the yoginī bears fruit when she abducts Mālatī, whisking her off to the sacred mountain Śrīparvata to offer up in sacrifice. In this terrible deed she is foiled by Saudāmini, Kāmandaki’s first disciple, who has herself attained the powers of a yoginī and undertakes the Skullbearer-observance (kāpālikavrata) on Śrīparvata. Saving the day, Saudāmini then applies her power called ākṣepini śiddhi to shuttle the heroine and hero through the sky back into the presence of Kāmandaki. The good yoginī then flies off to rescue Mālatī’s father from suicide, returning again to magically revive the swooning maiden.

Mādhava’s appearance and activity make it clear he was carrying out a tantric vrata or “special observance.” Although I am unable to find a description in tantric Śaiva sources corresponding precisely to the vrata Mādhava undertakes, almost all aspects have parallels. While the practice of offering human flesh in fire ritual (homa) is more common, Mādhava’s flesh-for-boons barter with cremation-ground spirits is attested in tantric sources, and mentioned, for instance, by Bāna in the Harsaacarita. Mālatimarādhava’s twelfth-century commentator Harihara attributes such a practice to the authority of the Siddhāyogesvarīmata, and quotes a passage to this effect which does not occur in the text’s surviving short recension. Moreover, in the context of initiatory dream prognostication, lists among auspicious portents the sight of heroes, zombies, and siddhas trading human flesh in the cremation ground. This cremation-ground practice is apparently mentioned in the Buddhist

---

176 In Act One, Avalokita says to Kāmandaki, “Your reverence, Saudāmini now carries out a kāpālikā observance on Śrīparvata, having obtained wondrous powers of mantraśiddhi” (bhāvita sa sudāmini aluṇā samāsiddhcaryājanantasaiddhipahāna śrīparvade kāpālikāvanadānā dhārād).  
177 A relevant passage is quoted above (n. 156). Note also a reference in Harsaacarita vi to the son of Prayota, described as māhātvānmaṁsakṛṣṇāvādottulā, “mad with the doctrine of selling human flesh;” he loses his life to a vetāla called Talajangha.  
178 The passage attributed to the Siddhāyogesvarīmata reads, virahastam maṁsam grhita vṛtyābhimatiḥtanādānam (“Having accepted human flesh from the hand of a hero, there is the bestowing of the desired boon to the hero”). Comments ad prose preceding verse 8 (p. 154). While the first eight syllables could form an odd-numbered pāda, the remainder is unmetrical.  
179 In the Kashmiri recension of the Svācchandatāntra, as reflected in the kṣṛs edition, dreaming of a cremation ground and dreaming of the sale of human flesh appear to be separate portents. However, in the Nepalese recension, as well as this passage as it was redacted into Tantrasādhāvata 9, the cremation ground forms the setting for this flesh trade. Comparing the kṣṛs edition (Sr1759), three mss of Tantrasādhāvata 9 (as reported by Dyczkowski), and an early Nepalese Svācchandatāntra codex (Sr92 = NAKI-224/NGMPP reel 128/34), all of which have independent value for constituting the text, the following
Subhuparipṛcchā as well. As for timing, the fourteenth night of the waning lunar
fortnight (kṛṣṇapakṣa) on which both Mādhava and Aghoraganṭa undertake their
rituals is customarily favored for cremation ground rites, including those involving
flesh offerings.

Mādhava is described as dark, his body nonetheless grey. This could be a refer-
tence to the otherwise dark Mādhava being pale from love-sickness, which is in fact
alluded to elsewhere in the play. However, this might possibly refer to his dark
body being smeared with ashes, for vratas described in Śaiva sources usually enjoin
wearing particular colors, especially black or red, or else going naked, smearing the
body with ashes, etc. He has bound his curly hair upwards in the fashion of the

is proposed as the original form of the verse in question (Śvācchandatantra 4.14cd-15ab, in the kṛṣṭa
edition):

>vratas described in Śaiva sources usually enjoin
wearing particular colors, especially black or red, or else going naked, smearing the
body with ashes, etc. He has bound his curly hair upwards in the fashion of the

Keśmarāja, however, understands "siddhais in the Kashmiri recension as an associative instrumental
(viravetalasiddhais ceti sādhūthe trtvya).

For example, in brah+ xv, the practice of vetalasādhana, a cremation-ground rite involving a corpse,
is enjoined on the eighth or fourteenth night of the waning moon (xv.15). Śiddhayogesvarātma
provides a further example of an heroic rite (sādhana, performed after completion of pūrveṣa) on
the fourteenth dark lunar night. In this case, the hero fasts three nights and offers
homa of human flesh

before preceding on the fourteenth to the cremation ground, naked and alone. Standing erect, he recites
the mantra until yoginis surround him, to whom he offers blood from his left hand as the guest-offering
(argha).

Tantrasadbhāva 17 attests a rite in which one proceeds to the cremation ground on the kṛṣṇacaturdāśi,
bearing a human skull and reciting a mantra of Cāmunḍa. One offers there, in front of the cremation
ground, animal flesh as bali.

om cāmuṇḍe tiri tiri cchinda chinda vidhiṭre hiri hiri sphura sphura tiṣṭha tiṣṭha vīcīdha vīcīdha
svaḥa | anena śmaśānaṃ gataḥ maṇaṇaśaṅkaptālāṃ dhīrāyaṁ kṛṣṇacaturdāśiṁ paśūmāṃṣewa
tasyāgraṇa balīṃ datva tāvāj japed yāvat śpuṣṭati | akṣena gacchati yatra śmaśānē tiṣṭhati tatra
grāham paśyati |

mss as reported by Dyczkowski; s/s silently regularized. The sequence of events envisioned in the last
sentence is unclear ("he goes via the sky[?]; in the cremation ground where he stands[?]; he sees
a building").

Act Five, verse 5a: [ya esah] kvalayadalasyāmo 'py angam dadhat paridhāsaram.

In Act Three Kāmandaki refers to Mādhava having a body by nature dark like the priyāṅgu vine,
own pale and emaciated through his love-sickness (priyāṅguśāmādhipakātār api cāpīṇāmādhirohaṃ vapiḥ
kṣaṇam kṣaṇam vahatī ramanītasya ca bhavati, 9cd).
matted, upward-fastened locks of the Śaiva ascetic. In addition, his bearing of a sword has parallels in cremation-ground observances. The *Kulapaṅcāśīka*, for example, refers to “great heroes” who, devoted to worship and meditation, swords in hand and lusting to drink human blood, wander the cremation grounds seeking encounters (*melaka*) with yoginīs. Compare also the *mahocchusmāvṛata* of *Bṛhya* xx, fourth of five *vratas* corresponding to the Four Devīs and Bhairava. In this observance, the sādhaka wears black clothing and garlands and a variety of ornaments, applies red lac on the feet, and bears a skull, skull-staff (*khatvāṅga*), a variety of weapons, and a *ḍamaru*-drum, etc. Meditating and practicing penance in solitude, he wanders by night through places that include the cremation ground.

In addition to this portrayal of a radical *vrata*, Bhavabhūti’s drama attests technical knowledge of a number of other aspects of Śaiva ritual. Aghoraghaṇṭa is described as a sādhaka, the specialist engaged in solitary practices in pursuit of siddhi. He had practiced his *mantrasādhana* in this very temple of Karāḷā, near the cremation ground, and dwells in the forest nearby. His practices are said to involve roaming by night, the sacrifice of living beings, and carrying out the Skullbearer-observance. His close connection to a female disciple is also noteworthy: her role

---

184 Act Five, prose preceding verse 5: tat ko ‘yam atigambhiramadhurākṛtir uttambhītakūṭalakuntalāh kṛpa-
napātiḥ śmaśānadeśam avatāratī (spoken by Kapālakūṭalā).

185 *Kulapaṅcāśīka* 3 (f. 4v):

prajāḍīya nāraratī ye tu nārāśākyālamāṁpatiḥ |

nityodyuktaḥ mahāvṛtṝḥ khadga-hastah pratiśthitah ||

śmaśānaniyag deva rātrau niyatane rātā |

kathāṁ na labhate nityaṁ yoginélpakam hari ||

‘O Hara, how do those great heroes who are devoted to worship and meditation, lusty for drinking human blood, endeavoring constantly, standing with swords in hand, devoted to wandering the cremation grounds at night, O god, always obtain melapa with the Yoginī?”

Nak 1-1076 (NGMPP A40/13): transcription courtesy of Somadeva Vasudeva.

186 *Bṛhya* xxi.83cd–100. Owing to length, an edition of this material is not provided here.

187 Act Five, prose following verse 4: śmaśānānāśya nātiḥ yad scanrāṣṭramadhyavṛtṝḥ svāmēravatir prayātvasita-
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might be restricted to that of a student and assistant, but the implication could be that she is his ritual consort as well. This possibility lacks explicit intimation.

While mortuary, kāpālikā elements were present in the Śaiva Atimārga, cremation-ground rites focused upon control of the powerful and dangerous forces which congregate there appear unique to the Mantramārga, and particularly characterize the Vidyāpītha bhairavatantras. Bhavabhūti vividly describes the cremation ground’s frightful night denizens, which include beings such as ulkāmukhas (“meteor mouths”), pūtanas (“stinkers”), and piśācas (“goblins”), as well as female varieties of the same.\(^{89}\)

Mādhava bears his food-offering in the left hand, as befits radical tantric ritual. He advertizes this flesh as uncut by weapons, a criterion that apparently makes it acceptable to the spirits.\(^{90}\) Śaiva sources however sometimes praise the corpse of one fallen in battle as particularly suitable for ritual use.\(^{91}\) Beyond the already extreme practice of making offerings of human flesh, scriptures such as the BraYā and Yoginīśaṅcāra mention the rite of actual human sacrifice as well,\(^{92}\) whether or not this actually took place with any frequency. Given its sensational quality, Bhavabhūti is not alone among medieval poets in utilizing this theme for dramatic purposes. Attempted human sacrifice to a fierce goddess comprises, for example, the dramatic focus of the

\(^{89}\) Act Five, verses 11–18. The ulkāmukha is a somewhat uncommon category in Indian spiritology. In his commentary on the Netratantra, Kṣemarāja identifies these with the piśāca (“goblin”): glossing piśācain 2.14b, he states, smaśānādhivātāh ulkāmukhāh piśācāh. Cf. his comments ad 18.99d (piśāca aśucisūryādīvarāhāḥ piśācāh). Tartrasadbhava 19 mentions a kṣetrapāla named Ulkāmukha.

\(^{90}\) Mālatīmadhava, Act Five, verse 12:

bho bhoh śmaśānamiketanaḥ kājapūtanāḥ

aśāstrapūtam avyādām puruṣāṁ gopakalpītam

vikriyate mahāmāṁśaṁ grihyatāṁ grihyataṁ idam || 12 ||

“O Corpse Stinkers, denizens of the cremation ground, the greatest of meats is for sale, not purified by [being slain in battle with] weapons, unadulterated, prepared from the body of a man; please take it, take it!”

\(^{91}\) Cf. Svacchandatantra 13.24cd: ramaśastraghītapatiṁ nurapiśitaṁ trimadbhaviorsaṁyataṁ juhuyāt, “One should offer oblations of human flesh felled by the blows of weapons in battle, mixed with the three types of honey.”

\(^{92}\) Note Yoginīśaṅcāra 6.26cd, a somewhat random example: sarvayogīsvarāṇātīdhiṁ rāmaśastraghītāṁ paśunād bhavet (“Due to a human as sacrificial victim, there would be [attainment of] power over all yoginis”). But note also, in contrast to Mālatīmadhata, that this source (6.100ab) appears to prohibit sacrifice of a woman: stīr paśute niyuktā tu mahāsiddhiḥ bhāvataḥ (“but a woman employed as a sacrificial victim ruins the major siddhis”).
Yaśastilaka of Somadevasūri as well, and finds mention in numerous other works of the medieval period.

Particularly relevant are the descriptions and activities of the two yoginīs, Kapāla-kunḍalā and Saudāmīnī. Both carry out Skullbearer-observances (kāpālikavrata), and the former’s kāpālika attire is described in vivid detail. Both frequent the sacred mountain Śrīparvata, and possess the spectacular power of flight. Although the source of Saudāmīnī’s ability to fly is unstated, it perhaps stems from the same means by which she has the power to draw others along through the air. When the bewildered Mādhava and Makaranda inquire as to her identity, she replies, “this you shall surely understand,” and rises:

I now shall for your benefit use this power of ‘drawing’ [through the air], which arises from my dedication to the guru, the observances, penance, tantras, and mantras.\textsuperscript{193}

This list bears comparison with accounts of the practices sādhakas carry out in order to attain encounters (melāpa) with yoginīs.\textsuperscript{194}

Kapāla-kunḍalā introduces herself and her powers with the same phrase, iyam aham idānāṁ. But the source of her ability to fly differs considerably: the pernicious practice of extracting the essences of living beings by invasive yogic methods. She describes herself as untired by a flight fueled by extraction of the “five nectars” through the body’s channels (nādi). This she does while absorbed in meditation upon the Self as Śiva in the heart lotus,\textsuperscript{195} in a cakra on which the six ancillary mantras (ān̄ga) have been installed.\textsuperscript{196} She praises Śiva as “lord of the saktis” (śaktinātha), surrounded by

\textsuperscript{193} Act Nine, verse 52:

\begin{quote}
jāttaiṣaṁ khaṇv etat | (uttāya) iyam aham idānāṁ,
gurucaryatapastantramantrayogāhiygajām | imāṁ āksepīṁ siddhiṁ ātānāṁ śīvāya vah || 52 ||
\end{quote}

Although I cannot locate parallels for the expression āksepīṁ siddhi, the ability of yoginīs to enable men to fly pervades the literature, indeed characterizes in no small measure their popular image. It is worth noting that here, tantra seems unlikely to mean “text,” but instead “spell” or something of this nature. Cf. the previous discussion of the Gangdhar inscription.

\textsuperscript{194} Cf Svacchandatana 15.32cd–33, BraYa lxxiii.40ab, and BraYa xcix.2–5.

\textsuperscript{195} Cf. Yoginīśāntatāra 6.56ab: kṣcakramadhyamādinānāṁ dhiṣṭānaṁ śīvasamaprabham.

\textsuperscript{196} Act Five, verse 2:
whom he is meditated upon in the heart in a cakra of sixteen nāḍīs, bestowing siddhi upon sādhakas.197 This conception of the deity with six ancillaries (śaḍaṅga) in the center of a cakra of nāḍīs visualized in the heart is consistent with terminology of the BraYa, which attests similar configurations of sixteen.198 Matching more precisely, the unpublished Yoginīsaṅcāra of the Jayadraṭhaṇṭamala describes as what appears to be its basic configuration the deity and six ancillaries (śaḍaṅga), who are the Six Yojinīs, in a cakra of sixteen nāḍīs.199 The latter correspond to the vowels, as do the sixteen mantra-deities of the BraYa’s bhautikacakra and kulacakra, the latter moreover having a special association with yojinīs.200 It seems probable that Kapālakundalā speaks of a


197 Act Five, verse 1:  


198 Perhaps the most significant cakra of sixteen mantra-deities is the kulaśodasa cakra, the subject of BraYa xiv, which does not, however, use the terminology of nāḍīs. It encodes a configuration of the sixteen vowels around the central deity. The bhautikacakra of chapter nineteen, on the other hand, explicitly correlates its sixteen nāḍīs with the vowels.  

199 On the sixteen nāḍīs as the vowels, cf., e.g., Yoginīsaṅcāra 11.47ab: nāḍīsādavagotthāḥ kramāḥ [kramāḥ] varṇān sanuddharet. Chapter ten narrates how the Six Yojinīs arose from the ancillary (aṅga) mantras of the vidyā, protecting Skanda from the Seven Mothers, who had become proud of their power after slaying the demons and receiving Śiva’s boon. The Six arise as deities of the kulaśaṅcāra, the same deity configuration mentioned in chapter 5 in connection with extraction of the five nectars.  

200 This connection is suggested in the Goddess’s opening question of BraYa xiv, which teaches the kulaśaṅcāra/cakra or khecaricakra: 
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comparable configuration of sixteen nāḍīs of the Sanskrit vowels encircling Bhairava and his six ancillary mantras. Sanderson has, in addition, drawn attention to the fact that the process Kapālakunḍalā alludes to of extracting the vital essences is described in considerable detail in the Yoginīsaṅcāra.\textsuperscript{201} As described in its fifth chapter, this involves placing the victim (paśu) before one and yogically drawing out the ‘nectars’ via the nāḍīs, through coordinated application of breath control and mantra.\textsuperscript{202} In this chapter, “meditation” (dhyāna) is defined as the “conjoining of bija-mantras and nāḍīs.”\textsuperscript{203} While flight is mentioned among the siddhis acquired through such practices, it is by no means the exclusive aim, however.

In the dichotomy of the cruel Kapālakunḍalā and virtuous Saudāmini, Ronald Davidson sees the contrast of the (Śaiva) “Kāpālika propensity for violence” and the “specifically Buddhist contribution to extreme ascetic practice” of “restraint in the service of a moral direction.” In his interpretation, Saudāmini is the first “Buddhist siddha” to be represented in non-Buddhist literature.\textsuperscript{204} A number of questions might be raised concerning this formulation, however. Saudāmini’s involvement with kāpālika observances might indeed attest emergent Buddhist participation in this domain of extreme Śaiva practice, for such begins to be described in eighth-century Tantric Buddhist sources. Yet the characterization of Saudāmini as “Buddhist” warrants further consideration, all the more so with regard to some of the play’s other major characters. Although one would expect the disciple of a Buddhist nun to follow her in religious orientation, the only testament of Saudāmini’s devotion is provided when, while flying, she spots the naturally-formed image of Śiva called Suvar-

\textsuperscript{201} “Purity and Power,” 213 (n. 89).

\textsuperscript{202} Yoginīsaṅcāra 5, especially from verse 41.

\textsuperscript{203} 5.37ab: dhyāne tu nāḍīṁjñānāṁ sāmyogo jñānapūrṇakah (“but in the case of meditation, there is the conjoining of the bija-mantras and nāḍīs, which depends upon knowledge”).

\textsuperscript{204} Indian Esoteric Buddhism. A Social History of the Tantric Movement, 203.

Cf. BraYa 1.12cd–13, and the annotation thereon. The implication appears to be that the pantheon and practices of the kulacakra are specifically for yoginis, female practitioners emulating their flying exemplars.
nabindu, to whom she offers homage and a verse of praise. It would thus appear that her kapālika practices involve her in devotion to Śiva. Of the young ladies and men who comprise the remaining cast—"the Buddhists" Davidson speaks of Saudāminī aiding—little indication of religious affiliation is in fact provided. Kāmandaki’s acolytes Buddhārakṣitā and Avalokitā have, unsurprisingly, Buddhist names. However, the heroine Mālatī is said to visit the temple of Śiva on the fourteenth day of the waning moon; this she does escorted by none other than the Buddhist nun.

Another reason why it might be unwarranted to read the contrast between Kapālakūṇḍalā and Saudāminī in sectarian terms is that the dichotomy of the pernicious, cruel sorceress and benevolent flying demi-goddess reflects yōgnī typologies found throughout Śaiva sources. Moreover, Bhavabhūti’s theme of the evil versus good witch might have been inspired by tales from the lost Bṛhatkathā—the source from which Bhavabhūti in fact drew the basic plot of his drama. If Davidson is nonetheless correct in seeing in Saudāminī evidence for Buddhist engagement in kapālika practice, it should still be pointed out that his interpretation reflects a one-sided, blood-and-power characterization of Śaivism that little captures the complexities of this tradition, echoing dramatic, polemical, or exoticizing treatments of extreme Śaiva practice in medieval literary texts. This attitude seems to extend even beyond Davidson’s depiction of kapālikas; note, for instance, his characterization of the medieval

---

205 Davidson remarks, “She [Saudāminī] has gained the siddhis, most particularly that of flight (khecari [sic]), and has come to assist the Buddhists in their struggle with the evil Kapālika siddha, Aghoragha-nta, and his female companion, Kapālakundala.” Ibid., 203.

206 Act Three, p. 103: aja kasanavacuddase thita bhūnādhe samam māladī samykaragraham gamissadi tado evam kila sohaggam vadāhadi ti devadārahayanimitam sahatthakusumāvacāmī uddāsia lavanīgādūddatam māladīm bhāvādī jenev kuśumādvarṣījāhā māNOWO tado amṣoraṇaṁ samykaraghratām thūdu hi (“Since today is the fourteenth of the waning moon, Mālatī will go with Her reverence [Kāmandaki] to the temple of Śiva. Then, as it is believed conjugal fortune (saubhāgīya) thus increases, Her reverence shall herself bring Mālatī, attended by Lavaṅgika, to the garden ‘Treasury of Flowers,’ with the aim of [her] gathering flowers with her own hands for the purpose of worshipping the deities. Thus may [Mālatī and Mādhava] behold each other”).

207 See the critical editions and annotation of Bṛgya lxxii.

208 See the introduction to M.R. Kale’s edition of the Mālatimādhava, 24–27. On the theme of the good versus wicked witch, note in particular an episode in Kaliṣastrisāgara xlii, a Sanskrit retelling of the Bṛhatkathā, in which a woman—secretly an evil sākini—transforms her husband into a buffalo when he catches her in a compromising position with a buffalo herder. He is later rescued through the kindness of a benign yoginī, who restores his form, provides him her daughter in marriage, arms him with magical mustard seeds to enact revenge, and instructs him finally in the vidya-mantra of Kālaṃkārsinī. I discuss related material in the subsequent section on the Bṛhatkathā retellings.
representation of Śiva: "a killer divinity with a permanent erection."\(^{209}\)

What I see this fascinating play providing evidence for is severalfold. First, the practices described are of course those of the Mantramārga, and not of a non-tantric kāpālika sect.\(^{210}\) This is evidenced in particular by Aghoraghaṇṭa’s stated engagement in mantrasādhana, and the above descriptions of the two yoginīs’ sources of ritual power. Significant parallels in descriptions of ritual and its aims, as well as the importance of Cāmunḍā, “leader of the Mother goddesses” (mātṛnāyikā), point moreover towards the kāpālika- and goddess-oriented cults of Vidyāpīṭha scriptures. Also present is a fundamental formulation of the Yoginī cult: the possibility of women becoming flying Mistresses of Yoga through ritual perfection. That this tantric and kāpālika cult had its centers of activity at sacred pīṭhas such as Śrīparvata, was viewed primarily as a domain of Śaivism, and invited Buddhist participation, might also be suggested. Altogether, the evidence from the Mālatimādhava suggests that by the early eighth century, the Yoginī cult described in bhairavatātras of the Vidyāpīṭha was prevalent, corroborating references to this literature in the old Skandapurāṇa.

THE HARAVIJAYA OF RATNĀKARA

While the Mālatimādhava shows general awareness of the kāpālika cult of yoginīs described in Vidyāpīṭha sources, the early ninth-century Haravijaya of Ratnākara,\(^{211}\) in contrast, contains clear references to the Trika—the cult of the goddess triad Parā, Parāparā, and Aparā—probably in its developed Kaula variety. This Kashmirian mahākāvya echoes specific siddhāntatantras, as identified by Sanderson,\(^{212}\) and in a hymn to the goddess Caṇḍī, displays technical knowledge of the Trika’s system of deity visualization.\(^{213}\) This hymn makes passing reference to yoginīs as well, describ-

\(^{209}\) Indian Esoteric Buddhism, 90.

\(^{210}\) In contrast, note that the Mattavilāsa, a seventh-century drama which parodies the antinomian and kāpālika activities of a Śaiva ascetic, provides no conclusive indications of Mantramārga practices.

\(^{211}\) Concerning the date of composition, Sanderson suggests “around 830,” based upon his assessment of the dates of Cippatājayapīṭha, the Kashmiri monarch in whose court Ratnākara apparently wrote the Haravijaya. “History through Textual Criticism,” 6 (n. 3).

\(^{212}\) “History through Textual Criticism,” 5–6.

\(^{213}\) See Sanderson, “Mandala and Agamic Identity in the Trika of Kashmir,” 169 (n. 1); and “History through Textual Criticism,” 18–19 (n. 21). See also David Smith, Ratnākara’s Haravijaya: An Introduction
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ing the Goddess in union with Bhairava as the radiant nave of a cakra of yogesvaris, i.e. yoganis, upon whom one meditates to attain identity with Šiva.\textsuperscript{214} Also noteworthy is the fact that yoganis, in contrast to the Seven Mothers, have not been incorporated into the rich Śaiva mythology of this work to any significant degree: they figure only in the above reference to esoteric ritual.\textsuperscript{215} In marked contrast, the thirteenth-century Haracaritacintāmanī of Rājānaka Jayadratha, also a Kashmiri, prominently integrates yoganis into Śaiva mythology.\textsuperscript{216}

The various retellings of the lost Prakrit Brhatkathā of Guṇāḍhya, "The Grand Tale," offer a wealth of material pertinent to Tantric Śaivism and the Yoginī cult. The Kathāsaritsāgara, an early eleventh-century Sanskrit version by the Kashmiri author Somadevabhaṭṭa, is permeated with references to tantric practices and practitioners and contains vivid accounts of yoganis. Closely parallel to this is the mid eleventh-century Brhatkathāmaṇijari of Kṣemendra, this too of Kashmiri provenance. An earlier Sanskrit version, the Brhatkathāslokaṇaṅgraha, also contains much that is relevant to the study of Tantra; but there are telling contrasts in these texts, probably separated by a century or more in time. Reaching further back to the Vasudevahindi of Saṅghadāsapāṇin, an early Jaina retelling in Prakrit, evidence for Tantra and the yoginī cult recedes from view.\textsuperscript{217}

In the Vasudevahindi, "The Odysseys of Vasudeva," we do nonetheless glimpse proto-tantric ideas and practices of some relevance to the formation of the Yoginī cult, especially its tales of the vijjāharas (i.e. vidyādharas) and their "lores" (viṭṭā, i.e.

\textsuperscript{214} Haravijaya 4.28; this has been quoted and translated by Smith, Ratnakara's Haravijaya, 262.

\textsuperscript{215} I base my knowledge of the deities and myths in the Haravijaya largely on the studies by Smith (Ibid., 225–76), and Santosh Kumari Sharma, Haravijaya of Ratnakara: a Criticism, 268–316.

\textsuperscript{216} An episode prominently featuring yoganis is described in Sanderson, "Religion and the State," 285–86.

While of uncertain dating, the text is written in a Prakrit Ludwig Alsdorf argues belongs to the early centuries of the common era. The Vasudevahindi therefore comprises the earliest surviving retelling of the Brhatkatha, though owing to its adaptation to Jaina “universal history,” not the most faithful. While yoginis have no role in this tale, another category of divine woman does have a significant position: the vidyadhari, female counterpart of the vidyadha or “lore-holder.” It is these “lores” (vidyā) and their semi-divine masters, both male and female, that have significance for the present study.

In Donald Nelson’s assessment, the core narrative of the original Brhatkatha had three concerns: the hero Naravāhanadatta’s gradual acquisition of wives, vidyās, and overlordship of the vidyādharas. These also form an integral sequence, for vidyās must be mastered in order to conquer vidyādharas, and Naravāhanadatta learns many of these from his vidyādharā brides. On the treatment of vidyās in the Vasudevahindi, I take as example an episode from book fourteen, which tells the tale of the hero’s marriage to the vidyādharā princess Mayaṇavegā. In an aerial scuffle with his vidyādharā abductor, the hero, Vasudeva, falls from the sky and finds himself in the River Gaṅgā. He encounters a person endeavoring to master a vidyā, standing in the water in the garb of a mendicant ascetic, who says, “on seeing you, my vidyā has become perfected (siddhā) … tell me, what token of friendship might I offer you? I am a vidyādha.” Vasudeva requests to learn a vidyā that bestows the power of

---


222 This chapter was brought to my attention by Nelson, 222-23, and Jamkhedkar, Vasudevahindi: A Cultural Study, 28. Here and elsewhere, I have consulted the comparative summary/translation of the Vasudevahindi and Brhatkathālokasamgraha by Jagdish Chandra Jain, The Vasudevahindi: An Authentic Jain Version of the Brhatkathā.

223 Vasudevahindi 14 (vol. 2), p. 229: siddhā me vijjā tumha dānsaṇaya ... samḍiṣaya, kim vā puyacchāmi...
flight. After initiating him, the *vidyādhara* instructs Vasudeva in this lore. He follows the prescribed ritual for a day; in the evening a divine woman manifests before him, and with his assent, carries him off into the sky.224

The method and terminology for *vidyā*-practice in the *Vasudevahindi* bears remarkable continuity with later tantric ritual. First and foremost, *vidyās* are not only "lores," in the sense of spells to be mastered that accomplish specific aims, but also deities to be propitiated. Thus when the divine woman manifests before Vasudeva, he wonders whether she is the *vidyā*-goddess herself, pleased with his worship.225 This shows clear similarity with the tantric conception of *vidyās* as goddesses, female mantra-deities. Furthermore, access to the *vidyā* requires initiation, for which the terminology is identical to that of later Śaivism: Vasudeva becomes *dikkhio*, i.e. *dikṣitah*, "initiated;" the rite is unfortunately not described. Just like a tantric mantra-deity, a *vidyā* bears fruit when it becomes "perfected" or "mastered" (*siddhā*).226 This initial process of making the mantra effective is, in our example, described as *puraccarana* (Sanskrit *puraścāraṇa*), "preliminary service/propitiation," a term having similar meaning in tantric ritual. As in tantric *puraścāraṇa*, this involves primarily incantation, alongside other rites and observances.227 For example, in order to master the *vidyās* called *sumbha* and *nisumbha*, Vasudeva must make food offerings to deities (*bali*) on a mountain peak on the fourteenth night of the waning moon, and repeat the *vijjā* one-thousand and eight times. Here, significantly, no distinction is made between the


225 Vasudeva at first wonders whether the divine woman is an "obstruction personified" (*vīghna*, i.e. *vighna*) taking the form of a beautiful temptress, but then decides she is the goddess of the *vidyā* (*vijjābhagavatī*), "pleased by his preliminary worship" (*puraccaranatosiyd*, i.e. *purascaranatosita*). It becomes clear in the course of the story that she is rather Mayaṇāvega, a *vidyādhari* princess—the sister of Dandaśeva, the *vidyādhara* Vasudeva encountered upon falling from the sky. *Vasudevahindi* 14 (vol. 2), p. 230.

226 Hence, the *vidyādhara* who teaches Vasudeva the lore for magical flight states, *ahora te athāh maṁ te sanāṭaṁ essāṁ ti, puraṇapuraccaraṇasya ya vijjā siddhā bhavissai tī ra saṁdeho so gato* ("He said, 'When a day and a night have passed, I will come to you', and 'you will master the *vijjā* when the preliminary worship is complete; of this, there is no doubt,' then left"). *Vasudevahindi* 14 (vol. 2), p. 229–30.

vidyā and its mantra: the vidyā is the mantra to be perfected, upon which it grants its powers. In this case, however, the two vidyās are not explicitly deified—although they might conceivably embody their namesake demons: the Śumbha and Niśumbha of Devīmāhātmya fame. In another story, a vidyādhara who had lost his powers is said to practice the sāhāna (Sanskrit sādhana) of a vidyā, this being in Tantric Śaivism the term for the observances one undertakes to achieve power (siddhi) with a particular mantra or vidyā. It is unclear whether in the Vasudevahindi this is distinct from purāścarana.

Further investigation is required into early Indian conceptions of vidyās, for they seem highly relevant to the development of Tantra and the Yoginī cult. In the Vasudevahindi’s vidyās, it would seem that we find, already, a conflation of mantras, female deities, and specific magical powers, access to which requires initiation. In other words, by the term vidyā/vijjā is connoted a specific mantra, the power resulting from its mastery, and the goddess who embodies it, who must be won over through purāścarana and/or sādhana. This nexus of ideas has clear continuity with later, self-consciously tantric conceptions of mantra and ritual. The idea of vidyās as goddesses takes on extraordinary significance in the later tradition, for the earliest literature of the Śaiva Yoginī cult identifies itself as belonging to the Vidyāpiṭha division of the Śaiva canon: “The Seat of Female Mantra-deities.” This level of the tradition is distinguished by its emphasis on practices for attaining power, siddhi, and upon vidyās or female mantra deities—myriad manifestations of Śiva’s primordial energy or power, sakti. Through the conception of this sakti as feminine, goddesses and

---

228 Vasudevahindi 6 (vol. 1), p. 195: aham vijjāhoro, atti me duve vijjāno suhasāhāno sumbhānisumbhāno uppavattipprayāṇo, tāso tava demi. taman si tāsim bhūyānam. jam puna bhavīhānam tām aham savam uvanem. tuman kalacūdānase ēgas māmāni mālasu. ātmaśahosāvattījā ye te vijjā sijjhāhi tti [=sijjahi tti?]: “I am a vijjāhara, and I have two vijjās easily mastered, Śumbha and Niśumbha, for flying up and coming down; I’ll give them to you—you are a fit recipient for these. I will on my part take care of all the hali food offerings. Meet with me alone on the fourteenth of the waning moon, and when the vijjā has been repeated one-thousand and eight times, you will master it.” My attention was directed to this passage by Jamkhedkar, Vasudevahindi: A Cultural Study, 228.

229 Vasudevahindi 4 (vol. 1), p. 176: esa anugraha vijjāhāte sāhānām kunati vijjā (“this is Angaraka, who has lost his lore and [hence again] does sādhana of the vijjā”). Cf. the description of the vijjās sumbhā and nisumbhā as suhasāhāna, “the sādhana of which is easy,” i.e. “easily mastered,” quoted in the previous note.
power become consubstantial—a connection absent in proto-tantric conceptions of *vidyās*.

It would appear that *siddhi*-oriented forms of tantric practice, which culminate in the cult of yoginīs, represent the continuity of proto-tantric *vidyā* practices integrated within Śaiva and Buddhist soteriological systems. One of the most distinctive characteristics of Tantric Śaivism, as well as Buddhist Tantra, is indeed the claim of efficacy for both soteriological ends and the pursuit of power. This pursuit of power was, in the broadest sense, a quest for superhuman agency: to embody the powers of deities. One important locus for such conceptions is the figure of the *vidyādhara*, the individual whose mastery of *vidyā* affords transcendence of the human condition. This transcendence is expressed through abilities such as flight, and entry into paradisal realms neither of this world nor, strictly speaking, beyond it; one may enter into the community of *vidyādharas*.

Attainment of *vidyādhara*apada, the status of a *vidyādhara*, was in fact the aim of much of the non-soteriologically oriented ritual outlined in early tantric literature, from the Śaiva *Nīstāsa* corpus to early Tantric Buddhist texts. Recall that this was, for instance, the aim of the ‘zombie rite’ (*vetālasādhanā*) in which the king Puṣpabhūti assisted Bhairavācārya, as portrayed in Bāna’s early seventh-century *Harsacarita*. Writing in 673 C.E., a Chinese monk in India named Yi-jing refers to the emergent corpus of Buddhist tantric literature as the *Vidyādhara*apīṭaka, “the canon of the *vidyādharas*.”

This concern with *vidyā* and becoming a *vidyādhara* must also be seen as a broader theme in ancient Indian folklore, apparently predating the early medieval formation of tantric sects. Nowhere is this more evident than in the retellings of the *Brhatkathā*—the narrative of an individual’s journey from human prince to emperor of the *vidyādharas*. With the development of the cult of yoginis, the

---

230 Becoming a *vidyādhara* appears as the goal of many of the *siddhi*-oriented practices outlined in the *Guhyaśūtra* of the *Nīstāsa*, this being mentioned a dozen times. Note, for instance, 11.85: *om paramesvaraparāyana namoḥ anena maṇtreṇa parvataśikharanārūhyā bhikṣāhara daśalaksāṇi japet| vidyādhara bhraṃati* || (*om paramesvaraparāyana namoḥ*—after ascending the peak of a mountain, one should incant one million times with this mantra. One becomes a *vidyādhara*).

figure of the *vidyādhārī* recedes somewhat into the background in Tantric Śaivism, while the quest to embody divine powers takes on new forms. The figure of the yoginī is itself among the foremost of these expressions, for as is the case with the *vidyādhāri*, a woman may aspire to become one.

Though written perhaps half a millennium after the *Vasudevahindi*, the Sanskrit *Bṛhatkathāślokaṃgraha* still contains scant references to yoginīs. A scene in chapter twenty describes a cremation ground, where at night a variety of tantric practitioners congregate:

> In one place I saw a circle of witches [*dākinīṃḍala*] with upraised arms and flowing hair dancing naked around a corpse. In another place I saw a man brandishing a sword and holding a skull that he was using as a bowl. He was saying, ‘Mighty ones, buy some human flesh!’ Then, guarded in each of the cardinal directions by a troop of armed men, there was an aspiring magician [*sādhaka*] with a magical sword who was floating up into the sky.

Here we see depictions of tantric cremation-ground ritual familiar from other literary sources: the sale of human flesh (*mahāmāṁsavikrāya*), as depicted in the *Mālatīmādhava*, and a rite parallel to the *vetālasādhana* Bhairavācārya undertakes under armed guard in the *Harsacarita*. However, there is also described a coven exclusively of women, *dākinīs*, engaged in a wild rite with a corpse. Most interesting of all is the subsequent depiction of Dhanamati, a *vidyādhāri* queen who has taken the guise of an elderly tribal woman (*mātaṅgavṛddhī*). There in the cremation ground at the root of a banyan

---


233 *Bṛhatkathāślokaṃgrahtā* 20.94–96:

```
uijhitāmbaram udbhūtā prakīrnakasamacayam |
puritāh kuṇapam nṛtyad dākinīṃḍaladā kvacit || 94 ||
kvacit puruṣam utkhadhgam upātiṣṭhātakparam |
mahāmāṁsaṃ mahāsātītāḥ kṛṣṇādīti viṇādīm || 95 ||
sāsstrapurusārārātāraṣṭātākṣācātūṣṭayam |
sādhaṇam saṭkhiṁśtriṣṭaṃ utpalantān nabhāḥ kvacit || 96 ||
```

tree she performs fire sacrifice, offering human blood into a charnel fire with a ladle held in her left hand, incanting a mantra ending with the syllable ‘Hām’.234 Animating a corpse to do her bidding, she uses this rite of subjugation (vaṣikaraṇa) to bring the hero under her power and marry him to her beautiful granddaughter. He offers scant protest.

In the parallel episode of the Vasudevahindi, chapter four, the disguised vidyādhari is said merely to recite a mantra in the cremation ground, by which she causes an animated corpse (veyāla, i.e. vetāla) to kidnap the hero.235 It thus appears that a reference in the original to a vidyādhari practicing her art in the cremation ground has in the Brhatkathāślokasamgraha been fleshed out with reference to later tantric ritual. That is, vidyās and their vidyādhara/T masters are to some extent recast in the image of contemporaneous tantric ritual and ritualists. Besides the reference above to dākinīs, the figure of the yoginī does not, however, feature with any prominence.

In contrast, the Kathāsaritsāgara affords a fascinating view of yoginis from a region and period in which their cult was highly prominent—eleventh-century Kashmir. In this text, yoginīs take on much of the imagery and roles of the vidyādhari from earlier retellings of the Brhatkathā.236 In the Kathāsaritsāgara, we encounter yoginīs as both divine and corporeal women: powerful and nameless groups of flying goddesses, as well as remarkably human characters, between which, perhaps, little distinction was intended.237 Those depicted as “actual” women range from impetuous, even vile

234 Brhatkathāślokasamgraha 20:97-98:

\begin{quote}
ityāddibhūryttāntaṁ pāṣyataḥ pretaketakam |
yātrāṁ yā gacchatā dṛṣṭā sa dṛṣṭā dhvāravīrṣa mayā || 97 ||
\end{quote}

\begin{quote}
vatamāle cītāvahmanau tāmāhastāṛintegravat || 98 ||
\end{quote}

235 Vasudevahindi 4 (vol. 1), p. 178-79, especially p. 179: ...sampātīvo piuvanam | dīffā yā mayā māyamgaṇvadāhā kim pi jampantī! | (“I reached a cremation ground, and saw the elderly tribal woman incanting some powerful [mantra]”).

236 Though omitted from the present discussion, the same may be said of the Brhatkathāmahatjarī, a text closely parallel to the Kathāsaritsāgara written not long after it in Kashmir.

237 I am grateful to Isaacson for first directing my attention to accounts of yoginis in the Kathāsaritsāgara, beginning with a Sanskrit reading seminar in the autumn of 2002. My awareness of the material has also benefitted from a stimulating article by Adelheid Herrmann-Pfandt, which draws on stories of yoginis from the Kathāsaritsāgara: “The Good Woman’s Shadow: Some Aspects of the Dark Nature of Dākinīs and Śākinīs in Hinduism,” in Cornelia Vogelsanger and Anette Wilke, eds.,
"witches" to virtuous and accomplished tantric adepts. This spectrum of characters accords with taxonomies of yogīṇīs from tantric literature: in the Kathāsaritsaṅgāra, yogīṇīs are classified, variously, as dākinīs or sākinīs—lowly and cruel varieties—while yogīṇīs without such qualifiers are frequently benevolent.

The yogīṇīs of the Kathāsaritsaṅgāra form a colorful assortment. In book six we meet one named Citralekhā, whose prowess in flight facilitates the union of her friend, the princess Usā, with Aniruddha of Dvāravatī.238 Another well-meaning yoginī instructs her friend in mantras for turning her illicit lover into a monkey, and for restoring her pet to human form on demand.239 In contrast, note for instance the dākinī Kālarātri, the grotesque and lusty wife of an orthodox brahmin teacher (upādhyāya) who possesses the power of flight through mantra-practice and consumption of human flesh. She secretly acts as guru to a coven of dākinīs, which a future queen joins with disastrous consequences.240 Another story tells of a weary traveller who unknowingly accepts the hospitality of a sākinī. He thwarts her attempt to use enchanted barley to turn him into a goat, but ends up being turned into a peacock by the butcher’s wife, a “wicked” (duṣṭa) yoginī.241 In another episode of book six, we find not yogīṇīs, but false accusations: a jealous queen, a greedy female renunciant, and clever barber conspire to make the king think his newest bride is secretly a dākinī, who sucks out his vitals whilst he sleeps.242 A different sort of yoginī is represented by Šarabhānanā, whose name and description are suggestive of a theriomorphic goddess rather than human ‘sorceress’.243

A number of tales in the Kathāsaritsaṅgāra pit benevolent and malefic yogīṇīs against each other, much as does the Brhatkathā-inspired Mālatiṁādhava. Book seven includes the story of a certain Bhavaśarman of Vārāņasi, who had an affair with a

---

238 Kathāsaritsaṅgāra vi.1.1–36.
239 Ibid., vii.107–18.
240 Ibid., iii.6.102–218.
241 Ibid., xi.4.263–77.
242 Ibid., vi.6, especially 153–80.
243 Ibid., viii.5.123–134. This name means “Śarabha-face,” the śarabha being an exotic, mythical beast.
fickle brahmin woman, Somādā, a “secret yoginī” (*guptayoginī*, 150d) of the worst sort—a “petty śākīnī” (*kṣudrāśākīnī*, 168b). One day, in a fit of jealous anger he beats her. Hiding her rage, the next day she slips his sacred thread around his neck and turns him into an ox. Sold as a beast of burden, another yoginī, Bandhamocinī, spots him and restores him to human form. Transforming themselves into horses, the two yoginīs duel, and Bhavāsarman and Bandhamocanī fell Somadā.244 In another, parallel episode, a certain Vāmadatta discovers that his wife, Śaśiprabhā, is secretly both an adulteress and a śākīnī. Caught in the act with a herdsman, she turns her enraged husband into a buffalo, beats him, and sells him off. A “perfected yoginī,” however, recognizes him in animal form and restores his humanness. She gives him her own daughter in marriage, supplies him with enchanted mustard seeds to enact revenge, and in the end, initiates him and his wife into the *vidyā* of the goddess Kālasaṃkarṣanī. Upon the sacred mountain Śrīparvata, their mantra-practice achieves fruition, and Kālasaṃkarṣanī herself manifests and bestows a magic sword. They become *vidyādhāras*.245

In the story of Kandarpa of Ratnapura, in *Kathāsaritsāgara* xviii.4, we encounter yoginīs as groups of powerful, flying beings. One day, when at dusk the brahmin Kandarpa goes to fetch water from the river Vēnā, the current sweeps him away. He nearly drowns, awakening on the riverbank near a deserted temple of the Mother goddesses. Entering the temple, he prays to the Mothers for succor. At night, from among the Mothers emerge a group of flying yoginīs who take Kandarpa under their protection. Later, while in flight, another group of yoginīs accost them, desiring to harm Kandarpa, and in the scuffle he falls to the ground, lost.246 This has some

---

244 This episode occurs as vii.3.147–69.
245 Ibid., xii.1.31–72.
246 There are considerable inaccuracies in David White’s summary of this episode (*Kathāsaritsāgara* 18.4.204–22). In his words,

A brahmin named Kandarpa from Ratnapura comes upon a deserted Mother goddess temple (*śānta mātādevagrha*) in the night. Entering, he sees a brilliant light. He prays to the Mothers to protect him. When the daylight comes, he finds garlands of bones and the skulls of children. He realizes they are from a host of Mothers [i.e., witches]. He later hears the group of Yoginis speaking amongst themselves: “Today we must go to the gathering of the circle (*cakramelaka*) that is taking place in Cakrapura.” The Yoginis

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
parallels in a story from book fourteen. After failing in his studies, a certain Nāgasvāmin sets off from Pātaliputra to see the goddess Vindhyavāsinī. In a town along the way, a housewife gives him a red lotus along with the alms he seeks. The lady of another house sees him, and exclaims, “O alas! You have been selected by a yoginī. Under the pretext of a red flower, she has given you a human hand—look!” And so it was. The housewife sends him to a brown cow (kapilā) in the home of a certain Devarakṣīta; nestled between her hooves, the divine cow affords him protection through the night when the yoginī and her coven descend upon him, seeking flesh and blood. Next he seeks the aid of a “great Pāṇḍavīta,” but he too can keep the yoginīs at bay only temporarily, and sends him off to someone else. Along the way, the yoginīs catch Nāgasvāmin and whisk him off into the sky. Like Kandarpa, he falls to the ground when there ensues an aerial battle with a rival group. He lands in a deserted place near a temple, where dwells a beautiful yaksinī, Sumitrā, cursed to dwell among mortals. She takes him as lover for the duration of her curse.

Looking at the development of the Brhatkathā corpus, it appears that the yoginī becomes an increasingly important locus for tales of magical women, encroaching

Kiss of the Yoginī, 213. Compare with the sound translation of Charles Tawney, The Ocean of Story, vol. ix, 57–61. In fact, having been swept away by a river, Kandarpa comes upon the Mother temple at dawn (dīnagane), and overcome by exhaustion, sleeps there into the night (205–10). No reference is made to “garlands of bones and the skulls of children;” the night is described as a female ascetic (rajanītāpasī) who is white with the ashes of moonlight, who wears a necklace of bones that are the stars, and whose gleaming skull-bowl is the moon

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
upon the territory of the *vidyādhari* especially. A number of conceptual continuities link the *vidyādhari* and yoginī, above all their command of mantras, powers of flight and shapeshifting, and their variegated transactions with mortals, for whom they present both danger and access to powers. We find, for instance, the *vidyādhari* Hiranṇamaṭī of the *Vasudevahīṇḍi* recast in the *Brhatkathāślokaśāṅgraha* as a tantric sorceress, Dhanamati, while in the *Kathāsaritsāgara*, the *vidyādhari* Bhadrā is also referred to as a *yogēśvarī*. Note also how in the *Kathāsaritsāgara* story of Vāmadatta, a perfected yoginī (*siddhayoginī*) takes on roles played by the *vidyādhāri* in earlier retellings: the yoginī bestows her own daughter in marriage to the hero, as did for instance Hiranṇamaṭī/Dhanamati, and she facilitates the hero’s mastery of *vidyās*, just as do Hiranṇamaṭī’s daughter and other *vidyādharīs*. In this case the *vidyā* is the mantra of Kālasaṃkaraṇī, a form of Kālī important in the Krama cult of contemporaneous Kashmir. Its fruit, however, remains that which the original *Brhatkathā* would have attributed to mastery of *vidyās*: Vāmadatta and his wife become *vidyādharaṇas*.

While the *Kathāsaritsāgara*’s yoginīs have direct continuity with the earlier figure of the *vidyādhāri*, we also find *yakṣinīs*, a class of demi-goddess with strong connections to trees and the natural world, recast as yoginīs. Note that the stories of Kandarpa and Vāmadatta, summarized above, both involve the theme of yoginīs dropping a man to the ground when they are accosted in the sky by rival groups. This appears to recast tales of *yakṣinīs* from earlier *Brhatkathā* versions: in the *Vasudevahīṇḍi*, in the beginnings of chapters five and fourteen, the hero fabricates stories of having been dropped from the sky when there ensued a scuffle over him between two *yakṣinīs*. This is of particular interest, for it illustrates the breadth of the cate-

---

249 While both share the ability to change forms, yoginīs more typically take on animal form, as discussed in the introduction to this dissertation. Cf. *Kaulajñanānimaya* 23, quoted later in this chapter (n. 309). *Vidyādhārīs*, on the other hand, more often transform themselves by taking on human guise; note e.g. the case of Dhanamati/Hiranṇamaṭī, mentioned above, who along with her daughter takes on the form of a tribal woman (*mātāngī*).

250 Ibid., iii.4.378.

251 On Kālī as Kālasaṃkaraṇī, see Sanderson, “Maṇḍala and Āgamic Identity in the Trika of Kashmir,” 188–204.

252 *Kathāsaritsāgara* xi.1.64–68.

253 For example, in chapter fourteen, after being dropped by the wicked *vidyādhara* Mānasavega, the
gory ‘yogini’, which could encompass earthly women of power as well as goddesses. This also reinforces the degree to which multiplicity was integral to conceptions of yoginis: pairs of rival yakṣiṇīs become cast as feuding groups of yoginis.

THE YAŚASTILAKA OF SOMADEVASURI

Beyond the ninth century, references to yoginis become common in literary sources, and a comprehensive review is beyond the present study. One work meriting particular mention is the Yaśastilaka, composed by a Jain author, Somadevasūri, in the Śaka year 881 (i.e. 959 C.E.).[^254] The Yaśastilaka’s frame story concerns the battle-lusty and passionate Māradatta, a king who, advised by a Kaula guru (kulācārya) named Virabhārava, plans a massive sacrifice to the goddess Caṇḍamāri. Through this he seeks to attain a magical sword and thereby become lord of the vidyādharas.[^255] On the appointed day, a veritable zoo of sacrificial animals is assembled, while the king himself is to slay two human victims. Unbeknownst to the monarch, those brought before him in the temple are his own nephew and niece, who had left home as children to become Jain ascetics. Chastened by their tranquil presence, the sovereign sets down his sword and listens to his nephew narrate the life of king Yaśodhara—the core narrative of the Yaśastilaka. In the end, Māradatta abandons his violent ways and becomes a renunciant. With its theme of a narrowly-avoided human sacrifice to

[^254]: I read primarily from the editio princeps: Yaśastilaka of Somadeva Śūri, with the commentary Candrika of Śrutadeva Śūri, ed. Pandit Śivadatta and Vāsudeva Laxman Śastri Paṇśikar (2 vols.). The more recent edition is that of Sundaralal Śastri, Śrutasmodevasūri-viracitam Yaśastilakacampū Mahākṛtyam. This work has been the subject of a rich and useful study by Krishna Kanta Handiqui, Yaśastilaka and Indian Culture, or Somadeva’s Yaśastilaka and Aspects of Jainism and Indian Thought and Culture in the Tenth Century. On the dating of the text, see ibid., 2.

[^255]: sa punar ekadā nṛpatir ātmārājādānyām eva ca caṇḍamārīdevacaṇṭāḥ prakataḥ sa kalalakṣisaṃpānmananuṣāṇaḥ kauśalyāvad bhūta vairāvaharavanāmaḥ kula- cāryakātād upāśravya khecārīlaucandaścakavakamakulaśitatātyām pratipanna mārān agencyaḥ... ("Once, the king heard from a kula-master named Virabhārava that by sacrificing all [sorts of] creatures before the goddess Caṇḍamāri in one’s own capital city, and oneself slaying a pair of humans endowed with all the auspicious marks, one gains the power of a magical sword that gives victory over the vidyādharas. His heart made eager to gaze into the eyes of the flying [vidyādharas-] women, and having learned the procedure for worshipping her [Caṇḍamāri], ... "), Yaśastilaka 1, vol. 1, p. 44.
the Goddess, this work hence appears to echo the *Mālatīmādhava* or the latter’s own sources.

References to Śaivism in the *Yaśastilaka* attest to Kaula goddess cults in the tenth century, a period from which in any case there survives abundant Kaula literature. Unsurprisingly, the text’s Jaina author provides a polemical characterization of the Kaula—what he refers to as the teachings of the “clan masters” (*kulācārya*)—connecting it intrinsically with blood sacrifice and the consumption of forbidden substances. Somadevaśūri also mentions a specific Kaula sect, referring twice to the “Trika system” (*trikamata*)—the important cult of the goddesses Parā, Parāparā, and Aparā. The text also alludes to practices connected with yoginīs: a spy of the king Yaśodhara disguises himself as a colorful and seedy Śaiva, an antimian ātītahā who mimics Śiva in his form as the tribal huntsman (*kīrata*), and who, on account of communion with yoginīs, is advertised as possessing astonishing knowledge and powers. His “communication with yoginīs” (*mahāyoginīsaṅgati*) undoubtedly signifies

Handiqui identifies and discusses numerous references to Śaivism in the *Yaśastilaka*, which concern Pāśupatas, the Śaivasiddhānta, and the Kaula. *Yaśastilaka and Indian Culture*, 199-219, 224-29, and 354-60.

One reference to the *trikamata* occurs in a brief doxography of views on liberation: *sāreṣu peyṛpeyabhaṣyabhāṣyadīśu niḥśiśiṣvākṣitād yatīd iti kulaṁtīraṇakālī | tathā ca trikamatoktadhī kādāraḥ muktiyodhānaḥ saṃsthāḥ pravṛttiśrayasīkhyāḥ śāktyāryodhānadhī kādāraḥ svagam ubhaḥbhavitvagāmānuṣyāḥ kṛṣṇayā sāravijñāyam [em. (silent) Handiqui, *Yaśastilaka and Indian Culture*, 204 (n. 3); sarvanC Ed.] anādhiṣṭād iti (“According to the kula-gurus, [liberation transpires] due to acting with a mind free of inhibition with regard to all that is considered fit or unfit for drinking, and fit or unfit for eating, etc. Hence the saying of the Trika system, ‘having one’s heart (at) . . . impassioned and gladdened on account of (?) a mouth dense with the fragrance of wine, having one’s female ritual partner seated on the left side, holding the posture of the śaktimudrā, themselves imitating Umā and Śiva, one should worship the Lord of Sarvāṇi [i.e. Bhairava] together with the Dark Goddess [kṛṣṇayā; or, “with dark spirits” (?)’.”] *Yaśastilaka* vi, vol. 2, p. 269. The text appears suspect at the point “raṇānārtarasaṇa”; perhaps emend “raṇanā taralasaṇa”?. The possibility that kṛṣṇā could refer to Kāli/Caṇḍikā was suggested to me by Isaacs (personal communication, March 2007). The variant reading reported for kṛṣṇā in the edition of Sundaralāla Śāstri is *madiraya* (“with wine”), which could suggest understanding kṛṣṇā as “dark liquor.” Śāstri (ed.), *Śrīmatomadacarī-viraḍatām Yaśastilakācampañ Mahākāryam*, 184. Another passage in *Yaśastilaka* 1 refers to initiation into the Trika system: *sakalajanaśuddhārāne ‘pi svadehe trikanupādāśīṣyate devabhitvyenaḥ bhavitaśravasaṇaṣaya (“[the king Madadatta] who, as though initiated into the Trika system, was obsessed with [the idea] that his body is divine, even though it is like everybody’s”). Vol. 1, p. 43. Sanderson points out that the *Yaśastilaka* thus provides evidence for the presence of the Kaula Trika in the Deccan in the mid-tenth century—one of several indications that the Trika was by no means a specifically Kashmirian tradition. “A Commentary on the Opening Verses of the *Tantrasāra* of Abhinavagupta,” 132-33.

*Yaśastilaka* iii, vol. 1, p. 399-400: . . . prarccapratikarmavivakṣātātāt śāṭhiputra darśanājīnākāś ca pari-varjākālī eṣā khalu bhagavān samātāmāḥ yogyasāṅgīnīgatīḥ atindriyājñānodgatīḥ śāktyāḥ śāmīḥ śāmāvaśāḥ śāmāvāśāḥ kāraṇāḥ karīnā kesariṇām api samguṇamāya vidvāsaṃśaṣajena janaṁ api ātmaesaṃvāraṁ visadāhātī
yoginīmālāpa, the “union” or “encounter” with deities texts of the Yoginī cult describe as among the foremost attainments of ritual, effecting access to the highest powers.

Caṇḍamārī (“Grim Destroyer”), the goddess to whom Māradatta intended to offer sacrifice, presides over a temple called Mahābhairava in the royal capital.259 The goddess’ association with this temple and her vivid kāpālika iconography link her to Bhairavi, the goddess consort of Bhairava and primary locus of the concept of the Mahādevī and “supreme Śakti” (parā śakti) in the bhairavatantras. Caṇḍamārī’s name and description also place her within the broader “fearsome goddess” typology epitomized by Caṇḍikā/Caṇḍī—the primary name with which Bāṇa addresses the “Great Goddess” in his panegyric, the Caṇḍīśataka.260 While the name Caṇḍamārī seems unattested in tantric sources, a goddess Mārī does appear to have had importance. The BraYa mentions texts by the names Mārī and Mahāmārī, presumably centered upon this goddess’ cult, while the Tantrasadbhāva contains some material concerning this deity.261 Purāṇic sources too refer to Mahāmārī; in particular, the Agnipurāṇa has a chapter devoted to her vidyā-mantra,262 while the Devimāhātmya provides mahāmārī as an epithet of the Goddess as universal destroyer.263

259 That the temple of Caṇḍamārī stands in the royal capital is stated in Yaśastilaka 1, vol. x, p. 44 (atmarājadhanayān eva caṇḍamārideratvātyāḥ purūtāḥ), while its name is given in the prose on p. 148 (line 4-5, mahābhairavānī nāma tad devaṭatanam).

260 Descriptions of Caṇḍamārī include Yaśastilaka 1, vol. 1, pp. 150–51 (in part quoted and translated by Handiqui, Yaśastilaka and Indian Culture, 56), and verses 1.136–37. Her iconography is entirely kāpālika, and her descriptions include images of sacrificial violence; cf. Bāṇa’s descriptions of Caṇḍikā in the Kadambari (pp. 224–28 of the edition).

261 BraYa XXXVIII.41C lists texts called Mārī and Mahāmārī in its account of the Vidyāpītha division of the bhairavatantras. A goddess called Mahāmārī is mentioned in Tantrasadbhāva 20.111–13, with her mantra and its application given in 20.124cd–139ab. This mantra-deity is, fittingly, connected with magical slaying (mātrana).

262 Chapter one-hundred and thirty seven, of which the colophon reads ity āgyene mahāpurāne yuddhajagārīyamahāmārī nāma sepatraṁśasadadhikasatatam o dhvalyāḥ.

263 Markandeyapurāṇa 92.35–36 (Devimāhātmya 12).
Somadevasūri connects Čandamārī and her temple with “mahāyoginīs,” bellicose goddesses whose flight through the heavens he depicts vividly. In contrast to the Mālattmādhava, in which yoginīs were accomplished human adepts, here they are portrayed as a horde of powerful deities. Brandishing skull-staves (khaṭvāṅga), adorned with snakes and skulls, and with third-eyes blazing, the yoginīs assemble in the Čandamārī temple from the skies, the earth, the depths of the netherworlds, and the intervening regions (digantarāla).264 The flight of the tempestuous goddesses shakes the heavens as they descend like the nights of universal destruction.265 While not specifically described as ensnared within its precincts, their association with Čandamārī’s temple is noteworthy, for, as Vidya Dehejia observes, the Yasastilaka belongs to the period in which major Yoginin temples were constructed.266 The temple environs “being filled” by alighting yoginīs evokes the language of embodiment used for describing deities as living presences in a temple, and suggests the possibility of their presence as sculpted images. This possibility receives some support in the reference made to worship of the “circle/group of Mothers” (mātyramandala) within the temple precincts; at least one period source appears to uses the term mātī to refer to the sixty-four goddesses of a yoginī temple.267 Irrespective of this possibility, the Yasastilaka appears to point toward a contemporaneous association between yoginīs and temples.

264 Note in particular, sasānrombham ambaratatal śatāmātālād digantarālebhyaś ca vibhātvaram tamataṃstatiḥbhir iteśvaroṃstitiḥbhīḥ ... (describing mahāyoginībhīḥ; Yasastilaka 1, vol. 1, pp. 44–45).
265 Cf., especially, Yasastilaka 1, vol. 1, p. 47: sūkṣmaśaṣ gataḥ kṣayakṣaptbhīḥ itcātārūnasāmādṛtahadehāḥbhīḥ mahāyoginībhīḥ āpūryamānaparīśaḥ ... (“[the temple of Čandamārī,] the precincts of which were filling up with powerful yoginis, whose bodies were extremely frightful and long, like the nights of the whole world’s destruction;” describing devayatanam [p. 49]). Cf. Handiqui, Yasastilaka and Indian Culture, 56–57.
266 Yogini Cult and Temples. A Tantric Tradition, 26. Dehejia provides an English translation of this passage from the Yasastilaka, ibid., 26–27.
267 Yasastilaka 1, vol. 1, p. 49, kvacit āpaṃpracatāprakṛṣṭasvayamtrayyantratradalanatayōmamātṛyramandalam, describing devayatanam (“in one part [of the temple], fanatic people appease the group/circle of Mothers by swinging by the contraption of their own extracted entrails”). Cf. Handiqui, Yasastilaka and Indian Culture, 22. The eleventh-century Siyān inscription of Bengal refers to the installation of Bhairava surrounded by sixty-four Mothers, i.e. yoginīs; this is discussed in the subsequent section.
2.4 TEMPLES OF THE YOGINĪS

By the middle of the tenth century, if not somewhat earlier, yoginīs became the focus of a temple cult of wide geographic distribution and evident prominence, with the construction of major yoginī temples continuing through perhaps the thirteenth century. Erected in stone from Orissa to Hinglajgadh, on the Madhya Pradesh–Rajasthan border, and as far south as Tamilnadu, the circular, hypaethral (open to the sky) temples of the yoginīs are architecturally unique in medieval India, and remain enigmatic in terms of religious history and ritual function. Numerous temples and much loose yoginī statuary have been documented by Vidya Dehejia, beyond whose important monograph on yoginī temples only a few additional contributions have been made in the past two decades.268 Despite her efforts to relate the art historical record to literary accounts of yoginīs, the state of the study of Śaiva literature limited Dehejia’s access to the textual corpus of greatest relevance to the yoginī temple tradition. Bringing these two bodies of evidence together still presents considerable challenges, and in the present section I offer only preliminary, general reflections upon the yoginī temples in light of Śaiva textual sources—an area to which I expect to devote further study.

Of the yoginī temple sites and image sets no longer in situ identified by Dehe-
jia, which number around fifteen, at least five were concerned with sets of sixty-four yoginis. The Bherāghāt temple contains eighty-one goddesses, while two ruined temples of central India might have housed sets of forty-two. In the remaining cases, the original number of images cannot be determined. With exceptions, such as the rectangular Khajuraho yogini temple, the temples have circular structures, and often feature a central shrine in the courtyard with a cult image of Śiva or Bhairava. All are hypaethral. Although the sites of the extant yogini temples and those associated with known loose statuary are concentrated in modern Madhya Pradesh and Orissa, the medieval temple cult was certainly not confined to these regions: one set of yogini images has been found in northern Tamilnadu, while inscriptive evidence points towards construction of yogini temples in Bengal as well. The extant images do not enshrine a group of deities with fixed individual identities: any given set of yoginis is unlikely to tally with another, with the exception of the Seven Mothers, who appear with particular frequency—a fact entirely consonant with textual accounts of yoginis.

One of two extant temples located in Orissa, the smallest of the yogini temples is situated in a secluded clearing near the village Hirāpur, not far from Bhuvanesvar (figure 2.15). According to one regional source, this would place the temple within the boundaries of Ekāmra, an important religious center that is included among the pīthas or sacred sites enumerated in early tantric literature, such as the BraYa. Thomas Donaldson, whose comprehensive surveys of Orissan art have considerable value for the study of early tantric traditions, opines on stylistic grounds that the

\[269\] Near Dudāhi survive the remains of a temple of forty-two yoginis, while Dehejia argues that the superstructure of the present Gadarmal Mother temple at Badoh was built atop a rectangular temple of forty-two yoginis; she finds evidence for forty-two niches, as well as eighteen fragmentary goddess images. Yogini Cult and Temples, 142-43.

\[270\] Ibid., 181-83.

\[271\] On the Siyan inscription of Bengal, see below.

\[272\] The following description of the temple is based upon analysis of photographs in the A11S Photo Archive, and the images published by Thomas Donaldson, Tantric and Sākta Art, vol. 3.

\[273\] Donaldson, Tantra and Sākta Art, vol. II, 661; he refers to the Ekāmracondrīkā, as quoted by R. L. Mitra, Antiquities of Orissa, vol. II (Kolkata: Wyman & Co., 1880), 103. The sacred geography of the BraYa is discussed in the subsequent chapter.
temple belongs to the middle of the tenth century. Comparatively well preserved, this small-scale hypaethral temple has an entrance passage protruding outward from its circular structure, lending to the whole the shape of the yoni-pedestal of a Śiva-līṅga, as Margrit Thomsen suggests. 

A (rebuilt) rectangular shrine stands in the center.

![Frontal view of the Hirāpur yogini temple. AIIIS Photo Archive.](image)

Nine grim goddesses of relatively little iconographic distinction appear around the exterior of the circular structure, which is unusual in yogini temples. Local tradition points toward identification of these as the “nine kātyāyanīs” (Figure 2.18). Two male “door guardians” (dvārapāla) flank the entranceway, while a skeletal male deity is present on either side of the entrance passage’s interior. The iconic program of the interior of the temple features sixty-four yoginīs, sixty of whom are arrayed in shallow cells along the interior perimeter of the circular wall. The goddesses therefore face towards the central shrine, a rectangular structure with four entrances.

---

274 This date is posited based upon similarity to the alasakanyā images on the Muktesvar temple of nearby Bhuvanesvar, which Donaldson assigns to the mid tenth-century. Dehejia had also noted these similarities, but considered the Muktesvar temple to be somewhat older; she places the Hirāpur temple in the second half of the ninth century. *Yogini Cult and Temples*, 99–100.


276 See the discussion of Donaldson, *Tantra and Śākta Art*, vol. II, 662.
that might once have housed an image of Śiva. Flanking each door of the central shrine is a deity pair: two pairs of yoginīs, who complete the sixty-four, and two pairs of bhairavas. The latter include Ekāpadabhairava (figure 2.20)—a deity of regional significance who also features in the BraYa under the name Jhānkārīśa or Jhamkārābhairava. One of the sixty goddesses along the perimeter (no. 31) appears to be "leader" of the group, for her image is positioned opposite the entrance, possesses ten arms rather than two or four, and is significantly larger. Perhaps intended as female counterpart to the central Śiva, this unidentified image is unfortunately in a poor state of preservation. Viewing the temple as a maṇḍala, an analogy likely to have substance in this case, Śiva stands at the center with an inner circuit of deities comprised of four yoginīs and four bhairavas, surrounded in the second circuit by sixty yoginīs. Nine kātyāyanīs form the outer layer of divinities, while additional deities guard the maṇḍala entrance (dvāra).

The yoginīs of the Hirāpur temple compose an expressive and variegated set, for detailed descriptions of which I refer the reader to K. N. Mahapatra, Donaldson, and Dehejia. Their iconography ranges from macabre (figure 2.21) to martial, playful (figure 2.16), and sensuous (figure 2.17). A number of the goddesses are theriomorphic (figure 2.19) and still more have animal vāhanas (figures 16–17, 21), encompassing species of considerable variety. Particularly common are images of dance, music, and war. Several, but still a small minority of the yoginīs have kāpālika iconography; some, for instance, carry or even drink from skull-bowls (figure 2.17) or stand upon severed heads or corpses. Excepting Cāmunḍā (figure 2.20), the most

---

277 Dehejia reports that the image of Śiva had been in situ when the temple was first discovered. Yogini Cult and Temples, 95. However, the basis for her claim is unclear, for nothing of the sort is reported by the first scholar to document the temple: K. N. Mahapatra, "A Note on the Hypaethral Temple of Sixty-four Yognīs at Hirapur," Orissa Historical Research Journal II (1953?): 23–40; reprinted in H. K. Mahtah, ed., Orissa Historical Research Journal. Special Volume, 1982.

278 On images of Ekāpadabhairava in Orissa, see Donaldson, Tantra and Śākta Art, vol. 2, 464–64. I have noted sculptures of Ekāpadā only in Orissa and neighboring Andhra Pradesh.

279 Published in Dehejia, Yogini Cult and Temples, 63. A full-bodied goddess, this image probably does not represent Cāmunḍā, who appears elsewhere in the circle (figure 2.21). None of the iconic emblems associated with her damaged ten arms remain discernable. Perhaps Bhairavi?

macabre deities of all are not the yoginīs themselves, but the goddesses upon the temple’s exterior face—grim, well-armed deities perched upon heads (FIGURE 2.18)—and the two skeletal male deities in the entrance passage. While few other sculpted sets approach the expressiveness of the Hirāpur deities, the breadth of characterization of the latter is typical of both textual and iconic representations of yoginīs.

Also perhaps of the mid-tenth century, the larger yogini temple at Rāṇīpur-Jharia in Orissa houses sixty-four goddesses, with its simple, four-pillared central shrine containing a dancing Śiva (FIGURE 1.1). Donaldson suggests that a damaged and relocated image of similar scale, perhaps of Cāmunda, might have originally have been situated in the company of the central Śiva.281 Probably of the same period, the yogini temple of Khajuraho in central India has a rectangular rather than circular plan,

although it too is open to the sky. Though none of its images appears to be extant, the niches number sixty-five, with no indication of there having existed a central shrine; a comparatively large niche opposite to and facing the entrance presumably housed the central cult image, whether of Śiva or the Goddess. A ninth-century dating had been proposed for this temple, but Dehejia considers the mid-tenth century more plausible on stylistic grounds.  

Figure 2.18: One of nine “kṛṣṇāgānis” (?); Hirāpur yoginī temple, to the right of the entrance, exterior facade, standing upon severed head. AIIS Photo Archive.

Figure 2.19: Lion-faced yoginī, Hirāpur temple. Photograph by Don Stadtner; included in the AIIS Photo Archive.

282 Dehejia, Yogini Cult and Temples, 115–17.
period. As for the temple’s dating, Dehejia suggests, with a degree of plausibility, that the labels inscribed on the yogini images’ bases date to the late tenth or early eleventh century, based upon paleographic comparison. This might make the Bherāghāt temple roughly contemporaneous with the badly damaged temple of forty-two yoginis at Dudāhī, near Lalitpur, M.P., but earlier than the Mitauli temple of sixty-four yoginis near Gwalior; a damaged inscription seems to place construction of the latter in the third quarter of the eleventh century. There are clear indications of royal patronage of several of the above temples.

---

283 Ibid., 125-27. While Dehejia describes this as a temple of eighty-one yoginis—and quite plausibly so—the iconic program is not entirely clear; many images are missing and few remain in their original positions, while three images of Vināyaka and two of male Śaiva deities presently occupy niches. Some of these appear similar in style to the yoginis, and might have had places in the circle or in the original central shrine, assuming one had been present at all.

284 Ibid., 138-39.

285 Dehejia’s proposed dating of the Dudāhī temple is based upon inscriptive evidence from a nearby Brahmā temple. Dehejia, Yogini Cult and Temples, 141. On the date of the Mitauli temple, see ibid., 89, 123-24.

286 The Mitauli temple appears to have been erected by the Kacchapaghāta ruler Devapāla (1055-75 c.e.), and an inscription shows that this temple still received major patronage as late as 1503 c.e. Ibid.
Among the loose sets of yogini images identified by Dehejia, one that was probably installed on a hill-top temple in Lokhari, Uttar Pradesh, merits particular mention. Although only twenty images have been identified, these are almost all theriomorphic, and hence suggest a unique iconic program (Figure 2.6). If Dehejia is correct that these images belong to the first half of the tenth century, this could also represent one of the earliest of the temple sites so far identified. Indeed, no compelling evidence I am aware of points toward the existence of yogini temples prior to the tenth century, although it would warrant little surprise if earlier examples surface. Most of the extant temples appear to have been constructed in the tenth through twelfth centuries, and the case appears similar with regard to the loose statuary identified as once belonging to yogini temples. It is of course probable that stone structures were preceded by yogini shrines and temples made from perishable materials; worship of yoginis has indeed continued into modern times in more humble temple contexts, sometimes using aniconic images. Davidson mentions the cases of two temples at Manḍi, Himachal Pradesh, where yoginis are represented by sixty-four sets of footprints on slabs of stone. That this could represent an old tradition is suggested by the depiction, below one of the Bherāghāt yogini's pedestal, of worshippers paying reverence to a set of sandals (Figure 2.22).

The hypaethral temples of the yoginis could perhaps have continuity with ancient conventions of shrines open to the elements. However, the template that appears most directly applicable to the yogini temple is the tantric yoginīcakra, as Dehejia recognized: the maṇḍala of mantra-goddesses surrounding Śiva/Bhairava, instal-

---

287 Among the images from Lokhari published by Dehejia, only Cāmuṇḍā is not theriomorphic.
288 On the loose yogini statuary, see Dehejia, Yogini Cult and Temples, 145-84.
289 David White, for instance, publishes a photograph of painted stones embodying yoginis outside of the Līlād temple of Ghatiyali, Rajasthan. Kiss of the Yogini, 268.
290 Indian Esoteric Buddhism, 181-83.
291 Note, for instance, depictions in early Indian art of simple liṅga shrines, with the phallic cult object set up upon a platform under a tree. Two are published by Doria M. Srinivasan, Many Heads, Arms and Eyes. Origin, Meaning and Form of Multiplicity in Indian Art, plates 17.2 (first century), 17.6-7 (a mukhalīṅga of Mathurā, early centuries C.E.).
292 Dehejia, Yogini Cult and Temples, 2, 185-86.
lation of which in various inflections and upon a variety of substrates was central to the ritual of the esoteric Śaiva cult of yoginīs. One might suspect other influences, for instance “tribal” or “folk” traditions of worshipping goddesses in a circle; yet tantric worship of “circles” of yoginīs appears to predate the temples by at least two centuries, and the remarkable congruity in Śaiva textual representations of yoginīs and their depiction in sculpture suggest direct continuity. It does appear possible that yoginī temples incorporated local deities into their iconic programs293 but in no case has this been demonstrated to be a process of central significance. Some yoginīs who have been singled out as “local” deities in fact present ambiguous cases.294

It is thus difficult to concur with Dehejia and Donaldson, without more evidence, in the view that the yoginīs enshrined in temples “represent localised cult traditions of village deities that eventually were transformed into potent groups of sixty-four yoginīs.”295

The extraordinary diversity of names and identities attested in yoginī sculptures appears wholly consistent with the tantric yoginī cult, with almost each scriptural tradition offering its own pantheon of this malleable category of divinity. Non-elite and tribal traditions might have been highly significant to the yoginī cult, however difficult to document; but if these were formative influences, they should be looked for in the early Śaiva and Buddhist esoteric traditions, given the apparent chronology of evidence.

293 Dehejia, for instance, points out that sixteen yoginīs listed in a late medieval Orissan purāṇa are worshipped as independent goddesses in Orissa. Ibid., 93.

294 The non-Sanskrit names of some goddesses might suggest locally meaningful identities. Dehejia draws attention to the yoginī labelled “Teramvā” at the Bherāghāṭ temple, identical to Durgā “Mahiṣāsuramardini” in iconographic type. One might mention the cow-faced Erudi of the same site. See ibid., 133–36. However, the name Teramvā, in the Sanskrit form tryambakā, is an attested name of the spouse-goddess of Śiva; cf. Kaulajñananimaya 14.28. In both vernacular and Sanskrit forms, this occurs in pan-Indian sources as a personal name (in the masculine) and as the name of a Śaiva monastic order (mathikā). See Sanderson, “A Commentary on the Opening Verses of the Tantrasāra of Abhinavagupta,” 121 (n. 79). It is hence problematic to ascribe local meaning to this name in the absence of evidence from regional sources. Similarly, a Śaiva pīṭha called Erudi is listed in the Tantrasadbhava (13.74b and 15.70b), and is also mentioned by Abhinavagupta in Tantraloka 15.91a (as Erudikā). The Bherāghāṭ yoginī is perhaps connected to the pīṭha by this name, but there are no grounds for linking the Erudi-pīṭha to the Bherāghāṭ region.

295 Donaldson, Tantra and Śākta Art, 658 (quotation); Dehejia, Yogiṇī Cult and Temples, 93–94.
No textual material intimately connected with the temples of yoginīs appears as yet to have come to light, such as a manual concerned with their construction, consecration of the images, and worship within the temple precincts. This is hardly surprising, for given the fragmentary record and present state of research, this level of correlation between text and temple remains rare in the study of early medieval India. Perhaps more surprising is the apparent paucity of references to yoginī temples in period literary sources. As discussed previously, the association between yoginīs and the temple of Caṇḍamārī in the Yaśastilaka is highly suggestive, given that this mid tenth-century work dates to the period of the construction of major yoginī temples. Dehejia claims that a tale in the Ākhyānakamaṇḍikā, a Jaina work of the late eleventh century, makes reference to a yoginī temple.296 We also find fascinating references to yoginīs in an eclectic Persian work presenting itself as a translation of the Kāmrubījākṣa, evidently a tantric Śaiva text connected with the cult of the goddess Kāmākhya. The Persian redaction, dating to as early as the thirteenth century, declares the sixty-four yoginīs the most revered deities of the Hindus, who worship their idols.297 The Rājatarāṅginī of Kālhaṇa attributes several figures of various Kashmiri courts with endowments to mātrcakras (“circles of the Mother goddesses”), but despite suggestions to the contrary, none of these are likely to refer to yoginī temples.298 As for the epigraphic record, this also appears minimal; an

---

296 Dehejia, Yogini Cult and Temples, 55. I have not yet had access to this text.
298 Four references to mātrcakras or devcakras in the Rājatarāṅginī were brought to my attention by
eleventh-century inscription from Siyān in Bengal does however state that a yoginī temple was constructed in this region.299 A number of textual sources on temple architecture, such as the Brhadārambhīta and Agnipurāṇa, mention the possibility of circular structures, but the yoginī temples are the primary surviving representatives of this rare type.300

Tantric Śaiva literature itself appears silent on the construction of yoginī temples, although a large quantity of potentially relevant material awaits study with this question in mind.301 There is nonetheless much that can be said, preliminarily, concerning the yoginī temple cult and Śaiva literature. Although configurations of eighty-one and forty-two are attested, the extant temples suggest that in the period of their construction, yoginīs were normally considered a set of sixty-four goddesses, a numerical association pervasive in purānic accounts of yoginīs that persists through the late medieval and modern periods. Much like the popular notion that tantras number sixty-four, this numerical association belies the fact that few lists agree in their particulars.302

White, Kiss of the Yogini, 137, who cites Marie-Thérèse de Mallmann, Les Eseignements iconographiques de l’Agni-Purana (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1967), 173. White implies that these might have been yoginī temples. Three cases do clearly refer to temples—probably of the Mother goddesses—while that of v.55 refers to a temple of Bhairava associated with a mātracakra. If M. A. Stein’s identification of the latter site is correct, it seems improbable that the ruins of the Bhairava temple at Buthiser resembled extant yoginī temples. See Stein (trans.), Kalhana’s Rājatarangini: A Chronicle of the Kings of Kashmir, vol. I, 194. In any case, this section of the text pertains to events of the ninth century, before yogini temples are attested; the other references (1.122, 1.333 [not 350, as gives White], and m.99) pertain to even earlier periods.

The eleventh-century Siyān inscription mentions, among various pious works undertaken by the Bengali monarch Nayapāla and his ancestors, installation of Bhairava surrounded by sixty-four Mothers, i.e. yoginīs, possibly in the capital city of the ruler (ghantisam yah svanagare nyadhat ksemaya dehinam | catwṣastiyā ca mātracāraḥ parita | tatra bhairavam || ). D. C. Sircar, Epigraphia Indica xxxix, 39–46. This inscription was brought to my attention by Davidson, who also cites the Mominābād inscription of Udayāditya as recording the construction of a yoginī temple. Indian Esoteric Buddhism, 185. However, the 1144 c.e. Western Cālukya inscription of Mominābād appears to pertain only to a cave temple of the goddess Jōgī or Ambejōgī (jōgī — yogini); I see no indication in the inscription for the presence of multiple yoginīs. P. B. Desai, Selected Stone Inscriptions of Andhra Pradesh, 94–95.

See Dehejia, Yogini Cult and Temples, 42.

The Pratistha-tantras in particular, works concerned with the construction and consecration of temples and images, are likely to be pertinent; I have unfortunately studied little even of the Pratistha-tantra associated with the Brāyā: the unpublished Pingalāmata, transmitted in Nepalese manuscripts.

Several scholars have given accounts of references to yoginīs in the purānas, perhaps the most complete being that of Olga Serbeeva, “Yoginīs in Saiva Purāṇas and Tantras. Their role in transformative experiences in a historical and comparative perspective,” especially 43–60. Incidentally, the earliest reference to tantras as sixty-four appears to be Siddhayogesvarīmata 29.19.
The earliest textual sources of the Yogini cult do not in fact associate yoginis with the number sixty-four. In the BraYā, groups of six dominate, with the primary set of six comprising the ancillary (aṅga) mantras of the supreme Goddess; the largest configurations of yoginis involve multiple groups of six, such as twenty-four.303 The primary group of sixty-four is a set of rudras, deities whose maṇḍala forms the subject of BraYā xxx. Sets of sixty-four goddesses are also absent from the Siddhayogeśvarīmata, another early scripture of the Vidyāpīṭha. A Vidyāpīṭha text postdating the BraYā and Siddhayogeśvarīmata,304 the Tantrasadbhāva presents what might be the earliest reference to sixty-four yoginis. In chapter thirteen, after delineating a maṇḍala of sixty-four bhairavas distributed in eight lotuses around a central lotus, a parallel configuration of sixty-four goddesses is introduced, called the “mātrīyīga” or “pantheon of Mothers.” Their names are feminine-gender mirrors of the bhairavas, suggesting a secondary status. Around the central Bhairava, the sixty-four yoginis form octads in lotuses grouped according to clans of the Eight Mothers, from Brahmāṇī to Aghorī.305 This explicit link to the Mothers is highly significant, for the same association is evident in most of the extant sculpted sets of yoginis, who include among them identifiable images of the Mother goddesses. This association persists in the profuse yogini name lists of the purāṇas as well, which most frequently concern sixty-four yoginis and often include among them the Mothers.306

In tantric Śaiva literature, the association between sixty-four and yoginis appears particularly common in Kaula sources, which, as discussed in the next chapter, ap-

---

303 On the Six Yoginis of the BraYā, see the section “navaṅkaravādīhāna” in chapter 5 of the present dissertation. BraYā xxx in particular features large sets of goddesses. This chapter teaches a pantheon and worship specific to the Four Devis, the extensive maṇḍala based upon which involves numerous sets of six yoginis. This maṇḍala is based nine cakras: the root cakra of Bhairava and Aghoresī, in the center, with cakras in the eight directions upon which are installed one of the Four Devis or Four Dūtīs/Kīṅkars, each associated with Six Yoginis and “servants of the servants” (kīṅkaryanwacarī). The latter groups of eight are associated with each of the Eight Mothers, forming, in a fashion, a set of sixty-four goddesses.

304 See the discussion in chapter 4.

305 The mātrīyīga begins with Tantrasadbhāva 13.56, and continues until the end of the chapter (verse 88). See the collation/draft edition of Dyczkowski.

306 For purāṇic and other yogini name lists, see Dehejia, Yogini Cult and Temples, 187–218 (appendices 1–111). As the case of the sixty-four yoginis of Tantrasadbhāva 13 suggests, the absence of Mothers from a list of yoginis should not be taken as evidence of dissociation between the two goddess types.
pear in general to postdate the early Vidyāpīṭha literature. Hence in the Kaulajñāna-nirnaya, a scripture describing itself as the Yoganīkula ("Kaula Scripture of the Yoginīs"), the most important cult deities are "the sequence of the sixty-four yoginīs" (catuḥṣaṭiyoginikrama), whose maṇḍala and ritual worship (the aṣṭāṣṭakavidhi) are central to this text.307 Preserved in a manuscript of the mid eleventh century, this text contains no indications of particular antiquity,308 and might date to the early period of the production of yoginī temples. Its twenty-third chapter describes the manifestation of the sixty-four yoginīs as female beings of every variety in particularly vivid terms. Yoginīs are said to sport on the earth as female animals of any type, from pigeons and vultures to cows and cats. When they assault non-devotees, they manifest as snakes, rats, tigers, and so forth, and as dangers such as disease, lightning, thieves, and royals. One is admonished never to insult women; we are not informed whether this is because yoginīs afford them special protection, or because any given woman might secretly be one.309 While not specifically concerned with temples,
this text, among numerous other period sources one might cite, gives indications of contemporaneous conceptions of the enshrined yoginis.

Although the Kubjikāmatā does not itself refer to yoginis as sixty-four in number, later literature of the Kaula cult of the goddess Kubjikā suggests a strong link. The Ciścinīmatasārasamuccaya, the “essence text” (śāra) of the Kubjikāmatā, appears to refer to “airborne yoginis” (gaganāgāminī) as sixty-four, while other types, such as terrestrial (bhuvanagāminī), are considerably more numerous. A work called the Kubjikāpūjāpaddhati enumerates sixty-four yoginis by name, while the Śrīmatottara (i.e. Kubjikāmatā Uttaratantra) has extensive material on yoginis, both sixty-four and eighty-one. More significantly, the unpublished fifteenth chapter of the Śaṭṭihātrasanāhitā provides a detailed account of the iconography and worship (pujā) of sixty-

catuḥṣaṣṭhiḥ ca yoginīḥ yathā kupyanti sādhake

I defer discussion of the interpretation of this passage until publication of a new edition of the Kaulajñānaniṁnaṁ, currently under preparation.

310 Kubjikāmatā 6.87–91, for instance, speaks of the Mothers as seven groups of seven, with additional unspecified subdivisions; the yoginis are yet more numerous.

311 Cf. Ciścinīmatasārasamuccaya 8.4cd–5ab:

From the draft edition of Dyczkowski.

312 See the five mantras given in prose following 9.121 in Dyczkowski’s draft edition; the first appears to be addressed to the sixty-four ākāsagadmini yoginis.

313 I have not personally studied either of these unpublished works. The sixty-four yoginis of the Kubjikāpūjāpaddhati are tabulated in Dehejia, Yogini Cult and Temples, 214; she draws the list from Gopinath Kaviraj, Tāntrika Śāhitya, 135. Dehejia makes extensive reference to the Matottara throughout her study, especially 45–51.
four yoginis.\footnote{This was brought to my attention by Olga Serbaeva, who quotes \textit{Satsahasrasamhitā} 15 from a draft edition of Sanderson. "Yoginis in Saiva Purāṇas and Tantras," 75 (in "Cited Sanskrit Passages") and 56–61 ("appendix 7.6"). This set of sixty-four yoginis is linked to the Eight Mothers—the standard seven of Brāhma to Cāmunda, plus Mahālakṣmī.}

The \textit{Satsahasrasamhitā} survives in manuscripts as early as the twelfth century, apparently, but postdates the \textit{Kubjikāmata} (10th century?), therefore belonging to the period of the major yogini temples.\footnote{On the date of the manuscripts of the \textit{Satsahasrasamhitā}, a text incorporating within itself the \textit{Kubjikāmata}, see J.A. Schoterman, \textit{The Satsahasra Sanhitā. Chapters 1–5: Edited, Translated and Annotated}, 12–13.} Olga Serbaeva tabulates three additional sources for the iconography of the same set of sixty-four yoginis: the \textit{Agni-purāṇa}, \textit{Pratiṣṭhālakṣaṇasamuccaya}, and the \textit{Mayādīpikā}, the latter as cited by Hemādri in the \textit{Caturvargacintāmani}.\footnote{Serbaeva, "Yoginis in Saiva Purāṇas and Tantras," 56–61 ("appendix 7.6").} Although not explicitly connected with temples, these pre-fourteenth-century sources, both Kaula and otherwise, attest a tradition of iconic representation of sixty-four yoginis.

The yogini temple pantheons hence have parallels in contemporaneous textual accounts of the sixty-four yoginis. However, the representation and worship of yoginis in images have earlier precedents. The \textit{BraYa} itself has extensive material on iconography and iconometry in its fourth chapter, which has as its subject “the characteristics of images” (\textit{pratimālakṣaṇa}). This chapter provides detailed instructions on constructing and empowering images of the cult deities of the \textit{BraYa}, whose images it classifies as “supradivine,” “divine,” and “semidivine” (\textit{divyādhikā}, \textit{divya}, and \textit{divyādivya}). The goddesses of the maṇḍala of Kapāliśabhairava are considered “divine”; these include the Six Yoginis, the four \textit{guhyakās/devīs}, four \textit{kinkarīs/dāris}, and Mothers, as well as their male counterparts (\textit{patī, vīra}), the sixty-eight \textit{rudras}, \textit{yogīnīs} of the sacred fields, and “guardians” \textit{lokapālas}.\footnote{\textit{BraYa} iv.4–7ab:}

\begin{quote}
\textit{saktiḥ sādāśītvaḥ caiva sākṣitrayam tu eva ca} | \\
\textit{ṣṛṅkaṇṭhaḥ ca tathā devīt umāpatis tathāpratāḥ} \textasciitilde 4 | \\
\textit{ete divyādhikāḥ prāktāḥ tathā divyam śyām priye} | \\
\textit{yoginiḥ guhyakādyāḥ ca matrīyaḥ tāś ca sakinkarāḥ} \textasciitilde 5 | \\
\textit{guhyakāpyatayaḥ caiva vīrīṣ caiva prati pratī} | \\
\textit{aśeṣaḥṣeṭṭhi tathā rudrā yoginīṣ ca kṣetrasambhūtāḥ} \textasciitilde 6 | \\
\textit{lokapālaḥ tathā caiva ite divyā práktītāḥ} | \\
\textit{4d umāpatis \textasciitilde} \textit{cm.;} umāpati \textit{By}^a \textasciitilde 5a “dhiḥkā” \textit{corr.;} “dhiḥkā By}^a \textit{5d mātrīyaḥ \textasciitilde cm.;} mātrīyaṁ \textit{By}^a \textit{sakikarāḥ} \textit{cm.; sakikaraṁ \textit{By}^a \textasciitilde 6a guhyakāpyatayaḥ \textit{conf.;} guhyakāṁ patayaṁ \textit{By}^a \textasciitilde 6d}
\end{quote}
yoginis bear general comparison to the extant yogini statuary. The names of the primary Six Yoginis alone—Kroṣṭhukī ("Jackal Woman"), Vijayā ("Victoria"), Gajakarna ("Elephant-ears"), Mahāmukhī ("Big-mouth"), Cakravegā ("Wheel-speed"), and Mahānāsā ("Big-snout")—suggest much of the iconographic range of extant images, including theriomorphism, auspiciousness, power, and the grotesque. As with the other "divine" images, all are four-armed kāpālika deities bearing the Five Insignia, skull-staves, skull-bowls, and rosaries, raising a right hand in the gesture of munificence. Garlands of skulls extend to their feet, and they stand upon human corpses. In contrast to the other maṇḍala goddesses, yoginis have only a single face—the norm in sculpted images.318 One contrast with the extant statuary lies in the disporportionate body parts suggested by some yogini names in the BraYā, such as Mahānāsā.
("Big-nose"); animal features are depicted in sculpture, but not, that I am aware of, disproportionate human mouths, ears, and so forth.

Otherwise rich in detail, *BraYā* IV nonetheless leaves many questions unanswered concerning the architectural and ritual contexts of religious images. Their scale suggests grand structures; the iconometric description of "divine" images, which include those of the Six Yogiṇīs, approaches the human: goddesses possess feet twelve *aṅgulas* ("finger-breadths") long,\(^{319}\) hips thirty-four finger-breadths wide,\(^{320}\) and throats five finger-breadths in width,\(^{321}\) for instance—only marginally smaller than the five-faced "supradivine" deities. Yet this chapter is silent on temples, and the material elsewhere in the text clarifies little. The instructions for image making are decidedly oriented toward the *BraYā*'s own esoteric pantheon, hardly a range of deities found in large public temples; yet at the same time, among the "supra-divine" images are deities of no cultic consequence in the *BraYā*—Umāpati and Śrīkaṇṭha. Religious images are clearly a significant concern, but their roles and context require further inquiry. Certainly the presence of the mantra-deities in a substrate is central to ritual: thus the ubiquitous instruction to perform ritual action "before/in the presence of the goddesses" (*devīnām agrataḥ*). Yet this need not, and usually clearly does not, refer to religious images.

**THE PROBLEMS OF RITUAL AND SECTARIAN AFFILIATION**

Much as the architectural and ritual contexts for the religious images the *BraYā* describes remain unclear, so too the cultic context of the yogini temples. Attempts to reconstruct the ways in which yogini temples served as cultic spaces have, given the paucity of textual descriptions, involved reading ritual from iconography. Thus Dehejia, remarking upon the presence of corpses and severed heads in the iconography of some yogini, wonders, "is this all an indication of human sacrifice, or is it in-

\(^{319}\) *BraYā* IV.157abc: pādau dirghena cākhyaśāu kalāh [em.; kalām By"] tu satpramānatah [pāṁśyaḥ [conj.; pāṁśya By"] cāṅgaṣṭakam yāvat.

\(^{320}\) *BraYā* IV.163ab: niṭambas tu tathā praktaḥ [em.; praktaḥ By"] kalāśaptadāsas tathā.

\(^{321}\) *BraYā* IV.168cd: kanṭhas tu protthataḥ praktaḥ [em.; prothataḥ praktaḥ By"] sārdaḥ caiva kālādvayam.
stead a pointer to śava-sādhana or corpse ritual?” Dehejia, Yoginī Cult and Temples, 59. By “śava-sādhana,” a term I have encountered only in late medieval sources, Dehejia refers to rites of the variety sometimes referred to as vetalasādhana; on the latter, see the discussion of the Harṣacarita earlier in this chapter.

323 Ibid., 186.

324 Indian Esoteric Buddhism, 180-1.

325 Ibid., figure 7. This is the very image I include as figure 2.18: one of the nine goddesses upon the exterior facade of the temple, which as mentioned earlier have been identified as nine kātyānyās. The depiction of jackals—emblematic of the cremation ground—on either side of the severed head reinforces the kāpalika rather than sacrificial nature of the iconography.
ing prominence of the yoganī in the religious landscape of medieval India, while burgeoning material on yoganīs in purāṇas suggests worship beyond the narrow confines of the tantric traditions. Dedicated to divinities widely regarded as potent agencies, the yoganī temples need not have been centers for the activity of initiated Kaula specialists, although it is entirely possible that worship of the goddesses was presided over by officiants with links to esoteric Śaivism. Despite their hilltop locations, the yoganī temples appear by and large to have been prominent, visible monuments, as evidenced by their proximity to other major state-sponsored temples—especially those of Khajuraho and Rānīpur-Jharial.326 Along with the increasing significance of yoganīs in the purāṇa corpus, the yoganī temples in fact appear to mark the entry of these deities into a wider religious domain, beyond the confines of the esoteric tradition—to the point that their ritual maṇḍalas are translated into monumental circular temples.

2.5 Conclusions

The foregoing chapter has focused upon the background and early evidence of the Yogini cult in non-tantric literature, inscriptions, and the art-historical record. In the course of presenting this material, I have attempted to establish a chronological framework and to place these varieties of evidence in relation to tantric literature, especially the BṛaYā. In the subsequent chapter the focus shifts to yoganīs in tantric literature proper, prior to undertaking more detailed examination of the BṛaYā in chapters four and five.

It was shown that the cult of yoganīs, as described in tantric literature, presupposes the Śaiva cult of the Seven Mothers (saptamātr), a development that art-historical and epigraphic sources situate in the fifth century, with possible fourth-century precedents. The roots of this heptad of Brahmanical goddesses lie in ancient

326 Hilltop temple sites include those of Mitauli, Rānīpur-Jharial, Bherāghāt, Khujaraho, Dudāhī, and probably Lokhari; on the latter two see Dehejia, Yogini Cult and Temples, 141, 156. The Hirapur temple appears to be neither on a hill nor near other major temples; but as mentioned, it is in the vicinity of the major pilgrimage site of Bhuvanēśvar/Ekāmra.
traditions of maternal deities possessing close ties to the natural world, fertility, and death. Although the Mothers have a close connection with Skanda in early sources such as the Mahābhārata, Śiva largely displaces this deity as companion of the Seven Mothers by the sixth century. Yet as the early fifth-century Gaṅgdhār inscription illustrates, a tantric or proto-tantric cult of Mother goddesses and female spirits might already have been in existence, possibly centered upon the mysterious, kāpālika goddess Cāmunḍā. It is in the context of describing the greatness of Koṭivarsa—a place sacred to the Mothers and presided over by Cāmunḍā, as Bahumāṃsa, and Śiva, as Hetukeśvara—that the old Skandapurāṇa (circa 6th–7th century) provides momentous references to the Śaiva yogini cult and its early scriptural sources, including the BraYā.

The Śaiva temple cult of the Mothers becomes prominent from the sixth century, and the inclusion of Mahākāla in mātr-shrine iconic programs from the late sixth century might reflect developments in Tantric Śaivism, for tantric cults of Mahākāla and the fierce Goddess—identified with Cāmunḍā—find unambiguous attestation in the early seventh-century works of Bāṇa and Vākpati. In these works, evidence for the ritual of the bhairavatantras is abundant, yet there are only vague suggestions of the cult of yoginiśī. The most significant textual account of yoginiśī from this period remains therefore the Skandapurāṇa, which attests the Śaiva cult of yoginiśī and Mothers and provides a list of “Tantras of the Mother-goddesses” (mārṭantra). That a Śaiva Yogini cult of the variety attested in Vidyāpīṭha literature existed by the eighth century receives confirmation in Bhavabhūti’s Mālatīmādhava, a work displaying detailed knowledge of Vidyāpīṭha ritual systems, if not specific texts. On the other hand, the Haravijaya of the early ninth century and Yaśastilaka of the mid-tenth show knowledge of a particular tradition: the Trika.

The sources reviewed attest to the growing prominence of yoginiśī and their cult in the religious landscape of medieval India, especially from the tenth century—the period in which temples of these goddesses were constructed throughout India. Ex-
amination of the Brhatkatha corpus illustrates this historical trajectory, for only in the eleventh-century redactions of Kashmir does the figure of the yogini become a significant locus for tales of magical women and demi-goddesses. This period is largely beyond the scope of the present dissertation, and the subsequent chapters are concerned primarily with pre tenth-century tantric literature. I have nonetheless attempted to show, cursorily, that the yogini temple cult appears to draw upon Kaula traditions of sixty-four yoginis, although iconic representation of yoginis has precedent even in early Vidyapitha literature. By the period of the temples and latter Kaula literature, yoginis appear to have become significant sacred figures beyond the confines of the esoteric traditions, as reflected in the material devoted to them in puranas of the second millennium.
CHAPTER 3

THE CULT OF YOGINIŠS AND ITS BACKGROUND IN EARLY TANTRIC LITERATURE

3.1 INTRODUCTION

Beyond the literary, epigraphic, and sculptural evidence for yoginišs in early medieval India reviewed in the previous chapter, there survives a substantial body of pre eleventh-century tantric Śaiva literature devoted in various degrees to their cult. The bulk of this material remains unpublished; and while fortunately extensive, the extant texts represent only a fraction of what might once have existed. Complementing the textual corpus of the Śaiva yogini cult, there survives another large body of yogini-cult literature as well: the Buddhist scriptural sources that came to be classified as yoganiruttaranatras ("The Ultimate Tantras of the Yoga Class") or yoginītantras ("Tantras of the Yōginīs"), upon which there also survives a considerable quantity of exegetical literature. The present chapter comprises a discussion, far from exhaustive, of the background of the Yōginī cult in early Śaiva and Buddhist textual sources, and a (rather cursory) review of actual tantras of the Yōginī cult. As with the previous chapter, the focus remains upon the early evidence—primarily pre tenth-century—with the BraYā remaining a constant point of reference. Chapters four and five will then focus upon detailed examination of the BraYā itself.

The nondualist Śaiva exegetical and philosophical literature that flourished from the tenth century, particularly in Kashmir, draws on an enormous and diverse corpus of tantric scripture, a canon that must have developed over the course of mul-
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tiple centuries. In his definitive review of the available early evidence, Sanderson concludes, "it is quite possible that by the seventh century most of the literature available to Śaiva scholars in the tenth century was already in existence. But it is not until the beginning of the ninth that we have firm evidence of specific texts."¹ Many of the sources that come into evidence in this period are siddhāntatantras of the cult of Sadāśiva, and have little direct relevance to yoginīs. Exceptional in this regard is the ancient Niśoṣatattvasamhitā, a text which, although not directly concerned with yoginīs, provides clues concerning their roots in earlier forms of Tantric Śaivism. The present chapter begins with review of the Niśoṣa. Subsequently, the discussion turns to varieties of tantric literature highly significant to the development of yogini traditions, but poorly represented in the surviving literature—particularly the vāṃmatantras of the cult of the “Sisters” (bhagini) of Tumburu.

The earliest extant tantras of the Yoganī cult belong to the corpus of bhairavatantras, scriptures centered upon Śiva as the archetypal skull-bearing ascetic (kapālin), Bhairava, as well as allied goddesses. One of the earliest of the bhairavatantras appears to be the Svacchandatantra, which, as will be discussed, attests the cult of yoginīs only in its final chapter—probably a late addition to the scripture. Following discussion of the Svacchandatantra, section three addresses the Śaiva tantras of the Yoganī cult. These belong to two primary categories: those identifying themselves as scriptures of the Vidyāpīṭha, “The Seat of Wisdom-[goddess] Mantras”—a division of the bhairavatantras—and the diverse corpus of Kaula scripture: tantras “Of the [Goddess] Clans.” The earliest attested yoginītantras, including the BraYa, belong to the Vidyāpīṭha, while on the other hand, the bulk of surviving Śaiva literature concerned with yoginīs belongs to various Kaula systems.

¹ “History through Textual Criticism,” 18. Sanderson has compiled a list of the sources cited by circa tenth to eleventh-century Śaiva authors, and also has identified the extant tantric scriptures we can infer, on the basis of datable references or manuscripts, were in circulation in the ninth century. For the texts of which “early Kashmirian authors show that they have direct knowledge,” see ibid., 3–4 (n. 1). This list supercedes those of Navjivan Rastogi, who enumerates the works Abhinavagupta cites in the Tantrālokā, and those Jayaratha refers to in his commentary thereon. Introduction to the Tantrālokā: A Study in Structure, 253–83; cf. 284–85. For Sanderson’s list of the texts probably in circulation in the ninth century, see “History through Textual Criticism,” 4–8 (fns. 2–5).
In the fourth section of this chapter, I attempt to trace the emergence of the Buddhist cult of yoginis. Through analysis of tantras of the Buddhist “Path of Mantras” (mantranayā), it is shown that the Yoginī cult’s development can be linked to the increasing prominence of Mother goddesses and a variety of other female deities and spirits, primarily as reflected in the literature classified as yoga- or mahāyogatantras. In particular, the emergence of a tantric Buddhist cult of yoginīs appears closely tied to the Buddhist “conversion” and transformation of the dākini, a female being figuring as a pernicious and lowly variety of yoginī in Śaiva typologies of goddesses. In Buddhist yogītantras, the term “dākini” becomes entirely synonymous with “yoginī.”

The final section of the chapter takes up an aspect of the complex problem of the relation between Śaiva and Buddhist yoginī traditions. An analysis of parallel passages in the BraYa and the Buddhist Laghuśanvaratantra, first identified by Sanderson, confirms the latter’s findings concerning the Śaiva sources of this Buddhist yogītantra.

### 3.2 THE BACKGROUND OF THE YOGINĪ CULT IN TANTRIC ŚAIVA LITERATURE

#### THE NIŚVASATATTVASAMHITA

Preserved in a Nepalese codex copied most probably in the ninth century,\(^2\) the Niśvasatattvasamhitā has been recognized on strong grounds as being among the earliest surviving texts of Tantric Śaivism, and perhaps the most ancient of all. Although a scripture of the cult of Sadāśiva and subsequently classified as a siddhāntatantra, the

---

\(^2\) Nāk 1-227 (NGMPP reel A41/14). Two apographs of this codex also survive: Nāk 5-2406 (NGMPP reel A159/18), and Wellcome Institute Sanskrit MS 1.33. See Dominic Goodall and Harunaga Isaacson, “Workshop on the Niśvasatattvasamhitā: the Earliest Surviving Śaiva Tantra?,” Newsletter of the NGMCP 3 (Jan–Feb 2007), 4. Sanderson assigns the Niśvasa manuscript to approximately 850–900 C.E.

"The Lakulas: New Evidence of a System Intermediate Between Pāñcarthika Pāśupatism and Agamic Śaivism," Indian Philosophical Annual 24 (2006), 152. Cf. Teun Goudriaan and Sanjukta Gupta, Hindu Tantric and Śākta Literature, 34. Unless otherwise noted, I cite the text of the Niśvasa from transcriptions of the aforementioned manuscripts, as circulated among the participants of the “Workshop on Early Śaivism: the Testimony of the Niśvasatattvasamhitā,” Pondicherry, École francaise d’Extême-Orient, January 2007. Those involved in preparing the transcriptions are mentioned in Goodall and Isaacson, “Workshop on the Niśvasatattvasamhitā,” 5 (n. 4). Note that in speaking of “the Niśvasa,” I exclude from consideration the Niśvasakārikā, which appears to be a late supplement to the Niśvasa-corpus.
Nisvāsa appears in fact to predate Tantric Śaivism’s bifurcation into the Sadāśiva cult of the siddhāntatantras, and the non-Saiddhāntika traditions, of which the cults of Bhairava and related goddesses form the primary division. The religious world of the Nisvāsa is undoubtedly far removed from the Vidyāpītha cults of Bhairava and yoginis, deities of powerful mortuary iconography whose siddhi-oriented worship was often radically antinomian in character. Yet in comparison to the later Saiddhāntika tradition, the gulf between the Nisvāsa and early Vidyāpītha sources appears less pronounced. In particular, the Nisvāsa’s fifth and largest book, the Guhyasūtra (hereafter Nisvasaguhya) contains a wealth of siddhi-oriented ritual presaging themes central to non-Saiddhāntika “magical” traditions. This material appears to afford a window into the formation of characteristic ritual forms of the bhairavatantras, and is hence relevant for inquiry into the roots of the Yogini cult. The following pages examine the Nisvāsa from this perspective, primarily with reference to the BraYā, as representative of the early Vidyāpītha.

The Nisvāsa places little cultic importance upon goddesses. It makes reference to worship of the “Great Goddess” (Mahādevī), yet only in the context of describing non-tantric, lay religious practices (laukikadharma). The goddesses Kāli and Vijayā also find passing mention, but in a context of no cultic consequence. In the domain

---

3 One of the most compelling arguments for the antiquity of the Nisvāsa concerns its considerable continuity with the early, non-Tantric Śaivism of the Atimarga, on which subject see Sanderson’s pioneering study, “The Lakulas: New Evidence.” See also Sanderson, “History through Textual Criticism,” 29–31. Another, related indication of the early date of the Nisvāsa concerns its unique position within the corpus of Saiddhāntika scriptures: although later included in canonical lists of siddhāntatantras, the text shows no awareness of this classificatory category nor of any other division within Tantric Śaivism, and is in numerous ways highly anomalous. Sanderson, ibid., and Goodall and Isaacson, “Workshop on the Nisvasatattvasamhita,” 6. Although the dating of the Nisvāsa corpus remains an open question, Goodall and Isaacson’s preliminary assessment would place “the earlier parts of the text between 450–550 AD.” Ibid.

4 Mukhagama (hereafter Nisvasamukha) 3.103cd–107 describes worship of the Mahādevī (mahadevyas tu pujanam, 103d). Present here is an unmistakable and perhaps comparatively early articulation of the idea of the “Great Goddess,” with Umā, the spouse of Śiva, heading a list of the following names and epithets: Umā, Kātyāyanī, Durgā, Rudrā, Subhadrikā, Kālarātri, Mahāgaurī, Revaṭī, Bhutanayikā, Ṭirīyā, prakṛtirūpa (“She Who Takes the Form of Prakṛti”), and ganiṭam nayika (“Leader of Śiva’s Troops”) (104cd–105). Noteworthy is the identification of the Mahādevī with the prakṛti of Śaṃkhya, and absence of explicit identification with sakti and maya.

5 In Uttarasūtra (hereafter Nisvasottara) 1.34d, Kāli and Vijayā are listed among the interlocutors of tantric literature, alongside various gods, Śiva’s ganas, and sages—as well as Mother goddesses, guhyakas, and other divinities, a number of which seem unlikely to figure in the revelation of a
of ritual, a triad of Śiva’s female “powers” (sakti) almost ubiquitous in later Śaivism does figure: Vāmā, Jyeṣṭhā, and Raudrī.6 Another common set of saktis appears as well: the series of nine beginning with Vāmā and ending with Manonmanī, who here as well as in the later tradition have place in the inner circuit of deities in the maṇḍala of Sadāśiva.7 Present in the Niśťāsā, furthermore, are key elements of the theology of sakti familiar from later sources, such as the cosmogonic role of the supreme Śakti and the function of the “descent of Śiva’s power” (saktipāta) in grace and initiation.8 Besides the aforementioned saktis, goddesses appearing in the Niśťāsā as tantric deities are to a large extent apotheoses of feminine principles, such as Vāgīśvarī, goddess of speech; Suśumnā Devī, the central channel of the yogic body; and tattvas with femi-

---

6 As described in Niśťāsāmūla (hereafter Niśťāsāmūla) 5.3-4, the initiation of the liberation seeker (muktirlakṣa) involves linking/fusing (yojana) the initiate’s soul to tattvas via the saktis Vāmā, Jyeṣṭhā, and Raudrī, although the mantras of the three are not there explicated. Elsewhere in the text, cf., e.g., Niśťāsaguhya 7.260ab (vāmā jyeṣṭhā ca raudrī ca saktitrayam atith param). Remarkably, the well-known triad of jhānasakti, kriyasakti, and icchāsakti seems absent as such. There does occur reference to icchāsakti (Niśťāsaguhya 8.79a), and jhānasakti and kriyasakti find mention as a pair (Niśťāsaguhya 7.260cd, and probably 8.65b), but these are not, it seems, linked as a set of three. This might lend plausibility to Hélène Brunner’s suggestion that the pair jhānasakti and kriyasakti underlies the later groupings of three or more. See “Jnana and Kriya: Relation between Theory and Practice in the Saivagamas,” in Ritual and Speculation in Early Tantrism. Studies in Honor of André Padoux, edited by Teun Goudriaan, 1-7.

7 Describing the basic maṇḍala for “worship of Śiva” (śivarcanavādhi, 2.1b), Niśťāsāmūla enjoins installing the Nine Saktis upon a white lotus (tasyopari sitam padmam navasaktisamanvitam, 2.2cd). This appears in continuity with the later tradition, in which the Nine are installed on a lotus of eight petals, forming the inner layer (dvarana) of the maṇḍala of Sadāśiva; see Goodall, et al., The Pahcavaranastavah of Aghorasivacarya: A Twelfth-century South Indian prescription for the visualization of Sadāśiva and his retinue, figure 4. Note also that Niśťāsaguhya 8.65b refers to “the ninefold sakti pantheon/worship” (navadha saktiṇyagam).

8 On the cosmogonic role of the supreme Sakti, see especially Niśťāsottara 1.5-6, where it is attested the notion that Śiva’s sakti, possessing his power, gives rise to bindu, the material cause of the upper levels of the universe (tasya saktih śiva nityā [ conj. (Diwakar Acharya); śivānirā Cod.] śivatejopabhāh | śivatejena samyukta śaktena śivam bindukah, 1.5cd–6ab). Nayasutra (hereafter Niśťāsanaṇya) connects saktipāta with Śiva’s grace (anugraha) and with initiation, grace’s quintessential expression in Tantric Saivism:

sivasaktinipatena dīkṣāte jñānam prayacchati || 88 ||
so ‘nugrahiḥ śrītra [by eva dātā caiva sadāśivah]

“Through the descent of Śiva’s power, he bestows initiation and the scriptural wisdom. It is this which is known as grace, and its giver is Sadāśiva.”

(The codex, NAK 1-227 (hereafter referred to as A11/t4), is not fully legible here; the bracketed syllables are transmitted by its two apographs.) Note also that in Niśťāsanaṇya 4, the guru (deśikā) whose initiation is efficacious is described as śivasaktypopabhīhitah, “brimming with Śiva’s sakti” (4.41b).
nine gender names, such as *vidyā* and *māyā*. Despite the presence of these goddesses, their roles appear largely ancillary in the *Nīśvāsa*’s ritual systems, and much of the material concerning *saktis* belongs to the *Guhyasūtra*, probably a comparatively late stratum of the text. There alone do we find allusion to a different sort of goddess, the fierce Caṇḍikā: the text gives in passing an otherwise anomalous “caṇḍīmantra” and its application, alluding to a tradition of ritual centered upon this deity—the goddess to whom the “Dravidian” *lāntrika* of Bāṇa’s *Kādambari* professed devotion.

As for the Mother goddesses so central to the development of the Yoginī cult, the *Nīśvāsa* describes them as cult deities only within the sphere of public, lay religion (*lauki̇kādharma*)—not as tantric mantra-deities. Like numerous other Śaiva sources, the *Nīśvāsa* also lists temples of the Mother goddesses among the places appropriate for performing solitary tantric ritual, along with crossroads, jungles, mountain peaks, Śiva temples, and so forth. It appears to be the liminality of the Mother temple—

---

9 The *Nīśvāsamukha*, for instance, twice describes Vāgeśvarī/Vāgesī (i.e. Vāgīśi) as the source (*yoni*) of the *pranava*, viz. 4.94ab and 4.125cd. An intriguing prescription for meditation upon the goddess Suśumna is given in *Nīśvāsa-sūtra* 7.203–208; she is said to be white, with the shape of a lotus stalk, and to “emerge from the body of Śiva” (*padmasūtragri̇tiḥ suklā, 294b; śivakāyād viññhorā, 297b*). As for tattva-goddesses, *Nīśvāsanāya* 3 describes meditation upon the series of tattvas as male and female deities, beginning with the goddess Prakṛti in 3.20. See also *Nīśvāsa-sūtra* 7 (especially 219–252) and 8 (52–57); in the latter section on the subject of *lāttvayojana*, note worship of Māyā (8.52c) and “the goddess Vidyā” (*vidyādhe, 8.53c*).

10 Here I follow the working hypothesis on the stratification of the text put forward by Goodall in a presentation entitled, “The Structure of the *Nīśvāsa*-corpus,” at the “Workshop on Early Saivism: the Testimony of the *Nīśvāsatattvasamhitā*” held in Pondicherry, January 2007.

11 The passage giving the mantra is unfortunately lacunose; *Aśī4* reads, *om caṇḍike krama ... caṇḍīmantra 'yam* (3.25 ab).

12 *Nīśvāsamukha* 2.28 lists the Mothers among cult deities of temples (*prāśāda*), while 3.33–3.4ab refers to devotees of and places sacred to the Mothers and other divinities. Both of these passages occur within the description of *lauki̇kādharma* (*Nīśvāsamukha* 2–3).

13 Viz. *Nīśvāsottara* 2.4c and *Nīśvāsa-sūtra* 6.32. These bear comparison with the lists of suitable locations for *sādhana* provided in later sources, e.g. *Siddhayogēśvarīmata* 6.2–4, or *Brāhman* xviii.18–19, the latter of which, however, omits reference to Mother temples:

\[ \begin{align*}
\text{smasāne ekadēsa va naditīre viśeṣataḥ} \mid \\
\text{parvatādāre samudre va ekāsīne catuṣpathe} \mid 18 \mid \\
\text{nagare grāmamdeva va rājyāyām gopūre tathā} \mid \\
\text{ekārṇāke viseseyā kalpoktaṃ tu samacaret} \mid 19 \mid \\
\text{smasāne} \mid \text{corr.; smasāne Br}^6
\end{align*} \]

“In a cremation ground, (4) a solitary place (7), the bank of a river, particularly, the top of a mountain, the ocean, a solitary linga, a crossroads, a town or village, a road or a town gate, or a solitary tree, in particular, one should practice what is stated in the *kalpa*-text [for propitiation of the mantra].”

Cf. *Brāhman* xiv.11cd–13ab, which adds empty houses, old wells, ant hills, and Mother temples to the list.
presumably a secluded shrine rather than public temple—that makes it suitable for the rituals envisioned, for these do not directly involve worship of Mother goddesses. In the *Nīśāṇa*, there is in fact only limited evidence for the Śaiva appropriation of the Mothers, and this occurs in the context of cosmology rather than ritual. Chapter five of the *Nīśāṇaguhya* lists the Mother goddesses among other lords (*patayah*) of a series of seven *pātālas*, “netherworlds,” together with deities such as *rudras*, *gaṇas*, *nāgas*, *rākṣasas*, *bhaginīs*, and *yogakanyās*.14 None of these are presented as tantric deities proper, that is to say, mantra-deities.

Several of the *Nīśāṇaguhya*’s netherworld divinities warrant discussion. By and large, the cosmological spheres described are populated with male mantra-lords (*mantreśvara*, etc.) and manifold *rudras*. While in later Vidyāpiṭha accounts of the cosmos, goddesses would largely eclipse male deities, in the *Nīśāṇaguhya* the goddesses of the netherworlds are exceptional. In the lowest *pātāla* are present groups of Mothers (*mātrgaṇāḥ*) and Sisters (*bhaginyāḥ*).15 It seems unlikely that these refer to their most famous representatives, the Brahmanical Seven Mothers and the Four Sisters of Tumburu; most probably are intended amorphous bands of minor female deities. Two other sets of Mother goddess find mention: “tawny” (*piṅgala*) Mothers who bear blue lotuses in the third netherworld, while in the fourth preside *kapālamātṛa*, “Skull Mothers.” The latter, who have parallel in the *kapālarudras* of the next higher cosmological sphere, appear to represent a transformation of the Mothers into Śaiva, tantric goddesses, whose *kāpālika* iconography presages the image of the yogini.16

Positioned even higher in the series of netherworlds are *yogakanyās*, “yoga maidens” or “daughters of Yoga,” deities of the sixth and seventh *pātālas*. Here described merely as “possessing great power” (*mahāvīryāḥ*),17 goddesses by this designation

---

14 *Nīśāṇaguhya* 5.1–21.
15 *anye mātrgaṇā rudrā bhaginīṣ ca gaṇaḥ tathā* (5.6cd).
16 See *Nīśāṇaguhya* 5.9ab (*mātārāḥ* *piṅgala* yatra vasanti utpalahastikāḥ), 5.11cd (*kapalāmātāravatra yatra* ... [lacuna]), and 5.14ab (*tathā kapālarudrāḥ ca asaṃkhyeyaḥ pīṇalḥ* sthitāḥ).
17 *yogakanyākās* are mentioned in *Nīśāṇaguhya* 5.15d, in a description of the city Ratnavati of the sixth
are little attested in Śaiva textual sources familiar to me. Yet as powerful, youthful goddesses connected with yoga who transcend the Skull Mothers, these “yoga maidens” might have continuity with the deities later referred to as yogesvaris, “female masters of yoga,” or yoginis. This connection is in fact drawn much later by a Kashmirian, Kṣemarāja, in commenting upon a parallel passage in the Soacchandatantra. Unfortunately, the Niśvāsā provides little material for further exploration of this possibility. Nonetheless, this cosmological system describes a hierarchy of divinities with goddesses suggestive of those later brought within the rubric of the yogini: multiple categories of Mother goddess, the Sisters, and maiden goddesses born from or possessed of yogic powers.

Although the cosmology of the Niśvāsaguhya only faintly suggests developments relevant to the formation of the Yogini cult, its ritual offers more substantive material for comparison. It is rich in siddhi-oriented practices that foreshadow varieties of ritual elaborated upon in the bhairavatantras. Particularly noteworthy are its mortuary (kāpālikas) practices, the use of magical substances (siddhadratvas), and instances of sexual ritual. The kāpālikas rites of the Niśvāsaguhya appear largely magical in orientation, which places them in much closer relation to those of the bhairavatantras than the liberationist kāpālika ritual of the Pāśupatas. This is particularly evident in the Niśvāsaguhya’s prescriptions for preparing magical substances in a skull; in one case the end-product is an ash that would turn the practitioner into a vidyādhara, and in another an eye-ointment that induces invisibility. Similar procedures are common

18 Sīla below, n. 59.

19 Cf. BraYā lv and lxxii; both chapters contain detailed typologies of yoginis, and are edited in the present dissertation. Compare also the list of potentially malevolent deities in Netratantra 2, the female ones among these being “hordes/groups of śaktis and yoginis; the bhagins, rudramātris, etc.; dātis, dāmarikas, and rūpikās” (“śaktisvāgyninīgas bhagīnirudramātrādānmarikādibhiḥ rūpikādhīḥ ...,” 13b-14a). This list hence includes both Mother goddesses and “Sisters,” the latter, according to Kṣemarāja’s commentary, “originating from partial incarnations of [the Seven Mothers,] Brāhmi, etc.” (brahmyāgyamśakotthā bhagīnīḥ).
in the *Bṛaya*, where however more marked use of the ‘impure’ is made.\(^{20}\) Perhaps the most extreme of the kāpālika siddhi-practices taught in the *Niśvasaguhya* is chapter three’s rite of fire sacrifice, performed in the mouth of a corpse, which in structure and aim parallels vētālasādhanā as described in the *Bṛaya* and *Harsacarita*. As in the *Bṛaya*, the rite culminates with the corpse’s tongue emerging, which when severed becomes a magical sword.\(^{21}\) Elsewhere, the *Niśvasaguhya* describes rituals for mag-

---

\(^{20}\) A process for producing invisibility-inducing kohl in a human skull is given in *Niśvasaguhya* 3.81–82. The recipe involves nothing more offensive than ghee. The process in 11.110 utilizes ash:

\[ \text{om yogyādhipa namah} \text{ anena mantrya bhūma gṛhya kapālasam ṭute śhāpya ātav japed yātav tācārattamatiḥ tatas tu tenaḥdūlana vīdāyādhalo bhavati } \ldots \]

\[ \text{“om yogyādhipa namah—taking hold of ashes using this mantra and placing them in the hollow of a skull, one should repeat the mantra until (j) } \ldots (\text{?). Then, when one is dusted with these ashes, he becomes a vīdāyādhalo. ...”} \]

Compare with *Bṛaya* xlix, which taps the powers of considerably less innocuous substances:

\[ \text{kroṣṭukakalpa} \text{ tu pīśitaḥ harītala manacchilām } | \]

\[ \text{rocanāṭa ca mahāmānasam ekākṛtya tu pīṣaṭ} \text{ y } | 8 \]

\[ \text{kapālasampute kṛtyo atmaraṅkena māṇīram} \text{ } | \]

\[ \text{sahāsasrāṭādikām jāpya śrīkṛtya tilakāṁ kuru} \text{ } | 9 \]

\[ \text{bhavate bhūṭale śiddhoh adreṣyoh} \text{ kālavaśinaḥ } | \]

\[ \text{(j) ... (j). ...} \]

The recipe in 11.110 utilizes ash:

\[ \text{om yogadhipa namah—taking hold of ashes using this mantra and placing them in the hollow of a skull, one should repeat the mantra until (j) } \ldots (\text{?). Then, when one is dusted with these ashes, he becomes a vīdāyādhalo. ...”} \]

---

\(^{21}\) Guhyasūtra 3.60cd–64ab:

\[ \text{ekalihge ekavṛksam samāgam vane } | 60 \]

\[ \text{tatra mandalam ṭattvāṅgabhumanum śubham } | \]

\[ \text{aksātaṁ mṛtyakam gṛhya śhāpyāvītośaśākīṭīḥ } | 61 \]

\[ \text{susnāpitaṁ ca liptāṅgāṁ pūpaspargadāsahūṣṭam } | \]

\[ \text{hrādi tasyopavīśṭam tāttena sṛavitaṁ caruṁ } | 62 \]

\[ \text{tasya vaktre tu holidyaṁ sataśaṁsra-m-āyuṭam } | \]

\[ \text{tato jīhved vinīkeśam tām tu māntreṇa cchedayaḥ } | 63 \]

\[ \text{vā jīhved bhavate khadgo guhyate } " \cdot " \cdot " \cdot " | \]

\[ \text{anāhata-gañthi so hi jīved ācārāntātākam } | 64 \]

\[ \text{61a tatra maṇḍalām } \text{ conj. } | \]

\[ \text{61d “viśaśākīṭīḥ” conj. (D. Acharya);} | \]

\[ \text{“śaṅkitaḥ } \text{ A}^{41/14} 62a liptāṅgāṁ } \text{ em.; liptāṅge } \text{ A}^{41/14} 62b pūpaspargadāmā } | \]

\[ \text{Kathmandu apograph; pu - ma” } \text{ A}^{41/14} 64a khado } \text{ em.; khadgā } \text{ A}^{41/14} 64c anāhata” | \]

\[ \text{Kathmandu apograph; - nāhata” } \text{ A}^{41/14} 64d jīved } \text{ Kathmandu apograph;} | \]

\[ \text{ved A}^{41/14} \]

\[ \text{“At a solitary linga, a solitary tree, or in a cremation ground, confluence [of rivers], or forest, one should draw the auspicious maṇḍala which houses the tattva-mantra and its ancillaries. One should take an unmutilated corpse and place it there, without hesitation, one well-washed and with oiled limbs, decorated with flower garlands. Seated upon its chest and using the tattva-mantra, the melted (? sṛavita) food offering (cari) should be given in fire sacrifice [into a fire] in its mouth, one billion times. Then [its] tongue would} \]
ically enlivening a corpse that does one's bidding. Such magic was undoubtedly ancient, described for instance in the *Vasudevahindi*, as mentioned previously.

As for sexual ritual, the *Niśoṭaśaguhya* teaches an *asidhārāvratata* ("the razor’s edge observance") that involves the participation of a beautiful young woman. She is to be skilled in the erotic arts, although one who succumbs to lust in her embrace falls into hell. The description is brief; but it is worth noting that a full chapter of the *BraYā*, its thirty-ninth, is devoted to a rite of the same name almost identical in nature, though spelled out with attention to much more intimate details. Absent

emerge. One should sever this with the mantra. That tongue becomes a sword ... With
unimpeded movement, he lives as long as the moon and stars."

MSS as reported in the transcription of Goodall, et al. (see note 2 above). *śatatsahasrayutam* in 63b appears to mean *śatatsahasrayutam*, "one-hundred thousand ten thousands"—a case of sandhi-breaking -m-as well as metrical lengthening of *āyuta* to *āyuta*, it seems. However, *āyuta* might be a variant orthography; this is what the MSS of the *Siddhayogesvarimatā* read in 13.10a (*[ā]yutastakahomam ca*), as reported by Törzsökö.

22 *Niśoṭaśaguhya* 11.86 describes magically enlivening an unmutillated corpse, which if male becomes a slave whom one may ride as a mount and go anywhere; if female, the corpse becomes like a celestial maiden, with whom one may live ten-thousand years, invisible. The more elaborate rites described in 14.127–29 are performed in a cremation ground, and the enlivened corpse (zetāla) may be dispatched to do a particular task or fetch magical substances or treasure: *tataś cottiṣṭhati brucat ca | bhv vitrapuruśa kim karanitī | sa vaktuṣṭaḥ | īśitaṃ kāṇaṃ dadasveti | tataḥ saroṃ sampādayati | atha tāṇjanaaracanaanavāyāsīdhy aṣaḍhāratraṇānīdhanāṃ va ānayaṃsveti | tatas tat karma kṛtā tatraśa gataḥ nipatati || ("And then [the vetāla] arises and says, 'O heroic man, what shall I do'? He is to be told, 'provide the [following] desired wish'. The he accomplishes everything. Or [one should say], 'fetch ointment, yellow pigment, the *manahśīla* mineral, or herbs, gems, or hidden treasure'. Then, after doing that work, [the corpse] goes there and falls [back] down"). 14.127, excerpt.

23 *Guhyasūtra* 3.38cd–43ab:
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from the Nisvasaguhya, however, is focus upon what in the BraYa are the most potent of potent substances: the guhyāmṛtas or "secret nectars," i.e. sexual fluids. However, besides metal ores, neem oil, and the like, the Nisvasaguhya's ritual occasionally taps the power of conventionally impure substances, such as blood and beef.24

In the Nisvasaguhya, some glimpses may be had of the cult of spirits prominent in later bhairavatantras. In an example from chapter eleven, one who fasts, smears the body with crematory ash, and performs twelve-lakh repetitions of the mantra om anāthāya namaḥ has the darśan of spirits (bhūta), who offer him magical substances (siddhadravya) that induce invisibility.25 Such magical, transactional experiences are greatly elaborated upon in the Yoginī cult, wherein encounter (melāpa) with goddesses becomes one of the central aims of ritual. Also noteworthy is the Nisvasaguhya’s prescription for gaining the aid of a yaksīṇī, a subject to which the BraYa devotes a chapter.26 Further reference is made to achieving power over such

---

Note for instance that Nisvasaguhya 10.87 mentions homa using beef (gomāṃsa), while 14.66 describes smearing an effigy (pratikṣṭi) with blood as part of a rite of subjugation (vaśīkṛtā).24

25 Guhyasūtra 11.64: anena mantrayā śamsānavadānānāṃ svātāṃ nirādhūro dvidāsālaśaṃ suṣeṣṭāṃ bhūtagāndini paśyati [en.; paṣyanti Cod.] | siddhadravyāṇi prayacchanti | tathā siddhadravyair antarhito bhavati | 64 || ("Having bathed in ashes using this mantra, while fasting, one should repeat the mantra twelve-hundred thousand times. He sees groups of spirits; they bestow magical substances. Through those magical substances, he becomes invisible").

26 Nisvasaguhya 10.81-84. This procedure, called yaksīṇīvidhi (yaksīṇīyā eṣa vidhī), involves worship of an image that comes to life when the rite is complete: siddhā sā kim karomTti bharyd me bhavasveta | tayā saha rāmate yāvad acandratārakam ("when accomplished, she [says] 'what shall I do?' 'Be my wife'. He enjoys himself with her for the duration of the moon and stars"). The subsequent verse (10.84) provides
female spirits as the bhūti, pisācīni, and nāgīni, although generally, feminine-gender spirits are little emphasized. Erotic magic is present, such as a rite in the Niśvāṣaguhya wherein one magically transforms a female goat or sheep (ajīd) into a woman who fulfills "all of one's desires."27 Also noteworthy are the numerous references to joining the ranks of the vidyādhāras, suggesting that even at this level of the tradition, magical perfection and the attainment of embodied divinity had emerged as well-defined aims of ritual. In general character, the Niśvāṣaguhya thus suggests the extent to which the ritual of the bhairavatantras and Yogini cult has deep roots in earlier tradition, representing a shift in emphasis rather than something altogether novel.

TANTRAS OF ĐĀKĪNĪS, BHŪTAS, AND THE SISTERS OF TUMBRU

While aspects of the Niśvāṣaguhya afford insight into the cultic background of the bhairavatantras, the gulf between the Niśvāsa corpus and Vidyāpīṭha sources remains considerable. There appear, however, to have been early traditions within Tantric Śaivism possessing closer links with the cult of yoginis, possibly representing phases intermediary between the Niśvāṣaguhya and the Vidyāpīṭha, although the documentation for these is fragmentary. Most historically significant is the cult of the Sisters of Tumburu, the scriptures of which came to be classified as tantras of the vāmasrotas, the "Left Stream" of scriptural revelation spoken by Śaḍāśiva's northern or leftward face, the feminine Vāmadeva. We also find references to an early tantric literature devoted to exorcism, the bhūttatantras, and one concerned with a cult of female spirits called đākinīs.

In the first half of the seventh century, the Buddhist philosopher Dharmakīrti makes critical remarks concerning đākinītantras and bhaginītantras, the latter of which his commentator Karṇaṅkagomin identifies as "tantras of the Four Sisters" (catur-bhaginītantras)—in all probability, Sanderson argues, scriptures of the Śaiva vāmasrotas.

---

27 rāpaṇavi stī bhavati sa sarvakāmā[n] dādāti. The rite is described in Niśvāṣaguhya 14.153.
The dākinītantras Dharmakīrti refers to do not appear to have survived, yet the existence of Śaiva texts by this designation can be confirmed through several additional references. Authors mentioning these texts associate them with parasitic, violent magical practices of the sort ascribed to dākinīs, female beings characterized in Śaiva sources largely as malevolent. While this literature is no longer extant, descriptions of the activities of such beings and similar ritual practices do survive in Vidyāpiṭha sources, and it is possible that the tradition represented by the dākinītantras was in part subsumed into the Yoginī cult of the bhairavatantras.

While not clearly documented until Dharmakīrti’s reference in the early seventh century, magical practices centered upon dākinīs could be considerably older than this; as discussed earlier, such deities are attested in the fifth-century Gaṅghūr inscription, in association with the Mother goddesses. This association is certainly suggestive, for in Vidyāpiṭha scriptures, dākinīs and mātris figure with prominence in typologies of the “clans” (kula, gotra) of goddesses. Nonetheless, it is unclear to what extent Dharmakīrti’s reference to dākinītantras should be taken as evidence for the existence of a cult of yoginīs in the seventh century, for a tradition of ritual centered upon dākinīs does not necessarily presuppose a Yoginī of the variety evidenced by Vidyāpiṭha and Kaula sources. In any case, the dākinītantras undoubtedly have significance for the history of the cult of yoginīs, either representing one of its early forms or comprising one of the independent strands coming together in its formation.

28 Concerning the statements of Dharmakīrti and Kāṇḍakagomin, see Sanderson, “History through Textual Criticism,” 11–12. Sanderson identifies several other references to dākinītantras, including Kṣemarāja’s Netrādyota, ad Netratantra 20.39. Ibid., 12 (n. 10).

29 On dākinīs and their characterization in Śaivism, see chapter 2, n. 46. Cf. Sanderson, ibid., 12 (n. 10). BraYā xci.11–12 associates dākinīs with violent transactional encounters (hathamelāpa), and attainment of the state of being a dākinī with “inverted” (viloma) ritual means. See the edition in the present dissertation. Cf. Tantrasaṅgahatā 16.181–215, which describes the pernicious activities of several varieties of yoginī, such as the adhodisvaradesa and its sub-types; several verses from this passage are quoted by Kṣemarāja ad Netratantra 19.5. One would imagine that dākinītantras taught practices such as pāṭahadīrakāsana, “extraction of the five [bodily] nectars,” said in the Mālatimādhava to be the source of the wicked yoginī Kapalakundalā’s flight. This ritual is described in e.g. BraYā 111.198–207. Regarding such practices in the Imādrathayāvahana, see Sanderson, “Purity and Power among the Brahmans of Kashmir,” 213. The first half of Netratantra 20 contains a description of the yogic means by which yoginīs “liberate” their victims. Cf. Kulāsara 12, which describes the manner by which five varieties of yoginī invade the body; Törzsök discusses the relevant passage in the entry “dikcart” in Tāntrikābhādāna kośa (forthcoming).
Perhaps a contemporary of Dharmakīrti, the Brahmanical author Bhāruci in his commentary on the *Manusmṛti* mentions *bhūtatantras*, a class of tantric literature apparently concerned with exorcism and magic pertaining to “spirits” (*bhūta*). Although little early literature of this variety survives, it was once consequential enough to be classified as one of the five major divisions of Tantric Śaiva scripture, alongside the *siddhāntatantras*, *bhairavatantras*, *vāmatantras*, and *gāruḍatantras*. Unlike *dakini-tantras*, the *bhūtatantras* are unlikely to have concerned yogīṇīs directly; their ritual might however lie in the background of the Vidyāpīṭha’s cremation-ground cult of female spirits. The *Netratantra* in particular, a text Sanderson shows to be of Kashmiri provenance (circa 700–850 C.E.), provides a window into the exorcistic and apotropaic dimensions of the cult of yogīṇīs, which might have had roots in *bhūtatantra* material. In the *Netratantra*, yogīṇīs and their numerous varieties figure primarily as potentially harmful deities—a role that may be viewed in continuity with the early cult of Mother goddesses and the *grahas* of Skanda.

A question of considerable importance to the early history of the Śaiva Yogini cult concerns its relationship to the *vāmatantras*, scriptures of the cult of Tumburu and four goddesses known as “Sisters” (*bhagini*). Dharmakīrti in all probability refers to the *vāmatantras* when he speaks of *bhaginiṅtantras*, “Tantras of the Sisters,” a literature that is in any case demonstrably old. Unfortunately, there appears to survive only one complete *vāmatantra*: the brief *Viṇḍikāhātantra*, published by Teun Goudriaan.

---

30 Sanderson remarks, “[Bhāruci,] who may also belong to the first half of the seventh century, refers to the Bhūtatantras in his commentary on Manu as sources teaching rites for the mastering of Vetalas.” Sanderson also provides canonical lists of *bhūtatantras* from two sources, and identifies the *Kriyākalagūvottara* as an early extant source of this type, surviving in a twelfth-century Nepalese ms and quotations in the *Netroddyota* of Ksemarāja. “History through Textual Criticism,” 13–14. On the inclusion of *bhūtatantras* as one of the streams of Śaiva revelation, see e.g. Jürgen Hanneder, Abhinavagupta’s Philosophy of Revelation: *Mālinīlokavārttika* I, 1–399, 17–19.

31 “Religion and the State: Śaiva Officiants in the Territory of the King’s Brahmanical Chaplain,” 273–94.

32 Cf., e.g., *Netratantra* 20.50–75; this begins with a list of harmful entities including *bhūtas*, *mātras*, and *yogīṇīs*, and outlines means for their appeasement (*prasamana*). Among many other skills, the practitioner capable of averting the dangers they pose should be versed in the rites of the *bhūtatantras* (*bhūtatantravādhu*, 61a). On the cult of Skanda, the Mothers, and *grahas*, see chapter 2, section 2; see also David White, *Kiss of the Yogini*, 35–63.
on the basis of its single extant Nepalese manuscript. Concerning dating, there are other indications that vāmātantras existed in the seventh century, if not earlier. Most compelling is the discovery of loose folios from a Śaiva text in the tradition of the vāmātantras in the Gilgit manuscript horde, copied presumably prior to the eighth century. It seems that Śaṅkara, the famous Vedāntin (fl. c. 800 c.e.), refers to worship of the Four Sisters as well, alongside the Mothers, in his commentary on the Bhagavadgītā. Furthermore, the core pantheon of the vāmātantras features in several chapters of the Buddhist Mañjuśrīmūlakalpa, which includes a narrative of their conversion to the Dharma; portions of this tantra are held to date from the eighth century. Another indication of their antiquity lies in the fact that the BraYā, early as it may itself be, shows clear knowledge of the Śaiva vāmasrotas and mentions several of its scriptures by name, including the extant Viṣṇa (i.e. Viṇāśikha). As Sanderson

33 The Viṇāśikhatantra: a Śaiva Tantra of the Left Current, ed. Teun Goudriaan. This edition is based on the manuscript NAK 1-1076 (NCMPP reel A43/3). Sanderson has, in addition, suggested the possibility that the Śivasūtra, a text mentioned in early lists of vāmātantras, has been redacted into the first of the Śāradatathāgatamāla’s four sūtras. “History through Textual Criticism,” 31–32 (n. 33).

34 An edition of this material is under preparation by Sanderson and Somadeva Vasudeva; I thank the latter for providing this information.

35 Śaṅkara’s comments ad Bhagavadgītā 9.25 have been discussed by R. Nagaswamy, “The Sixty-four Yoginīs and Bhūta Worship as Mentioned by Śaṅkara in his Commentary on the Bhagavadgītā,” Berliner Indologische Studien 9–10 (1996): 237–46. Commenting on 9.25c, bhūtānī yānti bhūtejya (“worshippers of spirits attain to the spirits”), Śaṅkara remarks, according to the Ānandasrama edition, bhūtānī vināyakamātgratacaturbhāgimādānī yānti bhūtejya bhūtanām pūrjākhā; he hence glosses “bhutānī,” with “Ganās,” the group of Mother goddesses, the Four Sisters, etc.” Nagaswamy, puzzled about the identity of the Four Sisters, points out that the variant “caturbhāgimāt” (“the Sixty-four Yoginīs”) is reported for “caturbhāgimāt” in the edition’s apparatus, and is read by the commentator Dhanapatisuri; the ms he consulted in the Sarasvati Mahal Library read “caturbhāgimāt,” however. Ibid., 242–44. Although further examination of the manuscript evidence is warranted, I doubt Nagaswamy is correct in opining that the reference to sixty-four yoginīs is original. As discussed in the previous chapter, the notion of the yoginīs as sixty-four does not seem particularly early, and only becomes prevalent in Kaula sources from around the tenth century.

36 See the discussion of the Mañjuśrīmūlakalpa in section 4 of this chapter.

37 In a list not necessarily of vāmātantras alone, BraYā lxxv.91–93 mentions the Bhairava, Naya (or Bhairavnaya?), Śaṅkra, Mahāsammoha, and Viṣṇa:

satyam etan mahādevi na kathāyam yasya kṣaya cait || 91 ||
bhairave tu naye caiva śaṅkra caiva tu śādhikāhy || 92 ||
mahāsammohavīte ca guhyāntitre sudurlabham || 92 ||
brahmaydmalatantra tu vidyāpītho tu bhāṣītam || 93 ||
kathitam picutantra tu prayojam ida durlabham || 93 ||
92b śaṅkra | cor.; śaṅkra Br°

“This is the truth, O Mahādevi; it must not be told to just anyone. [This] is very difficult to obtain in the Bhairava, Naya, Śaṅkra, (?) ... (?) and the secret Mahāsammoha and Viṣṇa-tantras. But it has been spoken in the Brahmaydmalatantra in the Vidyāpītho; this rare procedure has been taught in the Picutantra.”
shows, there are also indications that texts of the vāmasrotas such as the Viṇāśikha were in circulation in Southeast Asia in the ninth century, along with Saiddhāntika sources such as the Niśvāsa.38

It is possible that the vāmatantras represent the earliest significant tantric Śaiva goddess cult, the pantheon of Tumburu and the Four Sisters presaging the goddess-dominated maṇḍalas of Bhairava in the Vidyāpītha. There are in fact significant iconographic parallels between Tumburu and the Four Sisters and certain forms of Bhairava and the Four Devis in the BraYa.39 In general concerns and character, the rit-

Of these, the Śaṅkra, Mahāsaṅkṣetra, and Viṇa (= Viṇāśikha) are certainly tantras of the vāmasrotas; the former two are listed as such in BraYa xxxviii.77, along with the Nāgottara and Ṭhānacat. See TABLE 4.3. Note in 93d 1da for idam, netri caus. In 93d, guhyatantra could, rather than be an adjective, refer to a specific text—potentially the Niśvāsaguhya.

38 “History through Textual Criticism,” 7–8 (n. 5). See also “The Śaiva Religion among the Khmers (Part I),” 355–57.

39 That the cult of the bhaginis lies in the background of the BraYa is suggested by their position in the latter’s cosmology. BraYa lv describes a hierarchy of clans (kula) of the goddesses in which bhaginis occupy the penultimate position, just below the [Four] Devis of the maṇḍala of the BraYa’s Kapālīsabhairava. See TABLE 4.7b, and verses 11–14 in the critical edition.

In the Buddhist Māṭijñāvatālakalpa, which contains rare and important material on the cult of bhaginis, the iconography of the Four Sisters and Tumburu has unusual maritime elements. The Four Sisters are repeatedly described as mounted on a boat (nauyanasamarudhah) with Tumburu as the helmsman (karṇadāra). Cf., e.g., 47.23–24. The maritime association of the bhaginis finds confirmation in Netranatna 11 as well, which envisions the deities on a boat in the Ocean of Milk (nītānī kyārānvam corvīṇ śaktim aḍāhrīkāṁ śubhāṁ) (sdāntīrtham pravuṇijita sāntyartām sītanīṣājanī, 11.25c–26a). While impossible to determine with certainty, it seems probable that this representation of the Sisters and Tumburu is the source for the iconography of certain forms of Bhairava and the goddesses in the BraYa. Chapter four, a veritable treasury of tantric iconography, describes the eight goddesses of the retinue of Kapālīka—the Four Devis and Four Dutís—in a row (pākta) in a boat, mounted upon human corpses, with Bhairava the helmsman, sporting in the Ocean of Milk. Compare with Mahāmardakaśabhairava in BraYa lxvii—a ardhanāriśvara form of the deity possessing eight arms and four faces, standing upon a corpse in a boat. A similar four-faced, eight-armed Bhairava is mentioned in Netratantra (pahka), and verses 11-14 in the critical edition.

“... a veritable treasury of tantric iconography, describes the eight goddesses of the retinue of Kapālīka—the Four Devis and Four Dutís—in a boat, mounted upon human corpses, with Bhairava the helmsman, sporting in the Ocean of Milk. Compare with Mahāmardakaśabhairava in BraYa lxvii—a ardhanāriśvara form of the deity possessing eight arms and four faces, standing upon a corpse in a boat. A similar four-faced, eight-armed Bhairava is mentioned in lxxvii–29. While Mahāmardaka is worshipped as a solitary deity (ekatīrṇa), chapters lxxxii and lxvii describe Bhairava and the eight maṇḍala goddesses with similar iconography. Cf. BraYa lxxxii.162–66:
ual world of the Viṇāśikha is largely consistent with the Vidyāpīṭha, and the colophon of the Viṇāśikha’s Nepalese manuscript in fact refers to the text as a yāmalatantra. However, despite elements of congruity, it is unclear whether and to what extent a cult of yoginis was present in the vāmatantras. The short Viṇāśikha contains only a single passing reference to yoginis, describing them as deities who would punish those violating the scripture, the initiatory Pledges, or the gurus. And although predating the BraYa, the Viṇāśikha cannot be regarded as one of the earliest of its class of scriptures, for it situates itself as revelation subsequent to fundamental vāmatantras such as the Nayottara and Śaukra. Hence, while the vāmatantras undoubtedly figure prominently in the background of the cult of yoginis, it seems impossible to adequately assess the nature and extent of this role.

But [they] should be meditated upon as mounted in a boat, one should worship them mounted in a boat. Thus the deity [Bhairava] and the goddesses, (i) in their respective order (?), are said to be naked, with four faces, mounted upon human corpses. The Dūtis are said to have lotuses in hand, and to have three faces and six arms. But the Devis the wise siddhāka should know to have eight arms. Through this procedure, they are known to bestow siddhi rapidly. Through worship, supplication, and salutations they grant siddhi, and through the yoga of meditation on their forms, of each one individually, they give liberation.”

In this schema, the Four Devis appear to supplant the Four Sisters, attended upon by four more goddesses—the Dūtis. Accordmg to Goudriaan’s edition, the colophon reads, viṇāśikhaḥ sārdhāsatātrayam yāmalatantram samāptam iti (“thus ends the Viṇāśikha, a yāmalatantra of three-hundred and fifty verses”). The middle section, in particular, concerns rituals for pacification (śaṃtika), nourishing (pausṭika), magical subjugation (vasaṅkarana), attraction (ūkṣaṇa), driving away enemies (uccāṣana), causing enmity (indaṃśa), and slaying (maraṇa), similar in character to those of the BraYa. Some, for instance, involve cremation-ground fire sacrifice using human flesh (mahāmāṃsa); cf. 162, 189-90ab. Sanderson reports that the Jayadrathāyamala classifies vāmatantras as belonging to the Vidyāpīṭha. “History through Textual Criticism,” 31 (n. 33).

40 Viṇāśikha 329cd–21ab:
swaṅgṛhitamantrāḥ ca nastikā vedānindakāḥ || 329 ||
śaṃyebhyah parībhṛṣṭāḥ tathā tatrāvīḍaśakāḥ ||
guruṇāṁ vibhitanaṃites trantarāvīlokapāḥ || 320 ||
yoginibhiḥ sadā bhraṣṭāḥ kathyaṃte dharmalopakāḥ ||

“Those who take up mantras on their own, atheists, critics of the vedas, breakers of the Pledges, desecrators of the tantras, those intent on harming the gurus, and those who violate the essence of the tantras—those who violate Dharma are said ever to be ruined by the yoginis.”

41 Viṇāśikha 4–10. The Nayottara and Śaukra are both mentioned in the BraYa; see above (n. 37).
In a model of the Śaiva canon expounded in BraYā xxxviii and a number of other sources, scriptures of the cult of Bhairava and associated goddesses—those designated "bhairavatantras"—are classified according to four pīṭhas or "mounds:" those of mudrās, maṇḍalas, mantras, and vidyās. However, this classification appears to mask what Sanderson identifies as a more fundamental twofold division between the Mantrapīṭha and Vidyāpīṭha, the pantheons of which consist predominantly of "male" mantra-deities and "female" vidyā-mantras, respectively. Literature of the Vidyāpīṭha, "The Division/Seat of Female Mantras," is thus intrinsically concerned with goddesses, and the Vidyāpīṭha/Mantrapīṭha divide itself appears intended, primarily, for distinguishing bhairavatantras connected with the cult of yoginis from those which are not—a distinction bearing comparison with that between yoga/mahāyoga- and yoginiṭantras in the canon of tantric Buddhist scripture (discussed subsequently). As appears true of the latter division, this might reflect an historical development, with the Vidyāpīṭha yogini traditions developing within a Mantrapīṭha cultic context.

In some respects, the Vidyāpīṭha/Mantrapīṭha division appears contrived: note that the BraYā places the Svacchandatantra at the head of the Vidyāpīṭha as the first of eight tantras named after particular forms of Bhairava. Only four scriptures are assigned to the Mantrapīṭha, none of which appear extant. However, the Svacchanda or Svacchandalalitabhairavatantra is in some sources, including its own colophons in the Nepalese manuscripts, held to belong to the Mantrapīṭha—a scriptural category otherwise poorly represented in the surviving literature, having this text alone as its major early exemplar. The paucity of surviving texts might suggest that

---

47 The BraYā's vision of the Śaiva canon is discussed in chapter 5 of this thesis. The notion of the bhairavatantras being divided according to four pīṭhas is not uncommon; note for instance, in the Svachandatantra, the Goddess's initial question and 13.6cd. Jayadrathayamala I, chapter thirty-six, comprises an exposition on this subject.


45 See table 4.4 in the next chapter.

46 On the Svachandatantra and the Mantrapīṭha, see Sanderson, "History through Textual Criticism,"
the yogini cult of the Vidyāpīṭha corpus largely superceded “Mantrapiṭha” forms of the Bhairava cult, much as the vāmanatantras appear to have lost relevance and gone out of circulation. The kāpālika Vidyāpīṭha itself appears to have been eclipsed by Kaula cults, eventually, the scriptures of which comprise the bulk of surviving non-Saiddhāntika Śaiva literature.

The Svacchandatantra survives in two recensions, one in comparatively polished Sanskrit transmitted in Kashmir, commented upon by Kṣemarāja in the eleventh century and published in the Kashmir Series of Texts and Studies; and another preserved in Nepalese manuscripts. Though these cover most of the same content, the rustic language of the latter in all likelihood reflects the text in an earlier form. Sanderson highlights a number of respects in which this scripture and the cult of Svacchanda-bhairava have distinctive historical significance, representing an early and widely influential tradition in Tantric Śaivism. Although it has not been firmly dated, the Svacchandatantra heads several lists of the non-Saiddhāntika tantras, including the BraYa’s account of the bhairavatantras and the sixty-four tantras of the sādāśivacakra in the Śrīkanṭhīyasamhītā. It bears a close relationship to the ancient Niśvāsatattvasaṁhitā, from which it redacts substantial material, and predates the Tantrasatāttva.
of the (Trika) Vidyāpīṭha. No evidence I am yet aware of firmly establishes its chronology relative to the BraYā—an issue discussed in the subsequent chapter.

In cultic orientation, the mildly kāpālika Svacchandatantra shares much with the siddhāntatantras, and in fact defies or potentially predates distinct divisions between the Saiddhāntika and non-Saiddhāntika traditions; indeed, the scripture had substantial authority in Saiddhāntika circles, evidently. In the Svacchandatantra, the cultic status of the spouse-goddess of Bhairava, Aghoreśī or Bhairavī, is secondary, while goddesses in general have little prominence in its pantheons. The Mother goddesses who feature in the background of the early Yoginī cult have only a marginal presence in the Svacchandatantra. However, Svacchandatantra 10, in describing the cosmological sphere (bhuvana) called Sucāru, describes Śiva (Umāpatī) in a maṇḍala of the Brahmanical Mothers. This appears to be an elaboration upon a brief reference in Niśvasaguhya 5, upon which this section of the Svacchandatantra is based, to a divine city called mātrṇandā, “dear to the Mothers.” One of thirty-four cities (pura) on embriated Meru, the Niśvāsa describes this as the abode of Umāpati, where sport

51 Sanderson, “History through Textual Criticism,” 22–32.
52 The evidence for this includes the existence of a Saiddhāntika tradition of Svacchandatantra exegesis, referred to by Śemaraṅga. Sanderson, “Purity and Power among the Brahmans of Kashmir,” 204. Furthermore, Sanderson shows that the influential Saiddhāntika ritual manual of Bhojadeva, the Siddhāntasāroppadhati, drew upon the Svacchandatantra “extensively and deeply.” “History through Textual Criticism,” 21–22 (n. 26; quote on p. 22); and “The Saiva Religion among the Khmers,” 359–60, 403 (n. 197).
54 Although referred to as prominent attendants of Śiva in the text’s opening (stūyaṁmaṇu maheśānam gauamāryaṁśeṇīm, 1.2cd), the Mothers are otherwise mentioned primarily in passing, in lists of deities. Cf., e.g., Svacchandatantra 10.214cd–15ab:

devagandharvasiddhā ca ṛṣayo 'tha vināyakāḥ || 214 ||
gauamāryaṁśeṇī ca vetālā rākṣasādaśāya ||

55 Niśvasaguhya 5.67cd–68:

elkāḍaśātma lokātāma vīrvarudra umāpatiḥ || 67 ||
mātrṇandā purī rāmyā sarvaratnavicitritā ||
krīdante māturas tatra madhupānavīgāṁśeṇī || 68 ||

Cf. Svacchandatantra 10.140cd–41ab:

paścime dharmarājasya mātrṇandā purī smṛtā || 140 ||
krīdanti māturas tatra madhupānavīgāṁśeṇī
sion, these are recast as a mandala of the Brahmanical Seven Mothers, described in full iconographic detail and apparently joined by an eighth goddess, Mahālakṣmī.\(^{56}\)
The Kashmiri recension of the *Svacchandatantra* provides additional evidence for the incorporation of Mother goddesses: in a description of the Mātrkā, the “alphabetical Matrix,” the eight *vargas* of the Sanskrit alphabet are correlated with the Eight Mothers, a connection absent from the text as transmitted in Nepalese manuscripts;\(^{57}\) no link of this sort is made concerning the *vargas* of the Mātrkā in the *Niśöṣāsa* either,\(^{58}\) although this becomes commonplace in latter times.

The cult of yoginī goddesses registers a clear presence only in the *Svacchandatantra*’s fifteenth and final chapter, although these goddesses are mentioned elsewhere in the text.\(^{59}\) This chapter concerns subject matters characteristic of the Yogi cult: *chommā* (*chummmā/chummakā* in the Kashmiri recension), the verbal and non-linguistic secret codes used for communication between initiates and with yoginīs;

\(^{56}\) *Svacchandatantra* 10.1017cd–30 describes the Seven Mothers in some detail, closing with a remark that suggests the presence of Mahālakṣmī as their eighth and highest member:

\[
\begin{align*}
evam sa bhagavo devo mātrbhiḥ pariśrūtaḥ & \\
āste paramāya laksmyā tatrastho dyotaya jugat & || 1030 ||
\end{align*}
\]

\(^{57}\) This has been pointed out to me by Sanderson (personal communication, January, 2007). See *Svacchandatantra* 1.31cd–37ab in the Kṛṣṇa edition. Mahālakṣmī’s prominence is illustrated in the fact that she presides over the *a-varga* or the vowels, while Cāmuṇḍā merely presides over the sibilants.

\(^{58}\) The first two chapters of the *Niśöṣottara* in particular concern the Mātrkā and its *yoga*. See also *Niśöṣasāra* 1 and *Niśöṣaguhya* 12.

\(^{59}\) In particular, note *Svacchandatantra* 10.116cd–9ab, describing the temple of Śiva as Hāṭakesvara:

\[
\begin{align*}
yadhṛdeha caitre saucaranāṁ pāṭālam pariśrūtaṁ & \\
laṭā vastasy asau devo hāṭakah paramēswaraḥ & || 116 ||
purakotisahasraṁ tu samantā pariśrūtaḥ & \\
siddhāi rudraganair dīvyair bhagināṁ mātrbhīḥ vyṛtaḥ & || 117 ||
yoginīyogakanyāṁ bhrīḥ rudraś caiva saṃkāyaṁ & \\
siddhāyudrayasmānair mantrāī cintāmiṁ rāṣṭrayayāntaiḥ & || 118 ||
siddhāvindyaśamṛddhiṁ u hāṭakeśasya vaṁdiṁ |
\end{align*}
\]

Here yoginīs are mentioned alongside *siddhas*, *rudras*, *bhaginīs*, *mātrīs*, *yogakanyās*, and perhaps *rudrakanyās*, in the entourage of Śiva-Hāṭakesvara. The commentator Kṣemarāja interprets the “yoga maidens” (*yogakanyās*) as a high grade of yoginī (*yoginīya yogena siddhāḥ*, *yogakanyāś tu jītamātrī eva saṃsmṛtirājeyāḥ*, “yoginīs are perfected through [practice of] yoga; but yogakanyās are caused to recall their yoga upon merely being born”). This passage in the *Svacchandatantra* is an elaboration upon *Niśöṣaguhya* 5.16cd–17ab, where the deities mentioned are *rudras*, *vidyās*, and *vidyāśevaras*:

\[
\begin{align*}
saucaranāṁ saptamāṁ jīyaṁ pāṭālam nīgasevitaṁ & \\
yatram cīravati nāma purī rudrasamākulaṁ & || 16 ||
tatrasu hāṭukā devo vidyāśvidyāśevarair vyṛtaḥ |
\end{align*}
\]
and yoginīmelāpa, transactional encounters with the goddesses. The section on melāpa describes a visionary encounter in which the yoginī, it would appear, indicates by gesture the reality level (tattva) corresponding to the supernatural attainment the sādhaka shall by her blessing obtain.60 Otherwise, the yoginī would bestow a food offering (caru), the mere consumption of which transforms the sādhaka into Bhairava.61

Chapter fifteen of the Svachchandatantra is present in both the published Kashmiri recension and in all the old (palm-leaf) manuscripts of the Nepalese-transmitted recension. Nonetheless, one might suspect, as William Arraj suggests, that it belongs to a late stratum of the text.62 The Goddess’s initial questions in chapter 1 do not intimate its subject matter, which appears out of character with the Svachchandatantra as a whole. At least one of the verbal code words does occur elsewhere in the text (giri, "mountain," for sādhaka63); yet by and large, these imply a cultic context distinct from earlier chapters—one that includes ritual coitus, sacrifice, and engagement with a level of impurity otherwise uncharacteristic.64 By all appearances, this chapter would seem to have been appended somewhat awkwardly. If so, the growth of the

60 Svachchandatantra 15.24–32

61 Svachchandatantra 15.36:

satatābhyaṣaya yogena da date carukam svakam |
yāṣya sampṛśanād devi vireṣasādṛṣṭo bhucet || 37 ||

"Due to [his] engaging in constant practice, she bestows her own cam, by the mere consumption of which, O Goddess, he would become equal to [Bhairava,] Lord of the Heroes."

Cl. Kaulajātanānirnaya 23, quoted in section 4 of the previous chapter.


63 The verbal code is given in 15.2c (sādhakas tu girī jīvaḥ). "Giri" occurs in the sense of sādhaka in 5.46c, in the context of enumeration of the Pledges. Arraj also suggests that the compound mṛtasūtra ("sacred thread from a corpse?") in 13.21b is used in the code sense of "ligament" (snāya). This is uncertain, however; the verbal code-word given for snāya is "sātra" alone (15.5d). Since the "thread" of a corpse would itself satisfy the context—kāpalika fire sacrifice—it seems unnecessary to posit a different referent.

64 An exception is Svachchandatantra 13 (referred to in the previous note), on the subject of fire sacrifice. The flesh of a man slain with weapons and mixed with the "three honeys" is among the various impure offering substances listed (ransesāstraghāttapatitam narapīṭham trimadhusāmyutam jhūyāt, 13.24cd).
Svakchandatantra might support the hypothesis that the yogini cult of the Vidyāpīṭha evolved within a “Mantrapīṭha” context—a cult of Bhairava and male mantra-deities, primarily, its kāpālika dimension and ritual engagement with impurity presaging major concerns of the Vidyāpīṭha.

3.3 SCRIPTURES OF THE ŚAIVA YOGINI CULT: THE VIDYĀPĪṬHA AND KAULA

Pre eleventh-century Śaiva scriptures in which the cult of yoginis is prominent appear to be of two basic categories: those of the “Vidyāpīṭha” (“Seat of Female Mantra-deities”) and “Kaula” (“[Tradition] of the [Goddess] Clans”). The distinctions between these are at once significant and problematic—problematic because the Kaula tradition appears, most probably, to have developed within and had substantial continuity with the Vidyāpīṭha, complicating a neat division between the two. Thorough investigation of this important issue is beyond the present study. Most relevant is the fact that the earliest attested literature of the Śaiva Yogini cult, including the BraYa, belongs to the Vidyāpīṭha, while in contrast, the greater portion of the extant Śaiva literature concerned with yoginis belongs to various Kaula traditions.

Four Vidyāpīṭha works of the kāpālika yogini cult appear extant: the BraYa, Siddhayogeśvarīmata, Tantrasadbhāva, and Jayadrathayāmala. Among these, the BraYa and Tantrasadbhāva alone survive in comparatively early and complete forms. The Siddhayogeśvarīmata is preserved only in a short, probably secondary redaction transmitted in Nepalese manuscripts, missing some passages attributed to it in the exegetical literature, while in the form we have it, the Jayadrathayāmala might not predate Abhinavagupta. However, the third book of the Jayadrathayāmala—the Yoganisāṅcārapakaraṇa—appears to have been an early, independent work of the Vidyāpīṭha, for along with the BraYa, Siddhayogeśvarīmata, and Tantrasadbhāva, it is one of the extant Śaiva texts that Sanderson identifies as sources for the Buddhist Laghu-?

---

67 See Sanderson, “Remarks on the Text of the Kubjikāmata,” 2. Sanderson points out that the Jayadrathayāmala is cited by Kṣemarāja, but not apparently by his preceptor Abhinavagupta.
śāṇvaratantra. Of these four, only the *Siddhayogesvarīmata* has been critically edited, in part, while the present dissertation contributes an edition of selections from the *BraYā*.

Although focused upon distinct pantheons, these early Vidyāpīṭha scriptures share much in ritual orientation, exemplifying the yoginī cult in its most radically antinomian and possibly archaic form. The character of the ritual world of the Vidyā-pīṭha has been memorably captured in the words of Sanderson:

Smeared with the ashes of funeral pyres, wearing ornaments of human bone, the initiate would carry in one hand a cranial begging-bowl and in the other a *khatvānga*, a trident-topped staff on which was fixed beneath the prongs a human skull adorned with a banner of blood-stained cloth. Having thus taken on the appearance of the ferocious deities of his cult, he roamed about seeking to call forth these gods and their retinues in apocalyptic visions and thereby to assimilate their superhuman identities and powers. These invocations took place precisely where the unintitiated were in greatest danger of possession: on mountains, in caves, by rivers, in forests, at the feet of isolated trees, in deserted houses, at crossroads, in the jungle temples of the Mother-Goddesses, but above all in the cremation-grounds, the favorite haunts of Bhairava and Kālli and the focus of their macabre and erotic cult. The initiate moved from the domain of male autonomy and responsibility idealised by the Mīmāṃsakas into a visionary world of permeable consciousness dominated by the female and the theriomorphic. Often transvestite in his rites he mapped out a world of ecstatic delirium in which the boundaries between actual women and the hordes of their celestial and protean counterparts, between the outer and the inner, was barely perceptible. Intoxicated with wine, itself the embodiment of these powers, he sought through the incantation of mantras and the offering of mingled menstrual blood and semen, the quintessential impurities, to induce these hordes to reveal themselves. Taming them with an offering of his own blood, he received from them the powers he desired. At the same time he was alert to perceive their incarnation in human women and was provided by the tradition with the criteria by which he might recognize their clan-affinities. For a divinatory rite at the time of his initiation had determined his occult link with one of these clans, in order that by the grace of his clan-sisters, who embodied the clan-goddesses and were his spiritual superiors, he might attain by the most direct route liberating possession by the ferocious cosmic deity who was the controller and emanator of all these forces.69

---

68 The matter of the *Laghuśāṇvarًا source*, as identified by Sanderson in “History through Textual Criticism” (pp. 41–47), is taken up in section 5.
69 Sanderson, “Purity and Power,” 201–2. The annotation to this passage, rich with references to
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As Sanderson portrays, yoginis are central to the ritual world of the Vidyāpiṭha—as goddesses met with in visionary ritual encounters, as the luminous matrix (jāla) of Śiva’s feminine “powers” or śaktis, and as embodied in female practitioners. Recognition of yoginis and transactional encounters with them are among the most characteristic subjects treated in Vidyāpiṭha scriptures. Indeed, the entire edifice of tantric ritual appears oriented within the Vidyāpiṭha toward the aim of yoginīmelāpa, power-bestowing “union” or encounter with the goddesses. In the BraYa, the centrality of encounters with yoginis finds expression in the abundance of references to such as the outcome of ritual. These vary from cursory statements, such as “the goddesses manifest directly,” “he becomes dear to the yoginis,” or “he attains melaka,” to vivid accounts of transactions with the deities. The very material ingredients of ritual are selected for their ability to bring about the goddesses’ proximity. Several passages explicitly describe yoginīmelāpa as the ultimate fruition of tantric ritual in the broadest sense: BraYa Lxxiii specifies ritual discipline (caryā), yoga, and “rites” (kriya)—besides Śiva’s volition—as the causes of melaka, while longer lists of modes of tantric ritual are enumerated in passages in BraYa xcix and Svacchandatantra 15.

Through his communion with yoginis, the sadhaka attains the powers of Bhairava himself.

Vidyāpiṭha literature, is omitted here.

Note expressions such as denvīḥ pratyaṅkṣatāt māyau (“the goddesses would become directly perceptible,” BraYa iv.359b; here the perfect tense, third-person singular, appears optative plural in meaning), yoginīlakṣābha bhūvat (“he would become beloved of the yoginis,” BraYa lxvii.120d), yoginīmelakā bhūvat (“there would transpire melaka with the yoginis,” BraYa lviii.111f), and śeṣānāsāraṇanāyauvā siddhā disyaṇī melakāṁ (BraYa lxxxi.70ab; see the critical edition). Detailed accounts of the encounters envisioned with goddesses are numerous, and will be discussed in a future publication on yoginīmelāpa.

In particular, ‘impure’ incenses (dhūpa) and mixtures offered in fire sacrifice are described as devīsānāidhyakāraka or -kāraṇa, “cause of the goddesses’ proximity” (sānāidhyasaṁkara, “proximity”). Cf., e.g., lxvii.118 (kaṇṭhañcāntaskāraṇ ca hārattālamanahciśīla [i.e. manahśīla] | gugguliṃ ghratasamuktaṃ dhūpaṃ sānāidhyakārakaṃ). In lxxvii.126cd, 159ab, and 232a, particular mudrās are similarly described as sānāidhyakārikā.

See BraYa xcix.2–4 in the critical edition in part 11. In Svacchandatantra 15, the description of yoginīmelaka concludes with remarks suggesting it is the fruition of total accomplishment in tantric ritual—from worship (pūjā) and fire sacrifice (homa) to mantra incantation (japa) and meditation (dhyāna). See verses 32cd–38.

Cf., e.g., BraYa lviii.108:

saraṇādāvavyān mahādevi vatsāra+sāraṇīvaṇat
prāptamelāpako bhūtāvā kriḍate bhairavo yathā || 108

“After one year of observances, O Mahādevi, he, being one who has obtained melāpa [with
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Subsequent chapters offer a more detailed view of the Vidyāpīṭha through the lens of the BraYa—a demonstrably early and well-preserved scripture of this category. In the critical edition of part II are presented editions and translations of select chapters of the text, including materially focused upon charateristic aspects of the cult of yoginīs.

The distinction between Kaula and Vidyāpīṭha levels of the tantric Śaiva tradition was posited by Sanderson, whose exposition of two decades’ past remains the only significant contribution on this issue.\(^7^4\) Seeing the roots of “Kaulism” in the Vidyāpiṭha or “Kula” cult of yoginīs,\(^7^5\) he identifies multiple levels of distinction. In the

\(^7^4\) Sanderson, “Śaivism and the Tantric Traditions,” 679-90.

\(^7^5\) For the term “Kaulism,” see ibid., 679. What Sanderson describes there as the Kaula-Vidyāpīṭha dichotomy, he spoke of in an earlier article as one between the Kaula and “Kula,” rather than Vidyāpīṭha:

The distinction between Kula and Kaula traditions ... is best taken to refer to the clan-structured tradition of the cremation-grounds seen in the Brahmayamala-Picumata, Jayadrathayamala, Tantrasadbhava, Siddhayogesvarinata, etc. (with its Kāpālika kaulika vidhayah) on the one hand and on the other its reformation and domestication through the banning of mortuary and all sect-identifying signs (vyaktalihgata), generally associated with Macchanda/Matsyendra.

Sanderson, “Purity and Power among the Brahmins of Kashmir,” 214 (n. 110). The distinction between “Kula” and “Kaula” is found in primary sources; the Kaulajñānānirṇaya, for instance, contrasts “Kula” and “Kaula” scriptures, though in some cases using the former in a broad sense that includes the latter. Cf., e.g., Kaulajñānānirṇaya 9.9ab, ete pūrvahāsīdiddhah kulakaulavatāraṇāh (“these are the great Perfected ones of yore, revealers of the Kula and Kaula [scriptures]”); for kulāgana in its broader sense, note, e.g., Kaulajñānānirṇaya 17.5ab, klīṣyanti manuṣī jñāṇītām ajañātvā tu kulāganaṃ (“Having failed to learn the Kula scripture, human beings suffer grievously”).

Significantly, the final chapter of the BraYa provides a solitary reference to “Kula scriptures” (kula-jñānānī), which comprise or at least include Vidyāpīṭha texts:

\[\begin{array}{l}
\text{ṣaṃmāsībhyaantarād devi kulasāṃkhṛatāṃ vṛtjet} || 16 ||
\text{aśeṣyoginīniḥah kulaśvijñānasampadāḥ} ||
\text{bhavatā sādhuśnrendras tu bhairaveśa itvīparaḥ} || 17 ||
\text{kulaśvijñānānī yavantā aśeṣaṁkṛtojñānānī tu} ||
\text{vṛtta sarvābhi devesī dadāti ca tādattinān} || 18 ||
\end{array}\]

16c sat\(^a\) [ corr; ṣat\(^b\) By\(^a\) 17a “nāthah” [ corr; “nāthah By\(^a\) 17e bhavate ] em.; bhavatet By\(^a\) “After an interval of six months, O goddess, one would attain equality with the Clans [of goddesses]. Master of all yoginis, endowed with the scriptural wisdom of the Clans (kulaśvijñāna), he becomes an Indra among sādhus, like another Lord Bhairava. He knows all the Clan scriptures (kulaśvijñāna)—as many as exist in the entire universe—and he gives [these] to their seekers, O Queen of the gods.”

In the subsequent chapter I show that this section of the BraYa is likely to belong to a late stratum of the text. Nowhere else does this vast work mention or describe itself as a “Kula scripture”—a designation which in fact seems alien to early Vidyāpīṭha sources themselves.
domain of ritual, the Kaula tradition attenuated the mortuary or kāpālika dimension of
the Vidyāpīṭha, shifting the primary locus of ritual from the cremation ground to the
body and consciousness itself. This shift involved internalization and simplification of
ritual processes, increasingly interiorized conceptions of divine agencies, disavowal
of the outer trappings of the kāpālika ascetic, emphasis on ecstatic experience in erotic
ritual, and development of comparatively sophisticated systems of yoga. The Kaula
tradition hence transforms the Vidyāpīṭha emphasis on the potency of ‘impure’ ritual
substances, the cult of spirits, and visionary, transactional encounters with deities,
although these dimensions persist to some degree. In addition, on the social level the
Kaula opened up new possibilities for the engagement of practitioners maintaining
conventional social identities and kinship relations.

The figure and cult of the yoginī retain considerable significance in Kaula scrip-
tural sources—the corpus of texts which designate themselves, frequently, as Kaula
āgamas, sāstras, or jñānas. A notable shift lies in increasing emphasis upon internal-
ized, yogic conceptions of the presence and manifestation of the saktis. Nonetheless,
decidedly exoteric conceptions of yoginīs persist; indeed, Kaula conceptions of
yoginīs appear to inform the temple cult of the sixty-four goddesses and purānic
accounts of yoginīs from the early second millennium, as discussed in chapter two.
By way of illustrating Kaula conceptions of yoginīs, I shall focus presently upon
their roles in the Kaulajñānanirnaya (“The Definitive Judgment on Kaula Scriptural
Wisdom”). The choice is admittedly arbitrary, for no single text is “typical” or repre-
sentative of this large corpus. Preserved in two Nepalese manuscripts, the oldest
of which belongs to the mid eleventh-century, the Kaulajñānanirnaya describes it-

---

76 Note, for instance, that the Mālinītejāyottaratantra of the Kaula Trika describes yoginīmelaka as either
an external encounter with goddesses, who assemble to bestow power upon the sādhaka, or as the
manifestation of yoginīs within the yogic body. See Mālinītejāyottaratantra 19, especially 18cd–27ab.

77 The Kaulajñānanirnaya was published in 1934 by Prabodh Candra Bagchi, in Kaulajñānanirnaya and
Some Minor Texts of the School of Matsyendranātha. His edition is based upon a single eleventh-century
manuscript from the collection of the erstwhile Darbar Library in Kathmandu: ‘Mahakaulajñānanirnaya’,
NAG 3-362 (NGMPP reel A48/13). This manuscript has been described by Haraprasād Sāstrī in the
Bagchi, Kaulajñānanirnaya and Some Minor Texts, 1. Although undated, its writing bears to my eye a
strong affinity to a Nepalese Svacchandātantra manuscript dated to 1068/9 C.E.: NAG 1-224 (NGMPP reel
self as the Yoginīkauła, "Kaula scripture of the Yoginīs."78 Revealed by Matsyendra at the mythic "Moon Island" (candradvīpa), the text also associates itself with the sacred site (piṭṭha) of Kāmarūpa or Kāmakhyā, in modern Assam; indeed, the powers of the yoginīs of Kāmakhyā are attributed to the Kaulajñānanirṇaya.79 As with many Kaula scriptures, its constellation of divinities features "perfected ones" (siddhi) and lineages of past gurus—figures of little cultic status in early Vidyāpiṭha texts.80 Its primary pantheon of mantra-deities is however the krama ("sequence") or cakra ("circle") of sixty-four yoginīs explicated in chapter eight.

Although the Kaulajñānanirṇaya lacks an exposition on the typical Vidyāpiṭha topic of chomma, "secret signs" used for communication with yoginīs, it contains abundant yoginī material, including a vivid exposition on their "movement/manifes-

---

78 See the introduction of this thesis, section 1.
79 The Kaulajñānanirṇaya's chapter colophons connect the scripture with Matsyendra and Candradvīpa, an association explicated in the revelation narrative of chapter sixteen. The connection with Kāmarūpa/Kāmakhyā is made in verses 22.10c and 12c, while 22.12 mentions both Candradvīpa as well Kāmakhyā:

kāmarūpe imāṁ sāśtram yoginīnāṁ grhe grhe || 10 ||
nigrāhānugrahaḥ caiva siddhāmelāpaḥ tathā ||
kurvaṇi satatam devī aṣṭa jñāna-prasādātāḥ || 11 ||
candradvīpe mahākāstram avaṭīraṁ salocane ||
kāmakhyārye ghyate nāthe mahāmatsyodarasthitam || 12 ||


"In Kāmarūpa, this scripture is present in the home of every yoginī. By its grace do they ever [have power to] punish and favor, and [grant] siddhi [bestowing?] encounters (melāpa). The Great Scripture was brought down at Moon Island, O woman of fair eyes. It is [then?] proclaimed in Kāmakhyā, O Mistress—[the scripture that was previously] located in the belly of the great fish."

80 Yoginīs, siddhas, and gurus form a trinity of sacred figures in the Kaulajñānanirṇaya, being mentioned together numerous times. Cf., e.g., 18.4cd (pārṣṭre tu pūjyaṇaḥ siddha[n] yogínīn gurum eva ca; singular for plural?). In some ways the siddhas, "perfected ones," appear to function as male counterparts of the yoginīs. Note for instance that the "secondary sacred mounds" (upapīṭha) are said to be "places of the goddesses and siddhas" (devinām siddha-dvalam, 8.20d); see also 11.32, quoted below. Chapter nine expounds the "series" (pākṣi) of siddhas, gurus, and yoginīs; this include an enumeration of several "past great siddhas," who are described as "revealers of the Kula and Kaula [scriptures]" (kulaKauḷavattātraṭeṣiḥ, 9b). This role of revealing scriptural teachings is one shared with yoginīs; see, for instance, my discussion of the term sampradāya in the annotation on BraYā lxxvii.74.
tation” (yoginīsaṅcāra) on the earth in various guises. In this text, characteristic Vidyāpītha classifications of yoginīs based on clans of the Mother goddesses lose significance; instead, chapter eight presents an expanded taxonomy of manifestations of divine women encompassing both ritual consorts (śakti) and goddesses. Consorts are threefold—sahajā, kulajā, and antyajā—manifesting in both external and internal forms (bahisthā and dehasthā). Externally, the “innate” (sahajā) consort is one’s wife, while the internal “innate” consort traverses the body, producing intoxication and bliss. The external “clan-born” (kulajā) consort is a courtesan, her internal counterpart being the Sanskrit alphabet. Finally, the “outcaste woman” (antyajā) exists internally as the great shining śakti called Vyomamālī. Absent from the BraYā and Siddhayogesvarīmata, such internalized conceptions of ritual consorts do have precedent in the Tantrasadbhāva, a subsequent Vidyāpītha scripture. The Kaula-

81 Passages from Kaulajñānanirnaya 23 have been quoted and discussed in chapter 2, section 4.

82 Kaulajñānanirnaya 8.6–12a:

| 6c mahādevi [KINd]; mahādevi KINod 7b sa [em]; sa KINod 7d antyajā [KINd]; antyajā KINod 8c gāmāgama [KINod]; gāmāgama KINod 9d “kūṭāmīkā” [KINod]; “kūṭāmīkām KINod 10c antyajām [em]; antyajā KINodKINd sampravakṣyāṃi [KINodKINd]; sampravakṣyāṃi KINodKINd 11d yathāsthitaṃ [KINd]; yathāsthitaṃ [KINod]; yathā viyathā sthitum KINd; KINod; 11c “sāmā suddhā [KINd]; “sāmā suddhā (unmetrical) KINd 12d mahāsaktī [corr]; mahāsaktī KINodKINd 12a manātmāna [conj]; mahātmāna KINodKINd

Text provisionally edited from the oldest codex (NAK 3/362; reported as KINod), taking into account the editio princeps of P. C. Bagchi (KINod). Here and in the other passages quoted below from Kaulajñānanirnaya 8, translation and discussion of the interpretation are deferred; a new edition and translation of the text is under preparation by the present author.

83 Tantrasadbhāva 15.125cd–148 posits internal or “spiritual” (adhyātmitā) homologues for a taxonomy of consorts, encompassing a variety of cosmic and internal manifestations of the śakti. The context of the chapter is “observance of the vidyā-mantra” (vidyātātra). In this schema, consorts (duti) are ninefold, on the basis of kinship or caste:

mātā duḥtā bhaginī sahajā ca tahtāntyajā 127 rajākā cārmakārī ca mātangi cāngrajñātmikā |
jñānanirnaya’s schema features several varieties of yoginī: kṣetrajā (“born in sacred fields”) and pīṭhajā (“born in sacred mounds”), whose powers are rooted in the sacred places they arise from;\textsuperscript{84} yogajā (“born from yoga”) and mantrajā (“born from mantra-[propitiation]”), attained to divinity by dint of mastery of yoga and mantra, respectively;\textsuperscript{85} sahaļā (“innate, natural”) Mother goddesses, apparently born from the

Characteristic of this material is its privileging of the internal, but not in manner that precludes actual performance of rites with a partner. Tantrasadbhava 15.25cd–26ab, 144:

dūthiṁ na siddhyantī taṁ nāthiṁ saṁśāreyat \| 125 ||
sabhyābhyantaraṁ sā tu jñāṇavāy ākṣāṁcayate ||

... aṁjñāanti dehaṁṇā śaktiṁ bāḥyaśilāṃgatāṁ priye ||
ācaraṁ ca ye maṇḍaḥ paścāṁ te durātmanāṁ || 144 ||
125 dūṁ triḥ || duḥ m ss 144b bāḥyā' || cor.; bāḥyā m ss

“Without consorts, they do not obtain siddhi; therefore one should resort to a consort. She should be known as both external and internal in the lineage (anvaya) of the Clans. . . .

“And without understanding the feminine power (śakti) arising in the body, my dear, those fools who resort to a ‘feminine power’ in an external place are wicked-natured, bound souls.”

\textsuperscript{84} Kaulajñānanirnaya 8.16–17, 19cd–22:

pāṭijñāntaṁ mahādevyam kṣetrajāṁ tu cāyasthitāṁ ||
karaṇaṁ mahākālaṁ deviṁ yatanāṁ || 16 ||
vārṇaṁyāṁ praṇāgam tu caritraṁkāmakaṁ tathā ||
atthahsaṁ jayantī ca ebhīḥ kṣetraṁ ca kṣetrajāṁ|

\textsuperscript{85} Kaulajñānanirnaya 8.24:

yogābhyāśena ye siddhā mantrāṇam ārādhanaṁ tu ||
yogena yogajā maṁ taṁ mantrāṇaṁ kṣetrajāṁ priye || 24 ||

mantrajāḥ || cor.; mantrajā Kṛṣṇa\textsuperscript{ed} Karnāḍa
wombs of women who consume empowered caru in ritual, and the Sixty-Four goddesses comprising the core pantheon of the Kaulajñānanirṇaya, whose mantras are inflected forms of the eight syllables of its vidyā-mantra.

Gaining visionary encounters with yoginis and assuming their powers remains a significant aim of ritual practice in the Kaulajñānanirṇaya, alongside this text’s more characteristic emphasis on attaining bodily immortality. Yogic practices take on far greater importance than in the BraYā and Siddhayogesvarīmata, sources which place comparable emphasis on e.g. worship of the deities (yōga) and fire sacrifice (homa). Thus while the BraYā devotes a chapter to the “secret nectars” (guhyāmṛta)—‘impure’ liquids, especially sexual fluids and menstrual discharge—the Kaulajñānanirṇaya is more concerned with internal, yogic nectars. Nonetheless, the Vidyāpīṭha concern with impure substances registers a continued presence, especially in Kaulajñānanirṇaya 11, a chapter devoted to “nondual” ritual cuisine (caru). Perhaps the most

86 Kaulajñānanirṇaya 8.25–26:

sahājā mātrārdeva rūruyuddhe mahābālàh
bhakṣiṣṭaṁ tu caraṁ divyaṁ saptaśaṁmāntikaṁ paśuṁ || 25 ||
teṣaṁ garbhe prasūtānāṁ nirāśaprāśītāṁ ca
garbhe jātana devaśi garbhā jānantī अत्मनाः || 26 ||
25a devaḥ | em.; devā KṛṇedKṛṇa 25b rūruyuddhe | Kṛṇed;
26d garbhe | conj.; garbha Kṛṇed; garbham Kṛṇed

87 Kaulajñānanirṇaya 8.31–33:

aṣṭādha tu liked vidyāṁ prathamāśaṭakahādhitam |
yathā ekam tatāṁ sārve jñātāḥ yogyākramam || 31 ||
aṣṭaṣṭakavidhānena catuḥśasti yathākramam |
yogināmelakam cakraṁ animadgusaṭākam || 32 ||
bhacaty eca na sansālaḥ dhūmānapījātatraśa ca |
31a vidyāṁ | em.; vidyā KṛṇedKṛṇa 31c ekam | Kṛṇed; etat Kṛṇed 32a aṣṭa- 
32d aṣṭaṣṭakavidhānena | Kṛṇed; aṣṭaṣṭakavidhānena Kṛṇed; 
32d a- 
avimādi' | Kṛṇed; animādi' Kṛṇed 33a eva | Kṛṇed; evam Kṛṇed

88 References to attaining the “state/status” (pada) of or “equality” (sāmānyā) with yoginis occur throughout the text. Additionally, several references are made to “union/encounter” (melaka) with the goddesses; see for instance Kaulajñānanirṇaya 11.7cd–10, quoted later in this chapter (n. 165).

89 Both BraYā xxii and xxiv have the title guhyāmṛtapatala (“Chapter on the Secret Nectars”) provided in their colophons; the former, however, is concerned with such fluids only in its final section. The imagery of fluids is prominent in the yogic visualizations of the Kaulajñānanirṇaya. Note, for instance, the yoga of the short fifth chapter, having “conquest of death” (mrtyujñaya) as its aim, while chapter fourteen speaks of churning nectar from a cakra of goddesses through yoga, effecting immortality (devo bhūtvā ca yogīnā mātrācakravāsāyogayāḥ | liyante khecāro akre kshabhyet paramānāṃ || amṛtēṇa vinā devi ararattvaṁ kathāṁ priye, 14.93–94ab).

90 See especially Kaulajñānanirṇaya 11.32:
dramatic shift is the occlusion of the cremation ground and mortuary ritual—a significant departure, considering the pronounced mortuary and exorcistic dimensions of the Vidyāpīṭha.91

The prominence of the cult of yoginīs in the Kaulajñānanirnaya appears unexceptional in the Kaula scriptural corpus. Such is true, for instance, of the Kubjikā texts of the “Western” Kaula (paścimāmnāya), some examples from which were cited in connection to temples of the yoginīs in chapter two. More comprehensive analysis of the relevant sources—as yet poorly surveyed and largely unpublished—is unfortunately beyond the present study, although eminently worthwhile.

3.4 YOGINĪS IN EARLY BUDDHIST TANTRIC LITERATURE

Parallel to the Śaiva tantras of the Vidyāpīṭha and Kaula emerged a corpus of Tantric Buddhist scripture devoted to a cult of yoginīs, deities whose significance the tradition makes explicit by classifying this literature, according to one of the most common schemas, as yoginītantras: “Tantras of the Yoginīs.”92 This corpus of scripture and its exegetical traditions represent the last major wave of Buddhist literary production in India, and the liturgies, deities, and meditational systems of the yoginītantras dominate the latter centuries of Indian Buddhism—the form in which the religion was transmitted to Tibet. Much as the literature of the Śaiva yoginī cult is marked by a shift from Sadāśiva to Bhairava as supreme deity, the maṇḍalas of the Buddhist

---

91Although apparently optional, skulls do retain a place in ritual: after listing a number of alternatives, chapter twelve describes the “Skull of Visvāmitra” (i.e. a brahmin) as the best of ritual vessels (jpatra; Kaulajñānanirnaya 12.13).

yoginītantras center not upon Mahāvairocana, supreme Buddha of the earlier yoga-
tantras, but upon divinities of the “vajra family” (kula) presided over by the Buddha
Akṣobhya. The iconography of these deities is frequently kāpālikā, while their man-
dalas attest increasing emphasis on goddesses, including consorts of the Buddhas. It
is within the scriptures and practice systems centered upon Akṣobhya’s subsidiary
deities, especially erotic, kāpālikā Buddhas such as Cakrācāḷavara, that a Buddhist cult
of yoginīs comes into evidence—modelled in significant ways, Sanderson argues, on
that of contemporaneous Śaivism.93

A distinctive aspect of the Buddhist yoginī cult is terminological: while in Śaiva
and earlier Buddhist literature the term ḍākini generally describes a vile, often vampi-
ric variety of female being, the Buddhist yoginītantras by and large treat this word
as a synonym of “yoginī.” This elevation of the ḍākini is consonant with Buddhist
precedents for “conversion” and incorporation of hostile deities, noteworthy exam-
ples of which include the early tradition’s assimilation of yaksas and yaksīs, and the
Mother goddess Hāritī. Within tantric Buddhist literature, transformations in con-
ceptions of ḍākini and related female deities, especially the Seven Mothers, appear
to provide key indicators for the emergence of a Buddhist cult of yoginīs. Not a
specialist in this material, in the following pages I nonetheless attempt a provisional
mapping of aspects of this process, limited by my reliance upon the scholarship of
others and lack of competence in Tibetan and Chinese.

Significant uncertainties surround the chronology of Buddhist tantric literature,
though attenuated by the assistance Chinese and Tibetan sources offer in dating spe-
cific works. Of particular value, we know the periods of early learned authors such as
Buddhaguhya and Vilāsavajra, active in the mid and late eighth century, respectively,
who quote or comment upon tantric scriptural sources; for extant, datable Śaiva com-
mentaries, we must on the other hand wait until the tenth century, although Sadyo-

93 Sanderson, “Vajrayāna: Origin and Function,” passim. Some of the textual evidence for his thesis
is discussed in the subsequent section.
jyotis probably lived considerably earlier.94 As is well known, proto-tantric Buddhist literature of the variety later classified as kriyātantras survives from the early centuries of the common era, often only in Chinese translation. Concerned largely with accomplishing worldly aims, this literature contains much that is characteristic of later tantric ritual, yet without articulating mantra-practice within a Mahāyāna soteriological framework.95 Evidence for a developed tantric literature and eye-witness reports concerning the prevalence of tantric Buddhist traditions in India emerge only in the middle or latter half of the seventh century.96

No cult of yoginīs is yet evident in the Mahāvairocanābhisambodhisūtra, one of the few extant Buddhist texts of the transitional variety classified as caryātantras, similar in many respects to the subsequent yogatantras but appearing to lack a developed soteriological vision of tantric ritual.97 Composed, according to Stephen Hodge, around 640 C.E. or somewhat earlier, this survives only in Chinese and Tibetan translations.98

Prominent in the mandala of the supreme Buddha Mahāvairocana, as delineated in

---

94 On the dating of Buddhaguhya, see Stephen Hodge, The Mahāvairocana-abhisambodhi Tantra with Buddhaguhya's Commentary, "Introduction," 22–23. Concerning Vilasavajra, I follow Ronald Davidson, "The Litany of Names of Mañjuśrī: Text and Translation of the Mañjuśrīśūlamānasangīti," 6–7. Although almost certainly a pre tenth-century author, little concerning the dating of the prolific, influential, and perhaps quite early Śaivasiddhanta exegete Sadyojyotis can be said with certainty. He was known to Somananda (early tenth-century), and his commentary on the Śū Umaḥaśirasūtrasamgraha appears to be paraphrased in the Haravijaya (circa 830 C.E.), while in his critique of the Advaitavedānta, he displays no awareness of the Vivartavāda or "illusionism" associated with Śaṅkara (fl. c. 800 C.E.? ) that came to dominate this school. On this and other issues pertaining to the dating of Sadyojyotis, see Alex Watson, The Self's Awareness of Itself: Bhaṭṭa Ramakāntaka's Arguments Against the Buddhist Doctrine of No-self, 111–14. Watson's conclusion is that "a seventh or early eighth century date is more likely than a late eighth or early ninth." Ibid., 114.

95 Hodge provides a valuable account of the chronology of the Chinese translations of early tantric literature. Mahā-vairocana-abhisambodhi Tantra, "Introduction," 5–8. The Buddhist kriyātantras in all likelihood drew upon ancient and perhaps nonsectarian magical traditions, such as the vidyā practices discussed in the previous chapter in the section on the Vasudevahindi.

96 Hodge points out that a Chinese traveller, Xuan-zang, gives no indication that tantric traditions were prevalent in India in the period up to 645 C.E. On the other hand, there are first-hand reports concerning tantric practices and scripture from the latter half of the century. Ibid., 9–11.

97 See Tribe, "Mantranaya/Vajrayāna," 207–10. Hodge, offering a different assessment of the soteriological dimension of the Mahāvairocanasūtra, considers this text "likely to have been one of the first, if not actually the first fully developed tantra to be compiled, that has survived in some form to the present day." Mahā-vairocana-abhisambodhi Tantra, "Introduction," 29 (quotation), 33–39. In my discussion of this text, I rely entirely upon Hodge's English translation from the Chinese and Tibetan.

98 Concerning the dating, see Hodge, ibid., 14–17. Translated into Chinese in 724 C.E., it appears that a copy of the Mahāvairocanasūtra was among the manuscripts collected by Wu-xing in India at some point during the eight years prior to his death in 674.
the second chapter, are goddesses such as Tārā. More significant to the present study are references to the Mother goddesses: in the same maṇḍala appear “wrathful Mothers” headed by the goddess Kālarātrī, who form the retinue of Yama, lord of Death and guardian of the southern direction. This set is elsewhere identified as Kālarātrī, Raudrī, Brahmī, Kaumārī, Vaišṇavī, Cāmunḍā, and Kauberī—an unusual heptad of Mother goddesses. That they are tantric divinities, however minor, is evidenced by occurrence within the maṇḍala and their invocation by mantra. Kālarātrī and seven unspecified Mothers also figure in the entourage of Śākyamuni, while elsewhere Mothers are included in an enumeration of potentially dangerous spirits. Chapter six links them to mantras for causing illness, bridging the goddesses’ roots in the mythology of Skanda’s grahas with tantric “magical” practices. Furthermore, as do the Nīvāsaṅgaṇī and a variety of other tantric sources, the Mahāvairocanasūtra lists Mother shrines—as well as temples of Śiva—among the places appropriate for performing solitary sādhanā, but without cultic emphasis on these deities.

Besides Mother goddesses, the Mahāvairocanasūtra contains several references to dākinīs and female divinities such as the yaksīṇī, while the text’s “supplement tantra” (uttaratantra) describes rites for bringing the latter and female denizens of the

---

99 Mahāvairocanasūtra 11.50 mentions “wrathful Mothers” in the retinue of Yama; these deities are named in xiii.89. Even without consulting the Tibetan or Chinese, I would assume that “wrathful Mothers” translates the Sanskrit rudramātarah. That this refers specifically to the Seven Mothers is suggested by Kṣemarāja’s explanation of the term as it occurs in Netratantra 2.13c (he glosses rudramātarah with brahmyadyas—“Brahml, etc.”). The present heptad is unusual insofar as Cāmunḍā’s preeminent position is usurped by Kālarātrī, who appears to be identified with Yāmī, the female counterpart of Yama. The identification of Yāmī with Kālarātrī is suggested in the Chinese translation of 1.19; see Hodge’s note thereon (p. 63). Yāmī and Vārāhī alternate in textual accounts of the Seven Mothers, while sculpted sets appear as a rule to depict Vārāhī; see chapter 2, n. 9. Also unusual is that Kauberī replaces Indraṇī/Aindri in the present heptad.

100 Note also their association with a series of drawn insignia (mudrā), as with the other maṇḍala deities (xiii.89). While Kālarātrī is invoked with her own mantra, the others are paid reverence with the generic namah samantabuddhanām mātṛkhyām svāhā (iv.11).

101 See Mahāvairocanasūtra iv.11.

102 Mahāvairocanasūtra xvii.13; also mentioned are, e.g., piśācas and rākṣasas.

103 Cf. vi.15: “Then, for example, the Asuras manifest illusions with mantras. Or, for example, there are [mundane] mantras which counteract poison and fevers. Or else there are the mantras with which the Mothers send sickness upon people...”.

104 Lists of suitable locations are present in v.9 and vi.30. In Mahāvairocanasūtra, Uttaratantra iii.2, Mother shrines are listed among the places appropriate for fire sacrifice having as its goal “subduing” (Sanskrit voṣṭhrana, presumably).
netherworlds under one's power.105 While in yogini tantras of the subsequent period ṅākinīs would become prominent deities, identical with yoginīs, the Mahāvairocanasūtra groups them with minor, potentially pernicious beings such as the rākṣasas, yakṣa, and piśāca. This appears consistent with early non-Buddhist conceptions of the ṅākinī. No evidence for the figure of the yoginī is present, although the vocative-case epithets yogini and yogesvari appear in a mantra; the deity is not named.106 In the Mahāvairocanasūtra we hence find evidence for interest in some of the divinities prominent in the cult of yoginīs, particularly a limited appropriation of the Mothers as tantric deities. This accords with roughly contemporaneous sculptural evidence for Buddhist interest in these goddesses, for a shrine of the Mothers is present in the Buddhist cave temple complex at Aurangabad.107

The Mañjuśrīmūlakalpa attests a similar, yet broader range of female deities and spirits. Classified within the tradition as a kriyātantra, a portion of this heterogeneous text has been shown to herald from the middle of the eighth century, the period in which some sections appear in Chinese translation.108 In its opening chapter, the Mañjuśrīmūlakalpa enumerates a vast pantheon of divine, semi-divine, and human beings who assemble to hear the Dharma, among whom are an array of female divinities that include pūtaṇās, bhagins, ṅākinīs, rāpiṇīs, yakṣinīs, and ākāśamātrīs, "Sky Mothers."109 This list is highly suggestive of the range of female divinities described in literature of the yoginī cult. Although they are not prominent in the ritual of this text, the Mañjuśrīmūlakalpa, like the Mahāvairocanasūtra, positions the Seven Mothers

105 A short series of mantras for minor divinities and spirits such as rākṣasas, ṅākinīs, and asuras is provided in iv.16, while mudrās and mantras for a larger series, including ṅākinīs, are listed in xi.98–99. A list of dangerous beings in the uttaratantra includes both ṅākinīs and what Hodge translates as "witches" (iv.1). As described in iii.9 of the uttaratantra, through fire sacrifice one may "draw to himself yakṣinīs and likewise girls of the subterranean realm with the male and female assistants."

106 Xv. 10; the mantra for the "Mudrā of Upholding the Bhagavat's Yoga" is given as namāḥ samantabuddhānām mahāyogayoginī yogesvari khāṇjalika svāhā.

107 See the discussion of post Gupta-era Mother temples in chapter 2 of this dissertation.


109 Each of these beings is said to have ordinary and "great" (mahā-) varieties, and many of the latter are listed by name; the "Great [Sky] Mothers" include the standard Seven augmented by Yāmā, Vāruṇi, Pūtaṇā, and others, with retinues of innumerable nameless Mothers. Mañjuśrīmūlakalpa 1, vol. 1, p. 20–21 (Trivandrum Sanskrit Series edition).
in the retinue of Yama among the non-Buddhist deities in the outer layers of the maṇḍala.¹¹⁰ The effort to give them a Buddhist identity is suggested by the addition of “Vajracāmūṇḍi” to their ranks.¹¹¹ In general, however, the depiction of the Mothers is more consonant with the ancient cult of Skanda’s countless grahas, with whom their connection is made explicit.¹¹² As for dākinīs, their characterization is entirely that of pernicious, possessing female spirits, against whom one requires mantras for protection; no indications are present of the positive associations and prominence assigned to them in yoganītantras. One vidyā-mantra, for instance, is said to have the power to conjure a yakṣīṇī, or else to destroy dākinīs.¹¹³ Of additional interest in this tantra is its incorporation, as tantric deities, of Tumburu and the Four Sisters—Jayā, Vijayā, Ajitā, Aparājītā—the core pantheon of the early yet largely lost Śaiva vāmatantras. Chapters forty-seven to forty-nine are devoted to practices connected with these deities, and include the tale of their conversion to Buddhism.¹¹⁴

Further developments towards a cult of yoginīs are evident in the Sarvatathā-gatattvaṃṣa-graṇha, among the earliest extant scriptures classified as yogatantras and representative of a developed Buddhist soteriological vision of tantric ritual. Its composition had apparently commenced by the last quarter of the seventh century, while

---

¹¹⁰ The Seven Mothers (precise identities unspecified) occupy a position in the southeastern direction, adjacent to Yama in the south, and are also among the deities around the perimeter of that layer of the maṇḍala; their company includes major brahmanical gods, gana-lords such as Mahakāla, sages, Tumburu and the Four Sisters, the Planets, and so forth. Manjūṣrīmālākāla 2, vol. 1, p. 44-45.

¹¹¹ Manjūṣrīmālākāla 45 provides mudrās connected to and named after the Mothers, and includes both Cāmūṇḍi (45.228cd–229ab) and Vajracāmūṇḍi (45.228cd–229ab). Vol. 2, p. 510.

¹¹² Most of the Manjūṣrīmālākāla’s copious references to the Mothers point toward their identity as dangerous female spirits, and only rarely the seven brahmanical goddesses. The Mothers are mentioned among the spirits by whom one may become possessed, alongside beings such as the piśāca and dākinī; see for example Manjūṣrīmālākāla 3, vol. 1, p. 53, and chapter 9, vol. 1, p. 82. Cf., e.g., 22.229, in a vivid description of the activities of Mother goddesses (verse numbers here and elsewhere as per the reprint edited by P. L. Vaidya; vol. 1, p. 249 in the tss edition). “The Mothers of Skanda” (skandamatr) are mentioned in 22.24b (tss edition vol. 1, p. 233)—a chapter rich in its accounts of beings fabulous and dangerous.

¹¹³ Manjūṣrīmālākāla 2.4–5, vol. 1, p. 30. Among the many other references to dākinīs, note for instance a curious rite to remove the breasts and genitalia of proud, wicked dākinīs and women. Used on a man, it removes the penis and facial hair, and causes breasts to appear. Chapter 52, vol. 3, p. 563–64.

¹¹⁴ The vidyā-mantras of these deities are first given in 2.15–17, where they are said to be “attendants of the Bodhisattva” (bodhisattvaṃcarikā[ī], 2.16b). Vol. 1, p. 32. Manjūṣrīmālākāla 47 presents a brief narrative of their taking refuge in the Dharma, after which begin instructions on their worship.
the text as we have it was translated into Chinese in 753.\textsuperscript{115} Although the Tattva-
sangraha thus does not necessarily postdate the Mañjuśrīmūlakalpa, it takes the “con-
version” of goddesses considerably further, and its range of female deities even more
clearly intimates that of the yogini\textit{tantras}. Here, for instance, we find reference to
Mother goddesses classified under the categories antarikṣacāri (“aethereal”), khecari
(“aerial”), bhūcāri (“terrestrial”), and pātālavāsini (“denizens of the netherworlds”—
closely related to categories applied in later classifications of yoginīs. Along with a
host of other erstwhile hostile deities, headed by Śiva, Vaiḍrayāni confers upon them
tantric initiation and initiatory names; thus Játhāhāriṇī becomes Vajrāmekhālā, Mārāṇī
becomes Vajravilayā, Kauberī becomes Vajravīkātā, and Cāmunḍā becomes Vajraṅāli,
to name one from each respective class.\textsuperscript{116} The latter kāpālika goddess is once ad-
dressed as Vajradiākini.\textsuperscript{117} Leaving behind their identities as grahas of Skanda or as
maternal, brahmanical goddesses, the Mothers here take on identities as goddesses
of the “Adamantine Vehicle,” the Vajrayāna.

In the Tattvasamgraha, we are presented with perhaps the earliest narrative of the
conversion and accommodation of dākinīs. Charged with quelling wicked beings,
Vaiḍrayāni utters the “Heart Mantra for Drawing Down All Dākinīs and other Wicked
Possessing Spirits,” upon which the dākinīs and other grahas assemble in a circle and
supplicate. Undoubtedly concerned by the dietary restrictions their new allegiance
will entail, they beseech, “we eat meat; hence order [us] how [this matter] should
be understood.”\textsuperscript{118} Advised by Vajrasattva, the supreme Buddha, the compassionate

\textsuperscript{115} Elements of this text were introduced in China by an Indian, Vajrabodhi, who would have learnt
the teachings around 700 C.E.; Amogha\v{u}jra translated the text in 753. See the discussion of Hodge,
\textit{Mahā-vairocana-abhisambodhi Tantra}, ”Introduction,” 11–12.
\textsuperscript{116} Tattvasamgraha 6, p. 173 (lines 3–21). I cite the text from the edition of Isshi Yamada: \textit{Sarvantathāgata-tattva-saṅgraha. A critical edition based on a Sanskrit manuscript and Chinese and Tibetan translations}
(New Delhi: Śatapīṭha Series, vol. 262, 1981). On the classification of yoginīs into aerial, terrestrial,
and so forth, cf., e.g., the Saiva \textit{Kulasara}, as discussed in the entry ‘dikcarī, etc.’ by Judit Törzsök, in
\textsuperscript{117} Tattvasamgraha 14, pp. 306–7 (lines 10–14, 1–4); Cāmunḍā/Vajraṅāli is also addressed as e.g. kapalā-
nābāmālaṅkārī (“adorned with a garland of skulls”) and vajrakāṭaṅgadālāṅkārī (“bearer of a vajra and skull-
staff”).
\textsuperscript{118} Tattvasamgraha 6, p. 180–81 (lines 8–17, 1–3):

\begin{verbatim}
atha vaijraśādarmabhīsattvah punar api sarvadosādikāyālidādrgrahāhākārṣaṇahādayam abhāṣat
| Oṁ VAIJRAKARŚÁVARŚŚVARADVUSTAGRAHĀN VAJRAĐHARASATYENA HUM JAHI ||
\end{verbatim}
Vajrapāni provides appropriate means, saying thus: "through this mudrā, you may extract hearts from all living beings and eat them." The episode, a conversion story of sorts, suggests growing concern with the figure of the dākini, and perhaps also the entry of mantra techniques associated with them into the battery of those available to practitioners. An early eighth-century Chinese commentary on the Mahāvairocanaśūtra provides a closely related narrative, wherein the association of dākinīs and their practices with Śiva and Śaivism is made explicit. While this signals a process of providing Buddhist identities to dākinīs and connected practices—presumably

Concerning vairamanya, see its lexical entry in Edgerton, Buddhist-Hybrid Sanskrit Grammar and Dictionary, vol. 2.
similar in nature to those described in the lost Śaiva đākīnitāntras referred to by Dharmakīrti—there is as yet little indication in the Tatvavesāmagraha of their transformation into the wild and ambivalent, yet supremely powerful and potentially beneficent sky-wanderers of the yoginītantras.

A scripture composed perhaps in the latter half of the eighth century, the Guhyasamājatantra evidences a marked increase in engagement with the erotic and the impure, intimating developments carried even further in the yoginītantras. Its ritual has a significant kāpālikika dimension and incorporates both coitus and ingestion of impure substances, while erotic imagery distinguishes the iconography of its deities.121 Focused upon the Buddha Akṣobhya, patriarch of the vajra-clan deities, the transitional status of this and closely related literature is reflected in its classification, frequently, as neither yoga- nor yoginī-, but mahāyogatantras.122 In chapter seventeen of the Guhyasamāja occurs an important early reference to vajradākinīs—transformations of these hostile beings into wielders of the vajra sceptre, marking their entry into the Vajrayāna pantheon. Vajrapāṇi discloses a series of initiatory pledges (samaya) connected with specific deities, among whom are female beings: yakṣinīs, queens of the snake women (bhujagendrarājñī), asura maidens, rākṣasīs, and vajradākinīs.123 The “Pledge of All Adamantine Đākinīs” binds one ever to the consumption of urine, feces, blood, and alcohol, and to magical slaying;124 this suggests as yet little fundamental trans-

---

121 On the dating of the Guhyasamāja, I follow Isaacson, who cites the discussion of Yūkei Matsunaga, The Guhyasamaja Tantra, “Introduction,” xxiii–xxvi; this edition has not been available to me. Isaacson points out that the iconography of the Guhyasamāja is not yet kāpālikika, although erotic. “Tantric Buddhism in India (from c. AD 800 to c. AD 1200)” (unpublished lecture transcript, Hamburg 1997), 4.


123 Guhyasamāja xvi, p. 130 (Gaekwad Oriental Series no. 53, Benoytosh Bhattacharya, ed.).

124 Guhyasamāja xvi, p. 130:

\[\text{atha vajrapāṇiḥ sarvatathāgataḥ dipatiḥ sarva-vajradākinīśamayaṁ svakāya-vākṣīvān vajra-bhyo nisāryām āsā} | \]

\[\text{vijñānārūpadhīraṁ bhakṣed maḍayāṁ ca pīvet sādā} | \]

\[\text{vajradākinīyogena māraṇaṁ padalakṣamanīḥ} | \]

\[\text{sabhatvāvaitaṁ sambhātā vicaṁanti tiradhātuke} | \]

\[\text{ācacet samayaṁ kṛṣṇaṁ sarvāsattvāhiliśiniṁ} | \]

\[\text{sarvatradhātukasamayasyasamsaraṁ nāma samādhiḥ} | \]

“Next, Vajrapāṇi, lord of all Buddhas, sent forth from the vajras of his body, speech, and mind the Pledge of All Vajra-đākinīs:
formation in conceptions of dākinīs, despite their conversion.

Some evidence points toward the emergence of actual yoginītantras material in the eighth century, separated little in time from the yogatantras. Amoghavajra wrote a description of the Sarvabuddhasamāyogaḍākinījālaśānvara, probably the earliest of this genre, after his return to China in 746 c.e. But this transitional text, referred to in some scholarship as a “proto-yoginītāntra,” was only retrospectively grouped with the yoginītāntras corpus; it seems likely that most of the yoginītāntras literature dates to the ninth century and beyond. David Gray, however, suggests that the late eighth-century commentator Vilāsavajra quotes one verse and paraphrases another from the Laghucaṅkraśāṅvaratantras or Herukabhīdāna, probably the earliest and most authoritative scripture in the cycle of yoginītantras focused upon Cakrasamvara. While this is not implausible, the evidence awaits publication; Vilāsavajra does not apparently name the source for the verses in question.127 This issue is of considerable importance, not only for the history of Tantric Buddhism, but because the terminus ante quem of the BraYā might depend upon the dating of the Laghuśānvara, as discussed subsequently.

The Buddhist yoginītantras and their exegetical literature constitute a vast corpus,

‘One should always eat urine, feces, and blood, and drink wine and so forth.
One should slay through the vajradakimīyoga, through padalaksanaih. Arisen by their very nature, they [dakinīs?] roam the triple universe (?). One should observe this pledge wholly, desiring the good of all beings’.

‘[Then Vajrapāni entered?] the meditative trance called ‘The Assembly of the Entire Triple Universe’.

Aspects of this seem puzzling; vajradakimīyoga might refer to the invasive yogic processes by which dākinīs prey upon victims. See the discussion of the Mālatimālākha in chapter 2. padalaksanaih suggests no plausible interpretation to me, while the interpretation of the next verse-quarter is unclear as well. Candrakirti, commenting on this verse, glosses vajradakimīyogena with “the yoga of Gaurya, etc.” (gauryadiyogena). His remarks on padalaksanaih are unfortunately corrupt, but include clear reference to the parasitic practices of dākins (padalaksanaih duṣṭānām udāparakālīḥ ṛṣyāpastayogaiḥ mārṣyayet, “One should slay with padalaksanaih, i.e. the application of … extraction of blood from the wicked”). Pradīpodyotana, p. 206.


126 English, Vajrayogini, 5.

127 Gray, “Eating the Heart,” 54 (n. 38). He refers to his forthcoming study and translation of the Laghusamvara for a detailed discussion, remarking that most of the Laghusamvara quotations Ronald Davidson had identified in Vilāsavajra’s work come, in fact, from the Sarvabuddhasamāyogadakimījālā-
much of which survives only in Tibetan translation and relatively little of which has been published, in cases where the Sanskrit original is preserved. Among the most important yogini tantras are the Laghuśaṃvara and Śrīveśvara dākinījālasaṃvara (i.e. the Hevajra tantra), texts considered foundational to the systems of practice and cycles of scripture focused upon the Buddhas Cakraśaṃvara and Hevajra, respectively. Other important texts of this genre include, for instance, the Caṇḍamahāraṣṇatantra and Kṛṣṇayamāritantra—although the latter is technically considered a mahāyogatantra\textsuperscript{128}—texts teaching the cults of their namesake Buddhas. While the dating of the major yogini tantras is problematic, they undoubtedly belong to the period prior to the Laghuśaṃvara and its important commentary, the Vimalaprabhā, which date between 1025 and circa 1040 C.E., as John Newman shows convincingly.\textsuperscript{129} Perhaps one of the earliest of all, the Laghuśaṃvara might have existed in the latter eighth century, as Gray suggests, while its earliest commentator, Jayabhada, probably wrote in the mid-ninth century.\textsuperscript{130}

The cult of yoginis thoroughly permeates the literature and ritual of the Cakraśaṃvara tradition. By way of illustration, I shall take the Laghuśaṃvara as an example of the content of the yogini tantras, for this happens to be a text with a significant relationship with the BraYā—a relationship addressed in the subsequent section. In the Laghuśaṃvara, the cult deities comprise a kāpālika Buddha, Cakraśaṃvara or Heruka, and his sow-faced consort, Vajravārāhi or Vajrayogini, who preside over a maṇḍala primarily of twenty-four goddesses referred to as dākinīs, vajra dākinīs, or dālis ("consorts").\textsuperscript{131} While the maṇḍala dākinīs have male counterparts in the twenty-four "heroes" (vīra), the latter have only secondary significance.\textsuperscript{132} The Laghuśaṃvara’s dākinīs are fully representative of the yogini typology described in chapter

\textsuperscript{128} Isaacson, personal communication (May, 2007).
\textsuperscript{130} David Gray presents evidence suggesting that Jayabhada, the third abbot of Vikramaśila, was active in the mid-ninth century. “Eating the Heart,” 62 (n. 65).
\textsuperscript{131} The primary maṇḍala is described in chapter 2 of the Laghuśaṃvara, while the twenty-four dākinīs are listed in chapter 4.
\textsuperscript{132} Mentioned first in 2.19cd, the vīras are not named until chapter forty-eight.
of this thesis, combining in their kapālikā, theriomorphic iconography images of power and eroticism. They “pervade the universe,” a wild horde with names such as Khagāṇāna (“Bird-face”), Surābhakṣī (“Drunken”), Cakravegā (“Wheel-speed”), Vāyuvegā (“Wind-speed”), Mahābalā (“Mighty”), Mahānāsā (“Big-nose”), and Cāndākṣī (“Grim-eyes”). All but the first two of these names are held in common with goddesses mentioned in the BraYā, indicative of the shared Śaiva-Buddhist image of the yoginī or dākinī.\(^{134}\)

As goddesses of the clan of Vajrayoginī/Vajravārāhī, the Laghuśaṁvara’s twenty-four maṇḍala dākinīs represent a single class from a broad spectrum of female beings with which the cult is concerned—deities whose principle varieties are the yoginī, dākinī, rāpiṇī, lāmā, and khaṇḍarohā.\(^{135}\) Collectively, they comprise the “web” or “matrix” (jāla) of dākinīs that pervades the universe. This has its reflection in the “great maṇḍala” of deities (mahācakra) described in chapter forty-eight, the “abode of all dākinīs” (sarva-adākinīyālaya); based upon the “heart mantra of all yoginīs,” this incorporates goddesses of the five classes together with the twenty-four male “heroes.” The whole constitutes the “Assembly of the Matrix of Dākinīs” (dākinījālasaṁvara),\(^{136}\) and the supreme Buddha himself, Vajrasattva—the highest Bliss—“consists of all dākinīs.”\(^{137}\) The nature of the goddesses’ manifestation and movement (saṁcāra) on the earth forms a central focus, reflected in the several chapters the Laghuśaṁvara devotes to typologies of the clans (kula) of goddesses: chapters sixteen to nineteen, and twenty-three. While in the yogatantras deities were organized according to clans

\(^{133}\) Laghuśaṁvara 4.1ab, ... dākinīṣe bhuvānāni vijñīnabhañjanti. Cf. 41.16ab, caturvīṁśatidākinīyā vyāptam trailokyaṁ saacāravam.

\(^{134}\) The names of the twenty-four are given in Laghuśaṁvara 4.1-4. While Khagāṇāna has no precise counterpart in the BraYā, for avian imagery, note Lohatuṇḍī, “Iron-beak.” Surābhakṣī too does not figure in the BraYā; however, the principal Six Yoginīs are said to be fond of alcohol (nādirāsavapriya nityam yoginyah sa ṣat prakāritah, 111.15ab).

\(^{135}\) Lists of the five goddess classes occur in e.g. 13.3 and 14.2. Additional subcategories of dākinīs are described in chapters 16-19 and 23. The twenty-four maṇḍala dākinīs are said to belong to the vārāhīkula in 2.18cd (dākinīs ca [caturvīṁśat] vārāhīkulaṁ kulasambhavāḥ).

\(^{136}\) The description of the sarva-adākinīyālaya (“abode of all dākinīs”) begins in 48.8, and is based upon the pantheon of the hrdaya mantra stated in 48.3. The “great cakra” is described as the dākinījālasaṁvara in 49.16 (pārvaśekena viḍhūnena yajjād dākinījālasaṁvaram | mahācakrama sarva-siddhiyālayaṁ iṣṭaḥ; here I read as per the Baroda codex, f. 35v).

\(^{137}\) Laghuśaṁvara 1.3ab: sarva-dākinīmayaṁ sattvau vajrasattvah paraṁ sukham.
(kula) of the five Buddhas of the Vajradhātu maṇḍala, the Laghuśaṃcara and similar systems introduce new, matriarchal deity clans, much as Śaiva yoginīs were classified according to clans and subclans of the Seven Mothers. The Laghuśaṃcara devotes several chapters to the subject of chomma as well, the secret verbal and nonverbal codes for communication between practitioners and the deities, or between initiates mutually.\(^{138}\) Sacred geography forms a concern as well, a mapping of the powerful places where the goddesses are said to manifest.\(^{139}\)

As with the Śaiva Vidyāpītha, the yoginī cult of the Laghuśaṃcara is thoroughly kāpālika in character,\(^{140}\) and this text’s rites of fire sacrifice utilize a battery of meats and other things impure, largely with aggressive magical aims.\(^{141}\) Prominent among the goals of ritual is attainment of encounters with dākinīs; to the heroic sādhaka, they may bestow the power of flight and freedom from old age and death.\(^{142}\) Enabled by the dākinīs, the sādhaka comes to traverse the entire world as their master.\(^{143}\) Significant attention is devoted, furthermore, to rites of bodily transformation, a domain of magic characteristic of the shapeshifting, theriomorphic yoginī.\(^{144}\)

---

\(^{138}\) Chapters on chomma include Laghuśaṃcara 15 (single-syllable chommās), 20 (communication through pointing at parts of the body), 21 (similar gestures plus their correct responses), 22 (gestures made only with the fingers), and 24 (single-syllable and other verbal codes).

\(^{139}\) Lists of pithas occur in Laghuśaṃcara 41, which associates specific sets of goddesses with these; and Laghuśaṃcara 50.20–27.

\(^{140}\) Note, for instance, that the initiatory maṇḍala described in chapter 2 is constructed with mortuary materials such as cremation ashes.

\(^{141}\) Particularly noteworthy are the homa rites described in Laghuśaṃcara 50.

\(^{142}\) See for instance the brief chapter thirty-nine; the heroic sādhaka is promised attainment of the state of a Sky-wanderer (niyakte khecarīpādam, 4b), and freedom from old age and death (na jāmṛtyuh sarvatra sādhaka mantravigrahah, 5ab).

\(^{143}\) Laghuśaṃcara 3.16:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{dākinino lāmayaś caiav khaṇḍarohā tu rūpiṇī} \\
\text{etat vicared jagat sarvaṃ dākinīyāḥ saha sādhakah} \quad || 16 || \\
\text{sarvāḥ kikkaris tasya sādhakasya na samśayaḥ} \\
\end{align*}
\]

Highly irregular grammatical forms such as etat (masculine, for the feminine etabhih) and dākinīyā (for dākinībhī) are none too rare in this text, while the metrical irregularities of 16c and 17a are even more typical.

\(^{144}\) Note in particular the rituals of Laghuśaṃcara 49, which promise the yogin the power to transform himself at will (kāmarūpo mahāvīrya yogī svān nātra samśaya, 49.14ab).
In a pioneering article of 2001, Alexis Sanderson identified extensive parallel passages in tantric literature, within and across sectarian boundaries, and argued that substantial portions of important Buddhist yogini tantras were redacted from Śaiva sources, largely unpublished.\(^{145}\) This constitutes some of the most important evidence marshalled in support of his thesis concerning the historical relationship between Śaivism and the esoteric Buddhism of the yogini tantras, first argued in an article of 1994 asserting that “almost everything concrete in the system is non-Buddhist in origin even though the whole is entirely Buddhist in its function.”\(^{146}\) While Sanderson’s examples concern several Buddhist texts, the most remarkable case is that of the Laghu cakraśamvaratantra or Herukābhīdāna, nearly half the contents of which he holds “can be seen to have been redacted from Śaiva originals found in texts of the Vidyāpīṭha division” of the bhairavatantras—the BraYa, Siddhayogeśvarīmata, Tantrasadbhāva, and the Yōginīśāncāraprakaraṇa of the Jayadrathayāmala.\(^{147}\) The implications are considerable, for this would mean that one of the most fundamental scriptures of the latter phase of Indian Tantric Buddhism took shape, in large measure, through appropriation of material from tantras of the Śaiva yogini cult.

Undoubtedly some of the most significant historiographic questions concerning the cult of yōginīs lie in the dynamics of Śaiva-Buddhist interaction, and the formation of parallel tantric ritual systems across sectarian boundaries focused, to a large degree, upon the figure of the yōginī. For while there is much that is similar in older forms of Śaivism and Tantric Buddhism, it is with the cult of yōginīs that parallels in ritual, text, and iconography reach their most remarkable level. Assessment of the enormous body of evidence relevant to these questions and its interpretation in light of the social and historical contexts of early medieval India shall require sustained

\(^{145}\) Sanderson, “History through Textual Criticism in the Study of Śaivism, the Pañcarātra and the Buddhist Yōginītantras,” especially 41–47.

\(^{146}\) “Vajrayāna: Origin and Function,” 92.

\(^{147}\) Sanderson, “History through Textual Criticism;” 41–47 (quotation on 42).
scholarly engagement, admirably begun in the works of Sanderson, to whose work Ronald Davidson has offered a significant rejoinder.148

In the present discussion I shall confine myself to aspects of textual history, primarily as concern the BraYa, rather than attempt to address the larger picture of Śaiva-Buddhist interactions. The passages Sanderson identifies as shared by the BraYa and Laghusamvara belong to the first portion of BraYa lxxxv, a chapter entitled “The Section on the Pledges,”149 and the greater part of chapters twenty-six to twenty-nine of the Laghusamvara. He notes that chapter forty-three of the Abhidhānottara—a text of the Cakrasamvara cycle, to which the Laghusamvara is fundamental—has parallels in BraYa lxxxv as well, while the Buddhist Saṃvarodayatantra has a section concerning the classification of skull-bowls parallel to a section in BraYa iv.150 To the passages identified by Sanderson I can add the final five verses of BraYa lxxxiv, which correspond to the opening verses of Laghusamvara 26 (Table 3.1).151

148 Davidson, Indian Esoteric Buddhism, 202–18.
149 The colophon reads, in By, sanaqādhikāra nāma cāsitimaḥ patalāḥ.
150 Sanderson, “Vajrayāna: Origin and Function,” 95. In the case of chapter fifteen of the Saṃvarodaya, the pātuhaktamānirdeśapatulāḥ that Sanderson describes as “closely related” to a section in BraYa iv, the content indeed overlaps considerably. The verses in question are 747–87 of BraYa iv, which concern the specifications for ritual vessels (patras) and more specifically skull-bowls. For the Saṃvarodaya, I have consulted Tokyo University Library manuscript no. 404.
151 Sanderson notes that in the period between penning the article “History through Textual Criticism” and its publication in 2001, he identified additional passages from Śaiva scriptures redacted into the Laghusamvara—the parallel I identify above might belong to this category. “History through Textual Criticism,” 42 (n. 52).

Note also that Laghusamvara 26.13cd (aprakāśyam idam guhyam gopaṇīyam prayatnataḥ), which occurs again as 31.14, is parallel to BraYa 87.2cd (aprakāśyam idam devi gopaṇīyam prayatnataḥ); variants upon this phrase appear in chapters xxi, xxii, xlv, and xlv of the BraYa as well. Note the absence of the (contextually inappropriate) vocative devi in the Laghusamvara version. There are other similarities of idiom too: another phrase shared by the BraYa and Laghusamvara, and not with other Buddhist sources I am aware of, is nātāḥ parataram kincit triṣu lokesu vidyate. This occurs as Laghusamvara 5.25cd, 38.7ab, 49.14ab, and 50.14ab (cf. also 26.1ab and 49.16), and BraYa xiv.262ab and lxxxiv.222ab. Other idiomatic expressions shared by the BraYa and the Laghusamvara include variations upon the following (Lagh−

Striking the sky and drinking from a mirage are proverbial expressions of futile endeavor. My attention was first drawn to this verse by Isaacson in a Sanskrit seminar in the autumn of 2003. Compare e.g. BraYa lxxviii.44:

Striking the sky and drinking from a mirage are proverbial expressions of futile endeavor. My attention was first drawn to this verse by Isaacson in a Sanskrit seminar in the autumn of 2003. Compare e.g. BraYa lxxviii.44:

avādītva d-inām sarvām yah pūjāṇa kartum arhati |
hanate mūṣṭinākāśanam ibhati mṛgatṛṣṇikām ||
Hence, *Laghusamvara* 26–29 corresponds, more or less in sequence, to the last several verses of *BraYā* lxxxix and first fifty-odd verses of lxxxv, although individual verses and several short sections in both have no parallels in the other. Unfortunately, the only codex in which the original Sanskrit of the *Laghusamvara* appears to survive is lacunose from the third verse of chapter twenty-two up to the colophon of twenty-nine.\(^{152}\) Janardan Shastri Pandey has however made what appears to be a creditable reconstruction of the Sanskrit, utilizing the Sanskrit commentary of Bhavabhaṭṭa, the Tibetan translation, and parallels in the *Sampuṭātantra* and *Abhidhanottara*.\(^{153}\) TABLE 3.1 places the previously unidentified parallel passage from *Brahmāyāmala* lxxxiv alongside the corresponding verses of *Laghusamvara* 26, the latter from Pandey’s edition (reporting variants he notes are suggested by the Tibetan).

In the *BraYā*, this passage concludes the first chapter of the *Uttaratantra*, an “addendum tantra” to the *BraYā* possibly belonging to a later stratum of the text.\(^{154}\) This chapter comprises, primarily, a long and comparatively sophisticated description of yoga for which the passage in question forms the concluding statement. Parallels for the some of the obscure terminology occur earlier in the chapter and elsewhere in the text. In the received *Laghusamvara*, this passage instead opens chapter twenty-six, giving the appearance of having been awkwardly rewritten as an introduction; in verse six, it then shifts to the subject of the Eight Pledges, with a passage parallel to *BraYā* lxxxv.1–42.\(^{155}\) The product, or so it seems to me, is a tract of decontextualized text cobbled together with scant regard for meter and still less for grammar, the interpretation of which challenges the imagination.

There are multiple and clear indications of the dependence of *Laghusamvara* 26–29.

---

\(^{152}\) Oriented Institute of Baroda manuscript no. 13290.


\(^{154}\) On the structure and possible stratification of the *BraYā*, see the next chapter.

\(^{155}\) Preceding *BraYā* lxxxv.1 is a short series of mantras, the text of which is badly damaged. These have no precise counterpart in the *Laghusamvara*. There may however be a loose structural parallel, for the short chapter preceding *Laghusamvara* 26 consists of a single long mantra, introduced by a verse.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Brahmāyāmala lxxxiv.222–28:</th>
<th>Laghuśaṇṭaratra 26.1–5:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>nātāḥ parataram kiṁcit</td>
<td>ataḥ param mantrapadaṁ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>triṣu lokesu vidyate</td>
<td>triṣu lokesu na vidyate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jñātvā picumatam tantram</td>
<td>śrīherukamantram jñātvā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sarvatantrān parityajet</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>carvāhāravibhāge 'pi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tālakāra ṛdhake tathā</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sarvātmaka ca yogo 'yam</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sarvataḥ svānurūpataḥ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dūtiyoṭgāmayoγāc ca</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prakriyāyogayojanāt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sarvatra ca caturām tu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yogo 'yaṃ parikirtitāḥ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dūtayāṃ sanvyaavasthitāḥ</td>
<td>yogaियां saṃvyavasthitāḥ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>adhordhvaśiddhidā devi</td>
<td>adhordhvaṃ siddhidā nityām</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ātmadūttī tu sarvādā</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>taddrayaṃ sarvādā siddham</td>
<td>tām dūti tu sattvārthasiddhidāṃ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>darśanāt sparśabhāsanāt</td>
<td>darśanaṃ sparśanaṃ tathā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cumbanād guhanāc caiva</td>
<td>cumbanaṃ guhanām nityāṃ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>śīvapīṭhe viśeṣataḥ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yāvanto dravyasanghātāḥ</td>
<td>yāvanto yogasanghātāḥ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sarvasiddhikarāḥ param</td>
<td>sarvasiddhikaram śṛṭaṃ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dātavyaṃ mantrasadbhāvaṃ</td>
<td>sārvāsadbhāvaṃ deyaṃ ca</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nānyathā tu kadācana</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mātā ca bhaginī putrī</td>
<td>mātā bhaginī putrī vā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bhāryā vai dūtayaṃ śṛṭaṃ</td>
<td>bhāryā vai dūtayāḥ sthītaḥ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yasyā mantrāṃ dadeṇ nityāṃ</td>
<td>yasya mantrāṃ dadeṇ nityāṃ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tasyaiṣo hi vidhīḥ śṛṭaḥ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 The Tibetan supports reading dūtayah
2 The Tibetan supports reading śṛṭaṃ
upon BraYā lxxxiv–lxxxv, for the redactors appear to have been less than successful in removing traces of technical terminology distinctive to their source text. Sanderson has discussed one case in detail: a reference to the smarana, a word in ordinary parlance meaning “recollection,” but in the BraYā, a technical term for the seed-mantra of Kapālīśabhairava (hūm). An ostensibly neutral word, the Buddhist redactors allowed this to remain, perhaps unaware of its significance in the source text.156 In addition to the smarana, I would single out another case in which characteristic jargon from the BraYā has not been redacted out of the Laghuśaṃvara: 26.14cd–15ab, which corresponds to BraYā lxxxiv.9. This verse concerns a typology of the sādhaka that is as far as I can determine distinctive to the BraYā—and certainly alien to the Laghuśaṃvara. The text of the Laghuśaṃvara version of the verse is as follows, in Pandey’s reconstruction:

śuddhāsuddhātha mīśram vai sādhakas trividhā157 sthitih || 14 ||
ārādhako viśuddhas ca dīpako guṇavān narah

Jayabhadra, the earliest commentator on the Laghuśaṃvara, recognized that this verse should concern a classification of practitioners, and offers the following interpretation:

The “man of virtue” (guṇavān narah)—the yogin—has a threefold division. Ārādhaka means “one in whom understanding has not arisen”; viśuddha means “one in whom capacity has arisen”; dīpaka (“light”) means the madhyadīpaka (“middle light”): one in whom some understanding has arisen, and who enlightens himself and others. Or else, ārādhaka means “worshipper of the deity through practice of mantra and yoga,” guṇavān means “one who understands the meaning of scripture,” [while] dīpaka means “capable of fulfilling the goals of all living beings,” like a lamp (pradīpa).158

156 Sanderson, “History through Textual Criticism,” 44–47. The term smarana occurs in Laghuśaṃvara 29.3c in the critical edition. See also, in the present dissertation, the section in chapter 5 on the BraYā’s titular epithet “navīkṣaraśrīdhanā.”

157 The commentator Bhavabhaṭṭa instead reads sādhakas trividhāh.

158 Jayabhādra, Cakrasamvarapañjika: ārādhaka viśuddhas ca dīpako guṇavān narah iti guṇavān naro yogy tṛidhā bhūdyate [em. Isaacson; viyate Ed.] ārādhaka ity anupannapratībhāḥ viśuddha ity utpannasaṃpratībhāḥ dīpaka iti madhyadīpakaḥ kīṃcitupannapratībhāḥ svaparāruhabolbhadhaḥ ca || athav-ārādhaka mantrayogābhivyāsaṃ desātārdhakah guṇavān śāstrasṛtvacetā dīpakah pradīpaḥ sarvasattvārtha-kriyāsamarthāḥ ||
Jayabhadra’s creative yet incongruent attempts to find three sādhakas in the second line testify to the fact that this verse lacks context; a threefold classification of this nature is otherwise absent from the Laghuśamvara.

In contrast, the triad of ‘pure’, ‘impure’, and ‘mixed’ comprises a key conceptual framework in the BraYā: practitioners, ritual, scripture, and the Three Śaktis are patterned accordingly.¹⁵⁹ ‘Arādhaka’ too has a specific, contextually germane meaning. In the BraYā, the verse in question occurs as lxxxv.8, in a passage which follows an enumeration of the initiatory Pledges (samaya):

```
.................. ity aṣṭau samayāḥ parah || 7 ||
jñātavyāḥ sādhakair nityaṁ sādhanaṁ sādhanasthitau |
sāmānyāḥ sarvatantrānāṁ na hantavyā̃s tu hetubhiḥ || 8 ||
sudhāsuddhavimśras tu sādhakas trividhāḥ śṛṣṭaḥ |
ārādhaka visuddhas tu dipakādīgūnair vinā || 9 ||
grāme grāme vrataṁ tasya devatārūpālaksanam |
unmattam asiḍhāraṁ ca pavitrakṣetravairitaḥ || 10 ||
sādhakas tu āvidhā ātītā carunārgo ‘tha ādākaḥ |
tālamārgavairānāṁ tu na carur naivo sāmyamaṁ || 11 ||
vidyāvataviśuddhis tu triṣaṣṭiṃvratam eva ca |
abhedayatvan tatas tasya tālādau śādheṣe vidhau || 12 ||
carunārgaikadeso hi tālaḥ sarvatmako bhavet |
keṣṭrañānāṁ sādhānī yogyoṣya yatra sāṃgataḥ || 13 ||
ṭeṣu sthitāḥ japam kuryād ca carum alabhate dvijaḥ |
```

7d samayāḥ | corr.; samaya By∞ 8a jñātavyāḥ | corr.; jñātavyā By∞ sādhakair nityaṁ |
em.; sādhakai nityaṁ By∞ (tops damaged) 9a “vimiśras tu” | em.; “vimuktas tu By∞ 9b trividhāḥ | corr.; trividhāḥ By∞ 12b triṣaṣṭi” | em.; triṣaṣṭhi” By∞

“...these are the supreme eight Pledges. [7d] They should always be known by sādhakas when in the state of [mantra-]sādhana or [deity] worship (ārādhana). They are common to all the tantras, and should not be assailed with reasoned arguments. [8] The sādhaka is threefold—pure, impure, and mixed¹⁶⁰—while the ārādhaka is very pure, free from the qualities (?) ‘light’ and so forth (?).¹⁶¹ [9] From village to village, his observance (vrata) is [that of taking on] the form and characteristics of the deities, and

¹⁵⁹ On the classification of scripture in relation to the śaktis, see chapter 5; see below concerning the sādhaka.

¹⁶⁰ There are strong grounds for emending sudhāsuddhavimuktas to “vimiśras, as I have done, for this threefold classification of sādhakas based upon degrees of ‘purity’ pervades the BraYā and fits the present context. Cf., e.g., xxxi.331c, sudhāsuddhavimśreṣu. Furthermore, the Laghuśamvara offers some confirmation for the emendation, reading sudhāsuddhātha misraṁ, as reconstructed by Pandey.

While the sense of 9b is certain, one could consider emending to sādhakas trividhā śṛṣṭaḥ, or to sādhakas trividhā sthitāḥ; the latter is supported by Bhavabhūta’s reading of the Laghuśamvara parallel.¹⁶¹ I am unfortunately unable to determine the probable intended sense of 9d, dipakādūgūnair vinā,
the 'madman' and 'razor's edge' [observances].\textsuperscript{162} avoiding the locations of sacred fields.\textsuperscript{[10]} But the sādhaka is [actually] twofold: the one following the path of caru ('food offerings'), and the tālaka. For those on the tālaka path, there is neither caru nor self-restraint.\textsuperscript{[11]} [After engaging in] purification by the vidyā-mantra observance and the 'sixty-three observance',\textsuperscript{163} he then [reaches] the state of [making] no distinction between the ritual procedures of the tālaka, etc.\textsuperscript{[12]} Following the way of the caru, having a single location, the tālaka would become a sarvātman ("universal") [sādhaka].\textsuperscript{164} Remaining in the sacred, empowered places where the yoginis assemble, he should perform his mantra recitation in those; the twice-born one obtains caru [from the yoginis].\textsuperscript{165} [13–14ab]

Here ārādha, "worshipper," refers to a specific category of practitioner. Typically, the BraYā describes a threefold typology of the sādhaka: pure, impure, and impure-

---

\textsuperscript{162} The unmattakavrata is fourth of the Nine Observances described in BraYā \textsuperscript{21}, involving feigned insanity, as the name implies. The asidhāravrata ('observance of the sword’s edge') for its part comprises the subject of BraYā \textsuperscript{39}.

\textsuperscript{163} While the various observances taught in BraYā \textsuperscript{21} are referred to collectively as vidyāvatitas, "observances of the [nine-syllable] vidyā," this term is primarily used for the final and most important of these, a kāpālika observance also called the māhravrata (108a) or bhairavravrata (109b). As for the trisāṣṭi-vrata, this appears to be connected with a mantra-deity pantheon (yāga) of the same name; yet while the "yāga of the sixty-three" and its vrata are mentioned in several chapters, I have not identified a detailed description.

\textsuperscript{164} The implication is that the sarvātman sādhaka is bound by no single discipline and may engage at will in practices associated with the lower grades of initiate. This is consistent with the description of the sarvātman found in BraYā \textsuperscript{14iv}.

\textsuperscript{165} The notion that one may attain siddhi through consuming food offerings (caru) given directly by the yoginis is mentioned in BraYā \textsuperscript{29}, and is in all likelihood alluded to here in 14b. For a more explicit description, note Kaúla\textsuperscript{11}.

---
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**cum-pure, for which the designations are tālaka,166 carubhojin (“one who consumes ritual offerings”), and miśra (“mixed”), respectively.167 This classification receives detailed elaboration in the text’s massive forty-fourth chapter, “the section on the sādhaka” (sādhakādhiṅkāra). However, the latter chapters of the BraYa—LXXXIV–CI, comprising the Uttara- and Uttarottaratantras168—introduce a new fourfold taxonomy of initiates: the ārādhaka, carubhojin, tālaka, and sarvātman (“universal”), whose activities and subdivisions comprise the respective subjects of BraYa xci–xciv. This typology differs from the threefold insofar as the category of miśraka, the practitioner of “mixed” purity, appears to be reconfigured as the highest grade, the sarvātman—above the tālaka.169 On the other hand, the ārādhaka represents a variety of householder practitioner.170**

That the redactors of the Laghusamvara had intended to remove references to a Śaiva typology of practitioners is suggested by comparison; in table 3.1, note that **BraYa LXXXIV.223–24**, which makes specific reference to the classification of sādhakas

---

166 The word tālaka appears non Indo-Āryan, and Sanderson (personal communication, May 2004) suggests a connection with the Tamil tāl, “energy, effort, perseverance, application.” The University of Madras Tamil Lexicon, 1885. Accessed online (April 2007) through the Digital Dictionaries of South Asia project (http://dsal.uchicago.edu/dictionaries/).

167 The terms for the threefold sādhaka are provided in BraYa XLIV.10c–11ab:

| Sūdhaṣa tu tālakaḥ proktas carubhojiṁ tu aśūdhaḥkāḥ | 10 |
| Sūdhaṣaḥ sūdhaḥ bhavet miśrakāḥ sādhakās tu na samśaṇeḥ |
| proktas | en.; proktaṁ Bya|m | miśraḥ | em.: miśraṃ Bya|m |

168 The structure and possible stratification of the text are discussed in the subsequent chapter.

169 It is evident from the descriptions in BraYa XLIV that the miśraka, as one might expect, constitutes the middle grade of sādhaka. Hence in XLIV.472, it is said that a miśraka purified through constant practice may become a tālaka (kādaciṇi miśrako devi karmayogena nityaśah | tālakamārgaḥ| saṃspnoti yadda sūdhaḥ prajyate). However, the sarvātman sādhaka is “mixed” in an entirely different sense: he is free from all regulations, engaging at will in the disciplines associated with lower practitioners, including consumption of the impurest of substances—the domain of the carubhojin.

170 It appears that the ārādhaka might not be considered a sādhaka, per se; their characteristic modes of ritual, ārādhana (“worship”) and sādhana, are placed in contrast. See e.g. LXXXV.8b above. Nonetheless, the term ārādhaka figures in later Śaiva typologies of the sādhaka. In the Kulasāra, the ārādhaka features as fourth of the five grades of sādhaka, above the tālaka, cumbaka, and carvaka (=carubhojin, presumably); transcending the ārādhaka is the śivodbhūta:

| tālako cumbakas caiva cārvākārādhaḥ kas thātā | śivodbhūta-m-ataḥ proktah pāmcabbedo “pr sādhakah |
| cārvākārādhaḥ | en.; cārvākārādhaḥ ms śivodbhūtam ms | en. Vasudeva; śivodbhūtam ms |

I am grateful to Vasudeva for providing me with his transcription of this material. Given the terminological continuities, it seems possible that this fivefold typology develops out of the threefold classification present in the BraYa, the addition of the ārādhaka reflecting an intermediate stage.

---
in question, is absent from the *Laghusamvara*. Yet *Laghusamvara* 14cd–15ab refers nonetheless to what is, in the *BraYā*, the same typology expressed with different terminology.\(^{171}\)

In the case of the *Laghusamvara*, I believe there can thus be little doubt concerning Sanderson's proposal: that this text has incorporated material from the *BraYā*, whether directly or through another derivative source, seems the only plausible explanation for the relationship between the passages in question. Derivation from an unknown common source is perhaps not impossible, but this would in all likelihood have been a text intimately related to the *BraYā*, to the extent of sharing unusual terminological similarities. The case is similar with chapter forty-three of the *Abhidhānottara*, another text of the Cakraśāṃvara tradition;\(^{172}\) as Sanderson points out, this corresponds to the same material shared by the *BraYā* and *Laghusamvara*. This begins with text corresponding to *Laghusamvara* 26.6 and *BraYā* lxixv.9, omitting the five verses parallel to 26.1–5 and lxiv.222–28 of these respective works. Though the text of *Abhidhānottara* 43 closely parallels *Laghusamvara* 26–29—fortuitously so, given that this section of the *Laghusamvara* does not survive in Sanskrit—the former contains none of the latter's divisions in chapters, being hence closer to the *BraYā*. This in fact appears true of the early *Laghusamvara* as well, for the commentator Jayabhadrā shows no awareness of the chapter divisions known to the later commentator Bhavabhāṭṭa.\(^ {173}\) Sanderson contends that several other sections of the *Abhidhānottara* derive from Śaiva sources as well, for which Judit Tőrzsök has provided convincing evidence in the case of its relationship to the *Siddhayogesvarṁata*.\(^ {174}\)

---

\(^{171}\) A reference to the fourfold typology of practitioners is clearly present in *BraYā* lxiv.223, although out of sequence: *carohāra* (=*asuddha* or *caruhbejīn*), *tālaka* (=*suddha*), *ārādhaka* (by emendation of *ārādhane*; =*sūdha*), and *sārvatmaka* (=*miśra*). While the interpretation of 224b remains unclear to me, the point of 224cd is that the yoga expounded in this chapter is applicable to all four (*caturṇāṁ*) types of practitioner.

\(^{172}\) I have consulted two manuscripts of the *Abhidhānottara*: Institute for Advanced Studies of World Religions, Buddhist Sanskrit Manuscripts film-strip no. MBB-1071-100 (Nepalese script, dated to the equivalent of 1138 CE); and a late Devanāgarī manuscript that has been published in facsimile: Lokesh Chandra, ed., *Abhidhānottarā-tantra: a Sanskrit Manuscript from Nepal*.

\(^{173}\) This has been pointed out to me by Isaacson, personal communication (April, 2007).

\(^{174}\) Tőrzsök discusses parallels between *Siddhayogesvarṁata* 29 and *Abhidhānottara* 38, identifying indications of the direction of redaction from the former to the latter. Her examples include "changes of
Ronald Davidson has voiced skepticism concerning a number of Sanderson’s claims pertaining to the relationship between Tantric Śaivism and Tantric Buddhism. Of particular relevance to the present discussion, he questions the plausibility of extant Śaiva texts being significant sources of material found in the Buddhist yogini-tantras. One of his principal objections is chronological: he considers problematic the evidence attesting specific, extant works of tantric Śaiva literature prior to the ninth and tenth centuries. He questions, for instance, whether the mid eleventh-century Cambodian Sdok Kak Thom inscription should be taken as an accurate record for the existence in the ninth century of the Śaiva texts it mentions—four vāmatantras—which the inscription associates with a brahmin in the court of that period. While such caution is laudable in principle, here it appears excessive: the existence of Śaiva vāmatantras prior to the ninth century is suggested in multiple manners, and the texts mentioned in the inscription are known to have been fundamental scriptures of this genre.175 In fact, Davidson’s objection appears somewhat imbalanced considering that he draws upon a single reference in the late medieval Kālikāpurāṇa for reconstructing the alleged pre-Buddhist origins of the deity Heruka, relying heavily on a mythological text for reconstructing history at a remove of well more than half a millenium.176

---

175 Davidson addresses Sanderson’s remarks on this inscription as they were presented in “Plistory through Textual Criticism,” 7–8 (n. 5). Sanderson has discussed this material in greater detail more recently, in “Saiva Religion among the Khmers (Part I),” 355–57. On other early evidence for the vāmatantras, see the discussion of these in section 2.

176 Davidson’s attempts to show that Bhairava and “his Buddhist counterpart, Heruka,” have (independent) roots in tribal or local divinities seem unconvincing. The Kālikāpurāṇa, a text that in its current form is unlikely to predate the sixteenth century, associates a cremation ground called Heruka with Kāmākhya, and Davidson identifies this (plausibly) as the modern site called Masânbhairo (śmasānabhairava). He postulates that “Buddhists apparently appropriated a local term for a specific Assamese ghost or cemetery divinity and reconfigured it into the mythic enemy of evil beings in general”—Heruka. Indian Esoteric Buddhism, 211–16 (quotations on 211, 214). On the dating of the Kālikāpurāṇa, see Sylvia Stapelfeldt, Kāmākhya–Sati–Mahāmāyā: Konzeptionen der Großen Göttin im Kālikāpurāṇa, 35–40. Assuming that the Kālikāpurāṇa’s Heruka cremation ground is indeed the site Masânbhairo, this in fact tells us no more than that Heruka and Bhairava were at some point prior to the sixteenth century considered cognate, to the point that their names could be interchanged. To argue that the Buddhist Heruka was originally an Assamese cremation-spirit deity on this basis calls to mind what David—

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
Critiquing Sanderson’s thesis of the Buddhist yoginītantras’ indebtedness to Śaivism, Davidson counters that “a more fruitful model would appear to be that both heavily influenced the final formations of the agonistic other and that each had alternative sources as well.”\textsuperscript{177} A model of mutual influence certainly has appeal when considering Buddhist-Śaiva interactions broadly over the course of the first millennium,\textsuperscript{178} yet such cannot be assumed \textit{a priori} in any particular case; indeed, most of the texts Davidson cites as examples of Tantric Śaivism’s syncretic sources appear to be post twelfth-century works, and accordingly have little bearing upon the relation between the Śaiva Vidyāpitha and Buddhist yoginītantras. An exception is the \textit{Jayadrathayāmala}, which as Davidson points out mentions Buddhist tantras in its account of the scriptural canon, apparently naming the \textit{Guhyasamājā}.\textsuperscript{179} The \textit{Jayadrathayāmala}, Sanderson suggests, is an historically layered composition that took its final form in Kashmir prior to the period of Kṣemarāja (fl. circa 1000–50).\textsuperscript{180} That

\textsuperscript{177} Davidson, \textit{Indian Esoteric Buddhism}, 217.

\textsuperscript{178} Note for instance Davidson’s plausible suggestion that Pāśupata monasticism is a response to the śramaṇa ascetic orders. Ibid., 185–86. One might also mention the possible influence of the Buddhist Yogācāra school upon nondualist “Kashmir” Śaiva thought, although this requires further investigation.

\textsuperscript{179} \textit{Indian Esoteric Buddhism}, 217, citing Mark Dyczkowski, \textit{The Canon of Śaivism}, 102.

\textsuperscript{180} Sanderson, “The Visualization of the Deities of the Trika,” 32 (n. 6); and “Remarks on the Text of the Kubjikāmatatantra,” 2. The \textit{Jayadrathayāmala} is a heterogenous, layered work; Sanderson sees within it multiple texts that might originally have been independent: the \textit{Sirascheda}, an early ārāmatantra; and the \textit{Mādhavakula}, a text cited by Abhinavagupta and incorporated into the fourth book (ṣātka) of the \textit{Jayadrathayāmala}. On the \textit{Sirascheda}, see “History through Textual Criticism,” 31–32 (n. 33), and “Remarks on the Text of the Kubjikāmatatantra,” 1–2. On the \textit{Mādhavakula}, see the latter. His claim, to which Davidson responds and for which the evidence has not yet been published, is that the ninth chapter of the \textit{Jayadrathayāmala’s} third book, the \textit{Yoginīsaṃcāraprakāraṇa}, was a source for Buddhist yoginītantras.
sections of the text show awareness of Tantric Buddhism is hence neither surprising
nor unusual, and Davidson’s assertion that this suggests “dependence on Buddhist
tantras” should require demonstration of the nature of such dependence. Among
the other Śaiva texts Davidson singles out is “the Brahmāyāmala;” but what he refers
to is in fact a late medieval east Indian composition by this title, rather than the
early Vidyāpiṭha scripture. It would indeed appear that the later śākta tradition
of Śaivism, particularly in east India, appropriated much from Tantric Buddhism
during the centuries of the latter’s decline. This is dramatized, for instance, in tales
of the brahmanical sage Vaśiṣṭha’s sojourn to Mahācīna (“Greater China”) in order
to learn worship of Tārā from the inebriated Buddha, and evidenced by the emer-
gence of syncretic pantheons such as the “Ten Great Vidyā-mantra Goddesses” (daśa
mahāvidyāḥ), who include Tārā. The old BraYa, in contrast, mentions in its account
of the scriptural canon works of “agonistic others” such as the Vaiṣṇavas and Vaidikas,
yet shows no awareness I can discern of Tantric Buddhism. The same may be said of
the Niśvāsa, an even earlier composition which otherwise shows enormous interest
in hierarchically ordering rival systems.

Regrettably, Davidson goes so far as to suggest that Sanderson’s model of the
Vidyāpiṭha is informed by a “curious theology of scripture,” contending that “while
it is seldom that a received body of texts reflects no influence at all, this seems to be
Sanderson’s ultimate position on the Vidyāpiṭha Śaiva scriptures.” This assertion
appears entirely unsustainable in light of Sanderson’s research into the layered gene-

---

182 Davidson refers to the Rudrayāmala, Tārātantra, and Brahmāyāmala as texts transmitting the legend
of Vaśiṣṭha learning “chadastra” (“the Chinese method”) from the Buddha. *Indian Esoteric Buddhism*, 216,
citing Benoytosh Bhattacharya’s introduction to Sādhanaṇaṇā, vol. 2, cxi–II (in fact cxii–ii); and Bhattacharya,
“Buddhist Deities in Hindu Garb,” in *Proceedings and Transactions of the Fifth Indian Oriental
Conference*, vol. 2, 1277-98. In this matter Bhattacharya drew upon Sanskrit textual materials published
in a particular volume, edited from Bengali manuscripts: Girīścandra Vedāntatīrtha (ed.), Tārātantram.
Śrīgarīścandravedāntatīrthasākālītīt. *With an Introduction by A. K. Maitra*. As I discuss in chapter 1,
section 1, this publication includes excerpts from the first two chapters of a certain “Brahmāyāmala” pre-
served in a manuscript of the Varendra Research Society. There is no indication that the text is related
to the Vidyāpiṭha scripture of the same name.
183 Davidson, *Indian Esoteric Buddhism*, 386 (n. 105).
ologies of Śaiva scriptures, including those of the Vidyāpīṭha. Concerning the *Tantrasadābhāva*, a Trika text of the Vidyāpīṭha, he demonstrates that it has incorporated and expanded upon cosmological material from the *Śvacchandatantra*—an extensive tract of text which the latter, in turn, drew in part from the *Niśvāṣaṇa-guṇa*, transforming this in the process within its own cultic system.\(^{184}\) He argues, moreover, that the *Niśvāsa* itself—perhaps the earliest extant tantric Śaiva scripture—is heavily indebted to pre-and proto-tantric Śaiva sects of the Atimārga.\(^{185}\) Particularly noteworthy is Sanderson's more recent investigation into the formation of the *Netratantra*, a Śaiva text he argues was produced in the milieu of an eighth- or early ninth-century Kashmiri court.\(^{186}\) Note also his demonstration that the *Brhatkālottara*, a Kashmiri-provenance *tantra* of the *Śaivasiddhānta*, has incorporated material from a Vaiṣṇava scripture of the Pañcarātra.\(^{187}\) In light of this obvious commitment to identifying agents, circumstances, and sources involved in the formation of Śaiva scriptural literature, it hardly seems defensible to attribute bias to Sanderson for failing to unearth examples of the indebtedness of early texts of the Vidyāpīṭha to tantric Buddhist sources. I am aware of none; yet given the current state of research, it is entirely possible that examples will surface.

### 3.6 Conclusions

The present chapter has attempted to trace the early development of the yogini cult in Śaiva and Buddhist tantric literatures. It was shown that significant elements of the Śaiva cult of yoginis have roots in earlier Śaiva scriptural genres. In particular, aspects of the *kāpālika* cult of Bhairava—in association with which the Śaiva cult of yoginis comes into evidence—have discernable precedents in the *Niśvāsatattvasaṃhitā*.

\(^{184}\) Sanderson, "History through Textual Criticism," 23–32.

\(^{185}\) Sanderson, "History through Textual Criticism," 38–41.

\(^{186}\) Sanderson, "Religion and the State: Śaiva Officials in the Territory of the King's Brahmanical Chaplain," passim.

\(^{187}\) Sanderson, "History through Textual Criticism," 23–32.
This archaic scripture of the cult of Sadāśiva appears to predate clear differentiation between siddhāntatantras and other tantric Śaiva scriptural traditions. More direct precedents for the cult of yoginīs appear to lie, however, in scriptural traditions for which the record is fragmentary: dākinītantras, bhūtatantras, and the bhagīnītantras of the cult of the Sisters of Tumburu. The latter, attested by the seventh century, were shown to figure in the background of the BraYā, one of four extant, early bhairava-tantras of the Vidyāpīṭha (“Seat of Female Mantra-deities”). These scriptural authorities for the Śaiva cult of yoginīs distinguish themselves from bhairavatantras of the Mantrapīṭha (“Seat of Male Mantra-deities”) through their emphasis upon goddesses (vidyā). It was argued that the Vidyāpīṭha yoginī cult might have developed within a cultic context of the variety represented by the Svacchandatantra—a text sometimes assigned to the Mantrapīṭha in which goddesses have a secondary cultic status, and in which the cult of yoginīs registers a presence in only the final chapter, probably a late addition to the text. While Vidyāpīṭha literature represents the yoginī cult in its earliest accessible form, the vast majority of Śaiva sources connected with yoginīs belong, however, to subsequent Kaula traditions. As discussed in chapter two, it is Kaula conceptions of yoginīs that appear to inform the post ninth-century temple tradition connected with these goddesses.

A Buddhist cult of yoginīs is attested by the late eighth or early ninth century with the appearance of yoginițtantras, “Tantras of the Yoginīs.” While heralding a remarkable shift in the character of Tantric Buddhism, the prominence of goddesses in the yoginițtantras is the culmination of developments observable in earlier literature. The Brahmanical Mother goddesses feature in Buddhist mañḍalas as early as the mid-seventh century, in the Mahāvairocanasūtra, while the range and prominence of goddesses and female spirits given Buddhist identities grows considerably in subsequent literature, such as the Mañjuśrīmūlakalpa. It was shown that the emergence of the Buddhist cult of yoginīs is linked closely to transformation of the dākinī—from the pernicious female spirit represented in early Buddhist and non-Buddhist sources
to the powerful, potentially benign vajradākinīs of the yoginītantras. Evidence for the conversion and elevation of the dākinī appears in eighth-century sources—the Tattva-
samgraha and Guhyasamāja—a process completed in the early yoginītantras, such as the Laghuśaṇḍvara.

In general character, the Śaiva and Buddhist cults of yoginīs possess remarkable similarities, and the relations between these religious systems in their historical contexts merits comprehensive inquiry. In the final section of this chapter, I offered evidence in support of Alexis Sanderson’s proposal that the Buddhist yoginītantras in several cases depended heavily upon Vidyāpīṭha scriptures. It was shown that the BraYā is indeed the source of a substantial tract of text redacted into the Laghu-
śaṇḍvara and Abhidhanottara, texts of the Cakraśaṇḍvara scriptural cycle. This is significant, moreover, not only for the history of tantric Buddhist literature, but also for locating the BraYā in time, as discussed in the subsequent chapter. While this case of textual borrowing undoubtedly provides a limited window into complex historical processes, it nonetheless illustrates that despite Ronald Davidson’s objections, Sanderson’s thesis concerning the dependence of the Buddhist yoginītantras on Śaiva models remains compelling.
CHAPTER 4

THE CONTENT, STRUCTURE, AND PROVENANCE OF THE
BRAHMYAMALA

4.1 INTRODUCTION: SELECT TOPICS IN THE BRAHMYAMALA

This chapter and the next shift focus more directly to the BraYa, beginning in the present chapter with discussion of its content, structure, and provenance. The first section provides an overview of the BraYa’s material on several major topics, including mantra, initiation and consecration, and religious images. This is complemented by appendix A, a transcription of the text’s chapter colophons as found in Byz, which provides some indication of the range of the text’s subject matters. Section two of the present chapter analyses the BraYa’s structure. It is shown that the text has multiple divisions, the nature of and disparities between which suggest the existence of at least two textual strata. In section three, I address the question of the BraYa’s dating, both in absolute terms and in chronological relation to some of the extant literature. This section also explores the geographic and social horizons of the text on the basis of places and individuals named therein.

The BraYa consists of one-hundred and one chapters of considerable variety in length, containing a total of more than twelve-thousand verses. It takes the form of a conversation between Kapalīśabhairava and “the Great Goddess” (mahādevī) or “Supreme (parā) Śakti,” designated in this text by the names Bhairavī, Aghorī, and Caṇḍā Kapālinī. The Goddess poses questions, and Bhairava answers, his didactic

---

1 At one extreme, chapter seven contains only eleven verses, while BraYa IV extends almost nine-hundred and fifty in length. On the length of the BraYa, see chapter 5, section 5.
responses constituting most of the text. Ordinarily, a chapter begins with a new question, although there are numerous exceptions; within a chapter, further questions might inaugurate new subjects. The primary departures from the dialog mode are occasional third-person asides, such as the common “thus did speak Bhairava” (evam vai bhairavo 'bravit). Aside from several mantras given in prose, and a smattering of verse in the sradghara meter, the text consists entirely of the thirty-two syllable anushtubh verses typical of tantras, purāṇas, and much other religious literature.

The BraYā commences with the narrative of its revelation. Following this, chapters two and three introduce key topics: the Nine-Syllable Vidyā-mantra (navākṣaraṇa vidyā) of the Goddess and the pantheon of mantra-deities this embodies, in BraYā II; and in chapter three, the fully elaborated form of the deity maṇḍala, associated particularly with initiation. While the text is not systematic in its organization, there are several clusters of chapters concerned with particular topics, especially the cycle on initiation and consecration (BraYā xxxi–xxxvii). Other important chapter clusters include the those on mantra (reviewed below) and the sādhuaka, while a number of chapters, clustered especially between fifty-three and eighty-two, are devoted to the propitiation of particular mantra-deities, primarily forms of Bhairava (TABLE 4.1).

Chapters devoted to yoginīs are scattered throughout the second half of the text, several of which are critically edited in part II. A compendium of rituals, by and large, the cohesion of this sprawling text lies primarily in the leitmotiv of the navākṣaraṇa vidyā.

---

2 The verses in the sradghara meter (the four quarters of which contain twenty-one syllables, with caesuras after the seventh and fourteenth) are the opening benediction, and two verses and a stray quarter in the closing section of BraYā lxv.

3 The principal exposition on the nature and practices of the sādhuaka is BraYā xliv, a chapter of just over seven-hundred verses. Chapters xc–xciv expound a fourfold typology of sādhuakas, which as mentioned in the previous chapter (section 5), differs from the threefold classification advanced in xliv.

4 A number of the treatises are specifically called kalpas or mantrakalpas, which “[set] out the procedure for the propitiation of a Mantra.” Sanderson, “History through Textual Criticism,” 13. Many of these mantra-deities are connected with sādhanas of a radical nature. Besides the male deities delineated in TABLE 4.1, the BraYā has chapters concerned with the goddess Aghoresvari (BraYā lvii), the Six Yoginīs (lxxviii), and “sādhanas on an individual yogīnī” (prthakyoginiśādhanā) (lxxix).

5 BraYā lv concerns the classification of the clans (kula) of yoginīs, as well as secret signs; these topic are also treated in lxxiii. BraYā xcviii too concerns the divisions of yogini-clans, while xcix provides a brief account of yoginiśālāpa—transactional encounters with the goddesses. Several chapters delineate ritual concerned with particular yogini sets: BraYā lvi with a configuration of twenty-four yogini, and lxxviii with the Six Yoginīs of the primary maṇḍala.
and its mantra-deities, which suffuse and pattern the basic rites and their countless inflections.

In both bulk and emphasis, the BraYYa is a prescriptive text overwhelmingly concerned with ritual. Within this amorphous category must be made numerous distinctions: *dikšā* ("initiation"), *abhiṣeka" ("consecration"), *yōga" ("deity worship"), *vrata" ("observance"), yoga, and *sādhana* (special practices of the *sādhaka*), to name some of the major categories. Actual practices of these ritual types often overlap, for ubiquitous are the *nyāsa" ("installation") of the mantra-deities upon a substrate (e.g. the body), *japa" or mantra-incantation, *dhyāna" or meditative visualization, *mudrā" or ritual signs, and to a lesser degree fire-sacrifice (*homa*). A number of chapters are devoted specifically to these techniques.6

---

6 On the subject of *nyāsa*, note in particular *BraYYa* xli, the *nyatapatala* ("Chapter on Mantra-installation"), which provides general instructions, and *BraYYa* xil, which elaborates upon the *nyāsa* of the extended mantra-deity pantheon taught in the preceding chapters (x and xi). General procedures for mantra-recitation, *japaśūdāna*, are expounded in detail in a chapter bearing this title, *BraYYa* xviii. This provides, for instance, a threefold classification of *japa* and technical terms for mantras when inflected in particular ways. *Mudrā" forms the exclusive subject of chapter xlii; a transcription of this from the oldest manuscript has been made available by Somadeva Vasudeva (see chapter 1, n. 88). Several *mudrās* and their mantras are elaborated upon in the last section of *BraYYa* xxiii, such as the Ocean of Milk (*ksāroda") and Defeat of Death (*mṛtyunjaya*). Chapter lxxv—called the *Mahakālamata* and the *Mudrāpīṭhādikārā" ("The Seat of Mudrās Section")—describes *mudrās* associated with the Eight Mothers. *BraYYa* lv also outlines a number of *mudrās*. Several chapters and sections focus specifically upon *dhyāna*, meditation on the visual forms of the deities; note e.g. *BraYYa* viii, which is concerned with yogic visualization on the goddesses, with magical aims. Similarly, *BraYYa* vii (only eleven verses) describes iconographic inflections of the goddesses as mounted upon yantras (*yantrārdhaṅkāra*). Chapters focusing in more detail upon aspects of yoga include *BraYYa* ix, which concerns *laksyaḥabheda" ("the types of desiderata"). This entails meditation upon goddesses—perhaps the Four Goddesses of the core maṇḍala, although this is not specified—as connected in turn with an hierarchy of cosmological levels (*tattva") and cosmic creative powers (*kāla*). (On the subject of *laksyaḥabheda", see Somadeva Vasudeva, *The Yoga of the Maṁitvijyottaratantra", 253-92.) Fire ritual, *homa* or *agnikārya", forms the subject of chapter
A number of chapters are specifically concerned with *mantroddhāra*, "the extraction/derivation of mantras." The core mantra system of the *BraYā*, based on the nine-syllable *vidyā*-mantra of Aghoreśvāri, is explicated beginning in *BraYā* 11, which outlines the *vidyā*-mantra itself (on which see chapter 5, section 5). *BraYā* x delineates the extended mantras of the principal maṇḍala goddesses, while xi concerns those of Bhairava, Bhairavī, the Three Śaktis, etc. *BraYā* xxiii elaborates upon numerous inflections of the *vidyā*, and in its final section teaches the Defeat of Death (*mṛtyunijaya*) *mudrā* and mantra.

Parallel mantra-systems are taught in several other chapters. Two seem particularly important: the *khecara-cakra* of *BraYā* xiv, from which are extracted the *kula-vidyā* and *samaya-vidyā* (the "Clan Vidyā-mantra" and "Pledge Vidyā-mantra," respectively), as well as the *pāṣupatāstra* (the "Weapon Mantra of Paśupati"); and the *kūrma-prastāra* (the "Tortoise Chart") of *BraYā* lxxxviii. Several chapters in the latter portion of the *BraYā* teach deities and ritual based upon mantras derived from this *kūrma-prastāra*. *BraYā* lxi, the *Tilakatantra*, contains a new *mantroddhāra*, although based upon the root pantheon.7 A number of other chapters throughout the text teach additional mantras, many of which are connected to specific forms of Bhairava. *Mudrās* too have association with particular mantras; thus for instance *BraYā* xxvi teaches *mudrā-mantroddhāra*, "extraction of the mantras of the *mudrās*," while liv, called the *Mudrāpiṭhādhikāra* or *Mahākālamata*, delineates the mantras of *mudrās* associated with the Eight Mothers.

Several sections of the text teach the basic yāgas or mantra-deity pantheons of the *BraYā* and their associated rites (*yāgavidhi/vidhāna*). The Nine Yāgas, pantheons centered upon each deity, in turn, of the core maṇḍala—Bhairava(-Bhairavī), the Four Devīs, and Four Dūtīś—are listed by name in the opening of *BraYā* III. These have

---

7 As discussed later, this chapter appears remarkably self-contained, containing its own descriptions of, for instance, initiation, *mantroddhāra*, construction of the maṇḍala, *pūruseṣṭa* or preliminary propitiation of the mantra-deity, the Nine Yāgas, *puraṣcaraṇa*, and the topic from which it appears to draw its name: substances used for applying a magical bindi upon the forehead.
their configurations specified in *BraYa* xiii, the “chapter on the Nine Pantheons” (navayāgāpatālāh). *Grhayāga*, or the worship performed in a shrine utilizing the Nine Pantheons, appears to be the normative form of daily worship (*nityakarman*). This subject is taught in *BraYa* xxix (from verse 193), which explains installation of the pantheons in the context of shrine worship.⁸ *BraYa* xxix’s primary subject is however the *mālayāgavidhi*, “ritual procedure of the root pantheon,” for which it teaches an elaborate *māṇḍala* distinct from that of the *mahāyāga* of *BraYa* iii.

Many occasional rites (*naimittika*) and those with special aims (*kāmya*) utilize the “Great Yāga” (*mahāyāga*), the extended pantheon as installed in an elaborate *māṇḍala*. The subject of *BraYa* iii, the *mahāyāga* is explicitly contrasted with the ninefold *yāga* used in a shrine context. According to a definition in *BraYa* xv, the *mahāyāga* is distinguished by its construction in a cremation ground with a *māṇḍala* containing eight directional cremation grounds, as delineated in *BraYa* iii.⁹ *BraYa* xxv, called the *yāganirṇayapātalā* (“the chapter of definitive judgment on yāga”), offers a detailed explication of the mantra-installation (*nyāsa*) and ritual procedures connected with several of the system’s important *yāgas*. This chapter claims that there are in total sixty-five *yāgas* to which all *sādhatas* are entitled; for another fourteen, only *sādhatas* of the upper two of three grades, the *tālaka* and “mixed,” have entitlement. The *yāga* of the Three Śaktis, Vāmā, Jyeṣṭhā, and Raudrī, comprises the subject of *BraYa* lxxxiii, while chapter twenty-seven describes the *yāga* of a more unusual triad: the Vāmā (“left”), Madhyamā (“middle”), and Daksīṇā (“right”) Śaktis, who in *BraYa* xxxviii are said to preside over the three primary streams of scriptural rev-

---

⁸ A passage in *BraYa* xvii teaches the procedures for *nityakarman*, which in this (possibly incomplete) account consist of installation and worship of the mandala of the *vidyā*-mantra, i.e. the *vidyācakra*, and binding of the skull and skull-staff mudrās, or else the Pledge-mudrā. Just prior to this are taught the *naimittika* and *kāmya* worship based upon the *vidyāyāga*. These descriptions appear incomplete, omitting for example mantra-installation on the body of the practitioner; some of the expected material appears instead in chapter xxv.

⁹ *BraYa* xv.11:

śmasāne tu mahāghore yo yāgo kryate praye
dsmaśanair aṣṭabhir yuktā mahāyāgā sa ucyate

“That *yāga* which is performed in a terrible cremation ground, my dear, possessing the Eight Cremation grounds, is called ‘the Great Yāga’.”
elation and their practitioners. Chapter thirty, the “chapter on the different Śivas and rudras,” teaches a yāga called navanābhamanḍala, the “manḍala of nine naves.” Exceptionally, this is a configuration entirely of male deities.

Elaborate alphabetical cakras and their associated rites form the subject of chapters xiv, xvii, and xix. BraYā xiv, mentioned above, describes the khecarīcakra or kulacakra, which forms the locus of powerful rituals performed in a cremation ground, crossroads, a shrine of the Mother goddesses, etc., or is ritually etched upon cloth, metal, or another substrate. BraYā xvii teaches an elaborate cakra based upon the nine-syllable vidyā. This vast chapter also describes a variety of connected magical rites (karma), involving etching the cakra upon a moveable surface or the ground. The mantra-deity configuration called the bhautikacakra comprises the first subject of BraYā xix, a chapter that delineates a cakra based upon the nine-syllable vidyā as well.

**INITIATION AND CONSECRATION**

Much material pertaining to the important topics of initiation and consecration is clustered in chapters xxxi–xxxvii. Together, these comprise more than ten percent of the BraYā. Chapter thirty-two purportedly covers dīkṣā, initiation proper, but in fact focuses almost exclusively upon one important dimension: the initiations of the sixfold “courses” or “ways” (sadadhvan) of ascent to Śiva: bhuvanadīkṣā (287–158ab), padadīkṣā (158cd–245), bīja- or varṇadīkṣā (246–67), kaladīkṣā (268–88), mantra-dīkṣā (289–95ab), and tattvadīkṣā (295cd–307ab). The universe contains six adhvan, which the six initiations purify in relation to the initiand: the ways of the hierarchy of worlds (bhuvanādhvan), words (padādhvan), phonemes (varṇa-/bījādhvan), the primordial creative powers (kalādhvan), mantras (mantrādhvan), and reality principles (tattvādhvan).¹⁰ This cosmological system is explained in some detail in the preceding chapter, BraYā xxxi.¹¹ It appears that the BraYā viewed the initiation of the Six Ways

---

¹⁰ The sequence of presentation of the six adhvan differs within the tradition, and does so even within the text of the BraYā. On this notion of six adhvan, see the entry in Tāntrikabhidhānakosa, vol. 1, 110–11. See also the entries for kalādhvan and kaladīkṣā in Tāntrikabhidhānakosa, vol. 11, 74–76.

¹¹ That the cosmological systems explicated in BraYā xxxi bear upon initiation is stated explicitly:

---
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as central to destroying the impurity binding the initiand. The subject of tatvadīkṣā is taught in more detail in BraYā xxxvi, which bears this as its title.

BraYā xxxii hence does not give a full account of initiation. Indeed, it even lacks mention of “showing the maṇḍala” to the disciple (maṇḍaladarśana), an act so central that it is sometimes equated with initiation. This disjoint presentation of initiation makes it difficult to determine precisely what ritual sequence was envisioned. The initiation maṇḍala itself is described in BraYā iii, the elaborate maṇḍala of “the great rite” (mahāyāga) mentioned above. In its closing section, this chapter also provides a brief description of aspects of initiation ritual, including preliminary worship and maṇḍaladarśana. In the latter sequence, the blindfolded disciple is made to cast a flower into the maṇḍala, the point on which it alights establishing his or her initiatory clan.

A section of BraYā iv provides a concordance indicating which Mother-goddess clan an initiate belongs to depending upon where in the maṇḍala his or her flower lands. This probably pertains to the initiands known as the samayin and putraka; a different concordance is provided in BraYā xxxiii, which applies to the ācārya and perhaps

---

12 Note the initial instruction to the ācārya, BraYā xxxii.3cd-5:

paśuṁ paṁcāsaṁ samsthāpya daksinēm amano budhāḥ || 3 || sahajagantukānāṁ tu sansargikābhūnaṁ tathātva hī ||

“An intelligent [ācārya] should situate the bound soul at his own side, to the right. He should then perform seizure of the innate, adventitious (agantuka), and natural (samsargika) [karma], preceded by fusion of the [ācārya’s and initiand’s] nādiḥs.”

It seems paṁcāsaṁ in 3c must be singular in meaning although plural in form. Compare for example the Svayambhūsūtrasamgraha, which describes the sixfold dīkṣā as accomplishing a series of transformations of māya, primal matter, probably in the sense of māyāmala, the impurity associated with māya. This finds support in Svacchandatanttra 4.80, according to which adhvasuddhi accomplishes pāśaccheda, “severing of the fetters [of mala, impurity],” fetters elsewhere specified as māyā, “belonging to māya” (Svacchandatanttra 4.129).

13 BraYā iv.888–898, quoted in part in the introduction to chapter 2. Occurrence of this material in BraYā iv seems curious given the chapter’s focus upon ritual icons, and given that the immediate context is description of ritual bells (ghanta).
śādhaka.\textsuperscript{14}

A separate chapter, \textit{BrāYa} xxxvii, treats what it calls \textit{samayādkarana}, "the making of a Pledge-holder," suggestive of what other sources call \textit{samayādikṣā}.\textsuperscript{15} Confusing matters, this is said to be a "procedure for śādhas,"\textsuperscript{16} suggesting that it is instead śādhaṅkābhiṣeka, the consecration which makes one a śādha. Included in this ritual is the initial initiatory "sprinkling" (prokṣaṇa) of the candidate, and the rite of the officiant placing his mantra-empowered hand upon him—here a śaktihasta, "śakti-hand," rather than the śivaṭasta, "Śiva-hand" mentioned in other layers of the tradition. These two acts normatively precede and follow maṇḍaladārsana, respectively.\textsuperscript{17}

It is possible that this chapter provides a brief outline of the combined \textit{samayādikṣā} and śādhaṅkābhiṣeka, for the śādha is after all the primary practitioner to which the \textit{BrāYa} addresses itself. Neither this chapter nor \textit{BrāYa} xxxii provides an account of the initiatory Pledges (samayas), which are not ennumerated until \textit{BrāYa} lxxi and lxxxv. The lists of the latter two chapters are moreover discrepant. \textit{BrāYa} lxxi, a long and remarkably self-contained chapter called the sātrāḍhikārāpatāla ("chapter on who has entitlement to the teaching") or the Tilaka, opens with the "menstruating Great Goddess, Bhairavi," asking for a synopsis of "everything which has been said and not said."\textsuperscript{18} In this chapter's eclectic discussion of food offerings (cāru), magical pills (guṭikā), mantra, skulls, and much else, there occurs a list of Pledges (119cd-127).

Entitled \textit{samayādikṣāra}, "the chapter on the Pledges," \textit{BrāYa} lxxxv also ennumerates Eight Pledges, and, furthermore, teaches \textit{mantramayī dikṣā}, the "initiation consisting of mantras." \textit{Mantramayī dikṣā} appears primarily to involve destroying the fetters

\textsuperscript{14} The passage from \textit{BrāYa} iv is quoted in chapter 2 (n. 14), while an excerpt from the passage in \textit{BrāYa} xxxii is quoted in chapter 4 (n. 82).

\textsuperscript{15} This chapter calls its second subject brahmaṇḍotkārṣasa, "drawing down the cosmos." What this has to do with initiation is presently unclear to me. Curiously, in the colophon this chapter calls itself tattvādikṣāpatāla—the subject and title of \textit{BrāYa} xxxviii—probably in error.

\textsuperscript{16} Viz. i8ab, śādhasaṣva samābhyaḥto vidhīr esa mayā lāva ("this procedure I have taught you is for the śādha").

\textsuperscript{17} Sanderson, "Religion and the State: Initiating the Monarch in Śaivism and the Buddhist Way of Mantras" (forthcoming).

\textsuperscript{18} The opening half-sloka reads, \textit{ṛtuṁati mahādevi bhairavī vākyam abraṃti}, while the final half-sloka of the goddess's question is, \textit{uktāṅkhatām aśeṣaṁ tu samgrahañcaḥ brajavi me} (i6ab).
of impurity associated with the Course of Mantras (mantradhvan), and ends with bestowal of the sādhaka-consecration.

Consecration (abhiṣeka) forms the subject of BraYā xxxi’s approximately four-hundred verses. In contrast to the preceding chapter on initiation, here the description of the ritual appears complete and self-contained. The ritual is structured along the lines of Śaiva initiation and involves maṇḍaladārśana (“viewing the maṇḍala”), in which the initand is led blindfolded to the maṇḍala, made to cast a flower thereupon, and given a clan name accordingly; and the rite of “incubation,”19 involving prognostication using a tooth-pick (dantakaṣṭha), and afterwards based upon the candidate’s dreams. That the ritual described concerns the consecration of the officiant, ācārya, is made explicit through the nature of the Pledges taken, which include giving initiation and explaining the scriptures.20 The chapter ends with a description of ritual worship of the guru and bestowal of the sacredotal fee.

Mantrasamkalanavidhi, “the procedure for preparing the mantras,” comprises the subject and title of BraYā xxxiv. This massive chapter outlines the tedious syllable-by-syllable sequence of mantra-incipitation and fire-offerings by which an ācārya prepares or empowers the full pantheon of basic mantras.21 BraYā xxxi, having the generic title prakriyāpatala, is connected to dikṣā insofar as it describes the cosmological systems necessary for performance of the sixfold adhva-initiation.22 It provides a detailed exposition of the hierarchy of worlds, tattvas, etc., including their presiding mantra-deities. These collectively comprise the brahmaṇḍa or universe. The chapter also describes the hierarchy of rudras who lie beyond the brahmaṇḍa, bearing it (114–).

BraYā xxxv’s stated title is nādiśaṅcārapatala, the “chapter on the movement of the

19 This term has been adopted by Sanderson from scholarship on Greco-Roman religion, where it refers to “ritual sleep in a sanctuary in order to obtain a dream.” Sanderson, “Religion and the State: Initiating the Monarch in Śaivism and the Buddhist Way of Mantras” (forthcoming), quoting Hornblower and Spawforth.


21 That this material is directed toward the ācārya is clarified in the opening verse, which describes the mantrasamkalanavidhi as something “by the mere learning of which one is fit to perform initiation” (yena viññātanātreyā dikṣām vai karttum arhati, BraYā xxxiv.1cd).

22 See above (n. 11).
nādīs," and it describes the movement of the supreme deity within the channels of
the body. This chapter gives an exposition on the bodily channels and the principal
goddesses which they embody, these forming a ninefold cakra. Its occurrence within
the cluster of chapters pertaining to initiation perhaps has its basis in this knowledge
being necessary for the ācārya to accomplish yogic fusion of the disciple's channels
(nāṭisandhāna), as well as the final act of linking the disciple to the supreme deity
(śivayojanikā) after completing the initiation which purifies the adhvans.23

CULT IMAGES (PRATIMĀ, LIŃGA)

Iconography, iconometry, and rituals involving images (pratimākarma) form the sub-
jects of the BraYā's massive fourth chapter. One of the most significant sections of
the text, BraYā iv contains about a thousand verses on the subject of religious images
(pratimā) and other ritual objects, including their rites of empowerment and worship.
This unique iconometric and iconographic treatise merits extensive study in its own
right. Characteristic of chapter four is its hierarchical classification of deities and their
images as semi-divine (divyādivya), divine (divya), and supra-divine (divyādhika). In
the semi-divine are included the Hundred Rudras, female spirits called lāmās, and
the demonic rākṣasas. 'Divine' images comprise the sets of goddesses included in
the BraYā's maṇḍala—yoginis, guhyakās/devis, kinkāris/dūtīs, and the Mothers—as
well as their male counterparts (pati, vīra), rudras and yoginis of the sacred fields,
and lokapālas. Also 'divine' are the gaṇa-lords Nandin and Mahākāla, and the river
goddesses Gaṅgā and Yamunā, deities who typically serve as guardians (dvārapāla)
of a temple's sanctum. In the category of supra-divine come the high deities: the
supreme Śakti, Sadāśiva, the Three Śaktis (Vāmā, Jyeṣṭhā, and Raudrī), Śrīkaṇṭha,
and Umāpati. The text contains detailed instructions concerning image measure-
ment and iconography, rituals of image empowerment (pratiṣṭhā), the specifications
and empowerment rituals for skull-bowls, skull-staves, rosaries, etc., and much else.

23 On the processes of nāṭisandhāna and śivayojanikā, see Sanderson, "Religion and the State: Royal
Initiation" (forthcoming).
Several other chapters contain material relevant to images and their ritual (*pratimākarma*). In particular, *Bṛaya vi*, a chapter of twenty-two verses, describes the iconography of the maṇḍala goddesses sculpted from “mud of the cremation ground” and inflected in various ways according to each of the nine pantheon configurations (*navayāga*) and the magical results sought. Specifications and empowerment rites for *liṅgas* and their pedestals (*pīṭha*) are taught in *Bṛaya lxxvi*, the *liṅgalakṣaṇādhiḥkāra*, “chapter on the characteristics of *liṅgas*.” These are threefold: manifest (*vyakta*) *liṅgas*, hidden/unmanifest (*avyakta*), and manifest-cum-unmanifest (*vyaktavyakta*), the latter being comprised of *liṅgas* with sculpted faces (*mukhalinīgas*). Somewhat detailed iconometric and iconographic details are provided. This chapter, moreover, seems to be the only one expressly concerned with temples, although the Goddess’s request to learn the characteristics of temples (*prāśadalakṣaṇa*) meets with disappointingly little detail. *Bṛaya xciii* discusses moveable *liṅgas* for private use in the context of *sādhakacarya*, “ritual conduct of the sādhaka.”

### 4.2 Structure and Textual Strata

In the form transmitted, the *Bṛaya* contains several sectional divisions, but their demarcation is in part problematic. The opening verses of chapter fifty announce a new section of the text. This passage recapitulates the subjects of several earlier chapters, after which the Goddess poses a new set of questions; these new questions in turn presage the subjects of many subsequent chapters, up to and including *Bṛaya lxxii*. Chapter fifty’s introduction also appears to refer to the *Bṛaya* as twofold, although not unambiguously, and it might use the term *ṣaṭka* (“sextet”) to refer to its two halves—presumably designated thus because of consisting of six-thousand verses, in principle. In this respect, the *Bṛaya* might have served as model for the

---

24 *Bṛaya* L.1-6ab:

| devāuvaca ||
| śrutam dvādaśasahasram evam tu dvigunam vibho |
| yantramantrasamopetam karmaiś ca bāhubhiś citam || 1 ||
| sādhamārdhanair yuktāṃ mudrāmantrasamancitam |
Jayadrathayāmala, a text organized into four śatkās.

The second major section of the BraYā therefore commences with chapter fifty. This marks the halfway-point chapter-wise, yet in verse count is approximately two-thirds into the text. Virtually all integral facets of the BraYā and its ritual systems are taught within the first forty-nine chapters, from the primary mantra systems to initiation and consecration. On the other hand, the section beginning with chapter fifty—the second śatka?—has a miscellaneous character, containing a large number of short, often untitled chapters, as well as quasi-independent texts of the kalpa genre devoted to deities often marginal to the BraYā’s basic mantra system. It nonetheless contains some material of significance to the whole, whether or not belonging to the text in its earliest form, such as discussions of the meanings of the titles “Brahmayāmala” and “Picumata.”

Adding to the impression of its second half having disparate content, the BraYā contains two further sections, the contents of which are not intimated in the introduction to BraYā I: with chapter eighty-four, apparently, begins the Uttarādhikāra (“Addendum Section”) or Uttaratantra (“Addendum Tantra”), and this is followed, by the Uttarottaratantra (“Latter Adden-

1ab refers to the Doṣādaśasāhasra (a titular epithet of the BraYā meaning “The Tantra of Twelve-thousand Verses”—on which see chapter 5) as being dviguna, presumably in the sense of “twofold.” The possibility of this passage using the term śatka to refer to these two divisions depends upon the emendation of pratīmaṃ to prathīmaṃ in 6a; but an adverbial prathīmaṃ (“first”) might be possible. What follows this is an index of subjects that appear already to have been covered, such as pratīmālaśaṇa (BraYā iv) and worship of the khecara-cakra (BraYā xiv).

25 See the first two sections of chapter 5 of the present thesis.
dum Tantra”). Of all the material in the BraYa, this arouses the greatest suspicion of being a subsequent addition. In the opening of BraYa lxxxiv, the Goddess restates the subjects of several preceding chapters of the second șatka. She then poses questions that seem to intimate content from a number of remaining chapters, including material from both the Uttara- and Uttarottaratrantras.26 This suggests that the latter two sections were composed as a single unit.

The basic structure of the BraYa thus appears threefold or fourfold: 1) the first forty-nine chapters; 2) the section from chapter fifty to eighty-three, which includes, for instance, kalpa-texts of particular deities, chapters closely connected with the cult of yoginīs, and discussions of the text’s titles; 3) the Uttaratantra of chapters lxxxiv–lxxxi; and 4), the Uttarottaratrantra, chapters lxxvii–ci, these latter two sections being closely connected. It is possible that the first section was considered to constitute the first șatka, the second șatka comprising section two, or else the final three sections together. However, complicating the question of the BraYa’s structure, the closing verses of its final chapter make the additional claim that the text consists of five “śūtras.”27 One might expect these to be sections of the text, for the division into books called śūtras has precedent in the ancient Niśvásatattvasaṃhitā, which consists of a Mālasūtra, Uttarasūtra, Nayasūtra, and Guhyasūtra, prefaced by a fifth section, the Mukhāgama. Each of these contains multiple chapters. In addition, the Niśvāsakārika,

26 In particular, note the reference to “the conduct of sādhas” (sādhasattam vṛttam, in 7a) in the list of future topics, which appears to intimate chapters xci–xciv. This passage is quoted below (n. 32).

27 BraYa ci.31–32:

brahmāyāmalatantrantraṃ laksapādādhibhikāgatam |
satakotyujjvalat tantratā sāratā sāratattaratram || 31 ||
sthitam devādāsāhasram pāncasūtrojjanalā matam |
maya te kathitam bhadre bhadresādhnaprādayakam || 32 ||


“O good woman, I have taught you the Brahmayāmalatantra, which grants felicitous siddhis, and emerged from the Tantra of One and a Quarter Hundred Thousand. The Tantra of Twelve Thousand exists (sthitā) as the highest essence of essences from the Tantra endowed with a billion [verses]. It is held to be endowed with five śūtras.”

The emendation laksapādādhibhikāgatam is supported by the colophon of the Matasūtra quoted in chapter 5 (n. 140). Alexis Sanderson’s edition of these verses has been published in Dominic Goodall, Bhāṭṭa Rāmākṛṣṇha’s Commentary on the Kirantaṭrantra. Vol. 1: Chapters 1–6, lxxiii–iv.
which appears to belong to a somewhat later period, posits itself as the fifth śūtra of the Nīśvāsa.\footnote{See Sanderson, “The Lākulas: New Evidence of a System Intermediate between Pāñcarthika Pāśupatism and Āgamic Śaivism,” 152-53.}

How precisely the hundred and one chapters of the BraYa could be divided into five sections called śūtras is never explicated. The text nonetheless contains several other nebulous references to containing or consisting of śūtras,\footnote{Note e.g. BraYa lxix.77:}

\begin{verbatim}
ucchusmasambhavam tantraṃ devyas cocchusmasambhavōḥ |
tenyoktyaḥ tu mahādeva sūtradībhi mahēśvaraḥ 77 |
devyaḥ | conj.; devya Br\footnote{“O Mahādeva, through śūtras and so forth, you have taught the tantra arising from Ucchusmabhairava, and the goddesses arising from Ucchusmabhairava, O Mahēśvara.”}  
\end{verbatim}

Neither śūtra nor ādi (“etc.”) is clear in meaning here.\footnote{Note for instance the opening verse of BraYa xiii:}

\begin{verbatim}
ataḥ param pravakṣyāmi pūrvasūtreṇa coditāḥ |
nirayādiḥ mahādevi i am me nigadatāḥ śṛṇu | 1 |
coditāḥ | em.; coditā Br\footnote{“Hereafter, I shall teach the Nine Pantheons indicated previously [lit. ‘revealed with/by a previous thread’ (puṁśvatesudreṇa coditāḥ)], O Great Goddess; listen while I explain this.”}  
\end{verbatim}

Neither of the Nine Pantheons—the subject of the chapter quoted—were listed without elaboration in BraYa iii.2-4, to which the present verse probably refers.\footnote{Problematizing the possibility that mūlasūtra refers to the first fifty-odd chapters, the phrase mūlasūtreṇa coditam also occurs in BraYa xxxiii (77b); though unclear, this might mean “taught [previously] in/with the root (mūla) section/thread.”}

\begin{verbatim}
devy uvāca  
\end{verbatim}
appears to call itself “the vinaya.” As for the saṅghrāṣṭra, this is undoubtedly BraYā lxi, a remarkably self-contained treatise called the Tilaka (discussed below). By Uttarasūtra, in contrast, the redactors presumably had in mind the Uttara- and perhaps Uttarottaratantras.

While the BraYā certainly contains multiple sections, the notion that it consists of sūtras appears contrived, and perhaps belongs to a late phase of its redaction. Indeed, the principal references to the BraYā consisting of sūtras belong to the concluding sections of the text, probably its final textual stratum: BraYā lxxxiv, of the Uttara-tantra; and cit of the Uttarottaratantra. Two factors might have contributed to this conception: a smattering of vague references in the text to sūtras, and the sūtra model of the Niśvāsa corpus. The latter could have stimulated some redactors to an unlikely interpretation of the former. In turn, the statement in BraYā cit that the text consists of five sūtras appears to have stimulated further speculation within the tradition, for such is evident in the Jayadrathayāmala. As Sanderson notes, chapter forty-four of the latter’s first śatka, called the Brahmayāmalanirnayā (“A Definitive Judgment on
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graph LR
```

The text and interpretation of this passage—presented “as is” in By9, the oldest codex—are doubtful in several instances.

33 BraYā lxii 64d, vinaye ‘smim mahālīmane.
the *Brahmayāmala*”), claims that texts of the *Brahmayāmala* cycle contain five sūtras: a mūla-, guhya-, naya-, uttara-, and uttarottarasūtra. This appears to be an attempt to reconcile several things: the claim that the *BraYa* consists of five sūtras, the five-sūtra model of the *Niśvāsa* corpus, and the actual sectional divisions of the *BraYa*—for unlike the *Niśvāsa*, the *BraYa* possesses both an Uttara- and Uttarottaratantra/sūtra. It is possible that the *BraYa’s* vinaya section was considered analogous to the *Niśvāsa’s* Nayasūtra. The *Jayadrathayāmala* does not, however, speak of the *BraYa’s* sūtras strictly as sections: on the contrary, it describes the mūlasūtra, for instance, as the words “athaḥ,” with which begin many of the *BraYa*’s chapters and sections, while the guhyasūtra is said to consist of teachings on secret matters, such as the yogic body’s channels and the clans of yoginis.

34 Concerning the *BraYa*’s purported division into sūtras, and the elaboration of this in the *Jayadrathayāmala*, Sanderson expresses the following opinion: “in the case of the BY the schema of the five sūtras has nothing to do with the sequence of sections seen in the Niśvāsa. For it has no sequential divisions other than its paṭalas. It seems, therefore, that the FY understands the sūtras to be five classes of teaching within the otherwise unitary Tantra, in the same way that it claims to have four Pādas, though it lacks a corresponding division into a sequence of four parts bearing their names.” Quoted in Goodall (Bhaṭṭa Rāmakaṇṭha’s Commentary), lxiii–iv. This assessment of the *Jayadrathayāmala*’s understanding of the *BraYa*’s sūtras seems convincing; note however that the *BraYa* does contain several divisions, beyond its division into chapters.

35 *Jayadrathayāmala* 1.44 (folio unnumbered):

```
athaḥ śabdātmāṃ tu sarvatatārthaśāstikāca

nirācvatāndhāttārthān nādāmaṇḍāgatiḥ kramat

binduvajakahoganauvyākyagavivekacakam

mantra/tāṃtīlāryoginīkātākārtā

guhyasūtram tad uddhātām bhūyādhāntārthaśāstikāca

"gatih kramat [em.]; "gatikramat cod. "navyāga" [em.]; "vavyagā" cod.

"athaḥ is the root of speech, indicating the meaning of all tantras; and it is the very pithy mūlasūtra. Guhya indicates secrets: the meanings of “beyond regulations” (nirācara) and “immaculate” (avadhūta), the channels [of the subtle body] and movements of the channels, in sequence; it [also] indicates bindu, biṣa-mantras, the kālas, yoga, and the Nine Pantheons; [it is that] by which are proclaimed mantra, extraction of the nectar of living beings, and the clans of yoginis. This is called ‘Guhyaśūtra,’ expressing [both] external and internal meanings.”
```

This chapter of the *Jayadrathayāmala* makes the additional claim that the *BraYa* contains seven sūtras, from which derive eight Matatantras:

```
brahmayāmalam etad dhi sūtrair bhinnam tu saptabhīḥ

saptamam ca dvitīyā bhinnam ateṣāṃ matāṭākām

“For the *Brahmayāmala* is divided according to seven sūtras, and the seventh is divided in two; because of this the Matatantras are known as an octad.”
```

Codex of Viśvabharatl University (Manuscript Division, Department of Sanskrit). This is a Devanāgarī-script paper manuscript of Nepalese provenance, written on twenty-six folios and containing chapters.
The evidence reviewed above concerning the structure of the BraYā provides some indications that this heterogenous text incorporated new material over time. In addition, a number of discrepancies in the BraYā’s content suggest redacional discontinuity. One of these, mentioned in the discussion of the BraYā and Laghuṣaṅvara in the previous chapter, concerns typologies of the sādhaka: while a threefold classification of the sādhaka is presupposed in the earlier chapters, especially xxiv–xlv, the Addendum Tantras explicate a fourfold typology that appears to be a subsequent innovation.36 Less suggestive of historical development, other disparities nonetheless point toward heterogeneity. For instance, the BraYā has two chapters treating the subject of chomma or secret signs: lv and lxxiii. Striking is the lack of relationship between these chapters, which overlap in context and many particulars, but provide no clear indications of belonging to the same system.37 This sort of heterogeneity could point toward redacional discontinuity, but it might also reflect the disparate sources drawn upon by the BraYā’s redactors.

Significant to the question of the BraYā’s stratification is the conception of it containing twelve-thousand verses—hence its epithet, Dvādasasahasra[ka], “The Tantra of Twelve-thousand Verses.” References to this conception of the BraYā’s length are absent from chapters ii–xlix, aside from colophons, and it is conceivable that this notion of the text’s size does not belong to its earliest textual stratum. The text as we have it consists of upwards of thirteen-thousand verses,38 fewer than eight-thousand of which belong to the first forty-nine chapters. This suggests that the notion of the text consisting of 12,000 verses is unlikely to predate some or most of the chapters from fifty onwards. On the other hand, the brevity of the Uttarā- and Uttarottara-

35–42 of Jayadrathayāmala, satka i. Cf. the discussion of the Viśvabhārati codex of the BraYā, in the introduction to part ii.
36 The closing verses of BraYā lxxiv first intimate the fourfold typology of the sādhaka explicated in the Addendum Tantras, for here the practitioners called the aradhaka and sarvātman are first mentioned (arādhakas tu devoṣ sarvaiḥ sarvātmanah smṛtaḥ, 211ab).
37 In particular, note that lv.101–37 and lxxiii.16–40 overlap considerably; the chommas of these sections often involve similar secret signs made in similar contexts, for which distinct ritual meanings are nonetheless provided.
38 See chapter 5, section 5.
tantras—eighteen chapters, but only sixteen-hundred odd verses—in no way rules out the possibility that these were added subsequently.

As mentioned, several chapters of the second half of the BraYā, from chapter fifty, appear remarkably self-contained. This is in part because a number belong to the kalpa genre: treatises setting out the practices of mantra-propitiation connected with a particular deity. However, at least two chapters arouse the suspicion of being independent tantras subsequently redacted into the BraYā—a phenomenon attested, for instance, in the case of the Jayadrathayāmala.39 Two chapters in question are BraYā lxi, the Tilaka[tantra]; and BraYā lxxxi, the Utphulla[kamata], the titles of which match texts quoted by Abhinavagupta. The Utphulla[kamata], Utphullakan[tantra], or Utphullādhikāra,40 a chapter of roughly 195 verses, teaches practices connected with the deity Utphullakabhairava and the nine-syllable utphulla[kamana]. A text by the name Utphulla[kamata] is listed in the Śrīkaṁtiya[samhitā] as the seventh of eight mata[tantras].41 Abhinavagupta unfortunately provides too little information concerning the Utphullatantra he cites to link it with BraYā lxxxi.42 Sanderson suggests the intriguing possibility that this chapter has been derived from an independent tantra of this name.43 Indeed, the Utphulla[kamata]'s elaborate “Maṇḍala of the Nine-syllable Mantra” (navātmaka cakra) contains astrological elements unique in maṇḍalas of the BraYā.44 At the same time, the chapter in the form transmitted clearly identifies itself

40 The title Utphulla[kamata] is first intimated in BraYā 1, in its list of subsequent chapter subjects; two references to this title occur within the chapter (11d and 17b). In addition, the chapter calls itself the Utphullakan[tantra] in its opening verse (atah param pravaksyami tantrapram utphul[laku]kaparam, 1ab), while its colophon gives the name Utphullādhikāra.
41 Śrīkaṁtiya[samhitā], as quoted by Jayaratha, commenting on Tantraloka 1.18. The verses listing the eight matat[antras] appear absent from the Śrīkaṁtiya[samhitā] manuscript transcription provided in Hanneder, Abhinavagupta’s Philosophy of Revelation. Incidentally, heading this list is the Rakṣāmata, named after the first of the Four Devis in the maṇḍala of the BraYā’s Kapālīṣabhairava.
42 In Tantraloka 29.166a, Abhinavagupta cites the Utphulla, identified by the commentator as the Utphulla[kamata], alongside yogini cult scriptures such as the Siddhayogesvarakamata (assuming this is the referent of Śrisiddha) and the lost Nirnāma[dantra] (“The Tantra of No Constraints”). He cites these as sources for the erotic ādiyaga (“primordial rite”) expounded in this chapter of the Tantraloka. There does not appear to be a link between the BraYā’s Utphulla[kamata] and a ritual of this type, however.
44 This elaborate cakra, based upon Utphullakabhairava in a circle of four devīs and four dāttīs—hence mirroring Kapālīṣa’s maṇḍala—including (alphabetical representations of) the signs of the zodiac (rāśi),
as a section of the BraYa,\textsuperscript{45} suggesting a potentially complex history.

Chapter sixty-one of the BraYa possesses several titles: Tilaka (perhaps, “[Tantra] of the [Magical] Bindi”)?,\textsuperscript{46} Sūtraḍhikārapatāla, Saṅgrahatanastra, and Saṅgrahasūtra.\textsuperscript{47} About two-hundred and seventy-five verses long, this chapter claims to be the essence (sāra) of the Picumata/Brahmayamala,\textsuperscript{48} while nonetheless introducing novel material—calendrical dates (tithi), constellations (naksattra), and planetary conjunctions (yoga).

\textsuperscript{45} Reference to “the Brahmayamala” occurs, for instance, in laksapadadhike khyaṭam viśeṣād brahmayamale).

\textsuperscript{46} The contextual significance of this title word is unclear. The application of magical bindis (tilaka) is the focus of only one brief section of the chapter (237cd–49), which might nonetheless be the source of its name. Less probablc, the title could be connected to the term tilakā, used as an epithet of the supreme Sakti in another chapter, BraYa lxvii.12 (tilakābhīṣyā mahāśakti jñānaśāraṇā munaṃmān | sā śiva śivasāmyuktā aghori ghoravāsamānti). Tilaka might simply be intended in the sense of “decorative forehead dot” (bindi)—the chapter therefore being a “decorative ornament” to the BraYa, which it claims to synthesize. Cf. the title Sāradātilakātantra—“The Ornament of Sarasvati Tantra.”

\textsuperscript{47} The title “Sūtraḍhikārapatāla” is given in the chapter colophon, while “Saṅgrahatanastra” occurs in 145ab (tad atra sangrahe tantri samkṣiptatā ucya). In a synopsis in the opening verses of BraYa lxxxiv, this material is referred to as the “Saṅgrahasūtra” (kathitam saṅgraham sūtraṁ, 2a).

\textsuperscript{48} See for instance BraYa lxxi.6–9ab:

bhairava uvāca

śādhu śādhu mañabhatge jñānavijñānasampadam |
saṅgrahārthaviśeṣaṁ tu kalyāṇī tarvākhilam | 6 ||

jañāte picumate tanitre dāśa de ca sāhasraśe |
lata śṛṇāma mahādevi śaktijñānāmahodayam | 7 ||
tantrasya śāradāśaṁ tu tad atra tīlakā matam |
ye na jñānti tantrajñāh te bṛhamantī vidambakaḥ | 8 ||
kāraṣṭādhiṁ na paśyantī na ca yānti paṭāṁ gatīm |

6 b “sampadam” em.; “sampado Bya” 7c “sṛṇa” em.; “sṛṇa Bya”

“Bhairava spoke: ‘Excellent, O fortunate woman, excellent. I shall teach you (?) a particular digest treatise (saṅgrahārtha ?) in its entirety, replete with wisdom and knowledge. After the Picumatastanastra has been learnt, the Tantra of Twelve-Thousand [Verses], therein lies a treasure of knowledge of the Sakti, O Great Goddess, the essence of the tantra—known here as this Tilaka. Those who do not know [this] wander about as impostors, [even if they] know [other] tantras. They do not see the fruition of their rites, nor do they attain to the highest destination’.”

(On the possible use of the term artha as “treatise” or tantra, see the annotation to the translation of BraYa 1.65.) Compare also verses 250–51:

jñānta vidumata tanitre tīlakāṁ ca āya paścīnaṁ |
palānam ita dhīnaśārīrī tajjār mantrān aṣṭaṇaḥ | 250 ||

mālatantrārthasadbhāvam samastikṛtalokānaṁ |
saṃkṣepaśīrāsanī jañānta talō mantri prasādyati | 251 ||

250d mantram em.; mantram Bya 251a “sadbhāvaṁ” conj.; “sa - - Bya

“After learning the Picumatastanastra, and the Tilaka as well, (?) which has nothing afterwards (apāścīnān) (?), one should give up [all other] mantras without exception, like a vegetarian [would give up] meat. After learning the essence of the meaning of the Root Tantra, with [all] its characteristics brought together, both in abbreviation and at length, the mantram then attains siddhi.”
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The Goddess opens her questions asserting that she has already heard the \textit{Yamalatantra}, while other passages too draw a distinction between the \textit{Tilaka} and the \textit{Picumata} or \textit{BraYa}, clear indications of the independence of this section. \footnote{A striking example is the introduction of the \textit{navatmamantra}, a ninefold mantra-pantheon characteristic of the \textit{Nisvadsatattvasamhita}, which \textit{BraYa} \textit{Lxi} appears directly or indirectly to draw upon. See the discussion in section 3 of this chapter.} Consistent with its self-identification as the "essence" (\textit{s\=ara}) and "digest" (\textit{sa\=ngraha}) of the \textit{BraYa}, the \textit{Tilaka} has the appearance of a self-contained treatise, containing concise accounts of topics spanning initiation, the Pledges, a mantra-system (\textit{mantroddhara}) and its associated mandala and worship, substances and objects used in ritual, yoga, and more. Regardless of whether it was originally written as "part" of the \textit{BraYa}, the \textit{Tilaka} is deeply anchored in this tradition, as is illustrated by its focus upon several characteristic topics, such as the Nine Pantheons and the \textit{smarana}-mantra. \footnote{In the \textit{Paratrimsikavivarana}, Abhinavagupta attributes to the \textit{Sr\=tilakasastra} and the \textit{Sr\=tbhargasikha} the idea that assiduous practice of the "nondual" rites of heroes causes one's \textit{gl\=ani} ("lassitude, inhibition") to vanish suddenly, effecting the merger of individual identity (\textit{dvesa}) into the heart of Bhairava. After quoting the \textit{pratika} of \textit{Spandakarika} 3.8 (\textit{gl\=ani vilumpika dehe}), he remarks, \textit{seyatn yada jhatiti vigalit\=a bhavati tada nirastap\=adavayantranakalanko bhairavah\=rayad\=ayupra\=varis\=to bhavat\=iitr sarv\=ahaitadabhy\=aye yatil\=a\=syam | \textit{Sr\=tilakasastra} \textit{yam bhak\=ah} | \textit{Sr\=tbhargasikha}\=yam api \textit{uktam} ("when this very [\textit{gl\=ani}] suddenly dissolves, then, being one who has cast off the blemish that is the bound soul's affliction, he becomes merged into the heart of Bhairava. One must hence in every respect endeavor in this practice [of the \textit{adiyaga}]. This idea is present in the \textit{Sr\=tilakasastra}; this is also stated in the \textit{Sr\=tbhargasikha}"). From the commentary on \textit{Paratrimsika} 9cd-i8ab (p. 235). \textit{BraYa} \textit{Lxi} enjoins one to perform ritual with a "nondual" mental disposition, but no particular statement correlates closely with the idea and phrasing Abhinavagupta attributes to the \textit{Tilakatantra}. Note for instance \textit{BraYa} \textit{Lxi} 26-27ab:} It is possible that the \textit{Tilaka} had an independent life; however, there is insufficient evidence for identifying it with the \textit{Sr\=tilakasastra} cited by Abhinavagupta. \footnote{On the Nine Y\=agas, see the previous section of this chapter; on the \textit{smarana}-mantra (\textit{h\=on\=am}), see section 3 of chapter 5.}
in fact figures in lists of scriptures in the *Siddhayogeśvarimata* and *Śrīkanṭhīyaśasāṃhitā*, suggesting that there might have existed an ancient scripture by this title distinct from the *BraYā*.

Evidence for the independent existence of the *BraYā*’s *Utpullakamata* and *Tilaka* is hence inconclusive, and it cannot be said with certainty that the *BraYā* incorporated previously independent treatises. Another chapter too—*BraYā* _liv_, the *Mahākālāmata_*—possesses a title matching a scripture early enough to be mentioned by Bāṇa; but in this case as well, the grounds are insufficient for linking the texts. Nevertheless, internal evidence from the *Tilaka* chapter, in particular, suggests that new material was added in the course of the *BraYā*’s transmission, and other chapters from this portion of the *BraYā* merit similar suspicion.

Altogether, the *BraYā* has the appearance of a layered and composite text, the production of which involved multiple individuals potentially separated in time and place. Nonetheless, while its language is utterly non-classical, it appears consistently so, betraying no obvious linguistic or stylistic discrepancies from section to section. This relative stylistic uniformity might point toward production within a single textual community, our understanding of the geographic, social, and chronological parameters of which remains nebulous. Simplistic as it may seem to suggest that its primary sections represent consecutive strata in its development, this possibility appears to have merit, particularly in the case of the *Addendum Tantras*. As a working hypothesis, I would suggest that the core of the old text consists of much or most of *BraYā* _i–xlix_, to which, in the next stage, material from chapters _l–lxxiii_

"For the sake of attaining the clan siddhis, [one should remain] standing before the goddesses, having reached a state of nonduality, without apprehension about the rites with [impure] gruel; by the mere consumption of this, one would obtain the siddhi of the flying yoginis (khecat)."

54 *Siddhayogeśvarimata* 29.16d, and *Śrīkanṭhīyaśasāṃhitā* 223, 245–246 (numbering as per the manuscript transcription in Jürgen Hanneder, *Abhinavagupta’s Philosophy of Revelation: An Edition and Annotated Translation of Malimślokavārttīka I, 1–399*); the latter two lacunose verses refer to a *Vidyatilaka* and *Bhairavatilaka*, suggesting that *tilakatantras* comprised a scriptural genre, like the yāmalas or matsas.

55 See the discussion of Bāṇa in chapter 2, section 3.

56 On the language of the text, see the remarks in the next section, and particularly the annotation to the critical edition in part II.
was incorporated. The final stage of redaction is probably represented by the Uttara- and Uttarottaratantras, chapters LXXXIV–CI.

4.3 ON THE PROVENANCE OF THE BRAHMAYĀMALA

**DATING**

Nothing I am presently aware of makes it possible to date the *BraYa* with precision. A variety of factors, however, points towards the sixth to eighth centuries as the period within it would most plausibly have been composed. Quotations of the *BraYa* in the *Tantraloka* of Abhinavagupta, who flourished in the decades before and after the turn of the eleventh century, establish the existence of the text by this period, at the very latest. The distribution of Abhinavagupta's citations, which are drawn from most sections of the *BraYa*, suggests that he knew the text in a form close to that preserved in the Nepalese manuscripts.57 The oldest of these was in any case copied not long

57 Abhinavagupta cites the *BraYa* fifteen times in the *Tantraloka*; precise references are provided in the next chapter (nn. 1–2). In what follows, several of the passages he makes reference to are identified, instances spanning chapters IV, XXI, XLIV, I V, and (probably) LXXXIV of the *BraYa*.

1. In *Tantraloka* 27.21–23ab, Abhinavagupta paraphrases *BraYa* IV.308–15; *Tantraloka* 27.22ab is in fact a direct quotation of IV.308ab. In the !kṣṭ edition, *Tantraloka* 27.22ab reads, *tāre yagah sadā sastah Siddhidās dosavarjite*; *yogah* is however certainly a corruption of *yagah*. Codex By2 of the *BraYa* reads *tāre yagah sadā āstha sāddhānā dosavarjite*. The original text was perhaps *tāre yagah sadā sāstha sāddhitām dosavarjite*, and Abhinavagupta thus appears to have corrected the gender of *yaga* from neuter to masculine. In addition, Abhinavagupta refers in 27.29 to a typology of ritual skulls, for which the source is *BraYa* IV.747–55—from a section on the subject of “the characteristics of skulls” (*kapālakahā̄na*).

2. *Tantraloka* 4.55cd–65 makes reference to both *BraYa* XXI and LV, closely paraphrasing a passage from the latter (see below). The relevant passage from *BraYa* XXI concerns the observance (*vratā*) connected with the goddess Rakta, i.e. the *rakta-vratā*. Abhinavagupta draws on this in advancing the idea of “self-consecration” (*ātmabhāṣa*), closely paraphrasing *BraYa* XXI.69cd–70ab. Note the text of *Tantraloka* 4.55cd–65:

```quote
tatniru ca punah śrīmadraktārvadhānakārmanai || 63 ||
vidhiṃ proktāṃ sādā kūrae mānaēcarīyā ucyate ||
pakṣenā sādhakā 'rthāhārāhā putrikaḥ samayā tathā || 64 ||
ākṣaye ājāpanaṃ rakta-devāh kramād yataḥ ||
guror aśīhe proktāsya vidhiṃ etayam samaścāret || 65 ||
```

"And furthermore, in that very text, [the *BraYa*], in the [section on the] ritual procedure for worship of Śri Rakta, this procedure [of self-consecration] is taught; by practicing constantly, after a month one is called 'acarya', by a fortnight, 'sādhanā', from a quarter month, 'niraka'. and likewise in half that time 'samauin'. Since the
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This cites *BraYa* xxI.69cd–70:

> dvibhih karmasmarthas tu nāsendātrya ucyate || 69 ||  
> pakṣeṇa sādhako hi esa bhūtale mantravigrahāḥ |  
> pratīhāma tu vratam hy etad rakṣīyaḥ pariṁkṛtītaṁ || 70 ||  

“By two [months of following the observance], he is capable of [any] action. Through one month, he is called ‘ācārya’. By a fortnight, he becomes a sādhaka, having a body of mantra on this [very] earth. This is known as the first observance, of Rakṣī.”

3. Note *BraYa* lv.26:

> evamādi-r-anekais ca prakārais tu mahaśvararḥ |  
> kurute ‘nugraham pumṣām yasmasau sarvatanukhaḥ || 26 ||  

“And in these and many other ways, Mahēśvara bestows grace upon souls, since he is all-seeing.”

Abhinavagupta rewrites this as *Tantraloka* 4.56cd–57ab, correcting its irregularities:

> evamādyair anekais ca prakāraḥ paramesvararḥ || 56 ||  
> samsarino ‘nugrhnati visvasya jagataḥ putih |  

Note the rewriting of 26a to avoid internal-hiatus breaking -r-, the removal of the meaningless *tu* in 26b, and the total avoidance of 26d, with its non-standard yasmd for yasmat.

4. *Tantraloka* 28 makes reference to a passage in *BraYa* xliv, paraphrased in 28.383cd–84ab:

> srimatpicumate coktam ādau yatnena rakṣayet || 383 ||  
> praveśam sampraviṭṇasya na vicārāṇa tu kāraṇet |  

“And it is said in the revered Picumata that at first, one must guard entry [to the ritual assembly] carefully. However, one should not deliberate over one who has been admitted.”

Compare with *BraYa* xlIV.228cd–29ab:

> ādāvo eva na caai dadgāt praveśam kasya cit priye || 228 ||  
> praviṣṇeṣu sahātaceto bhaktiṣtvya na samśayaḥ |  

“At the very first, one should not admit just anyone, my dear. [But] with someone who has been admitted, one should feast together as one, without a doubt.”

5. In *Tantraloka* 15, Abhinavagupta cites the authority of the *BraYa* on the inseperability of internal and external worship, which he links to the dichotomy of gnosis (*jñāna*) and ritual action (*kriyā*). It seems possible that he had in mind a passage from *BraYa* lxxxiv. Note *Tantraloka* 15.43cd–44:

> nādhyaṭṭamena vinā bhūyam nādhyaṭṭham bhūyatārjītam || 43 ||  
> siddhiṣeṣe jñānakriyābhūyam tad dvitiyam samprakāśate |  
> sṛṭbrhmayāmala devo iti tena nyūpayaḥ || 44 ||  

“Not without the spiritual (adhyātya) would the external succeed, nor the spiritual devoid of the external; (?) the pair expression through gnosis and ritual action’ (?)—with this [statement] the Lord has explained in the revered Brahmaṇalā.”

`tad dvitiyam` (“the second one” [i.e. adhyātya?]) or `taddvitiyam` (“having that as its second”?) is problematic; Isaacson suggests, as one possibility, reading `tad dvitiyam` (“the/that pair”), which is adopted in the translation above. (Personal communication, autumn 2003.) Compare with *BraYa* lxxxiv.140:
afterwards, in 1052 C.E. Considerable historical development separates the Śaivism of Abhinavagupta from that of the BraYā—most notably the entire corpus of Kaula scripture, which finds no place in the BraYā’s account of the Śaiva canon—but this separation is difficult to quantify. Several sources of evidence nonetheless suggest with a high degree of probability that the BraYā existed two centuries or more prior to Abhinavagupta.

By the mid-tenth century are attested works of tantric literature that place themselves within the tradition of the BraYā, illustrating that it was by this time considered an important authority. A Nepalese manuscript of the Bhairavamaṅgalā, a scriptural text ascribing itself to the tradition of the BraYā, appears on paleographic grounds to date to this period. Furthermore, the Pīṅgalāmata, a scripture of the pratiṣṭhātantra genre that places itself in the tradition of the BraYā, appears to have been

**Śastra**

Adhyātmaṁ cintayed bāhyam bāhyam adhyātmikāṁ tathā

Cakre samānabhidvēsena tata vināyāsam śrutihet

“One should meditate upon the internal [cakra] as external, and the external likewise as internal. Considering [these] to be the same, one should [only] then commence installation [of the deities] on the cakra.”

In the BraYā, the pair adhyātma and bāhya simply refer to yogic processes and “external” ritual performance, respectively. In this case the correspondence with the Tantraloka citation is only suggestive, and Abhinavagupta might have had in mind other passages of the BraYā. Note for instance lxx-xxi.101 (also from the BraYā’s Uttaratantra). Here too, the text does not link jñāna and kriyā to the adhyātma-bāhya dichotomy in the manner of Abhinavagupta:

Anena vidhinā devi japahomadikarmasu

Bāhyādhyātmacarṇam mantrajñāṁ pūjāṁ kuruṇ prasidhyati

101b karmasu | cor.; karmasu Brā | 101d pūjāṁ | em.; pūjāṁ Brā

“One through this procedure, O goddess, in mantra incantation, fire sacrifice, and other rites, the knower of mantras achieves siddhi, practicing both external and internal worship” [bāhyādhyātmacarṇāṁ=bāhyādhyātmam eva].

In the future, I intend to publish a more comprehensive discussion of Abhinavagupta’s citations of the BraYā.

---

58 See chapter 1, section 1.
59 Bhairavamaṅgalā, NAK 5-687 (NCMP reel 127/21); regarding the dating of this manuscript, I am grateful for the learned opinion of Diwakar Acharya (personal communication, January, 2007). I quote the Bhairavamaṅgalā’s references to the BraYā in chapter 5 of this thesis (nn. 68, 103-4). This text is potentially identical to the Bhairavamaṅgalā listed in the Śrīkanṭhyasamhitā as first of the maṅgalatantras, described as picutanrasamudbhava (“arising from the Picumata [i.e. Brahmaṇyamālā]”). Śrīkanṭhyasamhitā 276 (in the numbering of Hanneder, Abhinavagupta’s Philosophy of Revelation).

60 Note for instance the colophon of the (incomplete) Viśvabhāratī codex of the Pīṅgalāmata (f. 11r): iti brahmaṇyamālājaya maṅgaladīkāre pīṅgalāmata pratimādīkāre nāma pratimānapraṇam [em.; prakaranas cod.] caturthāḥ (“Thus ends the fourth [chapter], entitled the ‘Section on Images’, in Book One of the Pīṅgalāmata, in the Jayadratha-[yāmala?] Section of the Brahmaṇyamālā”).
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commented upon by an important mid tenth-century Saiddhântika exegete, Bhâta Nârâyanaâkantha.\textsuperscript{61} Finally, the first of the \textit{Jayadrathayāmala}'s four books gives much importance to the \textit{BraYā} in its description of the canon of Śaiva scripture, even containing a chapter entitled \textit{brahmayāmalanirṇaya}, "A Definitive Judgment on the \textit{Brahmayāmala}." The dating of this heterogenous work is problematic; portions seem likely to be quite early, while its final form might postdate Abhinavagupta.\textsuperscript{62}

It is unclear how much prior to the mid-tenth century these works existed; one or more might belong to the ninth century, or even earlier. In any case, their attestation in the mid-tenth century suggests that the \textit{BraYā} probably existed by the end of the ninth century. Its \textit{terminus ante quem} can be pushed back somewhat further, however. As discussed in the previous chapter, there is strong evidence that the Buddhist \textit{Laghuśaṃvaratantra} incorporates a large tract of text from the \textit{BraYā}. Should it prove correct that Vilāsavajra quotes the \textit{Laghuśaṃvara}, the latter must have existed by the late eighth century; in any case, the \textit{Laghuśaṃvara} appears to have received a commentary in the mid-ninth century.\textsuperscript{63} Significantly, the section incorporated into the \textit{Laghuśaṃvara} belongs to the \textit{Uttaratantra}—in all probability a late stratum of the \textit{BraYā}—suggesting that the \textit{BraYā} existed in a redaction close to its extant form by the mid-eighth or early ninth century, depending upon the date of the \textit{Laghuśaṃvara}.

Besides the aforementioned cases, which pertain with little ambiguity to the extant \textit{BraYā}, there are more nebulous early references to a text by this title. As discussed in chapter two, the old \textit{Skandapurāṇa} provides a list of Śaiva \textit{mārtāntaras}, "Tantras of the Mother Goddesses," that includes the \textit{BraYā} (\textit{brahmam yāmalani}). Transmitted in a manuscript dated 810 C.E., it is the working hypothesis of its editors that the \textit{Skandapurāṇa} took shape in the sixth or early seventh century.\textsuperscript{64} It remains possible that the \textit{Skandapurāṇa} chapter referring to the \textit{BraYā} is a comparatively late

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{61} Alexis Sanderson, "The Śaiva Religion among the Khmers (Part I)," 441.
\item \textsuperscript{62} See section 3 of chapter 3 in the present thesis. The \textit{Jayadrathayāmala}'s \textit{brahmayāmalanirṇaya} chapter, mentioned in the previous section, is fortieth in the first \textit{satka}.
\item \textsuperscript{63} See the discussion of the \textit{Laghuśaṃvara} in section 4 of the previous chapter.
\item \textsuperscript{64} See the discussion of the \textit{Skandapurāṇa} in chapter 2, section 2.
\end{itemize}
addition to the text, while it is also conceivable that the text it refers differs from the extant BraYa. Nonetheless, the probability seems high that this passage intimates the existence of some form of the extant BraYa in the eighth century, if not considerably earlier. The passage contains clear reference to the Yogini cult and is to this minimal extent compatible with the extant BraYa. As for other early references to a “Brahmayamala,” a hymn entitled Bhairavotardhamanaka, of which several manuscript folios appear to date to the early ninth century, refers to the Goddess as “Brahmayamala,” apocryphal by this name.65

The grounds for establishing the BraYa’s terminus post quem appear tentative. While it is difficult to imagine that the BraYa existed as we have it in the sixth century, this cannot be ruled out entirely: the old Skandapurana, the inscription of Gangdhār, Dharmakirti’s reference to dākinītantras, and allusion to tantric goddess worship in early seventh-century literary sources leave open the possibility that a tantric Śaiva cult of yoginis, and perhaps a “Brahmayamala,” existed in this period. It is not until the early eighth-century Mālatimādhava of Bhavabhūti, however, that a yogini cult of the type described in Vidyāpīṭha tantras finds detailed attestation in reliably dated sources. Buddhist yogini tantras come into evidence only from around the mid-eighth century, as discussed previously; and the Laghusamvara—comparatively early in this corpus—appears to draw not only upon the BraYa, but on several Śaiva scriptures of the Vidyāpīṭha.66 How much earlier the latter sources might have existed is unclear, however.

A vast text, the BraYa provides substantial material of potential value for situating it in chronological relation to the extant Śaiva literature. Being an influential early scripture, the BraYa is mentioned by name in a variety of sources, while its indirect

65 Sanderson remarks that “the Bhairavotardhamanaka, the hymn to the Goddess of which some folios are preserved with the Pāramesvara codex of A.D. 827/28 ... knows a Brahmayamala, Viṣṇuyamala, and Rudrayamala, since it refers to the Goddess as the embodiment of these (f. 53r1): tvam brahmayamala tvam viṣṇuyamala tvam rudrayamala.” “History through Textual Criticism,” 19 (n. 21).

66 Sanderson identifies borrowings in the Laghusamvara from the Siddhayogesvaratmaka, BraYa, Tantrasadbhāta, and the Yogini Saṅcitra of the Jayadrathāyaśmala, which appear to comprise the oldest major extant scriptures of the Vidyāpīṭha. See “History through Textual Criticism,” 41–47.
influence can also be identified in some cases. In addition, early though it may be, the *BraYā* describes a vast and diverse scriptural canon, providing a detailed picture of the forms of Śaivism it claims to transcend. Internal evidence from the domains of ritual, doctrine, cosmology and so forth also provide indications of the text’s relative archaism, although considerable work remains to be done in these areas.

*BraYā* xxxviii—the *srotanirayapatala*,67 “Chapter on the Streams [of Revelation”]—maps out the canon of Śaivism, providing a valuable catalog of tantric Śaiva scriptures that it classifies according to three primary “streams” (*srota*[s]): those of the *vāmanatantras*, *siddhāntatantras*, and *bhairavatantras* (TABLES 4.2–4). Both of the latter are twofold; the *siddhāntatantras* include śiva-division (*bheda*) and rudra-division scriptures, while the *bhairavatantras* are divided into Mantrapītha and Vidyāpītha texts.68 The *BraYā* therefore presupposes varieties of tantric Śaiva literature that appear to have existed by the early seventh century.69 In addition, reference is made to Vaiṣṇava *tantras* of the Pāncharātra, the titles of which appear at least partly spurious (TABLE 4.3).70 Although the extant literature of the Vaiṣṇava Pāncharātra does not seem especially ancient, the Pāncharātra tradition itself is mentioned in the *Mahābhārata*, presumably in a pre-tantric variety; it does not seem possible at present to determine the antiquity of its earliest tantric literature, making the relevance of its mention in the *BraYā* unclear.71 Absent from the *BraYā*’s account of the Śaiva canon are Buddhist *tantras* and Śaiva scriptures likely to belong to Kaula traditions. These absences need not be read in strictly historical terms; yet the latter in particular would

---

67 In the vast majority of its occurrences, *srotas* ("stream, current") is thematized as an a-stem (*srota*) in the *BraYā*; “*srota*” is also very common, although this is potentially a scribal corruption.

68 On the *BraYā*’s conception of the Śaiva canon, see chapter 5 of the present thesis, passim. TABLES 4.2–4 provide lists of the texts mentioned in *BraYā* xxxviii.

69 As reviewed previously, the early seventh-century Buddhist author Dharmakirti appears to refer to *vāmanatantras*. Early-seventh-century inscriptions make reference to the initiation of kings into maṇḍalas apparently of the Śaivasiddhānta, the tradition for which *siddhāntatantras* are the scriptural authorities. Sanderson, “History through Textual Criticism,” 8–10 (n. 6).

70 That the titles given for Vaiṣṇava *tantras* are spurious is suggested by their generic nature—e.g. *Pāncharatradhāna* (“Tantra of the Pāncharātra Rites”) and *Vaikunthavidhi* (“Tantra of the Rites of Viṣṇu’s Heaven”)—as well as their apparent lack of attestation.

71 On some of the problems of dating Pāncharātrika literature, see Sanderson, “History through Textual Criticism,” 35, 38 (n. 50).
be difficult to reconcile with a ninth- or tenth-century period of composition, when Kaula traditions were prevalent.\textsuperscript{72} Additionally, the \textit{Bra/Ya}'s very model of the scriptural canon seems archaic, for it displays no awareness of the five-stream model of Śaiva revelation that became normative.\textsuperscript{73}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Śivabheda</th>
<th>Rudrabheda (list 1)</th>
<th>Rudrabheda (list 2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sarvakāmika</td>
<td>Vijaya</td>
<td>Vijaya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yogodbhava</td>
<td>Niśvāsa</td>
<td>Niśvāsa (em.; visvāsa cod.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acintya</td>
<td>Svāyaṁbhava</td>
<td>Svāyaṁbhava</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kāraṇa</td>
<td>Vāthula</td>
<td>Vīrabhadra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ajīta</td>
<td>Candrahāsa</td>
<td>Ágneya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dīptābha</td>
<td>Raurava</td>
<td>Raurava</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sūkṣma</td>
<td>Mākuṭa</td>
<td>Mākoṭya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sāhasra</td>
<td>Vireśa</td>
<td>Candrabhāsa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amśūmā[n]</td>
<td>Ágneya (conj.; tathā cānayām cod.)</td>
<td>tvīramvāundat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suprabha</td>
<td>Candrajñāna</td>
<td>Jñāna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bimba</td>
<td>Mukhabimba</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prodgīta</td>
<td>Prodgīta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lalita</td>
<td>Lalita</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siddhi</td>
<td>Siddhi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santānaka</td>
<td>Santāna</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarvodgīta</td>
<td>Kirāṇa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirāṇa</td>
<td>Sarvodgīta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pārameśvara</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Little of the extant Śaiva literature can be said on strong grounds to predate the \textit{Bra/Ya}. Nonetheless, several \textit{siddhāntatantras} that survive or are quoted in early

\textsuperscript{72} Incidentally, while the \textit{Bra/Ya} does not refer to Buddhism, the \textit{Matasāra}—a Kaula text placing itself in the tradition of the \textit{Bra/Ya}—in its fourth chapter makes clear reference to initiation into Buddhist tantras:

\begin{quote}
\textit{siddhānta dīkṣita ye ca vaiṣṇave ye ca dīkṣita |}
\textit{paṇcasrotodbhāva tantre saṃmohas caiva dīkṣita |}
\textit{saure ca gārude devi bausdbhe ye caiva dīkṣita |}
\textit{ātāpi pāśavat saure asmin tantre na dīkṣita |}
\textit{asmin | em.; yasmin cod. | tantre na | em.; tantreṇa cod.}

"Those initiated into the \textit{siddhānta}-, and those initiated into the Vaiṣṇava, Saura, Gāruda, or Buddhist [\textit{tantras}]—the \textit{tantra}s arising from the Five Streams—and those initiated into the [\textit{nīma}] Saṃmohas, all of them are still bound souls, [for they are] not initiated into this \textit{tantra}.

\textit{Nak} 3-379, f. 37, lines 1–2; transcription courtesy of Somadeva Vasudeva.

\textsuperscript{73} See chapter 5, section 4, and \textit{tables} 4.2–5.2.
### Table 4.3: Tantras of the Left Stream (vāmasrotas) and Lower Stream (adhaśrotas)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NORTHERN STREAM</th>
<th>LOWER STREAM</th>
<th>SUBDIVISIONS OF THE MĀKUTATANTRA:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sammohā</td>
<td>Vībhūti</td>
<td>Nārasiṃhavidhāna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tīhavāt</td>
<td>Adhyāya</td>
<td>vidhānāṃ kṣetrakalpanā (?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nayottara</td>
<td>Mākuṭa</td>
<td>vīvarāntargasṭa kalpaṣ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Śaukra</td>
<td></td>
<td>Varāhavidhi (em.; yarāhasya vidhi cod.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pañcarātravidhāna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Vaikuṇṭhavidhi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Garuḍavidhāna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>bhūtāntarādi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>oṣadhi kalpas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>rasāyanavidhi [s]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 4.4: Bhairavatantras of the Right Stream (daksināśrotas)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VIDYĀPĪTHA</th>
<th>EIGHT YĀMALAS:</th>
<th>OTHER:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Svacchanda</td>
<td>Rudrayāmala</td>
<td>Praṇacayoginiḻāla</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Krodha</td>
<td>Skandayāmala</td>
<td>Yoginiḻāla</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unmattta</td>
<td>Brahmayaḷamā</td>
<td>Yoginiḥṛdaya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ugra</td>
<td>Viṣṇuyāmala</td>
<td>Siddhā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kapālin</td>
<td>Yamayāmala</td>
<td>Mantramālinī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jhanākāra</td>
<td>Vāyuyāmala</td>
<td>Aghoreśī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sēkhara</td>
<td>Kuberayāmala</td>
<td>Aghoreśvarī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vijaya</td>
<td>Indrayāmala</td>
<td>Kṛđāghoreśī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lākinīkalpa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mārī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mahāmārī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ugravidyāgaṇa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bahurūpa (twofold)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Aghorāṣṭra</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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sources are listed in BraYa xxxviii: the Niśvāsa, Kirāya, Pāraveśvara, Raurava[sūtrasaṅgraha], and Svāyaṃbhūva[sūtrasaṅgraha]. In only one case thus far identified does a parallel passage shed further light on relative chronology: it would appear that the BraYa has incorporated a passage from the Niśvāsatattvasaṃhitā, whether directly or through an intermediary source. The relevant text is Niśvāsottara 1.10–13, and

Table 4.5: A parallel passage in the Brahmayāmala and Niśvāsatattvasaṃhitā

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nīśvāsatantra, Uttarasaṅtra 1.10–13</th>
<th>Brahmayāmala lxi.272cd–75ab</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>iśvara uvāca</td>
<td>ükārah prakṛtir jñeyā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ükārah pruṣaḥ śrtaḥ</td>
<td>yakārah puruṣaḥ śrtaḥ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vakāro niyatir vidyāl</td>
<td>vakāro niyatim vidyāl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lakārah kāla ucyate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>māyātattvaṃ makāraṃ tu</td>
<td>māyātattvaṃ makāraṃ tu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kṣakāro vidya eva tu</td>
<td>kṣakāro vidya eva ca</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rakāra iśvaro jñeyo</td>
<td>repham iśam iti prokto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hakāras tu sadāśivaḥ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dehavyāpi ca navamo</td>
<td>dehavyāpi tu navamaḥ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>saktiś ca daśaṃ śrtaḥ</td>
<td>kāraṇaḥ parameśvaraḥ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>akathyaś ca arūpi ca</td>
<td>etat tattvesvaram devaṃ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kāraṇa sa śivaḥ parah</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ete tattvāḥ samākhyātāḥ</td>
<td>272c ukāraḥ ] Bya; ukāra Byac</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sadāśivasamudbhavāḥ</td>
<td>prakṛtir ] em.; prakṛtir Bya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* * r eva jagat sarvaṃ</td>
<td>273a vakāro ] em.; vakāra Bya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>preśyāpṛṣyaṇ carācaram</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>273c * tattvaṃ ] em.; *tatta Bya</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>274b hakāras ] em.; hakāros Bya</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>274c navamaḥ ] em.; navamo Bya</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>275a tattvesvaramem.; conj.; tattvesvaram Bya</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>275b *tattvoktaṃ ] em.; *tattvokta Bya</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

BraYa lxi.272cd–75 (Table 4.575), the latter belonging to the BraYa’s saṅgrahasūtra chapter referred to earlier. This passage places the nine syllables of a mantra called “The Ninefold” (navaṭman) in correlation to a hierarchy of reality levels (tattva)—a nine-tattva series that appears characteristic of the Niśvāsa corpus (Table 4.6a).76 In

74 On the evidence for the antiquity of these five siddhāntatantras, see Goodall, Bhāṭṭa Rāmaṇṭha’s Commentary, xxxvi–xlvi.
75 The text tabulated from the Niśvāsottara is as given in the provisional edition circulated among participants of the “Workshop on Early Śaivism” (Pondicherry, January 2007); see the discussion of the Niśvāsa in chapter 3, section 2.
76 This series of nine tattvas is, for instance, presented in relation to the nine constituents of the letter
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the BraYa, however, this particular nine-tattva series (table 4.7a) is unusual; īśvara-
tattva, the seventh of the series, figures only rarely in the BraYa's accounts of the
"pervasion" (vyāpti) or "purification" (śodhana) of the tattvas. In this position, the
BraYa normally places the śaktitattva, between the vidyātattva and sadāśiva (Tables
4.7c–f). The particular nine-tattva series correlated with the navatman mantra occurs
elsewhere only in BraYa 1v (Table 4.7d). More significantly, the Niśvāsa's navatman
mantra is wholly anomalous in the BraYa, despite the latter's affinity for all things
ninefold. This combination of factors suggests that the BraYa has assimilated material
concerning the navatman mantra from another source, the obvious candidate being
the Niśvāsa's Uttarasūtra. The date of the latter could thus provide the terminus post
quem for the composition of the BraYa. This reveals relatively little about the period
of BraYa's composition, unfortunately, for some sections of the Niśvāsa could date
even to the fifth century c.e.77—a period improbably early for the BraYa.

**Table 4.6:** The Navatman Mantra in the Niśvāsottara and the Vidyārāja of the Svachchandatantra

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TATTVA</th>
<th>AKṢARA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>paraśiva</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sakti</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'dehavyāpin'</td>
<td>Ḍ?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sadāśiva</td>
<td>ḌA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>īśvara</td>
<td>RA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vidyā</td>
<td>KṢA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>māyā</td>
<td>MA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kāla</td>
<td>LA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>niyati</td>
<td>VA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>puruṣa</td>
<td>YA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prakṛti</td>
<td>Ū</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>śakti</td>
<td>pranava?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sakti</td>
<td>pranava?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>śiva</td>
<td>sakti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>śiva</td>
<td>sakti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>śiṣṭha</td>
<td>sakti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>śiṣṭha</td>
<td>sakti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>śiṣṭha</td>
<td>sakti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>śiṣṭha</td>
<td>sakti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>śiṣṭha</td>
<td>sakti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>śiṣṭha</td>
<td>sakti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>śiṣṭha</td>
<td>sakti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>śiṣṭha</td>
<td>sakti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>śiṣṭha</td>
<td>sakti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>śiṣṭha</td>
<td>sakti</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While it is hence likely that at least one of the earliest siddhāntatantras predates the

77 See chapter 3, n. 3.
### Table 4.7: The Nine Tattvas in the BraYā

#### (a) The ‘Lord of Nine Tattvas’ (navatattvayam) according to BraYā lx

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TATTVA</th>
<th>AKŚARA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>paramesvara</td>
<td>'dehavyāpin'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sadāśiva</td>
<td>HA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>īśvara</td>
<td>RA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vidyā</td>
<td>KṢA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>māyā</td>
<td>MA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kāla</td>
<td>LA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>niyati</td>
<td>VA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>puruṣa</td>
<td>YA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prakṛti</td>
<td>Ū</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### (b) Nine goddess clans (kula) and corresponding tattvas in BraYā lv

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TATTVA</th>
<th>KULA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>śiva</td>
<td>deivīs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sadāśiva</td>
<td>devīs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>īśvara</td>
<td>bhaginīs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vidyā</td>
<td>śīvās</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>māyā</td>
<td>rudradākinīs?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kāla</td>
<td>ādākinīs?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>viyā</td>
<td>dūtīs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>puruṣa</td>
<td>yoginīs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prakṛti</td>
<td>mātrīs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### (c) Pervasion of the tattvas by the Nine Saktis according to BraYā xxix.225-28

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TATTVA</th>
<th>MANTRADEVATĀ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>parasiva</td>
<td>Sadāśiva</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sadāśiva</td>
<td>Mahocchusmā (rĀ)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>candra</td>
<td>Canḍākṣī (kĀ)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>āditya</td>
<td>Karālinī (dē)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kāla</td>
<td>Raktā (cā)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prthvī</td>
<td>Karālā (lī)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>āpas</td>
<td>Danturā (nī)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tejas</td>
<td>Bhimavaktrā (svĀ)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vāyu</td>
<td>Mahābalā (hĀ)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### (d) Pervasion of the tattvas by the Nine Saktis according to BraYā xxix.229-34

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TATTVA</th>
<th>MANTRADEVATĀ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>sadāśiva</td>
<td>Mahocchusmā (rĀ)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>śakti</td>
<td>Canḍākṣī (kĀ)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vidyā</td>
<td>Karālinī (dē)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>māyā</td>
<td>Raktā (cā)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kāla</td>
<td>astras</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>niyati</td>
<td>Karālā (lī)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>puruṣa</td>
<td>Danturā (nī)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prakṛti</td>
<td>Mahābalā (hĀ)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### (e) Purification of the tattvas according to BraYā xxxii

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TATTVA</th>
<th>MANTRADEVATĀ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>śiva</td>
<td>Bhairava</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sadāśiva</td>
<td>Mahocchusmā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>śakti</td>
<td>Canḍākṣī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vidyā</td>
<td>Karālā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>māyā</td>
<td>Raktā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kāla</td>
<td>astras</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>niyati</td>
<td>Dūtīs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>puruṣa</td>
<td>Yoginīs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prakṛti</td>
<td>Mātrīs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### (f) Purification of the Nine Pantheons according to BraYā xxxvi (tattvadikṣā)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TATTVA</th>
<th>MANTRADEVATĀ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>śiva</td>
<td>Śiva</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sadāśiva</td>
<td>Bhairava-Bhairavī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>śakti</td>
<td>Māheśvarī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>īśvara</td>
<td>Brahmānī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vidyā</td>
<td>Vaiṣṇavī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>māyā</td>
<td>Kaumāri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kāla</td>
<td>Vivasvatī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>niyati</td>
<td>Māhendrī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>puruṣa</td>
<td>Cāmunḍā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prakṛti</td>
<td>Parā Śaktī</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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BraYā, the chronology of the BraYā relative to other early Śaiva literature is elusive. As mentioned in the previous chapter, the BraYā refers by name to several vāma-tantras, including the extant Vīṇāśikha—a text not among the earliest of its genre, yet nonetheless potentially quite old. There are, furthermore, faint indications of influence from the cult of the Four Sisters upon aspects of the BraYā.⁷⁸ As for the relationship between the BraYā and the Svacchandatantra, the evidence I am currently aware of is not especially strong. The former does list the latter in its account of the canon; but the evidence from texts lists must be treated with caution, as the case of the Siddhayogēśvarimata and BraYā illustrates (discussed below). On the other hand, preliminary analysis of cosmological materials suggests that the BraYā could be archaic in comparison to the Svacchandatantra. For instance, like the BraYā, the Svacchandatantra draws upon the Niśvāsa’s navātman mantra, placing a series of nine tattvas in relation to the syllables of the navātman. However, the Svacchandatantra version also correlates the series to the thirty-six tattva system normative in later Śaivism (table 4.6b)—a system absent from both the Niśvāsa and BraYā.⁷⁹

There are possible grounds for considering the BraYā’s principal male deity, Kapāliśabhairava, secondary in the historical development of Śaivism to Svacchandabhairava. Kapāliśa is first attested as an important rudra in the Niśvāsaguhya, heading the Hundred Rudras at the level of the “fire of time” (kālāgni), at the base of the hierarchy of world levels (bhuvana).⁸⁰ Kapāliśa the rudra is presumably an early form of the deity who figures as first of the eight bhairavas in the mandala of Svacchanda, according to the Svacchandatantra.⁸¹ He attains the apex of his cultic status as supreme Bhairava of the BraYā, alongside Aghoreśī—who is the goddess consort of

⁷⁸ In the previous chapter, see n. 39 in the discussion of vāma-tantras.
⁷⁹ Note that although the BraYā does not attest the thirty-six tattva series that becomes standard in Śaiva exegetical literature, all of the tattvas included in this schema do find mention at one point or another in the text, in its various non-standardized tattva series.
⁸⁰ The list of the Hundred Rudras (satarudra) begins, satarudrāṇi me śrṇu | kapālīśa hy ajo buddhāh vajradehāh pramardanāh (Niśvāsaguhya 7.82bcd).
⁸¹ In the Svacchandatantra, the eight bhairavas (bhairavastaka) forming the primary entourage of Svacchanda are headed by Kapāliśabhairava; the remaining seven are Śikhivāhana, Krodharaja, Vikarāla, Manmatha, Meghanada, Somaraja, and Vidyārāja. The names and mantras of the Eight are given in Svacchandatantra i.76cd–86; cf. 2.117–22.
Svachchandabhairava as well—in the form of Caṇḍā Kāpālinī. The BraYa’s convention for naming a new officiant suggests that Kāpāliśa might have usurped the position of Svachchandabhairava: during consecration, when the flower cast by the candidate falls upon the central god, he receives the name Svachchandabhairava, rather than being named after the BraYa’s own Kāpāliśa—an apparent carryover from the cult of Svachchanda.⁸²

Within the Vidyāpīṭha, the relation between the BraYa and the Trika Siddhayogesvarīmata remains an open question.⁸³ Possessing distinct pantheons, these texts nonetheless share much in the domain of ritual, both being decidedly kāpālika and siddhi-oriented scriptures intrinsically connected with the cult of yoginīs in what appears to be an archaic form. The Siddhayogesvarīmata’s account of the Śaiva canon lists the Brahmayāmala.⁸⁴ However, as Judit Törzsök points out, the BraYa might also refer to the Siddhayogesvarīmata, for it mentions a Vidyāpīṭha text by the title Siddhā—
one of several names by which Abhinavagupta cites the Siddhayogesvarīmata.⁸⁵ This circularity, which owes perhaps to ongoing revision or idealized text lists, suggests the need for weighing multiple types of evidence in determining relative chronology, evidence that appears lacking in this case. The BraYa does, however, contain material concerning the Three Saktis (Vāmā, Jyeṣṭhā, and Raudrī) that might potentially shed light on the cultic background of the Siddhayogesvarīmata’s triad (trika) of goddesses.⁸⁶

⁸² BraYa xxxiii.165–66:

bhairave tu yadā puspaṃ patate pūrvaśocitām |
śaktinām tu taddā tasya nāman vai kalpayed budhai! || 165 ||
svachchandabhairavo nāma taddā tasya prajñayate |
bhairavyam tu yadda pātta śaktibhairavasyanājanavai || 166 ||

There would seem to be a textual problem here, for 165cd appears misplaced (perhaps it followed 166cd?), or even interpolated; 166ab seems to intended to follow 165ab.

In BraYa iv, in the section explicating initiatory kinship based upon the flower-cast of the initiand, the applicable clans are those of the Eight Mothers and “Bhairava,” of whom no particular form is specified. This passage is quoted in part in chapter 2 (n. 14).

⁸³ As mentioned in the previous chapter, the Siddhayogesvarīmata survives only in a short recension missing a significant amount of the material attributed to it by Kashmiri authors. See Törzsök, “Doctrine of Magic Female Spirits,” iv–v.

⁸⁴ Siddhayogesvarīmata 29.18a.

⁸⁵ This is pointed out by Törzsök, ibid., ix (n. 42).

⁸⁶ Worship of the Three Saktis comprises the subject of lxxxx (the saktitrayavidhanapatala). Potentially relevant material is found in BraYa lxxx as well. In this fascinating chapter’s discussion of the origins
More can be said concerning the relation of the BrahYā with another major Vidyā-pīṭha scripture: the Tantrasadbhāva of the Trika, a text which explicitly situates itself in the tradition of the Siddhayogēśvarīmata.⁸⁷ There are several indications that the Tantrasadbhāva postdates the BraYā as well. While the Tantrasadbhāva makes no mention of a “Brahmayāmala,” it does refer to the yāmalatantras as a genre.⁸⁸ Given that the

of the skull-staff (khatvdhgotpatti), the various elements of the archetypal skull-staff of Bhairava are described in homological relation (adhidaiva) to a hierarchy of deities and cosmological spheres. In particular, the three prongs of the trident (trisūla) that caps the skull-staff are said to be presided over by the Three Śaktis. BraYā lxxx.172-.73ab:

There, above the trident, are known to be the Three Saktis—Vāmā, Jyestha, and Raudrl, on the left, right, and middle. Situated above, overhead all, is the quiescent Śiva.”

Visualization of the triad of goddesses—Parā, Parapārā, and Aparā—upon the prongs of a trident features in the initiation manjāla of the Siddhayogēśvarīmata, a fundamental work of the Trika; see Sanderson, “The Visualization of the Deities of the Trika,” 39. It is conceivable that the material cited above from the BraYā provides an early precedent for this aspect of the Trika, the goddesses of which might have had their identities grafted upon those of the Three Śaktis of early Saivism—Vāmā, Jyestha, and Raudrl.

Note that BraYā xxvii, the saktitritayāyagapatala, concerns a different triad of saktis: that of Vāmā, Madhyāmā, and Dākṣiṇā, who in BraYā xxxviii are described as presiding over the three primary streams of scriptural revelation and their practitioners.

⁸⁷ See chapter 5 in the present thesis, n. 100.

⁸⁸ Tantrasadbhāva 1.11–12, 34cd–35ab:

na śrutāṃ śrutiṃ ichchāmi tantrasadbhāvam uttamam || 14 ||

... ye māyā kathitās tantrā vāmadasaśīnasāmālāḥ || 34||

mss as reported by Dyczkowski; the edition proposed above is highly provisional. Cf. Tantrasadbhāva 25.301:
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extant lists of yāmalas almost all feature the BraYā, this alone might suggest that the latter was known in some form to the redactors of the Tantrasadbhāva. Furthermore, the Tantrasadbhāva once makes reference to a text called the Dvādaśasahasrā (“[Tantra] of Twelve-thousand [Verses]”), an epithet of the BraYā. So far I have identified only three verses shared by the two texts, with no obvious indications of the direction of redaction. In the first case, the context is that of the initiatory Pledges (samaya), which one might expect any number of scriptures to share—and indeed the Siddhayogesvarimata contains the same verse. Similarly, the texts share a verse listing eight sacred sites (piṭha). In the third case, which concerns chomnā, a garbled Tantrasadbhāva verse would be impossible to reconstruct but for its parallel in the BraYā. None of

89 Tantrasadbhāva 1.234a. This passage comes at the end of a list of deities, which it links to a text called the Dvādaśasahasrā:

\[
\begin{align*}
anena kramayogena paścāśānam samudbhavaḥ & || 232 || 
kathitā devadevena kṛtyakaranaścāledataḥ & ||
evam dvādaśasahasre prītāgāhārapakārtitam & ||
\end{align*}
\]

nāmāni rudrasamghasya sūcānāṁ pārvatī || 234 ||

Text as constituted in the draft edition of Dyczkowski.

90 BraYā Lxli.121:

na nagnāṁ vanīlāṁ paśyena cāpi prakatastamīṁ |
nālokaṇey paśu-kṛṣṇāṁ kṣudrakarmam na kārayet || 121 ||

paśyena | em.; paśye Bya  kṛṣṇā | em.;  kṛṣṇā Bya

This is identical to Tantrasadbhāva 9.543:

na nagnāṁ vanīlāṁ paśyena cāpi prakatastamīṁ |
nālokaṇey paśu-kṛṣṇāṁ kṣudrakarmam na kārayet || 543 ||

nagnāṁ | Ts5; naglām Ts5bTs6  prakatastamīm | Ts5Ts6; prakatastamīm Ts6  kṛṣṇām | em.;  kṛṣṇā Ts5

kṣudrā | Ts5Ts6;  kṣudrā | Ts5Ts6;  kṣudrā Ts6b

(aus as reported by Dyczkowski.) This verse also occurs as Siddhayogesvarimata 6.47cd–48ab.

91 See chapter 2, section 2 (n. 88).

92 BraYā Iv.103–4:

potāṅgaṇey abhirūḍdānaṁ pratipotaṅge pratyaabhivādaṁ |
yoginīṁ tu vīraṇāṁ nārīṣety abhirūḍdānaṁ |
pratipadaṁ abhirūḍdānaṁ procyate pratipadaṁ || 103 ||

ekāṅgulidārasanāt svāgataṁ dvābhyaṁ susūrgataṁ |
koṣṭhipraśvistauṇḍuṣṭhaṅa kṣemamudrā vidhiyate || 104 ||

103a potāṅgaya | BybByc; potāṅga(t)?ty Byb 103b pratipotage | BybByc; pratipotage  Byc  pratya-

abhivādaṁ | Byb; pratyaabhivādaṁ BybBycByc; 103d nārīṣety | BybByc; nārīṣehā Byc  104c

koṣṭha° | Byb; koṣṭha° Byb

Notes: In Byb, 104cd is missing, while 104cd is in the lower margin, possibly by original scribe. Byc skips from 103c (pratīnaśa,..) to 103c (..smṛse pādaṃ).

Cf. Tantrasadbhāvatantra 18.18cd–19:

potāṅgaṇey abhirūḍdānaṁ pratyeuttāṅge pratikrtam || 18 ||

ekāṅgulidārasanāt svāgataṁ dvābhyaṁ susūrgataṁ |
these isolated cases seem to warrant the assumption of direct borrowing.

More substantially, the twenty-first chapter of the *Tantrasadbhāva* includes in its "treasury of vidyā-mantras" (vidyākośa) the following: Ōṁ ṇāmūnḍe kāpālini svāhā, described as the "root mantra" (mūlamantra) of Aghoresī. This is remarkably similar to the Nine Syllable Vidyā (navākṣarā vidyā) of the same Goddess in the *Bṛaya*: Ōṁ hūṁ caṇḍe kāpālini svāhā. The *Tantrasadbhāva* describes several inflected forms of Aghoresī's vidyā utilizing the vocative caṇḍe, rather than cāmūnḍe, echoing still more closely the *Bṛaya*'s nine-syllable vidyā.93 It seems likely that the *Tantrasadbhāva* draws on the tradition of the *Bṛaya* with these mantras, although this cannot be stated categorically. Even more suggestive of a direct link between the texts is *Tantrasadbhāva* 19. This chapter's first section concerns sacred topography, mapping out a network of eight "fields" (kṣetra), "secondary fields" (upakṣetra), and "meeting points" (sandoha), for which presiding goddesses, male "field guardians" (kṣetrapāla), and sacred trees are enumerated. This system's eight kṣetras map precisely to the eight sacred cremation grounds enumerated in *Bṛaya* LXXIV (Table 4.10).94 In addition,

---

93 For instance, the krdaya or "heart" mantra is described as having the tāraka ("savior") in the beginning, then the word caṇḍe, ending with nāda (="nāmaṁ") (caṇḍe tāraka-dāyaṁ ca nādānām tārakaṁ param, *Tantrasadbhāva* 21.156cd). That the tāraka is hūṁ is suggested in *Bṛaya* XXIII, which describes the tāraka as the Root Mantra (mūlamantra) of Bhairava, when conjoined with its ancillaries (tārakāṁ yāṁ mṛgāṁ tārakaṁ vāktriyānāṁ & śāntaṁ - Bṛaya 21.156cd).

94 *Tantrasadbhāva* 19.4cd–5ab:

prāyaṁ varūnā kollā atītaḥāsa jayantikā || 4 ||
caritra-kāṃrakaś cāttā koṭivarṣaṁ tu cāṭvantam ||
aṁdrā śāmānabhyā yāvat śāmānagocaram || 5 ||
jaṭāvṛtum kṣetra-cīrīyāṁ mantriṁ tu yathākramam ||
"aikāmrankaś ām; ēkāmrankaś mss 6b mantrinā ām; mantrinām mss"

(mss as reported by Dyczkowski.) On the sacred geography of the *Bṛaya*, see the next section of this...
the Tantrasadbhāva organizes the goddesses of these and the subsidiary sacred places into clans (kula) presided over by the Four Devis and Four Dūtis of the BraYa's core pantheon—deities who have no cultic significance in the Tantrasadbhāva. For instance, belonging to the clan of Mahābalā, fourth of the Dūtis in the BraYa, are the goddess Karṇamoṭi, who presides over the eighth kṣetra, Koṭivarṣa; Cipītanāsā, of the eighth upākṣetra, Rājakṛṣṇā; and Carmanuḍā at Pundravardhana, eighth of the sandohas.

On these grounds it appears probable that the Tantrasadbhāva postdates the BraYa. The dating of the Tantrasadbhāva is itself problematic; according to Sanderson, it is one of several Vidyāpītha tantras, including the BraYa, drawn upon by the Buddhist Laghuśaṃvāra.95 This could suggest that a significant interval of time separates the BraYa and the Laghuśaṃvāra, with the Tantrasadbhāva belonging to the intervening period.

The BraYa contains a single potential reference to a work of non-tantric Sanskrit literature. A verse in the revelation narrative of chapter one predicts that the BraYa shall become as famous as the Saptasatāni ("The [Text of] Seven Hundred [Verses]").96 The possibility seems significant that the text alluded to is none other than the Durgāsaptāstati ("Seven-hundred Verses on Durgā")—the Devimāhātmya of the Mārkaṇḍeyapurāṇa. A work exceptionally well-known in latter medieval India, it appears fitting that the Devimāhātmya would be singled out as emblematic of popularity—although it is unclear how early it attained this status. There is little to base this identification upon, however; all other texts mentioned in the revelation narrative appear to be tantras.97 Would the BraYa know the Devimāhātmya, this could have

---

95 While this is certainly plausible, the primary textual parallel adduced in evidence is comparatively short, making the case less unambiguous than those of the BraYa and Siddhamārgesvarīnāta. Sanderson identifies nineteen pādas from Tantrasadbhāva 16 as the source of material in Laghuśaṃvāra 41. He also identifies "related" passages in Laghuśaṃvāra 18 and Tantrasadbhāva 16, and two verses redacted from chapter seven of the latter into Laghuśaṃvāra 49. "History through Textual Criticism," 44. In a presentation at the 13th World Sanskrit Conference, Ronald Davidson reportedly called into question the possibility that the Tantrasadbhāva is the source of any material in the Laghuśaṃvāra; both his and Sanderson’s arguments await publication.

96 BraYa i.ii5-i6 a b.

97 It might also be mentioned that another famous work—Hāla’s anthology of Prakrit verses—bears the designation Sattasa (≡Sanskrit Saptasati).
significant chronological implications: long held to be a work of the sixth century, or even earlier, Yuko Yokochi questions the basis for this, and argues that the Deśi-
mahātmya might instead belong to the latter part of the eighth century.98

Significant uncertainties thus surround both the absolute and relative chronologies of the BraYā, further complicated by the fact that the text appears to have multiple strata. It does seem highly likely that the BraYā, in a form close to that preserved in its oldest Nepalese codex, existed at some point in the eighth century, while I see no grounds for ruling out a seventh-century dating, especially for the older portions of the text. This period in fact appears quite plausible. The possibility that some form of the BraYā existed in the sixth century also merits consideration, especially given its mention in the old Skandapurāṇa, while it is also not impossible that the BraYā continued to develop into the early ninth century; this possibility depends upon the dating of sources such as the Laghuśamvara and Tantrasadbhāva.

**GEOGRAPHIC AND SOCIAL HORIZONS**

One might expect a text as vast as the BraYā to offer clues into its region of origin, and it is hoped that further study from a variety of perspectives will yield such information. At the present juncture, I would assert little more than that the text seems unlikely to herald from the far south or far north and northwest of the subcontinent.

In its first chapter, the BraYā provides an unusually detailed account of its "descent" (avatāra) or revelation. Mentioning numerous individuals, this narrative tacitly acknowledges the role of human agency—through the medium of the tantric guru—in the production of scriptural literature. More will be said in the subsequent chapter concerning the model of scripture accommodating this. Idealized though the BraYā's account of revelation certainly is, some of the personages and places mentioned appear entirely realistic. More than twenty-five individuals are referred to, the majority of whom have their castes and regions of origin specified (table 4.8). Most are designated by initiatory name alone; for several, however, additional in-

---

98 See chapter 2, n. 103, in the present thesis.
formation is provided: a pre-initiatory name, native village, and/or the name of a parent. These cases comprise the brahmin Śrīdhara of Kurukṣetra, near Delhi, whose initiatory name is Kapālabhairava; Caṇḍabhairava, an Aṣṭharvaveda-school (āṭharvaṇa-śākhā) brahmin from the village Bṛhadārī, of Sindh in modern Pakistan; Amantrī of Ujjayini (modern Ujjain, M.P.), a.k.a. Svaccandabhairava, son of the brahmin woman Deikā; and Sattikā or Santikā99 of Kanavira village, close to Prayāga (near modern Allahabad, U.P.), the daughter of a chandoga-school brahmin, Meghadatta. Sattikā is none other than the goddess Bhairāvī herself, manifesting in the world of mortals on account of a curse. She recovers her divinity through ritual perfection, and then sets in motion the descent of “scriptural wisdom” (jñāna) that culminates in the BraYā.

The narrative of revelation places these and the other, more anonymous individuals mentioned within a cosmic temporal framework: Bhairava teaches the Goddess the scriptural wisdom in its unabridged form of 125,000 verses at the beginning of a particular Kaliyuga, and she transmits this to Śrīdhara or Kapālabhairava in the second Tretāyuga thereafter. Kapālabhairava transmits an abbreviated redaction of 24,000 verses to his disciple, Devadatta or Padmabhairava, who further reduces the text to twelve-thousand in the Dvāparayuga, at the juncture of the Kali age. This would appear to be the BraYā itself, one epithet of which is Dvādaśasāhasraka, “The Tantra of Twelve-thousand Verses.”100 Padmabhairava has fourteen disciples from throughout the subcontinent (table 4.8), among whom the text’s circulation is apparently restricted for most of the age.

In the final quarter of the Kaliyuga, the initiate Svaccandabhairava comes to learn the scripture. Having had numerous miscarriages, a certain Deikā of Ujjayinī prays for a son before the Mother goddesses, and they place in her womb the child called “Without a Mantra” (Amantrī)—an accomplished initiate who in

99 It is unclear whether the name given is Sattikā or Santikā, for it and nt are often undistinguishable in the writing of the BraYā’s oldest codex. For a discussion, see the annotation on BraYā 1.28 in the translation.
100 See section 5 of the subsequent chapter.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME(s)</th>
<th>PLACE OF ORIGIN</th>
<th>CASTE/VEDIC ŚĀKHĀ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sattikā or Santikā (daughter of Meghadatta)</td>
<td>Kāṇavīra village, near Prayāga</td>
<td>brahmanā (chandoga)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Krodhabhairava</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Śrīdharā/Kapālabhairava</td>
<td>Kuruksetra</td>
<td>brahmanā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Devadatta/Padmabhairava</td>
<td>Oḍrādea</td>
<td>brahmanā (bahvrc)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DISCIPLES OF PADMABHAIRAVA:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raktabhairava</td>
<td>Madhyadeśa</td>
<td>brahmanā (ātharvāṇa)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jvāḷabhairava</td>
<td>Madhyadeśa</td>
<td>brahmanā (ātharvāṇa)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helābhairava</td>
<td>Madhyadeśa</td>
<td>brahmanā (ātharvāṇa)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vāmabhairava</td>
<td>Saurāṣṭrā</td>
<td>sūdra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vijayabhairava</td>
<td>Saurāṣṭrā</td>
<td>sūdra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bibhatsabhairava</td>
<td>Sindhuvīṣayā</td>
<td>kṣatriya, rājaputra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gajakarnabhairava</td>
<td>Sindhuvīṣayā</td>
<td>kṣatriya, rājaputra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caṇḍabhairava (son of Yajñasoma)</td>
<td>Brḥodarī village, Sindhuvīṣayā</td>
<td>brahmanā (ātharvāṇa)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DISCIPLES OF CAṇḌABHAIRAVA:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kumārabhairava</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Krodhabhairava (II)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tejabhairava</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DISCIPLES OF PADMABHAIRAVA (CONT.):</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karālabhairava</td>
<td>(Kashmir?)</td>
<td>māṭaiṅga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ucchusmabhairava</td>
<td>(Kashmir?)</td>
<td>māṭaiṅga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yamabhairava</td>
<td>Kashmir</td>
<td>brahmanā (chandoga)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viṣṇubhairava</td>
<td>Lampāviṣayā</td>
<td>brahmanā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dakṣinābhairava</td>
<td>Kāṣī</td>
<td>brahmanā (bahvrc)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Śekharabhairava</td>
<td>Oḍḍiyāna</td>
<td>brahmanā (taṭṭirīya, apastambhabhāmanā)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SVACCHANDA AND HIS DISCIPLES:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amantrī/Svacchandabhairava (son of Deikā)</td>
<td>Ujjayini</td>
<td>brahmanā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caṇḍabhairava (II?)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bindubhairava (=Vibhubhairava?)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Māyābhairava</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anantabhairava</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vibhubhairava</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viṣṇubhairava (II?)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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a previous birth had broken the initiatory Pledges and failed to achieve siddhi.\textsuperscript{101} Reborn, Amanṭṛi attains siddhi through practice of the vidyā-mantra. Consecrated as Svācchandabhairava, he learns the “Tantra of Twelve-thousand Verses” from Krodhabhairava, the primordial disciple of the Goddess.\textsuperscript{102} His own disciples preside over ever-diminishing redactions of the scripture at the twilight of the cosmic cycle, at the end of which yoginis hide away the teachings altogether. Concealed throughout the Kṛta, Tretā, and Dvāpara ages of the subsequent cycle, at the beginning of the next Kaliyuga the Goddess reveals the unabbreviated scripture of 125,000 verses to (the new incarnation of) Svācchandabhairava. He teaches a redaction of 12,000 verses to a certain Viṣṇubhairava\textsuperscript{103} in the legendary village of Kalāpa, renounced as an abode of sages.\textsuperscript{104} Viṣṇubhairava then transmits the text to the inhabitants of the “Isle of Maidens” (kumārdvīpa)—the civilized world.\textsuperscript{105} With this we arrive, unambiguously, at the BraYa. The narrative ends by predicting that the text shall achieve tremendous popularity, being present in the homes of all worthy of siddhi.

While this narrative contains tantalizing details concerning individuals and places, its idealized framework obscures potential historical data. Noteworthy is the fact that the text claims a pan-South Asian genealogy. This could reflect the wish to ascribe a universal dimension to what was, in fact, a manifestly local tradition. However, it is entirely plausible that the textual community involved pan-South Asian lineages. Among the figures mentioned, Svācchandabhairava of Ujjayini appears pivotal to

\textsuperscript{101} See BraYa i.78cd–86ab. The narrative concerning Amantrin or Svaccandabhairava and his disciples, spanning two Kaliyugas, comprises BraYa i.78cd–118.

\textsuperscript{102} The verses in question, 78–79, are somewhat problematic; see the annotation thereon.

\textsuperscript{103} “Viṣṇubhairava” is mentioned twice in the revelation narrative: as a vijnāna-dhyāna-school brahmin from Lampā, one of the fourteen disciples of Padmabhairava (verse 72); and as the student of Svācchandabhairava (verses 112–14), medium for the dissemination of the “Tantra of Twelve-thousand Verses” to the residents of Kumārdvīpa (see below). There is no suggestion that these are the same individual; however, the second could be a subsequent incarnation of the former.

\textsuperscript{104} See, for instance, Bhāgavatapurāṇa 9.12.6, 9.22.17, 10.87.7, and 12.2.37–38; and the Daśavatarā of Kṣemendra (opening of the Kalkyavatara section). In both sources, the site is associated with the Kaliyuga, its final period in particular. I am grateful to Isaacson for these references.

\textsuperscript{105} On Kanya- or Kumārdvīpa, see Tantrālokā 8.85–92, especially verse 92 (nānāvartāśramādāmasukha-duhkhatvicīrataḥ kanyādvīpe yatas tera karmabhūḥ seyya vanamātā; “Because of the existence of [the system of] manifold castes and stages of life, the variation of pleasure and suffering on Kanyādvīpa, it is the greatest land [for the performance] of pious acts (karma)”).
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the text's transmission; yet there are no strong grounds for assuming he or anyone else mentioned represents an historical figure. It is nonetheless possible that the BraYa's revelation narrative preserves a record of some key individuals connected with the scripture and its background, cast within an idealized temporal and geographic framework.

The geographical horizons of the BraYa, as indicated by the places it names, have two distinct spheres. On one hand, the revelation narrative presents an expansive topographic vision: individuals involved in the transmission of scripture span from Oḍrādeśa in the east—presumably related to today's Orissa—to Sindh (śindhuviṣaya) and the Swat Valley (ōḍḍiyāna) in Pakistan, and Kashmir (kaśmīra) and Lampā in the far north. The far south is not represented, however, nor, e.g., Nepal. In contrast, the sacred places mentioned in the BraYa suggest more restricted geographical horizons (tables 4.9–10106). The BraYa's primary deity maṇḍala, as delineated in chapter three, positions eight sacred sites in the cardinal and ordinal directions, referred to in this context as "cremation grounds" (śmaśāna). This maṇḍala of eight cremation grounds encompasses central India and the Deccan, the North-Indian heartland, and Orissa and Bengal in the east. This suggests a largely central-eastern geographic sphere, the farthest point west being Kollagiri, perhaps corresponding to the Kolhapur in the Deccan (in modern Maharashtra). Orissa is disproportionately represented, while Koṭivarṣa of modern Dinajpur district in northwestern Bangladesh marks the far northeastern horizon. This maṇḍala of eight cremation grounds has a close parallel in BraYa lxxxiv's list of eight pīṭhas ("sacred mounds;" see table 4.10).107 Discrepancies between the two can in part be accounted for by synonyms—Jayantikā is

106 In identifying the probable regions of the sacred sites the BraYa enumerates, I follow Sanderson, "History through Textual Criticism," 7 (n. 4).
107 BraYa lxxxiv.81:

prayagā varṇa kollā attahāsa jayantikā |
caritrekāmbrakaṇi caiva koṭivarṣāṃ tathāṣṭanāṃ || 81 ||
attahāsa || em.; haṭṭahāsa Br

Tantrasadbhāta 15.21 is identical to this verse, offering as substantive variants attahāsa (adopted above) and the corrupt caritrekāṁbukam (81c; mss as reported by Dyczkowski).
presumably Ujjayinī—but not entirely: Vārāṇasī is replaced by Prayāga, while the synonymity of some site names is uncertain.

It is difficult to say which of the two geographic spheres invoked—the pan-South Asian or the central and eastern—might better reflect the early textual community of the BraYa. The maṇḍala of cremation grounds might have been inherited from older sources, possibly shedding light upon the geographic horizons of the early tradition—or, potentially, the geographic sphere of the BraYa in its earliest form. The more expansive geography envisioned in the BraYa’s revelation narrative could, on the other hand, reflect a broadening of the cult’s horizons by the period of the text’s final redaction. In addition, it is difficult to imagine obscure villages such as Brḥodārī of Sindh and Kaṇavīra, near Prayāga—neither of which seems traceable now—finding mention in the absence of a genuine connection to the text.

Concerning the individuals mentioned in the revelation narrative, two facts stand out: the prominence of male brahmins in the production and transmission of scripture, and the simultaneous representation of a spectrum of other castes. Eleven brahmin men figure among the twenty-five odd individuals named, representing a variety of regions and Vedic schools. The roster features two ksatriyas and two śūdras, and includes two members of the tribal mātāṅga community as well; information is not provided concerning the remaining individuals. All of the more important figures are brahmins, with Sattikā—also a brahmin—the single woman of significant status. I suspect that this points toward the simultaneous diversity of participants in the tantric Śaivism of the BraYa—caste and gender are, in principle, not bars—and the reality that literacy, and therefore textual production, was undoubtedly a domain in

<p>| TABLE 4.9: The Eight Cremation Grounds in BraYa III |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME(S)</th>
<th>PROBABLE LOCATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vārāṇasī</td>
<td>Varanasi, U.P.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virajā</td>
<td>Jajpur, Orissa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kollagiri</td>
<td>Kolhapur, Maharashtra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prabhāsa</td>
<td>Somnath, Junagadh Dīt., Gujarat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ujjainī</td>
<td>Ujjain, M.P.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bhūteśvara</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ekāma</td>
<td>Bhubaneswar, Orissa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kotivarṣa</td>
<td>W. Dinajpur Dīt., Bangladesh</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
which male brahmins were particularly prominent. At the same time, the remarkably
rustic Sanskrit of the BraYa, heavily influenced as it is by the Middle Indic vernacular,
suggests redactors of little training in Sanskrit grammar—the study of which had
pride of place in Brahmanical education.

Indeed, the language

of the BraYa comprises a

body of data potentially

useful for locating the text

in time, place, and soci-

olinguisitc community. Its
evaluation faces limitations,

though, for the paucity of

manuscript evidence complicates the effort to distinguish between the vagaries of
scribal transmission and genuine irregularity. Nonetheless, the sheer volume of ma-
terial in a text of more than 12,000 verses partly compensates for this problem. In
the present study, I do not offer a systematic survey of the language of the BraYa,
although the philological notes to the critical edition discuss linguistic issues as they
arise. Further study is required to determine whether the BraYa possesses dialectical
features that could be linked to a particular region and period.

In general character and most particulars, the language of the BraYa bears com-
parison with that of the Siddhayogeshvarimata, on which Judit Törzsöök has written a
useful and detailed study.108 To provide a single illustration, note that in the BraYa,
metrical concerns override grammar when the two conflict, a principle consonant
with other varieties of Middle-Indic influenced Sanskrit. This is, however, taken
much further than in Epic and the so-called “Buddhist Hybrid” variety. Particularly
striking are cases in which a spurious visarga is suffixed for metrical reasons: note,
for instance, the cases of the adverb upari (BraYa xxxiii.86cd, izane cäsane sthāpya sap-

tadhānyoparis tathā), the locative plural noun dikṣu (evaṁ dikṣu vidikṣus ca āśanaṁ samniveś[layet, XLIV.646cd], and the verb rakṣyati (sādhakānāṁ padānāṁ tu putravod rakṣyatis tathā, BraYād xI.125cd). Again driven by meter, final consonants are optionally omitted, especially the final -t of optative verbs; as this is characteristic of Prakrit, pronunciation is surely a factor.109 Additionally, the BraYād accepts a degree of metrical freedom by allowing for verse-quarters of nine syllables, provided that the final four-syllable cadence pattern remains intact, and provided that several of the initial five syllables are short (laghu).110

For a text which places considerable emphasis on attaining worldly power, the BraYād makes surprisingly few references to political or military power as an aim of ritual.111 Furthermore, there are few significant indications of a courtly or even urban environment in the BraYād. Although urban centers find mention—Kāśi/Vārāṇaṣā and Ujjayini—their civic status seems incidental, for these are important Śaiva places of pilgrimage. These circumstances seem suggestive of a rural social milieu. Among the possible regions of origin, Orissa might seem a strong candidate: note, in particular, the prominence of Orissan sites in the sacred geography of the BraYād (Tables 4.9–10), and the text’s references to Ekapādabhārava, an unusual one-legged form of the deity common in Orissan-provenance sculpture but attested elsewhere, as far as I can determine presently, only in neighboring Andhra Pradesh.112 Temples suggestive of tantric goddess cults are, furthermore, widely attested in the sculpture of this region, particularly from the ninth century.113 In addition, Orissa, or a region

---

109 See the annotation on BraYād 1.60.
110 See the annotation on BraYād 1.20 in part II.
111 Exceptions include occasional reference to “the good fortune of kingship” or “royal fortune” (rājyasaubhāgya) as one of several aims of ritual; cf., e.g., BraYād XLIV.314 (anena kramayogena rājyasaubhāgyam eva ca | arthāṁ ca vidvādhiṁśa caiva mantri sammadhiṁ caiva | 314). “Kingship” itself (rāja) is mentioned in a list of siddhis in BraYād LXXVII.203d. Chapter LI specifies which meats should be offered in fire sacrifice depending on one’s caste and station; in this context, kings are mentioned as individuals who must offer human flesh. In addition, there are references to “protection of one’s army” (niṣesamāyasya rākṣaṇa) and “terrifying the opponent’s army” (parasaiṇyāsa trāśana) in lists of magical objectives, with no particular emphasis.
112 The connection between Ekapādabhārava, the BraYād, and Orissa has been suggested to me by Sanderson (personal communication, May 2003).
113 Thomas Donaldson, Tantra and Śākta art of Orissa, vol. 1, passim.
of comparable "peripheral" status in the Brahmanical cultural world, would seem compatible with the sociolinguistic milieu of the text.
CHAPTER 5

TO NAME A TANTRA: IDENTITY, HISTORY, AND THE ŚAIVA CANON IN THE EPIPHETs OF THE BRAHMAYĀMALA

The text thus far referred to as “the Brahmayāmala” in fact designates itself by a variety of titular epithets. In my attempt to introduce this little-studied and unusually voluminous tantra, the present chapter attempts to explicate the functions and historical significance of the text’s various titular epithets. I demonstrate how these provide important lenses into the text’s contents, history, and rhetorical world, especially the position its authors sought to articulate for it within a canon of Śaiva scripture.

Though possessing several titles, evidently the scripture was best known within the tradition as “Brahmayāmala.” However, the title Picumata had considerable importance as well, and the text has two additional titular epithets: Navākṣaravidhāna (“Procedure of the Nine-Syllable Vidyā-maṇtra”) and Dvādaśaśāhasūraka (“Tantra of Twelve-thousand Verses”). Abhinavagupta cites the text as “Brahmayāmala” on eleven occasions, also making four references to the “Picumata.” Within the body of the text, exclusive of chapter colophons, references to the titles Brahmayāmala and Picumata are clustered heavily in the latter sections of the text, while discussion of the significance

---

1 Viz. Tantrāloka 4.54b, 4.60b, 5.97c, 13.145ab, 15.44c, 18.9a, 23.43d, 27.29a, 28.419b, 28.423b, and 29.11a.
2 Evidently preferring the title Brahmayāmala, Abhinavagupta also mentions the “Picumata” in Tantrāloka 28.38a, while in 27.21a referring to “Picuśāstra,” and “Śripicu” in 28.409c. Note also the phrase picuproktam, “spoken in the Picuśāstra,” in Tantrāloka 27.24b. In addition, Jayaratha, commenting on Tantrāloka 1.18, quotes from a scriptural source that refers to the “Picutantra.”
3 References to the title Brahmayāmala occur in xxxviii.26a, lxii.11c (yāmalaḥ tantram), lix.35c (yāmala), lxx.100c, lxxv.36d, lxxvi.93a, lxxvii.1c (yāmalatatrantra), lxxviii.16b (yāmala), lxxix.101d, lxxxi.124b, lxxxvi.18b, and ci.31a, besides numerous references in lxx, lxxi, and lxxxiv. References to the title Picumatalaṭṭhaṇtra occur in lxii.7a, lxii.250a, lxii.110d, lxxiv.222c, while Picutantra occurs in lxii.39a,
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of both titles occurs particularly in lxx and lxxi. Both of these titles, moreover, had the distinction of apotheosis, for the BraYa describes the title deities Yāmalabhairava or Yāmaleśvara, “Lord of the Yāmalatantra,” and Picubhairava.4

5.1 Brahmayāmala

“Yāmala” has as its primary meaning “pair,” and in tantric literature, frequently has the specific sense of “coupled god and goddess,” especially in contrast to ekavīra or ekavīrā, a solitary deity.5 The yāmalatantras as a genre appear defined, in theory, by teaching the cult of a coupled supreme Godhead.6 On this basis I prefer the English rendering “Union Tantra” for the scriptures designated yāmala or yāmalatantra. In the Brahmayāmala, the supreme, paired divinity comprises the deities Kapāliśabhairava and the Great Goddess, whose primary names include Caṇḍā Kapālinī (“Fierce Skull-bearer”), Aghorī (“Un-Dreadful;” also Aghoreśī and Aghoreśvari), and Bhairavī. As noted already, Sanderson points out that the gender polarity of this supreme divinity is imbalanced, for the mantric being of the supreme Goddess, the Nine-Syllable Vidyā-mantra, subsumes that of Bhairava and the manḍala deities.

There might appear a degree of incongruity in a Śaiva tantra cast as dialog between Bhairava and the Goddess bearing the title Brahmayāmala, for the orthodox creator-deity Brahmā has remarkably little to do with the text. His role is confined to a narrative episode in BraYa lxxx, which contains an interesting tantric variant on the “Skull of Brahmā” (brahmakapāla) myth.7 In this episode, Brahmā has the distinction

---

4 Yāmaleśvara and his mantra, maṇḍala-deities, and the sakti in union with him (tadyāmala) are taught in BraYa lxxi, while Picubhairava and his “lump” (piṇḍa) or “heap” (kūta) mantra are described in lxxviii.

5 Note for example Kesmarāja’s expression bhairwayāmala, in the sense of Bhairava together with Bhairavī, e.g. ad Netratantra 10.12ab and 10.13ab (...caitat bhairwayāmalaṃ yajeta, and bhairwayāmalaṃ dhayyat, respectively). In the Tantraloka, Abhinavagupta uses the word yāmala in the sense of “male-female pair,” for example in the well-known maṅgalaśloka, where he speaks of his conception by the yāmala of his own parents. In 29.120, he appears to use yāmala in the sense of “conjoined śiva and sakti” (saktisaktimat).

6 Note Jayendrathayāmala lxxxiii.25ab: dāmpatyaṣuyogatā pījā yāmaleti niṣadyate, “The word ‘yāmala’ means worship of [in accordance to] the conjoined (yogatāḥ) [divine] conjugal pair.” I am grateful to Alexis Sanderson for providing this reference.

7 Compare this with, e.g., Skandapurāṇa 6–7.
of losing one of his heads to Bhairava, thence providing him a skull as alms-bowl.

Brahmā’s cosmogonic role, mentioned in a single passage, exists only by the blessing of Bhairava—and perhaps to the extent that his skull, filled with blood Viṣṇu offers Bhairava as alms from his own body, serves as locus for the creation of the primordial šaktis. Although few old yāmalatantras survive, extant text lists show that their titles were formed by appending -yāmala to the names of Brahmanical deities, or in some cases other mythical figures. In this regard, the yāmalatantras appear to mirror the naming conventions of Purānic literature, which includes texts with titles such as Skandapurāṇa, Viśnupurāṇa, Garuḍapurāṇa, and Mārkaṇḍeyapurāṇa.

More specifically, it appears possible that yāmalatantras were, in principle, texts named after the Brahmanical deities who serve as counterparts to and namesakes for the Mother goddesses (mātrī). This possibility receives support from the fact that a number of sources describe or identify the yāmalatantras as mātrītantras, “Tantras

---

8 BraYa LXXX.157-60ab:

```
etac chrutva tu tau deve pravīpatya punah punah |
janmamṛtyugahayatratau punas cāśāyatau mayā || 157 ||
datva varasahasrāni buddhikāmanusatratah |
sṛṣṭih kūrya vhe brahma tvaṃ pālana janārdana || 158 ||
ajītas triṣu lokēṣu subhagā ca bhavīṣyati |
mama tulyaśalo vañca maccharīre bhavīṣyati || 159 ||
prajñāṇi kāraṇaṃ brahma vivekāt veda-vādānām |
```

“After hearing this, the two gods [Brahma and Viṣṇu] prostrated again and again. Terrified by fear of [the cycles of] birth and death, I [Bhairava] again consoled them, after granting thousands of boons in accordance with their mind’s wishes: ‘O Brahma, create! You, Visṇu, maintain! You shall be undefeated in the triple universe, and fortunate. My child, having power equal to me, O Brahma, you shall be the cause of the beings (pra*jā) (ʔ) [arisen] from my body (?) the wisest of those adhering to the Vedas’.”

The interpretation of 159cd is unclear. By Isaacson’s suggestion, I have emended “balau to “balo, referring to Brahmā. 159d’s maccharīre has been tentatively construed as a “locative of source” (cf. V. S. Apte, The Student’s Guide to Sanskrit Composition, §77). Judit Törzsöö suggests the emendation maccharīro, which seems plausible (personal communication, November, 2006).

9 BraYa LXXX, e.g. 225cd-26ab:

```
brahmanasyottamaṃgīte tu viṣṇuṣoṇitapūrtate || 225 ||
mama dyāsāyatiṣena utthitāś ca śrasmayāḥ |
```

“And when my gaze fell upon the head of Brahmā, filled with the blood of Viṣṇu, the [śakti]-rays arose within it.”

One could alternatively understand 225cd as a locative absolute clause, viz. “when the skull of Brahmā was filled with the blood of Viṣṇu, . . .”
of the Mother Goddesses." Among these is the old Skandapurāṇa, as discussed in chapter two. The eight yāmalatantras listed in BraYa xxxviii correspond to six of the standard Seven Mothers, omitting the independent goddess Cāmunḍā, and adding yāmalatantras of Kubera and Vāyu.10 Although not normally included among the Seven or Eight Mothers, the BraYa and other sources do attest the goddesses Kauberī and Vāyavī, saktis corresponding to Kubera and Vāyu.11 While this possibility suggests a meaningful basis for the naming convention of yāmalatantras, evidence in support of this view is inconclusive. None of the early lists of yāmalatantras, as identified by Alexis Sanderson,12 map precisely to the Seven or Eight mothers, although yāmalatantras of Brahmapī, Rudrapī, Viṣṇu/Vaiṣṇavī, and Skanda/Kaumārī feature prominently. In addition, many yāmalatantra titles, whether of actual or idealized texts, do not seem compatible with this model. These include, for example, the NANDYAMALA,13 bearing the name of Śiva’s prominent retainer (gaṇa) Nandin, and the (extant) JAYADRATHAYAMALA, named after the ambiguous warrior and Śiva-bhakta of the Mahābhārata.

The JAYADRATHAYAMALA nonetheless advances precisely this Mother-goddess framework for understanding the yāmalatantras. In the thirty-sixth chapter of the first book (ṣaṭka), a passage listing root scriptures of the Vidyāpīṭha refers to the sevenfold “Union Tantras of the Mothers” (mātrayāmala), beginning with the Mother goddess Brahmaṇī. In this conception, BraYa is apparently first of seven scriptures corresponding to the Seven Mothers.14 Accounting for the diversity of titles, chapter forty-

10 BraYa xxxviii.25cd–27ab:

rudrayāmalam anyāḥ ca tatāḥ vai skandayāmalaṁ || 25 ||
brahmāyāmalamakaṁ caiva viṣṇyāmalaṁ eva ca |
yāmayāmalamakaṁ cāryam caiva rāmāyanam eva ca || 26 ||
kuberayāmalam caiva indrayāmalam eva ca |
25d skanda”] em. (Sanderson); kanda” By

11 BraYa xxix.94a includes Kauberī and Vāyavī in a set of six yoginīs, which also includes the Brahmanical saktis Hūtaśāri (i.e. Agneyī), Yāmīyā, Nairṛti, Vārūṇī, and Śākarti (i.e. Śakrāṇī, Indrāṇī?). Cf., e.g., Mālinīvaiṣṇavottaratantra 8.97–98 and Kubjikāmata 14.81.

12 Sanderson, “History through Textual Criticism in the Study of Śaivism, the Pāncaśāstra and the Buddhist Yoginītantras,” 7.

13 Mentioned in e.g. Skandapurāṇa 171.129b.

14 This passage also speaks of divisions of six and five yāmules corresponding to smaller groups of
two describes the five primary root-scripature yāmalas as Mother Tantras, from which emerge secondary (upa-) yāmalatantras. From the five upayāmalas in turn emerge various yāmalas of the dātis (“Consorts”), yoginis, and other minor goddesses. While this model of the core yāmalas as Mother Tantras might have historical value, it appears also to reflect a posthumous and idealized classification. Certainly it seems that many yāmalas and upayāmalas posited in this conception existed only in name.

Naming conventions of yāmalatantras hence suggest that “Brahmayāmala” has as an important, perhaps original meaning, “the Union Tantra of Brahmā” (or “of Brahmā-Brahmāṇ”), with the Jayadrathayāmala and other sources confirming a strong association between the yāmalatantras and Mother goddesses. However, the text’s self-understanding of its title diverges considerably. In the opening of chapter seventy-one, the Goddess asks, “But why [the word] yāmala, O God? I want to know truly.”

Commencing to answer, Bhairava declares, “this Brahmayāmalatantra emerged through the sequence of the brahma-[mantra]s.” Elaborating upon the link between the brahma- of the title and the archaic Śaiva brahmamantras, these five mantra-faces of Sadāśiva are identified with Tumburu and the Four Sisters, the core pantheon of the vāmatantras. As such, the brahma-mantras consist of both Śiva (Tumburu) and Śakti (the Sisters). The same passage also offers an alternative interpretation of brahma-, understanding it in the sense of brahman, the formless absolute, rather than the brahma-mantras or deity Brahmā. The scripture is called Brahmayāmala because Śiva

Mother goddesses. Jayadrathayāmala L.xxxvi.16–25 (text courtesy of Sanderson).

15 Jayadrathayāmala, L.xxxxi.1–7 (text courtesy of Sanderson). In this model, the five mūlaufalas are those of Brahmā, Śiva, Rudra, Skanda, and Uma, which give rise to the Vetalayāmala, Lśnayāmala, Atharva-yāmala, Somasvātayāmala, and Soma-yāmala, respectively.

16 BraYā Lxxi.1ab: yāmalaṃ tu kathaṃ deva jhātmā icchāmi tattvataḥ. BraYā Lxxi.3ab: brahmabhahgyayāntitaṃ brahmabhahgyayā nībhyāṃ sthitam, understanding “tantredaṃ as tantram idam, with metri causa elision of the case ending. (The same expression occurs as BraYā c.51a.) Brahmabhahgya refers to the sequence of the five brahma-mantras, beginning with that of Sadyojata. See Dominic Goodall, et al, The Pahcdvaranastava of Aghorasivacarīya: A Twelfth-century South India Prescription for the Visualization of Sadasiva and His Retinue, 136–37. See also Kṣemarāja’s explanation of the term commenting on Svāchchāntatrā c.1.46a. In the BraYā, cf. Lxxi.18cd: pravibhāṣbhyāṃ vidyārnyāṃ brahmabhahgya nīpayaṃ, “One should employ the vidya-mantra divided in five parts, in the brahmabhahgya sequence.” That this sequence begins with Sadyojata appears to be stated in a corrupt half-sloka, Lxxi.30d: sadyojāntāvibhāṣaṃ saṃśīrṇaṃ. Most probably, sadyojāntā should be emended to sadyojāti, “beginning with Sadyoja/Sadyojata.”
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and Śakti, the yāmala, are both vast (bhṛhattvāt) and cause expansion (bhṛṇhhakatvāt)—an etymology of brahman.  

An explanation in BraYa lxx focuses instead upon the term yāmala. The text is the “Brahmayāmala” because it encompasses within itself a variety of oppositions (yāmala): those of liberation and supernatural attainment (mukti and bhukti); ritual and doctrine (kriyā and jñāna); and teachings of both the ‘pure’ and ‘impure’ ways, as well as the ‘mixed’ and ‘unmixed’ ritual paths. This definition ties into the text’s classification of scripture, ritual, and practitioners according to the threefold schemata of pure, impure, and mixed. Because the text teaches ritual paths for all

---

18 BraYa lxxi.67–69ab:

brahman pañcaravibhāgastham na pañcarahitam koucit |
kāmābāna jayādyā ca denyas tumburupūrvakāḥ || 67 ||
nandāditītīhāyaḥ pañca śivaśaṅkāyātma-kāḥ priye |
brahhaudv bhṛṇhhakatvāc ca śivaśaṅkijī uhhā api || 68 ||
jagaty asmin sūgītāh tu brahnyāmolasanīṁjīhāya |

67c kāmavānā | en.; kāmavāna Bv² 67d “pūrvvakāḥ | en.; “pūrvvakā Bv² 68b śivaśaṅkāyāma Bv² 68c bhṛhhavād | en.; b(a?)havād Bv² “brahman always has five divisions; in no case is it devoid of the five. [These are] the five arrows of Kāmadeva, the [five] goddesses who begin with Jaya, preceded by Tumburu, and the five [auspicious] dates beginning with nandā, consisting of śiva and sakti. Because of being vast and causing expansion, both śiva and sakti are well-known in this world by the designation brahmayāmala.”

Bv²’s kāmabāna in 67c is suspect; the connective ca suggests reading kāmābānā jayādyās ca. It seems unlikely that the “arrows of Kāmadeva”—which number five—are identified with the Four Sisters and Tumburu, for this would make Tumburu himself one of Cupid’s weapons. In 68d, it seems that śivaśaktī represents the dual śivaśaktī, with an unusual hiatus-breaking -v-. This could reflect influence of sandhi of the type uhhā api for uhhau api.

Cf. the definition of the word brahman provided in BraYa lxx.24cd: bhṛha[t]tvād bhṛṇhhakatvāc ca tad brahnan sabdahin gam. This is a standard etymological explanation (nirukti) of the term; note, e.g., Kṣemarāja’s comments ad Śvacchandatana 1.46: brahmano bhṛhattvāt bhṛṇhhakatvāt viśeśyamah saktimūrtiḥ. In Parākhyanatana 14.78cd, a similar etymology is provided for Brahmā, as one of the five Causal Lords (kāranaśvara): bhṛhattvād bhṛṇhhakatvāca brahma vā brahmajñataḥ, “[He is called] Brahmā because he is great, because He fills, or because He possesses brahman” (translation of Dominic Goodall, The Parākhyanatana. A Scripture of the Śaiva Siddhānta, 374).

19 BraYa lxxi.99cd–102ab:

śuddhāśuddhā tathā marge mīrāmīśre ca tatasah | 99 |
bhuktiṣuṣṭiṣuṣṭiṣ̄jñānāḥ śuddhāśuddhāḥla kṣaṇam |
brahmayāmalam ity uktam elad dévyaśalam tathā | 100 |
śuddhāśuddhāvedbhāgānā jñānam uktam vāraṇām |
mantraśaktitve keka paraśyaśamayena ca || 101 |
śuddhāśuddhāvedbhāgānā tāṁs uktam iñśaṃ smrtam |
100a “kriyā” cor; “kriyā” Bv²

Intriguingly, Devyāmata in 100d appears to be another epithet of the BraYa. Cf. Devyāyāmala, the title of a text quoted by Abhinavagupta.

20 See, e.g., the annotation on BraYa 1.38–39 in part II.
three grades of sadhaka, characterized by the basic opposition of pure and impure, it is the yamalatantra.

5.2 Picumata

Alongside "Brahmayāmala," "Picumata" (and Picutantra) figures as foremost among the titles and epithets provided in the text's colophons. A number of other tantras also bear the designation -mata, "Doctrine [Tantra]," such as the Siddhayogēśvarīmata. This epithet actually occurs with twice the frequency of Brahmayāmala in colophons, and the text is cited by this name and variations such as Picutantra in the Bhairavamaṅgalā21 and Tantrāloka.22 Sanderson highlights the epithet's importance by referring to the scripture as the Picumata-Brahmayāmala.23 This choice has merit, for instance clearly distinguishing the text from later tantras claiming the title Brahmayāmala. Nonetheless, I deem Brahmayāmala the primary title and generally refer to the text as such, giving weight to the balance of evidence from citations and text lists. The relative priority of a text's titles is of course a modern concern; the tradition itself readily accommodated multiplicity.

In Sanskrit, picu ordinarily means "cotton," while picumarda and picumanda refer to the neem tree. It cannot be assumed forthright that picu has in the BraYa precisely the same meaning, but there are some indications of a botanical identification: we find references to picu trees, flowers, and leaves.24 It is conceivable that these refer to neem (Sanskrit nimba), picuvrksa being, that is, identical in meaning to picumanda and picumarda. More likely, perhaps, is that the picu "tree" refers to the cotton plant, or even the much larger silk cotton tree (Sanskrit apiranta).

Irrespective of the identity of the picu tree, a botanical referent is difficult to reconcile with most references to picu (as opposed to "picu tree," etc.) in the BraYa. In

21 See below (nn. 68, 104).
22 See above (n. 2).
23 See for example "Śaivism and the Tantric Traditions," 672.
24 Cf. BraYa lxiv.51cd (picuvrksa ato devi kṛtā maṇḍalakāṃ śubham), lxxvi.98ab (arkapatram picoh patrā[ṇ] ṭuribhagōtpuspaṃ eva ca), and lxxvi.104cd (arkapuspam picoh puspaṃ rāsabhaya tu sekajam).
many passages, it appears to be a liquid, a substance one “fills” (√pūr) into a vessel or the mouth, or uses to sprinkle on and thereby sacralize ritual space.²⁵ Frequently, it is a liquid used in the guest-water offering (argha) for deities, particularly as proffered from a skull-bowl. Often, argha is specified as consisting of either picu or alcohol, or both together.²⁶ It can also serve as an oblation in the fire sacrifice (homa).²⁷ BraYā xlv, expounding the deity Manthânabhairava and his unusual “churning [of the cauldron]” ritual, is particularly rich in references to picu as an offering substance. Typical is its instruction, “a skull filled with picu, fully empowered by the vidyā-mantra and its ancillaries— with that, the guest-offering should be given to the goddesses and to Bhairava.”²⁸ In BraYā vi and vili, the term picuvaktra occurs as an iconographical description, probably meaning “having picu in the mouth.” Related to this, Picuvaktrā is the name of a minor goddess mentioned in the Agnipurāṇa and Tantrasadbhāva, while the latter also mentions a Bhairava named Picuvaktra.²⁹

Despite substantial data, the identity of the substance “picu” is not entirely certain. As a liquid used in ritual, picu must surely be distinguished from the picu-tree and its products. It is in fact almost certainly a bodily substance, and appears primarily to refer to sexual fluids. That it is a bodily product is suggested, for instance, by references to mahāpicu, in which the prefix “great” (mahā-) carries its not-so-secret code sense of “human;” cf. mahāmānsa, “human flesh.” BraYā xlix makes reference to cooking rice for the food offerings (caru) using raja (female sexual/menstrual fluid) and picu, or else blood (rakta); paired as it is with female fluids, it seems likely that here picu refers to semen.³⁰ In no case where picu is listed alongside other substances

---

²⁵ Cf., e.g., lxv.105, quoted below.
²⁶ Cf., e.g., xliv.52cd (picunā madireṇaiva devidevān sa tapayet) and xlvi.38ab (vīgrhyā dāpayed arghanā picunā suraṇḍathā vā).
²⁸ BraYā xlvi.105:
kapalam picunā pāram prabhājaḥ sūdyānābhīh sumantritam |
leṣākham tu pradātyayān devēmāṃbhāya tu || 105 ||
²⁹ Agnipurāṇa 146.19ab (piśācī picuvaṅktra ca lὸṣūpā ainārsambhavāḥ), Tantrasadbhāva 13.83cd (bhairavō jhārijhārō caiva picuvaṅktra tathāparal[al]), and Tantrasadbhāva 13.41ab (bhairavo jhārijhārō caiva picuvaṅktras tathā-paral[al]).
³⁰ BraYā xlix.10cd–12ab:
does seminal fluid find separate mention. But as discussed below, several passages appear to identify *picu* with the combined male and female sexual fluids, although these passages read much else into the term as well. It hence seems possible that *picu* refers in general to sexual fluids, whether male, female, or both. But as discussed below, several passages appear to identify *picu* with the combined male and female sexual fluids, although these passages read much else into the term as well. It hence seems possible that *picu* refers in general to sexual fluids, whether male, female, or both.

Somewhat confusing matters, an unmetrical verse quarter in *BraYa* makes reference to gajapicu, “elephant *picu,*” and elsewhere reference seems to be made to *picu* of the jackal (kroṣṭika). It appears somewhat improbable that *picu* refers here to the sexual fluid of the elephant and jackal; urine or blood seems more likely. This might in fact sug-

---

31 This might explain what the *Matasāra* means by *picukrīḍa,* “sporting with *picu;” while not explicitly clear, the context suggests that this refers to something done after copulation. *Matasāra,* chapter 1:

32 On kroṣṭukapicu, see *BraYa* XLI.10c–12b, quoted above. *Gajapicu* is mentioned in *BraYa* XLI.21c:

This section, for which *Bya* is not fully legible, outlines a mandala with an inner circuit of eight skulls arrayed in the cardinal and ordinal directions, filled with various “nondual” liquids. These are empowered by the mantras of the four *devis* and four *dāttis* who are installed therein. The other liquids include, for instance, human and rabbit blood, blood of the practitioner (*yoginasya [!] raktas*), alcohol, and human *picu* (*mahāpicu*).
gest that *picu* is a general term for bodily fluids, usually having the specific sense of "sexual fluid."

Kashmiri nondual exegetical literature attests the term *picuvaktra* ("Picu-mouth") as a synonym for *yoginīvaktra*, the "mouth of the Yogi."

In a vision of the scriptural canon articulated in the *Tantraloka* and *Tantrasāra*, Abhinavagupta posits Kaula scriptures as revelations of a sixth, hidden stream, emerging not from Śadāśiva’s five faces but a "lower face/orifice" (*ādhowaktra*, etc.) or “netherworld [facing] face" (*pāṭālavaktra*). These are synonyms of *yoginīvaktra*.

In the *kula-yāga* ("clan rite") expounded in *Tantraloka* 29, this *yoginīvaktra*—the ultimate source of the lineage (*sampradāya*) and scriptural wisdom—becomes the divine homolog of the ritual consort’s sexual organ. Drinking fluids from this source thus becomes a medium for gnostic experience. The use of *picuvaktra* as a synonym of *yoginīvaktra* might be based upon the latter’s identification with the vagina in ritual, locus of the substance *picu*. However, anatomical conceptions of the *yoginīvaktra* are ambiguous: it in fact appears that to the Kashmiri Śaiva authors Jayaratha and Kṣemarāja, the *ādhowaktra* or the "lower mouth" refers in microcosmic terms to the root plexus of the human body, associated as much with the rectum as the genitals.

---

33 Jayaratha provides *picuvaktra* as a synonym for *yoginīvaktra* in commenting on *Tantraloka* 15.206.

34 On the concept of the *ādhowaktra*, see Tāntrikabhidhānākasā, vol. 1, 110, and Marc Dyczkowski, *The Canon of the Śaiva-gama and the Kubjika Tantras of the Western Kaula Tradition*, 63-65. The expression *pāṭālavaktra* is found in *Tantraloka* 15.206a, *ādhowaktra* in 6.193c, and "the mouth of the yogini" in 29.40d, 29.124d, and 29.221d. In all likelihood, the idea was already present in Kaula scriptural sources. Dyczkowski, for instance, cites a suggestive passage from the *Cincimmasarasamuccaya* which speaks of the *āmnāyāhrdaya* ("heart of the lineage") as located in the "mouth of the Yogini." *Canon of the Śaiva-gama*, 168 (n. 49).

35 In the *Pratyabhijñāhrdaya*, Kṣemarāja speaks of the bodily *śakti* as the middle nāḍī "extending from the brahmārānda to the lower mouth (ādhowaktra)" (sā ... ā brahmārandaḥ śaśtrayamānādānāthāṃ nāḍī pradīptavāmyataḥ) (29.40d). The "lower mouth/orifice" cannot of course refer here to female genitalia, for the central nāḍī would then not exist in males. Jayaratha, commenting after *Tantraloka* 6.194b, refers to the *ādhowaktra* as "where the *apāna* vital wind has its resting point," the orifice which "removes" the "defilement of duality." He explicitly identifies this with the *yoginīvaktra*. The imagery of waste removal suggests the anus, although perhaps also the urethra:

> yatra nāmaśāntāya visṛṇātis tad idam dvaśalukāṅkāpām 'adhovaktram' 
> svaśṬasrūtanā yugaṇīvaktraṁ ity ucyate ...

"[The place] where in fact the *apāna* [vital wind] rests, the ‘lower mouth’ by which the defilement of duality is removed, is called the *yoginīvaktra*, which takes the form of the sixth [scriptural] stream."

The association between the area of the rectum and the *apāna vāyu*, which is responsible for food intake
as well, the downward "netherworld face" (pātālavaktra) or picuvaktra is correlated with the yogic body's ādhāra- or "root" cakra.36 David White has suggested that picuvaktra means "cotton mouth," his hermeneutics of "literal readings" finding in it a synonym of "vagina."37 (Cotton, apparently, implies pubic hair.) Extrapolating from this, he renders picu itself as "vagina," interpreting the title Picumata to mean "Doctrine of the [Nether] Cotton Mouth."38 This seems highly improbable. More sound, but still unlikely, Marc Dyczkowski suggests that the title Picumata means "the Doctrine of Picubhairava," the latter deity being taught in BraYā lxviii.39 More probably, Picubhairava is an apotheosis of the title Picumata, in much the same manner as Yāmalabhairava or Yāmaleśvara, a deity expounded in BraYā lxxxi.

Whatever may be its basic, material referent, the BraYā also uses picu as a multivalent technical term (saṃjñā) some distance removed from the picu substance. As such, the title Picumata invokes a range of embedded homologies, from mixed male-female sexual fluids to the supreme Goddess. Several discussions of the term picu and the elimination of waste (Svacchandaṭāntra 7.307ab: pravēṣayēd annapāṇaṁ tan mañīśvād adhāḥ), is made explicit in Svacchandaṭāntra 7.316a: praṇāpāṇāṁ guḍa dhīṣyeta, “one should visualize/meditate on the apāna-wind in the anus.” Cf., e.g., the Gorakṣasaṭaka (Briggs’ edition):

ḥṛdi praṇo vases nityam apāna guḍaṃ ca dhanāndale
samanā nābhidaśe sārā udānōḥ kantiśamadhīyoḥgaḥ || 34 ||

"Prāṇa would always remain in the heart, apāna in the area of the rectum; samāna would be in the navel area, udāna within the throat.”

It seems certain that Jayaratha and Ksemarāja identify the adhavaktra as neither the rectum nor genitals, but rather the plexus associated with both located at the base of the torso, which they call the jannādāhāra, “the root of birth.” Jayaratha makes this identification explicit commenting on 3.953b, remarking, trikoṇam ity anena yoginavakrataparaparyayajanaṃ jannādāhārāvīrtaparitaṁ apy asya sācitam | tata eva hi parā śāktir udeśī—iti bārāḥ | Jayaratha elsewhere refers to the jannādāḥāra as the “place of the arising of the sakti,” commenting after Tentrāloka 5.944ab and 15.1044ab. He also provides as synonyms the terms annādāḥāra, kulamāla (e.g. ad 5.944ab), guṇya and guṇyacakra (“plexus of the privies,” e.g. ad 29.88), and nițtasthāna (“place of the root,” ad 32.35c), etc. Cf. Netratantra 7.31–32ab, which provides a list of synonyms for the base plexus.

It is perhaps worth noting that the later Śīvasanhitā speaks of a yoni ("vulva, womb") located between the penis and rectum as the locus of the kuṇḍalini:

guḍāḥ dhruvagulatāt cordinām medhavikāṅgulataṁ tv adhāḥ |
śaṃcā cāsti sanām kandam samantāc caturangulam || 77 ||
pasīcātānamuktiḥ yonīr guṇadēvītrīntardalāγaḥ |
tatra kandam samākhyātām tātāste kuṇḍalīt sattvam || 78 ||

Śīvasanhitā 5.77–78 (Lonavala edition).

37 Kiss of the Yogiṇī, 101; on “literal readings,” see ibid., 7–8.
38 Kiss of the Yogiṇī, 101.
39 Canon of the Śatīdāna, 168–70 (n. 56).
occur in the *BraYā*’s second half (ṣātkā), prior to the *Addendum Tantras*, particularly in chapters LXVI, LXVIII, and LXXI. In the last section of LXXI, the Devī asks, “Why does this *tantra* have the designation ‘picu’? What is stated by the syllable ‘pi’, and the syllable ‘cu’, O Maheśvara? [And what] through the conjunction of the two? Tell [me] everything.”

Bhairava in answer embeds in this two-syllable word a series of doctrinal and ritual meanings. Within the syllable ‘pi’ is present the supreme Śiva, for the entire universe “fell” (papāta), i.e. came to pass, through [his] contact with the śakti. In union with Śiva, the supreme Śakti is ‘cu’, for she kisses (cumbana) and sucks (cūṣaṇa). Their orgasmic discharge (kṣobha) is “the great substance” (mahādravya), the seed [of creation?]. Since the entire world is composed of Śiva and Śakti, the term picu, furthermore, connotes supreme nonduality (parādvaya). A subsequent, problematic line apparently describes picu as blood—presumably menstrual blood or female sexual fluid—as well as cognition (buddhi), and the “yoga of meditation upon Śiva.” Picu is nothing other than Śiva and Śakti; it is the nectar of immortality, in which all substances have origin. Picu has the nature of gnosia, the ever-exalted Ucchusmabhairava. ‘Pi’ has the form of the penis, while ‘cu’ denotes male and female sexual fluids. In chapter LXVI, picu is described as the union of Śiva and Śakti,

---

40 It is possible that the verb papāta is used in allusion to sukrapata, seminal emission.

41 This line—picu raktam tatha buddhi dhyanayogam śīstmaṇam, Lxxi.117ab—is highly problematic. It is conceivable that buddhi is a corruption of viddhi, the imperative of ज्ञाति.

42 *BraYā* Lxxi.110-21ab:

---

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
taking the form of the two-syllable mantra HUM PHE.\textsuperscript{43} The syllable ‘pi’ connotes the male genitals and semen, and ‘cu’ menstrual/sexual fluid and the female “hole” or “vessel” (kunda). In addition, picu is the supreme Śakti, Aghoreśvari, from whose

\begin{verbatim}
picu raktam tathā buddhir dhvanyayo gam śivātmakam |
picu śaktisivātīhām tu nātāram saravārini || 117 ||
yogavatā sarvanām ca sarvasattvaantivecandāt |
nityāyuktaṃ picu jñātānām śivānātmarṣaḥśītaḥ || 118 ||
amṛtam mṛtyunyāsām tu sarvadārayām picūdāha vam |
picu jiñānasabādhiḥ tu ucchusnam satatodītam || 119 ||
pūkāro līlaganasthānām cuktāh śakrasānitām |
picu-r-akṣarasanyogābuddhiśuddhavilākṣyā || 120 ||
antahkaranaśke bāhye saikā śaktih śītovitā |
\end{verbatim}


Bhairava spoke: ‘Hear, O goddess, the ultimate answer to the question about pica, in accordance with its state with the division of each syllable. Since the entire universe came to pass [lit. “fell”] through [his] union with the Śakti, the pervasive, immutable lord, Śiva, should be known as present in the syllable pi. [111cd–13ab] Since, in union with Śiva, the Śakti kisses (cumāraṃ) [and] sucks (caṣaṇam), (?) [and creates a] union that is all pervasive, conjoined with Śiva (?), the immovable [Śakti] is said to have the title pica when united with Śiva, O fair woman. [113cd–14] And the orgasm fluid (kośha) from their combined pleasure, (?) composed of pica, should in truth be known as containing the “seed” [for the creation] (?), the “Great Substance” (mahādravya), O Pārvatī. And everywhere verily are seen śīva and śakti, nothing else. Because of being pervasive and immeasurable, the term pica has the sense of supreme nonduality (parādvaya). [115–16] (?) Pica is [sexual/menstrual] blood and cognition (buddhi); yoga and meditation consist of Śiva (?). Pica is none other than śīva and śakti, O fair woman. [117] Because of its state of unity, because of omniscience, and because of discriminating knowledge of all beings, (?) (118) It is the nectar which destroys death; all substances originate from pica. Pica has the nature of wisdom; it is the ever-arisen Ucchusmabhārava. [119] The syllable pi has the form of the penis; the syllable cu is semen and female sexual/menstrual fluid (ṣonita). Possessing the conjoined syllables pi and cu, having both pure and impure characteristics, the Śakti is singular, both internally and externally, conjoined with Śiva. [120–21ab]

The text and interpretation offered are provisional. Note for example the problem of what Ba transmits as pīcavā bijāvaj in 115cd. This should probably read pīcavāt bijāvaj, the -vat suffix having the sense of “possessing, containing.” In 116cd and 120c, there appear to be compounds with internal hiatus breakers, vyāpita-m-aprameyam and pīc-r-akṣara, respectively. 118 is particularly problematic. For 118d, the only conjecture I can offer is sarvam ekopamāṣitaḥ, “everything, present in a single comparison.”\textsuperscript{44} Byā is not legible here, but the form of the mantra is perhaps confirmed by the occurrence of HUM PHE in 115-139b: humphephadeti rakṣādhaṃ tasto dāttadāyaḥśītām. However, there is a possibility that phe is corrupt for phe, a syllable whose importance is illustrated by the exposition of a deity called of Phekārābhārava (“the bhairava of the syllable ‘Phet’”) in the very next chapter, XVII. The manuscript evidence is mixed; in support of phe (or phe, phem?), note for example LXXIV.57c and 188c in Ba: hūmpheti devakṣaram mantra and humphepi devakṣaram mantra, respectively, the latter probably being the correct text for both (‘pheti appears to represent phe iti).
womb the entire creation arose. Hence, the title Picumata appears to foreground the importance of sexual fluids and coitus in the ritual of this scripture. The text's exegesis of this term advances a rudimentary theology of sexual ritual, embedding in picu's two syllables the polarity of śiva and śakti and their earthly embodiment in male and female fluids. And consistent with this scripture's emphasis on the female pole of the Godhead, although picu's syllables are homologous with śiva and śakti,

\[\text{\textsuperscript{44}}\] BraYa lxiv. The text of this passage has several problems, in part because the oldest codex, By\textsuperscript{a}, is damaged. The following edition reports the readings of By\textsuperscript{a}, By\textsuperscript{b}, and By\textsuperscript{d}:

\[\begin{align*}
6a & \text{humkāre} & \text{By}\textsuperscript{a}; & \text{humkāro} & \text{By}\textsuperscript{b}; & \text{humkār} & \text{By}\textsuperscript{d} & \text{6b phe} & \text{By}\textsuperscript{a} \text{Br}\textsuperscript{b}; & \text{pha} & \text{By}\textsuperscript{d} & \text{6c kāraśthā} & \text{By}\textsuperscript{a}; & \text{kāraśtho} & \text{By}\textsuperscript{b}; & \text{kārasṭha} & \text{By}\textsuperscript{d} \\
7 & \text{rakṣetātm} & \text{By}\textsuperscript{a}; & \text{bhairavo} & \text{By}\textsuperscript{b}; & \text{devo} & \text{By}\textsuperscript{d}; & \text{pha} & \text{By}\textsuperscript{b}; & \text{pēkha} & \text{By}\textsuperscript{d}; & \text{drastha} & \text{By}\textsuperscript{a} \text{Br}\textsuperscript{b}; & \text{drastho} & \text{By}\textsuperscript{d} & \text{6d sakti} & \text{By}\textsuperscript{a} \text{Br}\textsuperscript{b}; & \text{sakti} & \text{By}\textsuperscript{d} & \text{6e kund} & \text{By}\textsuperscript{a} \text{Br}\textsuperscript{b}; & \text{kund} & \text{By}\textsuperscript{d} & \text{7a} & \text{retā} & \text{By}\textsuperscript{a} \text{Br}\textsuperscript{b}; & \text{retā} & \text{By}\textsuperscript{d} & \text{7b} & \text{rūpā} & \text{By}\textsuperscript{a} \text{Br}\textsuperscript{b}; & \text{rūpa} & \text{By}\textsuperscript{d} & \text{7c} & \text{so} & \text{By}\textsuperscript{a} \text{Br}\textsuperscript{b}; & \text{so} & \text{By}\textsuperscript{d} & \text{7d} & \text{samanvita} & \text{By}\textsuperscript{a} \text{Br}\textsuperscript{b}; & \text{samanvita} & \text{By}\textsuperscript{d} & \text{9a} & \text{samt} & \text{By}\textsuperscript{a} \text{Br}\textsuperscript{b}; & \text{samt} & \text{By}\textsuperscript{d} & \text{9b} & \text{lo} & \text{By}\textsuperscript{a} \text{Br}\textsuperscript{b}; & \text{lo} & \text{By}\textsuperscript{d} & \text{9c} & \text{pi} & \text{By}\textsuperscript{a} \text{Br}\textsuperscript{b}; & \text{pi} & \text{By}\textsuperscript{d} & \text{9d} & \text{cuk} & \text{By}\textsuperscript{a} \text{Br}\textsuperscript{b}; & \text{cuk} & \text{By}\textsuperscript{d} & \text{10a} & \text{pi} & \text{By}\textsuperscript{a} \text{Br}\textsuperscript{b}; & \text{pi} & \text{By}\textsuperscript{d} & \text{10b} & \text{jiva} & \text{By}\textsuperscript{a} \text{Br}\textsuperscript{b}; & \text{jiva} & \text{By}\textsuperscript{d} & \text{10c} & \text{pi} & \text{By}\textsuperscript{a} \text{Br}\textsuperscript{b}; & \text{pi} & \text{By}\textsuperscript{d} & \text{10d} & \text{prad} & \text{By}\textsuperscript{a} \text{Br}\textsuperscript{b}; & \text{prad} & \text{By}\textsuperscript{d} & \text{11a} & \text{cint} & \text{By}\textsuperscript{a} \text{Br}\textsuperscript{b}; & \text{cint} & \text{By}\textsuperscript{d} & \text{11b} & \text{i} & \text{By}\textsuperscript{a} \text{Br}\textsuperscript{b}; & \text{i} & \text{By}\textsuperscript{d} & \text{11c} & \text{a} & \text{By}\textsuperscript{a} \text{Br}\textsuperscript{b}; & \text{a} & \text{By}\textsuperscript{d}  \\
\end{align*}\]

\[\text{"In the syllable hum is the god Bhairava; Mahēśvarī is present in the syllable phe. (2) The conjunction by both here, in the hole of the consort (?), O Mahēśvarī, as one, has the form of the everlasting picu, which consists of female fluid and semen. [6-7ab] It is the Śakti of the god of gods, possessing the seed of Śiva. Through combination of the respective syllables, it is the cause of the universal creation and destruction. [7cd-8ab] Through the divisions of the creation of the universe, it has the glorious form of the Śakti, located in the designation picu, vibrating and omnipresent. [8cd-9ab] The syllable 'pi' means "penis;" the syllable 'cu' means "the hole" (kund), 'pi' is semen; female fluid is present in 'cu.' (1) The combination pi-cu comprises the universe (bhāra) (?). [9cd-10ab] Picu is [both] śakti and the possessor of śakti, through the division of the soul (jīva) and body of living beings. She is Prakṛti (pradātā), by whom was born from the womb the animate and inanimate universe. [10cd-11ab] Everything seen consists of śakti, O goddess. That is why the Śakti, Aghori, is said to be like a wish-fulfilling jewel in this world, O goddess. [11cd-12ab] The interpretation offered of this somewhat obscure material is again provisional."}
as an integral unit it seems primarily to embody the supreme Śakti—she who gives birth to the universe.

Interestingly, the term picu occurs in mantras in several Buddhist yoginītantras: the Cāṇḍamahāroṣaṇatantra, Kṛṣṇamārṇītantra, and Hevajratantra. It features prominently, for instance, in the latter source in the “heart mantra” (hrdaya) of Hevajra: OṂ DEVA PICIUVAJRA HŪṂ HŪṂ HŪṂ PHAT SVĀHĀ. According to Isaacson, commentators on the Hevajratantra understand picu to refer to “fine cotton,” with Hevajra’s epithet picuvajra indicating his simultaneously soft or grace-bestowing nature and his hard, vajra-nature as destroyer of obstacles and evil. Outside of mantras, I am unaware of the occurrence of picu as a technical term in Buddhist tantric sources, wherein it thus appears anomalous—perhaps inherited from teachings no longer present in surviving scriptures, or drawn from Śaivism, even the tradition of the Picumata itself.

5.3 NAVĀKŠARAVIDHĀNA: THE “METHOD OF NINE SYLLABLES”

Among the secondary epithets or titles of the BraYa is Navākṣaravidhāna, the “Procedure/Method of the Nine Syllables” of the vidyā-mantra of Aghoresvari. This title foregrounds the pivotal function of the vidyā-mantra, the mantra-form of the supreme Goddess herself, in cementing this text’s doctrinal vision and vast corpus of ritual into a coherent whole. Whether in accounts of the cosmos, mantra, or ritual, the vidyā of Aghoresvari serves as the organizing principle which patterns and establishes order among these intersecting domains. As the sonic embodiment of the Goddess, the vidyā, moreover, encodes the core pantheon of the Brahmāyanāla and the mantras for its systems of practice. Its syllabic form is [OṂ] HŪṂ CĀNDE KĀPĀLINI SVĀHĀ, the nine syllable-deities accordingly being HŪṂ-CĀM-DE-KĀ-PĀ-LI-NI-SVĀ-HĀ: Bhairava; Raktā, Karāli, Cāṇḍākṣi, and Mahocchuṣmā—the Four Devis or guhyakās; and Karāla, Danturā, Bhūmakvaktra, and Mahābala—the Four Dūtis (“Consorts”), kiṅkaris, or anucarīs. A syllabic series based upon the vowels of the vidyā embodies the

---

45 Hevajratantra Lī.5.
46 Unpublished annotation to Ratnākaraśānti’s Bhramaharanatma Hevajrasādhana.
Eight Mothers, while the Six Yoginis comprise a set of inflected forms of the \textit{vidyā}. As the nine-syllable whole, the Great Goddess Aghoreśvarī or Bhairavī subsumes all (TABLE 5.1).

\textit{Vidhāna} and its synonym \textit{vidhi} connote in this context the processes of ritual. Procedures for mantra-incantation and consecration are, for instance, called \textit{japavidhāna} and \textit{abhiṣekavidhī}, the subjects of chapters xviii and xxxiii, respectively. The \textit{vidhānas} of the \textit{BraYa} are patterned by mantra-configurations representing so many inflections of the Nine, their uninflected configuration being the “basic/root pantheon” or \textit{mūlayāga}, consisting of Bhairava-Bhairavī, the Four Goddesses (\textit{devī}), and the Four Consorts (\textit{dūtī}). These pattern the entire gamut of ritual, from fire sacrifice to \textit{vratas} to yoga. In \textit{nyāsa}, for instance, installation of the mantra-deities upon the body and other substrates preliminary to almost all ritual, the practitioner or ritual object embodies the mantra-deities in various configurations. Among the fundamental rituals of the system are the \textit{vidhānas} of the \textit{navayāga}, “nine pantheons,” these being the \textit{mūlayāga} and eight other configurations of the pantheon.\textsuperscript{47} \textit{Vratas} or observances are also ninefold, or fivefold, corresponding to the mantra-deities of all nine syllables or the Four Devīs with Bhairava, respectively.\textsuperscript{48} Other \textit{yāgas} are based upon different and extended configurations of

\begin{table}[h]
\centering
\begin{tabular}{|l|l|}
\hline
\textbf{FOUR DEVĪS} & \textbf{FOUR DŪTĪS} \\
\hline
Raktā (\textit{cām}) & Karālā (\textit{lī}) \\
Karālī (\textit{de}) & Danturā (\textit{nī}) \\
Caṇḍakṣī (\textit{kā}) & Bhīmavaktrā (\textit{svā}) \\
Mahocchusmā (\textit{pā}) & Mahābalā (\textit{hā}) \\
\hline
\textbf{SIX YOGINĪS} & \textbf{EIGHT MOTHERS} \\
\hline
Kroṣṭuki (\textit{om hūm caṇḍe kāpālini namah}) & Mahēśvarī (\textit{am}) \\
Vijayā (\textit{om ... svāhā}) & Brāhma (\textit{ī}) \\
Gajākarna (\textit{om ... hūm}) & Vaiṣṇavī (\textit{ā}) \\
Mahāmukhī (\textit{om ... vaśāt}) & Kaumārī (\textit{a}) \\
Cakravegā (\textit{om ... vaśāt}) & Vaivasvatī (\textit{i}) \\
Mahānāsā (\textit{om ... phāṭ}) & Indrānī (\textit{i}) \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\caption{Deities of the \textit{Navāksara Vidyā}}
\end{table}

\textsuperscript{47} The Nine Yāgas form the subject of chapter thirteen. The opening verses of chapter 3, the \textit{mahāyajnapātala}, provide moreover names for each of the Nine.

\textsuperscript{48} The nine and five \textit{vratas} form the primary subject of chapter xxii. Among these, the fifth of the
the vidyā’s mantra-deities. Cakras or manḍalas drawn upon a substrate, usually the ground, provide templates for these pantheon configurations and loci for many of the vidhis connected with them.

The navākṣarā vidyā-mantra comprises the subject of the second chapter of the BraYa, which follows the narrative of revelation (BraYa 1.1–119) and a short exposition on the supreme Śakti (1.120–33). The vidyā’s mantric form and embedded pantheon were first identified by Sanderson:

…the essential components of the mantras of the nine deities who form the core of the greater manḍala and are the pantheon of daily worship are the syllables of the mantra of Caṇḍā Kāpālinī: (Om) हूँ चान्दे कापालिनी स्वाहा (‘O Caṇḍā Kāpālinī…!’). Thus Kaṭalīśabhairava (हूँम), his four goddesses (Raṅkā (Caṃ), Karalā (पे), Caṇḍākṣi (Ka) and Maḥoḥcuṣma (Pā)) and their four attendant powers or Dūṭīs (Kaḷāli (L), Dantura (N) Bhīmavaktrā (svā) and Maḥābālā (Hā)) are aspects of a feminine power which transcends the male-female dichotomy which patterns the lower revelations.

This account of the vidyā requires correction in one detail: the second Devī is Karālī, while Karalā is first of the Dūṭīs. The confusion is understandable, for these deities of similar nomenclature are frequently mixed up in the manuscript evidence. Besides the core pantheon of the Nine, the vidyā is said to contain within itself a pan-

Five seems most important: the “great Observance,” called also the “Bhairava-observance” and “observance of the vidyā.” This probably corresponds to the ekaviravidhāna, “procedure of the solitary Hero [Bhairava],” an important inflection of the mūlayaṅga in which the focus is Bhairava alone and not the coupled divinity (yāmala).

49 BraYa xxv in particular, the yāganiṁrayaṇapatala, teaches extended inflections of the basic pantheon.

50 Note that BraYa 11 has been included in the critical edition forming the latter part of the present dissertation.

51 “Saivism and the Tantric Traditions,” 672. Sanderson also provides the vidyā on the basis of a passage from BraYa lxxxv (verses 42–43ab in his numbering), in “History through Textual Criticism,” 44–46.

52 Among the numerous lists, see for example a concise one in chapter 4, quoted in full in the annotation ad BraYa 1.8cd–9; and another passage from the same chapter (verse 262):

rāktaīṣu tu karalā syāt karālīṣyāḥ tu danturā |
bhīmavaktrā tu caṇḍākṣaḥ uccuṣmāṇāḥ maḥābālā |
karalā | en.; karalān By° caṇḍākṣyā | en.; caṇḍākṣi By°

“The attendant) of Raṅkā is Karālī, but of Karālī, Danturā; of Caṇḍākṣi, Bhīmavaktrā; of Uccuṣmā, Maḥābala.”

Note that the genitive karālīṣyāḥ of karālī occurs with great frequency in the Brahmayāmala. This formation is similar to the locative uṣājāyāh in 1.81a, discussed in the footnote thereon.

53 For instance, in the oldest ms, By°, chapter lxxi (133–42) lists Karālī as first of the Dūṭīs, while for the second Devī, it provides karālīṣyāḥ[ī], the genitive of karālī. There is no metrical reason why these
Theon augmented by a sextet of yoginis and the Eight Mother goddesses (Table 5.1). The Six Yoginis “emerge from the limbs of Aghoresvari,”⁵⁴ although as the aniga-mantras of the vidyā,⁵⁵ these deities appear distinct from the aniga-mantras of the Goddess.⁵⁶ Somewhat less natural is the derivation of the Mother Goddesses (mātr) from the vidyā: the syllabic series AM-E-A-I-I-SVĀ-HĀ, which maps loosely to the vowels of the vidyā.

Evidence confirming Sanderson’s reconstruction of the vidyā-mantra is ample. The point of least clarity concerns its first syllable, हूम, the seed-mantra (bīja) of Kapālitābhairava. On the evidence of chapter two alone, it might appear that the vidyā begins with ॐ, and that this is the seed-mantra of Bhairava; II.15a states that “the God [Bhairava] exists in the pranava,”⁵⁷ and the chapter gives no indication of pranava having a sense different from its normal referent, ॐ. There are, moreover, mantras in the BraYa which begin, as would the vidyā, “ॐ CANDE …”⁵⁸ However, elsewhere the stated form of the vidyā clearly begins with हूम. Note for example LXXXVIII.113–15, where we find a mantra-installation (nyāsa) with the sequence हूम-CA⁵⁹-DE-KĀ-PĀ-LI-NI-SVĀ-HĀ—the nine-syllable vidyā. It seems in fact likely that pranava in BraYa II.15 refers to हूम. This possibility is illustrated by the Svacchanda-tantra, which appears also to attest reference to हूम, the seed-mantra of Svacchand-

---

⁵⁴ BraYa II.14ab.
⁵⁵ On the concept of aniga or “ancillary” mantras, see Tāntrikabhidhanakośa, vol. I, 93–95.
⁵⁶ Although in theory the vidyā-mantra is Aghoresvari, an important distinction appears between the two as well. The supreme Goddess is both embodied by the vidyā and appears as a subset within it—as eighth of the Mother goddesses, the mātrīpūrṇa (“she who makes the Mothers complete”; cf. BraYa II.18b, etc.). The latter’s root mantra, as given in BraYa x, is ॐ ह A N A M I, and her aniga- and other ancillary mantras are based upon this, rather than the full vidyā (see BraYa x.210cd–215ab). It hence appears that two levels of being are posited for the Goddess, the higher of which comprises the vidyā of nine syllables.

⁵⁷ pranave tu sthito deva.
⁵⁸ Cf. seven mantras provided in the prose following LXXXV.55, beginning with ॐ CANDE MOHANES-VARI CHĀTAN HŪM PHAT SVĀHĀ.
⁵⁹ Note that cakara is provided instead of camkāra, despite the latter occurring in the vidyā. This might not be a corruption; although cam is provided in the saṃkalanavidhi (quoted below), ca occurs as the bīja of Rakta used for nyāsa in x.24a.
abhairava, as 'pranava'.\textsuperscript{60} In the Brahmayamala, furthermore, reference is made to the "Bhairava-pranava;"\textsuperscript{61} and this surely refers to hūm, for the context is installation of the maṇḍala deities of the vidyā onto the body, beginning with Bhairava. Yet while the vidyā proper hence begins with hūm, in many of its applications, om is nonetheless prefixed to the nine syllables. This reflects standard mantra formation in this system;\textsuperscript{62} a mantra not preceded by om is said to be "headless."\textsuperscript{63}

As the seed-mantra of Kapāliśabhairava and the initial syllable of the navākṣara vidyā, hūm possesses particular significance in the Brahmayamala. It is given the special designation smarana, said to be formed by conjoining the sixth vowel (ū) and the candrabindu (m) to the hamsa (HA).\textsuperscript{64} One is to affix the smarana to all mantras,

\textsuperscript{60}Commenting ad Svacchandatānta 4.203, Kṣemarāja glosses pranava as niśkalanātha, which as Isaacson points out to me refers to hūm, the niśkala (undifferentiated, unmanifest) form of Bhairava in this system (e-mail communication, January 29, 2006). That the term can have multiple applications is evident also in the teaching of pātca pranavāh or five pranavās in Svacchandatānta 6, discussed by Kṣemarāja ad Svacchandatānta 6.3. It seems that these involve permutations of the five constituents of om, along with the hamsa (HA).

\textsuperscript{61}Bṛihadāraṇyaka 1.60cd: śikhāyaḥ[ḥ] pranavāṁ nyasya bhairavākhyam na saṁśayah.

\textsuperscript{62}Cf., e.g., Bṛhāraṇyaka 1.60xx, which opens with the mantra om hūm phaṭ vauṣṭ Kapālabhairāvaya Nāmaḥ.

\textsuperscript{63}Cf. xi.6cd–19ab:

kotiḥ sapta mantrāṇāṁ omkārasya na saṁśayāḥ \| 16 \||
kiṁkaraṇaṁ prakūrvasi evaḥ vai bhairavo bhūvat \|
sarveṣaṁ mantrajñāṇōṁ māstaka pranavāḥ smṛtaḥ \| 17 \||
yatadāu na bhavatīesa amuṇḍo mantra ucitayate |
nāmeṇa tu vinā mantrāḥ sidhyate kādācana \| 18 \||
tenādāḥ pranavāḥ proktāḥ sarvamantrāṁ suvratate |

16c mantrāṇāṁ ] em.; mantrāṇā hūm a 18c nāmeṇa ] em.; nāmeṇā By4 18d cana ] em.; canaḥ Bya

"The seventy million mantras are undoubtedly subordinate to om. Thus did speak Bhairava. The pranava is called the ‘head’ of all classes of mantra. When it is not present at the beginning, the mantra is called 'headless.' A mantra never bears fruit in this world without it; that is why the pranava is taught at the beginning of all mantras, O pious woman."

That the pranava is here om is made explicit in the preceding verses.

\textsuperscript{64}Cf. xi.36cd–39ab:

hansākhyam satataṁ bijaṁ niśkalam tu saṁuccaret \| 36 \||
adyasvaranā tathā caiva ucchenā nātra saṁśayāḥ |
ekākṣam mahādevi hakāraṁ parikṛtitaṁ || 37 \||
śaṭṭhasvarenaśaṁyuktam kartavyaṁ tu mahāśvarai |
arthaṇābdinākalaśaṁyuktam kārayet tatha \| 38 \||
smaṁrasyamijaṁ saṁākhyatiśaṁ sarvamantrāṁ suvratārāḥ |


"One would pronounce [the mantra] called hamsa constantly, but [just] the seed-syllable [h] without a vowel. One would likewise utter the first vowel [a], no doubt. Made one, O
particular those of the *BraYā*.\(^{65}\) Knowing the syllabic content of the *smarana*, the form of the *navākṣarā vidyā* can be confirmed from multiple other passages. In *BraYā* LXXXV, for example, we find the *navākṣarā vidyā* headed by ṢŪM and called the “Heart of All Śaktis”:

Possessing the *smarana*, with the word (*pada*) **caṇḍe** [afterwards] in the beginning, ending **kāpālinī**, and decorated [at the end] by the word **svāhā**—this is the Heart of All Śaktis, bestower of the fruits of supernatural experience and liberation.\(^{66}\)

*BraYā* XXXIV offers further evidence confirming the form of the *vidyā*-mantra.\(^{67}\)

---

\(^{65}\) *BraYā* xi.75cd–76ab:

\(^{66}\) *BraYā* xi.xxxv.42cd–43:

\(^{67}\) This extensive chapter, entitled *Mantrasaṃkalanavidhi*, teaches the preliminary ritual for preparing or empowering (*saṃkalana*) the basic mantras of the system, apparently necessary for entitlement to *ācāryābhiseka*, consecration as an officiant. Its instructions begin thus:

\(^{68}\) (It seems that 3b would mean *ekam dhutim tato juhuyat*. Note the optative verb *hunet* for *juhuyāt*, a formation, influenced by Middle Indic verbal systems, based on the non-standard, non-reduplicated
References to the *smaraṇa*, which appears distinctive to and probably has origins in the system of the *BraYā*, also occur elsewhere in Śaiva literature. The *Bhairavamāṅgalā* refers to the "eightfold smaraṇa" as "originating from the *Picutantra*." In the *Tantrāloka*, Abhinavagupta too makes reference to the *smaraṇa*, in a citation from the *BraYā* xi on the subject of expiation ritual (*prāyaścitta*). Sanderson, moreover, shows that a reference to the *smaraṇa* has found its way into the Buddhist *Laghuśaṅvaratantra*, in a passage redacted from *BraYā* lxxxv, for which the text’s commentators vainly endeavored to offer a plausible interpretation.

Despite the central importance of the *navākṣarā vidyā* and its components, a number of alternate or parallel configurations of mantra-deities exist within the *BraYā*, which while correlated in various manners with the *vidyā* and its pantheon cannot be said to derive from it. Such for example appears to be true concerning the *kula-* or *khecācakra*, which is connected with the *kulavidyā* ("Vidyā-mantra of the Goddess Clans") rather than the *navākṣarā vidyā*. A number of the deities taught in separate chapters (often called *kalpas*), furthermore, have only loose connections with the *navākṣarā vidyā* and its pantheon; these include Mahākālā, Kartābhairava, etc.

---

**Footnotes:**

68 Bhairavamāṅgalā 235ab: *smaranam astadha jhatva picutantrat samudbhavam* (*tantrat samudbhavam* cm.; "*tantra samudbhavam* cod.). Cf. Bhairavamāṅgalā 242:

```
advadhūtā tu sā saktir śivarūkhyā mahodāti |
 nirācārah śīvo jñeyāḥ smaraṇatve vyavasthitāḥ || 242 ||
śakti | en; sakti ms nirācāraḥ | corr.; nirācāra ms śīvo | corr.; sīvo ms
```

"The Advadhūtā Sakti is the [same] one I said is called ‘Īśvarā’. Śīva is known as ‘nirācāra’, existing as the *smaraṇa*."

69 Abhinavagupta’s citations of the *BraYā* are discussed in appendix A.

70 "History through Textual Criticism," 44-46.

71 The *kulacakra* or *khecācakra* forms the subject of *BraYā* xiv. Its basic form comprises a configuration of sixteen vowel-goddesses as *ādīs* around Bhairava in the center, in which it resembles the *bhautikacakra* of *BraYā* xix.

72 Mahākālā and his maṇḍala of the Eight Mother goddesses are the subject of *BraYā* lxiv.

73 Chapter lxix teaches this "Subterranean Bhairava" and his maṇḍala of four goddesses.
Hairambhabhairava (Gaṇeṣa or Gaṇapati as Bhairava), and Utphullakabhairava.

5.4 Mūlāntaṇa: the "Root Scripture"

In the revelation narrative of chapter one and at several others points in the text, the BraYā refers to itself as the mūlāntaṇa, the "Root Tantra" or "Root Scripture." Yet although claiming the status of the foundational, originary scripture, it also describes itself as originating from a text of 125,000 verses called the Vimala or "Unblemished," the primordial font of "scriptural wisdom" (jñāna). These claims are embedded within a theology of revelation that posits scriptural wisdom as originating at the pinnacle of the hierarchy of tattvas, reality levels or cosmological principles, its descent (avatāra) into the bounded form of texts marked by ever-increasing brevity and numerical profusion.

Perhaps the earliest surviving account of the 'descent' (avatāra) of revelation in Śaiva sources occurs in the Uttarasūtra of the Niśvāsatantra. In its simple description, scripture (the sāstra or śīvanānta) emerges from the formless, supreme Śiva as subtle sound (nāda), which Sadāśiva sets down into language. This he transmits to the gods, whence it reaches in various reeditions to the sages and mortals (Figure 5.1). A demonstrably later scripture, the Svachchāntaṇa describes a more detailed genesis of scripture. In its conception, from the supreme, formless Śiva emerges a

---

74 Taught in BraYā lxxvi, this skull-bearing, elephantine Bhairava has four heads and ten arms, and stands upon a dead rat (mahāmāṣakapreta). His is a ten-syllable vidiyā, and he possesses a maṇḍala of yoginis.

75 The subject of BraYā lxxxii. While Utphullaka's pantheon mirrors the mūlaśākta in having a nine-syllable mantra, embodying himself in a maṇḍala of saktis, the mantra-deities are distinct.

76 Colophons to chapters ii, xxx, and xxxiv. Text passages describing the BraYā as mūlāntaṇa are discussed below.

77 Niśvāsatantra, Uttarasūtra 1.22cd–25:

Text as constituted in the working draft edition of Goodall, et al.
sonic resonance (*tad dhanirūpaṁ*), which Sadāśiva transmits to Īśvara in the form of countless scriptures suitable to the variety of beings deserving of grace. Īśvara then teaches the *tantras* to the Mantra-lords and *rudras* of the upper reaches of the universe, as well as to Śrīkaṇṭha, via whom the teachings descend unto the various lower *rudras*. Bhairava too takes initiation from Śrīkaṇṭha and learns the scripture, and teaches the Goddess, who transmits *tantras* to the *gaṇas*, gods, Mothers, *nāgas*, *yakṣas*, etc., whence it finally reaches the sages and humankind (Figure 5.2).78 While both of these sources attest the notion of a subtle, sonic original wisdom, neither however applies to this or its first textual evolutes the term *miślatantra*.

The *Bṛyaḷa’s* conception of the genesis of scripture is considerably more complex (Figure 5.3). It in fact posits a hierarchy of levels of the originary scriptural wisdom: that of an undifferentiated totality, that of a scripture called the *Vimala*, and that of a Root Tantra. In some accounts, these appear to be distinct levels or stages of the primordial ‘wisdom’ in its descent into the texts of the canon, while other passages appear to conflate one or more of them. Chapter one describes the supreme

---

78 Svacchandatantra 8.28cd–39 (kṣaṭs edition):

```plaintext
tad evdpararupena sivena paramatmana || 28 ||
mantrasimhasanasthena pañcamantramahatmana ||
puruṣārthāṃ vidāryāsī sādhanāṃ prthak prthak || 29 ||
laukikādiśeṣāntāṃ paripunavibhūteye ||
tadānuvṛśagayogāṇāṃ svē svē visayagocare || 30 ||
amuṣṭupandādīśa buddhāṃ ketyaruddasastraḥ ||
gurūśatya pade sthitot swayam devaḥ sadāśivaḥ || 31 ||
pūreottarapadādī vēkṣaṇaṃ tantram ādīrābhedataḥ ||
taj jñānam iśvāre idāt taj iśvareṇa iśveccayaḥ || 32 ||
vidyāyāḥ kathitaṃ pūrvaṃ vidyēsēbhyaṃ tadādārīt ||
māyāniṣṭat-parānyatās tasmād rūḍrair acūpi tat || 33 ||
śrīkāṇṭhēṃ parayā prāptaṃ jñānam paramadurābhyam ||
tenāpi tadādāh prakṛtaṇāṃ rūḍraṇāṃ iśveccayaḥ || 34 ||
prakāśanāc chaitarudāntaṃ diṣṭānītē vīdhānātāḥ ||
mumāpi ca purā dēśāt tathā caitabhāścacyayam || 35 ||
śrīkāṇṭhēṃ purā dattāṃ tantranām sarvārthinādham ||
maṇāpi tata devēsī sādīkārāṃ samarpitam || 36 ||
tvam api skandarudhrīyāṃ dadaṃsa vēkṣāpūrovaṃ ||
brahmāνaśāntaḥ padmānābādīnābādīnāblādīnāblādīnāb ||
loke samāyūhaṃ nigāhāṃ yākṣāhāṃ paramāśeṣvā ||
kathāvasaṃ prāṇāḥ ca bhīṣaḥ mamāpalāyī api || 38 ||
ca evam tantraravindrayāṃ dīyaṃ sādhurā virtuesanādham ||
tvāpya gaspitravāṃ kāyaṃ na deyeṣaṃ yasyāḥ kasyacit || 39 ||
```

A Nepalese codex, Nak 1-224, in 37ab reads tvātyaṇāṃ gūnaraudrāṇāṃ dadaṃsa vēkṣāpūrovaṃ; and in 38ab, lokapādatāhāṃ nigāhāṃ yākṣāhāṃ paramāśeṣvā. Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
Śakti, Śiva’s volition, as awakening bindu, the primordial substance of cosmic sound, from which emerges the undifferentiated totality or “flood” of scriptural wisdom (jñānaugham niṣkalan). This takes the form of a “body of mantra” (mantravigraha) situated at the level of the sadāśivatattva in the pure universe.79 At the time of creation, Sadāśiva causes the Vimala to emerge forth from this, therefore representing the first descent of the primordial ‘wisdom’ to the level of language, taking shape as a text of 125,000 verses in the anuṣṭubh or śloka meter.80 This primordial text, the font of all scripture—even of the universe, in some descriptions81—also exists at the level of the sadāśivatattva. Thus, just as does the supreme deity, the mass or totality of scriptural wisdom (jñānauga) possesses a higher, undifferentiated (niṣkala) and a differentiated (sakala), manifest form, the latter being the Vimala. It is from

---

79 BraVā 1.35.
80 BraVā 1.37–38.
81 Cf. BraVā 1.44ab and xxxii.329ab, quoted below.
Figure 5.2: The 'Descent of Scripture' (śāstrāvatāra) according to Śvacchandatantra 8
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the Vimala that the Root Tantra emerges. Description of the Root Tantra as a text of twelve-thousand verses identifies this as the BraYā, one of the epithets of which is The [Tantra of] Twelve-Thousand [Verses] (dvādaśasahasrasa).

Mirroring and in some accounts interwoven with the cosmogenesis, scripture hence descends into the world from the apex of the universe through the levels of reality (tattva) into the materiality of language. In this conception, the scriptural wisdom first takes on fixed, linguistic form as the Vimala of one and a quarter hundred-thousand verses, learnt by Śrīkaṇṭha, who transmits it to humankind in countless abbreviated redactions.82 This is not a scheme which automatically privileges the BraYā, a problem apparently addressed by providing it the status of Root Tantra.

Chapter thirty-two, teaching initiation (dīkṣā), contains a passage contrasting the jñānaugha, the font of both scripture and the universe, with the Four-fold Bhairava-vatntra (catuspīṭham bhairavam) which emerges from it. In contrast with the account of chapter one, the jñānaugha itself is identified as the “primordial Root Tantra,” rather than the catuspīṭham bhairavam. In this account, no mention is made of the Vimala, nor is the BraYā specifically identified with the catuspīṭham bhairavam.83

82 BraYā 1.34-42.
83 Several verses preceding those quoted below, though relevant to the subject at hand, present yet unsolved textual problems and have unfortunately been omitted. BraYā xxxii.323cd-31:
Figure 5.3: The 'Descent of Scripture' (śāstraçatātra) according to Brahmāyāmala I and xxxviii
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Through the Lord Sadāsiva, who follows both paths [viz., the pure and impure], all this [scripture] emerged from this mass of scriptural wisdom, undoubtedly. [323cd–24ab] For the pure way, the impure, and likewise the [mixed] pure-impure, were taught pure [tantras], some that are impure, and others that are pure-impure. Having these divisions, Sadāsiva taught a variety of separate mantras with numerous elaborations for the followers of both [the pure and impure] ways. [324cd–26] But this [scripture] is the mass of scriptural wisdom, existing as [its] very true nature. Since it is second to none, it is therefore known as 'supremely nondual.' 84 [326–27] Pure, impure, and mixed comprise the threefold states, undoubtedly. The supreme mass of scriptural wisdom remains taught in accordance to the state. 85 [328]

Since the mantras [and] the triple universe, with its animate and inanimate [beings], came from this, [and] the tantras, without remainder, have divided from this, it is therefore called the Primordial Root Tantra (ādyam ūlatañtram), without doubt. From this emerged, O goddess, the Bhairava-tantra with four divisions (catuspītham bhairavam). [329–30] Therefore one initiated into this is initiated into all the tantras, pure, impure, and mixed. About this, there is no need for deliberation. [331]

Here too the boundary between the primordial scriptural wisdom and the text one actually reads is obfuscated: the proximate pronoun (ayam) describes the jñānaugha, as though it is the present text, while the catuspītham bhairavam—i.e. the BraYa—is referred to as another scripture altogether. Through such rhetorical claims, the BraYa continually inscribes upon itself the transcendental identity of the primordial scriptural wisdom.

Further evidence on this question emerges in chapter xxxviii, which, entitled “A Definitive Judgment on the Streams of Revelation” (srotanirṇayapaṭalā), is devoted to defining the Śaiva canon. Its account articulates more clearly the nature of the Root Tantra in relation to the jñānaugha, the two of which are not in this case mutually identified. From the jñānaugha emerge the tantras in three streams, which

---

84 There is here a play on the words dvaya (“two,” and “dual”) and dvitiya (“second”).

85 The implication here is that scripture is redacted from its primordial source in accordance with the differences in the speakers and audience—i.e. prchakāśrayabheda, as stated in xxxviii.14a (quoted below). Cf. Svacchandatantra 8.32b, referring to ādhārabheda, “difference in the locus [of revelation].”
Sadāsiva teaches to Śrīkanṭha. These correspond to the pure, impure, and mixed ways, and to the bhairavatantras of the Right stream, siddhāntatantras of the Middle stream, and vāmatantras of the Left stream, respectively. At the root of the Bhairava stream lies the mālātantra, the Bhairavatantra of Four Divisions (catuspīṭhāṇi ... tantrāṇi bhairavasamjñītām, 19cd):

Proclamation of the tantras is done according to differences in [their] interlocutors and recipients. Through three streams [of revelation] for the pure, impure, and mixed, respectively, the tantras emerged from the mass of scriptural wisdom, [and] were spoken. [14–15ab] The wisdom is not in all respects undivided; rather the tantras exist with differences in ritual for the pure, impure, and mixed, O fair woman. [15cd–16ab] The supreme mass of scriptural wisdom emerges forth in three streams, situated on the left, right, and middle with manifold divisions. Seventy-million mantras emerge from the Right stream, with a profusion of manifold tantras based upon it, having differences in ritual. Even within this [stream], the recipients vary, being pure, impure, and mixed. [16cd–18] Via the way of the Right stream arose the tantra called the Bhairava, possessing the four

---

66 BraYā xxxviii 14–26ab:

prccakṣāyaḥbhedād eva tantrāṇāṁ kṛttanaṁ kṛtam || 14 ||

śuddhaśuddhvamibhāvajayaḥ śrīḥ kroṭāya jñātakramam || 15 ||

vinirgatāṁ tantrāṇāṁ jñānaughaḥ bhūṣāti tu || 15 ||

nabhinnāṁ sarvalokāṁ jñānaṁ kriyābhedaḥ shiśāti tu || 15 ||

śuddhāśuddhbhāvajayaḥ tantrāṇāṁ varavanmī || 16 ||

jñānaughaḥ paramaṁ yas tu śrīḥ kroṭāya vinirgataḥ || 16 ||

vāmādakṣināmadhunāṁ nabhībhājanavasthitāḥ || 16 ||

saptakotyāṁ tu mantrāṇāṁ daksināṇa vinirgatī || 17 ||

tam aśritya kriyābhedaṁ nābhāntantrapravistāraḥ || 17 ||

tatrīpī bhraya bhīṁnāḥ śuddhāśuddhavāsāraṭāḥ || 18 ||

daksināśrotātmārṇeyā kriyābhādavyāvasthitām || 19 ||

catuspīṭhāṇāṁ samudānānāṁ tantram bhairavasamjñītām || 19 ||

daksināśrotātmābhīteṇa sarvam osmad vinirgatam || 1b tantranāṁ ||

tantranāṁ Bvā 14d vimśārebhyās || corr.; vimśārebhyāh Bvā 14d
trināṁ ||

trināṁ Bvā 15 javānaughaḥ || corr.; javānoghaḥ Bvā 15
dakṣināḥ ||
dakṣināḥ Bvā 15b javānaughaḥ || corr.; javānoghaḥ Bvā 15
saṅvartāh ||
saṅvartā Bvā 15d bhedaḥ || corr.; bheda Bvā 16 javānaughaḥ || corr.; javānoghaḥ

In referring to the “right” stream of scriptural revelation, the BraYā alternates between the masculine daksinā and feminine daksinā. In 15d, Bvā transmits kriyābhedaḥ, which appears to require emendation to the instrumental “bhedaḥ. Cf. xxxviii.33ab, vinirgatāṁ tantrāṇāṁ kriyābhājena caitaḥ hi, where however the instrumental is singular. Cf. also kriyābhājenaḥbhūgasaḥ, BraYā 1.41b. In 15c, nabhīnāṁ with its double negative is somewhat suspect; one might consider na bhīnāṁ. It is possible that the line intended something along the lines of “scriptural wisdom or ‘doctrine’” is singular, but the tantras are divided according to differences in ritual.”

In 18a, tam probably refers to the daksinā-stream, but one might also consider tān [mantrāṇ].


pīṭhas [or Catuspīṭhaḥbhairavatantra], and arranged according to divisions in ritual. Everything arisen from the Right stream emerged from this. [19–20ab]

The passage immediately following narrates the genesis of the Left and Middle streams.

Although not specifically designated as the mūlatantra, the text BraYā xxxviii describes as catuspīṭhaṁ bhairavan, identified elsewhere with the BraYā itself, functions as the Root Scripture, insofar as it is the source of the scriptures of the Bhairava Stream in its four divisions—the mantra-, maṇḍala-, mudrā-, and vidyāpīṭhas—which it alone contains within itself.87 As such, it occupies a position in the canon above all but the transcendental jñānaugha or Vimala. In the conception of this chapter, after Sadāśiva transmits the three scriptural streams to Śrīkāṇṭha, the latter transmits the canon to the world in ten streams in the ten directions, with tantras by the millions (table 5.2).88 In this ten-stream model, the three primary streams remain largely the

---

87 BraYā xxxviii 29cd–33ab:

daksinēna tu vaktreṇa daksināsrotasambhavam || 29 ||
catuspīṭhaprabhedena śiddhāśudhdharvibhāditaḥ ||
prcchakāśrayābhedaḥ bhudhā saṃvnyaśvasthitam || 30 ||
vidyāśritāṇi yāni syur vidyāpīṭhaḥ varānane ||
mantrāśritāṇi yāni syur mantrapīṭhaḥ tathāva ca || 31 ||
mudrāśritāṇi yāni syur mudrāpīṭhaḥ tu suvrate ||
mandalāśritākāṇāni syur maṇḍalam pīṭham ucyate || 32 ||
vinirgatāni tantrāni kriyābhēdena caiva hi

88 BraYā xxxviii 84–86:

ādīmo jñānasandohas tribhīḥ srotair vinirgataḥ ||
saddāśicena devena śrīkāṇṭhya prabhāṣitaḥ || 84 ||
saptādījñānasandohāḥ śrīkāṇṭhaḥa mahāyase ||
daksaravibhāgena bhāṣitaḥ sādhakeccayaḥ || 85 ||
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same. However, the siddhāntatantras become distributed among five streams, with the upward face of Sadāśiva revealing śiva-division tantras, and four streams in the intermediate directions revealing rudra-division tantras. The eastern face of Sadāśiva is said to teach the Vedic revelation, while the “downward” stream is also of considerable interest, for here the BraYa places the texts it considers least worthy of veneration: treatises on alchemy, magical herbs, exorcism, and snakebite cure; last, and perhaps least, are the tantras of the Vaisnavas (see tables 4.2–4).

**Table 5.2: The Ten Streams of Revelation according to BraYa xxxviii**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FACE OF SADĀŚIVA</th>
<th>PRESIDING ŚAKTI</th>
<th>DIRECTION</th>
<th>SCRIPTURAL CATEGORY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Southern</td>
<td>Daksīnā</td>
<td>[S]</td>
<td>bhairavatantras</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern</td>
<td>Vāmā</td>
<td>[N]</td>
<td>vāmanatantras</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upward</td>
<td>Madhyamā</td>
<td>[Up]</td>
<td>śivabheda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western</td>
<td>Vāmā and Madhyamā</td>
<td>[W]</td>
<td>rudrabheda [?]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern</td>
<td>Vāmā and Madhyamā</td>
<td>[E]</td>
<td>vedas, etc. (vedādīnī)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern</td>
<td>E, SE</td>
<td></td>
<td>rudrabheda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern</td>
<td>S, SW</td>
<td></td>
<td>rudrabheda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western</td>
<td>W, NW</td>
<td></td>
<td>rudrabheda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern</td>
<td>N, [NE?]</td>
<td></td>
<td>rudrabheda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A?</td>
<td>Down</td>
<td></td>
<td>rudrabheda</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This three- and ten-stream model is unusual, and probably archaic; what actually becomes normative is a five-stream model of Śaiva revelation, in which the primary three streams are augmented by the lowly bhūtatantras, in the west, and garudatantras

---

*The primordial mass of Wisdom emerged forth in three streams. The Lord Sadāśiva taught it to Śrikanṭha. Śrikanṭha, O woman of great renown, taught the mass of scriptural wisdom (1) having [one hundred] and a quarter [thousand verses] (?), through divisions of ten streams, according with the wishes of sadhakas. Those who learned these further revealed [the wisdom] manifoldly, with millions and millions of elaborations, (1) and kalpa-texts by the thousands (?)).*

The interpretation of sapādajñānasandohah (85a) is uncertain. I have taken this as an abbreviation of sapādālakṣajñānasandohah (flētananda meaning jñānaugha), i.e. the “mass of scriptural wisdom measuring 125,000 verses,” however, it is conceivable that sapāda here means “having verse-quarters,” i.e. actual text in verse. Of linguistic interest in this passage is the thematized a-stem tatvādī, for tatvādī.
in the east; these have as their respective concerns exorcism and the magical cure of snakebite. And although the Root Scripture, the Bhairava Tantra of Four Divisions, has here articulated for it a compelling position within the canon, never in this chapter is a relationship of identity with the BraYa stated directly. In fact, the BraYa appears to have a humble position in this account of the canon, being mentioned only as the third of eight yāmalatantras in the Vidyāpīṭha-division of the bhairavatantras.

The closing verses of the BraYa propose what seems to be another variation on the conception of its ‘descent’. In agreement with chapter one, the twelve-thousand verse BraYa emerges from the Tantra of One and a Quarter Hundred-Thousand. However, the BraYa is also said to be the ultimate essence of a tantra of one billion verses. ⁸⁹ This might imply that the billion-verse text forms the source of the 125,000-verse scripture, this in turn being the source of the BraYa; elsewhere, however, the lakṣapādādhika tantra is said to emerge from the undifferentiated totality of scriptural wisdom (niṣkalajñānaugha). Both schemes of course agree in positing three fundamental levels of originary scripture: gargantuan, 125,000 verses, and 12,000 verses.

Invoking the authority of an intangible Ur-wisdom and claiming for itself the status of mūlatantra, the BraYa positions itself at the apex of actual and possible texts within the parameters of existing models of the canon. ‘Scriptural wisdom’ (jñāna) is a transcendental essence which descends in streams from a primordial source, taking on concrete form according to the capacities of its various redactors and audiences. These linguistic manifestations of scripture are provisional, and the canon fundamentally an open one. Possibilities for new revealed texts are endless, each containing within itself the essence of what precedes.

This model of revelation dictates that a new scripture claim for itself a privileged position on a hierarchical scale of texts, a process which involves, if necessary, reconfiguration and extension of models of the canon and their implicit hierarchies. As the Root Tantra, the BraYa claims to be uniquely reflective of the primordial wis-

---

⁸⁹ See chapter 4, n. 27.
dom. Being the source and essence of the Vidyāpīṭha, it places itself at the head of
the four-fold (catuspīṭha) canon of bhairavatantras, which in turn it places as highest
of the three streams of Śaiva revelation. And in broader sectarian terms, its additional
taxonomy of ten scriptural streams positions the BraYā above the orthodox Veda, the Vaiṣṇava Pañcarātra, and so forth. Most distinctive about its articulation
of a place in the canon, however, is the layering of the BraYā’s identity. Drawing
upon the notion of scripture as an essence existing on a scale of texts, the BraYā
continually blurs the boundaries between itself and ‘higher’ levels of the scriptural
wisdom. This begins with chapter one’s revelation narrative: the text opens with the
Goddess stating that, having learnt the mūlatantra, she now desires to hear the Vimala
from which it emerged. Bhairava’s narration moreover is concerned primarily with
the descent of the Vimala, and this—not the twelve-thousand verse BraYā—is in fact
what he promises to teach her.90 Throughout the text, references to the BraYā “as”
the Root Tantra, the Tantra of One and a Quarter Hundred-Thousand, and the Vimala,
the boundaries of which are never completely clear, serve to articulate multiple levels of
identity: it is but one of several yāmalatantras, but also the Root Scripture of the entire
Bhairava stream, having moreover as its highest existence the primordial source of
scripture itself.

BraYā is by no means unique in utilizing the concept of mūlatantra. The idea
of a vast scripture as the source of texts on a smaller, more human scale is attested
in both Śaiva and Buddhist tantric sources, and similar conceptions are found in
Sanskrit texts of a variety of genres. Ideas of a divine-scale source text abound in
the purāṇa corpus, while the Mahābhārata itself is sometimes said to exist among
the gods in a version of millions of verses.91 Note also, for instance, in the med-

---

91 On the notion of an Ur-purāṇa, both in the purāṇas themselves and colonial-period Indology, see
Ludo Rocher, The Purāṇas, 41-47. It seems probable to me that the purānic notion of a mūlasamhita has
influenced the notion mūlatantras. As for the Mahābhārata, note for example two verses found in some
manuscripts of Saurāṅgadevaparvan 5 (quoted on p. 29 in the apparatus of the critical edition), which
speak of the Mahābhārata as having an Ur-text of six million verses, a three-million verse recension in
the world of gods (devaloka), versions of one and a half and 1.4 million verses among the Ancestors
(pitr) and the nāgas and yakṣas, respectively, as well as the 100,000-verse text known to men.
ical literature, that the *Suṣrutasamhitā* claims origins from a text of 100,000 verses composed by Brahmā himself, which was divided and abridged for the good of a short-lived and dull-witted humanity. In the Buddhist tradition, the exegetical tradition of the Cakraśaṃvara cycle of *yoginītantras* conceives of a Root Scripture of one-hundred thousand verses as the source of the *Laghuśaṃvaratana* or *Herukābhidiḥāna.*

Commentatorial literature of the Hevajra cycle also invokes a fabulously large Root Tantra, while the Kālacakra tradition purports to have the lost Paramādibuddha as its original scripture; the extant *Kālacakratantra* is but an “abridged tantra” (the *Laghu-kālacakratantra*), much as is the *Laghucaśaṃvaratana.*

Among early Śaiva scriptures, the *Śvacchandatantra* professes descent from a version of a billion verses, which posed understandable obstacles for short-lived mortals. Like the *mūlatantra* the *BraYa* describes, the original *Śvacchandatantra* contained within itself all four divisions (pīṭha) of the Bhairava canon. The conception of Root

---

92 *Suṣrutasamhitā* 1.1.6. This case was brought to my attention by Isaacson.


94 Although conceptions of the Hevajra vistaratantra or *mūlatantra* are diverse, perhaps most common is that of a *Hevajratantra* five-hundred thousand verses in extent, from which the received text was drawn. Isaacson, lecture handout, “The Problem of the Lost ‘Root-Tantra’ of the Hevajra Tantra,” University of Pennsylvania, February 2001.

95 On the subject of the *Paramādibuddha*, the Root Scripture of the Kālacakra cycle, see John Newman, “The Outer Wheel of Time: Vajrayāna Buddhist Cosmology in the Kālacakra Tantra,” 118; and especially Francesco Serra, “Constructing the Wheel of Time: Strategies for Constructing a Tradition,” 255–273. Serra also mentions the case of the *Yoginīśaṃvaratantra* and its references to a *mūlatantra*; ibid., 268.

96 *Śvacchandatantra* 1.4cd–7 (kṣt5 edition):

```
yat tvayā kathitām mahyām svacchandam parameśvara || 4 ||
śatakṣoṣpratyāśṛṣyāṃ bhedāntāntayavaisarpiṇaḥ || 5 ||
catuspīṭhaḥ māhātantram catusṭayaphalodayam || 6 ||
nā saknuvantī maṇuṣyā alpaśvaparāśkrāntiḥ || 7 ||
```

“O supreme lord, the great *Śvacchandatantra* which you had taught me, possessing [all] four divisions (catuspīṭha) [of the bhairavanatantras], bestowing the four fruits [of kāma, artha, dharma, and mokṣa], ten-million verses in extent, and spread forth with an infinitude of divisions, humans are incapable [of comprehending], being of little wealth, little spirit, little vital energy and courage. For this reason, please teach an abridged version (samgraha) of it with very little elaboration on the scripture’s meaning, which bestows supernatural experience and liberation.”

---
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Tantras continued to have currency in Kaula sources as well; note for example that the Ürmikaulāraṇava or Niratrantra refers to itself as “extracted from the Tantra of a Hundred-Thousand (lakṣapādoddhṛta).” Both the Manthānabhairavatantra and Sarvāvatrantra reportedly attribute their origins to massive mālatantras, as also do Vaiṣṇava tantras such as the Jayākhyasamhitā and Pādmasamhitā.

Not all Root Tantras were pious fictions, moreover, for the epithet is also applied to real texts deemed fundamental to particular traditions. As is the case with the BraYā itself, being or claiming to be an authorative source-text justifies the designation mālatantra. The Trika Tantrasadbhāva, for example, refers to the Siddhayogeśvarimata as mālatantra, although in a version one billion verses in extent. This might be linked to the Siddhayogeśvarimata’s own claim of being the source of the sixty-four tantras, including the BraYā. Reinforcing this status, the Mālinti-vījottaratantra claims origin from a version of the Siddhayogeśvarimata “ninety-million [verses] in extent,” via the intermediary stages of a Mālinti-vījottaratantra version of twelve-

A Nepalese codex, NCMP reel 928-18, offers as substantive variants “ānanta” for “ānanta” in 5b, alpacītīs in 6c, and ato ‘ṛhasamnanaṁ samyak for 7a. However, in the latter case the Bodleian Library’s Nepalese codex of the Svachchandatantra agrees with the kṣṛs edition, according to Törzsök’s transcription. “Doctrine of Magic Female Spirits,” 198.

Thus the colophon to Ürmikaulāraṇava 1: iti niratantre śrīmadānurikālāraṇavam mahāśātre lakṣapādo­ddhītre paramarthaśye śrīśrībhagavahavasikśrayādite śrīkaulūgiriprītiḥhauvinirgarte śrīmānaptapādōcātite saḍsatādhethe śate mantravadhārabhāsagnyanguruṣjñaptakśayiṣcācrito nīma prathama paṭalā. NAK 5-5207 (NCMP reel 8115/9).

99 Śferra, “Constructing the Wheel of Time,” 268.

Text as constituted by Dyczkowski; read however yonasāraṇava*. 100 Tantrasadbhāva 1.13-1.14ab:

siddhayogeśvarimatrte saλakotivravistare |
mālattamte mahāśātre sūtraṅavavinirgatam || 13 ||
tantraikam tu naya jñatam yonāryaṇacapanādhvačam |

101 Siddhayogeśvarimata 29.19:

evasaṃdyakas tu ye tantrāḥ catuḥśaktiḥḥombhitiḥ |

nirgataḥ iha caṇḍaksi siddhayogeśvarimata || 19 ||

Note also that Siddhayogeśvarimata 31.5 seems to refer to the bhairavasrotas as possessing one hundred-thousand verses:

śrīnastākamād bhadrāṇe pade vakṣyāmi samāśataḥ |

yena pṛṣṇyantā kārttyaṁ bhairavasya tu |

srotasya tu samagrasya lakṣapādāyutasya ca || 5 ||

Törzsök understands lakṣapādāyutasya to refer to multiple lacs of verses, which is also possible. “Doctrine of Magic Female Spirits,” 182.
thousand verses, and the thirty-million verse Urmālīnīvijayottaratantra. While it does not apply the term mūlātantra, the function is analogous.

At least two later sources support the BraYa’s claim for the status of Root Tantra. In the Bhairavamangalā, the Goddess states, “you have indicated the eightfold smaraṇa-mantra [taught] in the mūlātantra.” Confirming that mūlātantra refers to the BraYa, several verses later the text refers to the “eight-fold smaraṇa-mantra originating in the Picutantra,” i.e. BraYa. The Jayadrathayāmala, which conceives of multiple Root Scriptures, lists five yāmalatantras beginning with the BraYa among the mūlātantras of the Vidyāpītha. This account of the Vidyāpītha and yāmalas gives pride of place to the BraYa, and indeed many lists of yāmalatantras place the BraYa at their head.

In support of its claim to be a Root Scripture, there are moreover indications that the BraYa served as the primary authorizing scripture for a body of practice and exegesis. While the record is more fragmentary than in the case of the Trika, several surviving sources, such as the Piṅgalāmata (a pratiṣṭhātantra, i.e. concerned with rites of empowerment for images and so forth) and the Matasāra claim to belong to the tradition of the BraYa.

---

102 Mālīnīvijayottaratantra 1.8–12:

```plaintext
svasānaṃstham umā devī praṇipatyedam abracit
siddhayogesvaratāntraṃ nāvaktipravistaram 8
yat tvaṁ kathitaṃ pātraṁ bhedatrayavaisarpitam
mālīnīvijaye tāntre koṭītrīvaqalākṣite 9
yogamārgas tvā praktāḥ svajirṇāḥ maheśvara
bhūyās tymopasanyāhah prakto dvādasābhīhitāh 10
sahasraḥ so 'pi vистirṇāḥ gṛhyate nīḥpabuddhibhāḥ
atus tam upasannya tvaṁ sā saçcād aśīlpatntāḥ 11
sārvasādhiḥkaram brāhi praśādāt paramēśvara
```

“The goddess Uma prostrated to [Śiva] in his own abode, and said this: ‘the Siddhayogesvaratāntra which you had previously taught me extended ninety-million verses, spread forth with the three divisions [of the sakti?]. [And] the path of yoga which you had taught in the Mālīnīvijayottaratantra possessing thirty-million verses was extremely lengthy, O Maheśvara. And furthermore, the abridgment of this you had taught with twelve-thousand verses was also lengthy, not understood by those of little intellect. Hence, for the good of those of little intelligence, please further abridge this and teach [a tantra] which produces all the siddhis, O supreme lord.’”

103 Bhairavamangalā 230a/b: astadhā śmaranam deva mūlāntre tu sācitāṃ.

104 Bhairavamangalā 235a/b: śarvanam astadhā jñāte ca picutantrāsau mūlāntre.
5.5 *Dvādaśasāhasraka: the “Tantra of Twelve-Thousand Verses”*

A number of Indic texts are known by their verse count. Famous examples include the *Sattasaśī* compiled by Hāla, and the *Durgāsaptaśati* or *Devīmāhātmya*, both ostensibly compositions of seven-hundred verses. There exists also the *śataka* or “century” genre, comprising texts of approximately one-hundred verses such as the *Amaruśataka*, and the *Caṇḍīśataka* of Bāṇa. A number of Śaiva scriptures too make prominent reference to their length in colophons or the text, sometimes even in their titles; note for example the *Sārdhatrisātilottara* (“The Three-hundred and Fifty-Verse Addendum-tantra of the Kālatantra”). The *Bṛya* for its part calls itself *Dvādaśasāhasraka*, the “[Tantra of] Twelve Thousand [Verses].” Twelve-thousand is moreover not an exaggeration, as the text in fact consists of roughly 12,800 verses.¹⁰⁵

According to the revelation narrative (*sāstrāvataraṇa*) of chapter one, the *Tantra of Twelve Thousand* is but one of many redactions of various lengths from the *Vimala* or *Tantra of One and a Quarter Hundred-Thousand*. In this narrative, the numerous *tantras* mentioned are almost all referred to by length alone. The *Dvādaśasāhasraka* descends at the advent of the Kaliyuga, revealed to the residents of the Isle of Maidens. Taught the *Tantra of One and a Quarter Hundred-Thousand* by the supreme Goddess herself, a guru named Svācchandabhairava contracts this to the size of twelve-thousand verses, and then teaches the scripture to Viṣṇubhairava in the village of Kalāpa. Viṣṇubhairava then reveals the text to the residents of the Isle of Maidens (*kumārīdvipa*), among whom the scripture attains paramount popularity. In the last portion of the Kaliyuga, however, the scripture and lineage disappear altogether, snatched by the yoginis, not to reappear until the commencement of the next Kaliyuga.¹⁰⁶

The epithet *Dvādaśasāhasraka* hence places the *Bṛya* within a canon of myriad actual, possible, and mythical texts, structurally embedded in the cosmos and its cycles

---

¹⁰⁵ Approximated on the basis of an average of eighteen verses on each of seven-hundred and thirteen folio sides. There is a margin of error of perhaps three-hundred verses, for it is possible that I have overlooked errors in the folio numbering. The typical range of verses per folio is 17.5–18.5.

¹⁰⁶ *Bṛya* 1.102cd–105.
of time. In the course of cosmic cycles, the lineages of gurus abbreviate the scriptural wisdom and redact it into countless scriptures of various lengths for the good of a variously-abled humankind. Its ultimate condensation consists of the *vidyā*-mantra alone.  

107 At the other extreme lies the *Vimala* of 125,000 verses, from which directly emerges the *mūlatantra* of twelve-thousand verses—the *Bṛaya*. In these idealized terms, the *Bṛaya* is thus a redaction of merely medium length. Its size, however, makes it almost uniquely voluminous among surviving *tantras*, surpassed only, I believe, by the *Jayadrathāyāmala*.  

108 Other large and early surviving scriptures include the *Tantrasadbhāva*, and there may have existed several more extremely voluminous *tantras*. *Bṛaya*’s revelation narrative speaks of a *tantra* in twenty-four thousand verses, and the implication appears to be that anything larger than that is beyond the capacity of mere humans.  

Within the wider Śaiva tradition, the epithet *dvādaśasāhasra* does not appear to have been associated exclusively with the *Bṛaya*. I am not in fact aware of external references to the *Bṛaya* by this epithet, and Abhinavagupta refers in *Tantraloka* 15 to another scripture, the *Ānandeśvaratantra*, which his commentator describes as *dvādaśasāhasra*.  

109 As mentioned earlier, the *Mālinīcījāyottaratantra* as we have it claims to be an abridgement of a version of twelve-thousand verses, although it seems doubtful that such a text existed. The *Śrīkanṭhīyasaṃhitā* also refers to the *Śaukrasaṃhitā*, a lost *vāmatantra*, as containing twelve-thousand verses.  

110 Among Tantric Buddhist sources, the *Vimalaprabhā* “commentary” on the *Kālacakratantra* is *dvādaśasāhasra*, as is its purported Root *Tantra*, the *Paramādibuddha*.  

---

107 *Bṛaya* 1.67.  
108 Sanderson reports that the *Jayadrathāyāmala* consists of twenty-four thousand verses. “Śaivism and the Tantric Traditions,” 674. According to Dyczkowski, the *Manthānokhairavanattra* calls itself a *tantra* of twenty-four thousand verses as well, its actual verse-count being closer to 17,000. *Canon of the Saivagama*, 97.  
109 L.49ab.  
110 Jayaratha, commenting on *Tantraloka* 15.281. As mentioned previously (chapter 4, section 3, n. 89), the *Tantrasadbhāva* appears to mention a *dvādaśasāhasra* scripture, although the grounds for linking this to the *Bṛaya* appear weak.  
111 The *Śrīkanṭhīyasaṃhitā* describes the *Śaukrasaṃhitā* as *dvādaśasāhasrī*, “containing twelve-thousand.” Verse 258 in the transcription of Hanneder, *Abhinavagupta’s Philosophy of Revelation*.  
112 The *Laghutantratikā* in fact quotes from the *Paramādibuddha*, referring to it as *dvādaśasāhasrika* (chap-
5.6 Vimala and the Ucchusmatantra

Although there are but a handful of references to the BraYa as the Vimalatantra and the Ucchusmatantra, these may have disproportionate significance. What sets apart these particular epithets is that they might possibly refer to independent scriptures upon whose tradition and authority the BraYa draws, and with which the text also occasionally identifies itself. These text titles hence have a special status in the self-presentation of the Brahmayāmala. Moreover, the BraYa intrinsically connects the Vimalatantra with the deity Ucchusmabhairava, suggesting a relationship between the Vimala and Ucchusmatantra.

As discussed previously, the BraYa’s revelation narrative provides ‘Vimala’ (“Unblemished”) as the name for the jñānaugha in its manifest form as a text of 125,000 verses, the source of all scripture. In several instances the BraYa refers to itself by the title Vimala, thus claiming as its highest identity the originary scriptural wisdom.\(^{113}\) While the notion of 125,000 verses is surely mythic, a Śaiva scripture called the Vimala might nonetheless have existed. No old tantra by this title appears to survive;\(^{114}\) however, the Vimala has a place in some accounts of the fundamental Śaiva canon, and may hence have been an early Siddhānta tantra. Among the extant early Saiddhāntika sources attesting the ten-plus-eighteen model of the canon—that of ten scriptures of the śiva-division (śīravāda) and eighteen of the rudra-division (rudrabheda)—several, although not perhaps the earliest, include the Vimala among the rudrabheda tantras.\(^{115}\)

The colophon to BraYa xxxv provides Ucchusmatantra as yet another title for the

\(^{113}\) Viz., divyadivyāṁs tatāḥ bhūte ete tantro ‘śmin vimalābhavaye (iv.8cd.); śaktayas tu tārākṣatā[ś] tantro ‘śmin vimalābhavaye (lxxvii.149cd); and etāṃ tu tāhāyaḥ proktāḥ[ś] tantro vimalasamāṃtaka (xxiv.107cd).

\(^{114}\) There does survive some material attributed to a Vimalāgama in composite South Indian manuscripts, but these Saiddhāntika ritual tracts give no suggestion of antiquity. Cf., e.g., Institut Français de Pondichéry manuscript T. 71, which contains a tract on “temple mantras” (prākāramantra) drawn from the Vimalāgama. (This is a transcription of Government Oriental Manuscripts Library, Madras, ms no. R1498.) There also exists a Śaiva padhāti (ritual manual) called the Vimalāvatī, but this is certainly unrelated. It is preserved in a Nepalese palm-leaf MS (nak 1-131, NGMPP reel A186/10), and apparently two paper manuscripts as well (nak 3-586, NGMPP reel A187/1; and nak 1-131, NGMPP reel A186/10).

\(^{115}\) See Goodall, Bhāṭṭa Rāmakāṇṭha’s Commentary, appendix II.
text,\textsuperscript{116} while xlv cites a text called the \textit{Ucchusmottarabhairavatantra} as the source of the extended version of a ritual it teaches.\textsuperscript{117} We do have some knowledge concerning a text entitled \textit{Ucchusmatantra} or \textit{Ucchusmabhairavatantra}, although nothing by the name appears to have survived. Abhinavagupta cites a scripture bearing this title in the \textit{Tantrasāra} and \textit{Parātrinīśikāvivaraṇa}, while Kṣemarāja quotes from it in his commentaries on the \textit{Śivasūtra}, \textit{Netratantra}, and \textit{Svaśchandatantra}. One of the verses Kṣemarāja adduces from the \textit{Ucchusmatantra} is also quoted by Jayadratha, without attribution, in the \textit{Tantrālokaviveka}. From most of these short quoted passages it is difficult to ascertain the character of the text. Kṣemarāja, for example, quotes a passage which describes the distinct mantra-functions of \textit{om}, \textit{nāmaḥ}, \textit{svāhā}, \textit{phaṭ}, \textit{vausāt}, and \textit{hūm}.\textsuperscript{118} More illuminating, in the \textit{Tantrasāra}, Abhinavagupta appears to refer to the \textit{Ucchusmatantra} as representative of the radical "far left" of Śaiva scripture, paired opposite the Saiddhāntika \textit{Pārameśvara}.\textsuperscript{119} This is corroborated to an extent by a passage Kṣemarāja quotes several times in support for the nondualist position of there being no such thing as ‘impurity’.\textsuperscript{120} Offering further confirmation of the text's

\textsuperscript{116} \textit{Ity uccusmatantratre picumate nādīsaṅcārapaṭalalḥ saṭṭraśatimālḥ.}

\textsuperscript{117} Brāhīd. xlv.124–25:

\begin{verbatim}
pārvaṃ eva mayākhyātām ucchusmottarabhairave |
mahāmanthānavidhiḥanan vistareṇa yāvasivini || 124 ||
sanśāśktaṃ tantrasaddhvavm sarhasyayasaśuṣṭaṃ |
adahnaḥ gṛṭam izodhyetaṃ sārāḥ sārataṃ śubham || 125 ||
124 yāvasivina ] corr.; yāvasivini Brv | 125 adahnaḥ gṛṭam ] conj.; dadhnaḥgṛṭav Brv

"I had earlier taught the Great Rite of Churning at length in the \textit{Ucchusmottarabhairavatantra}, O woman of renown. The essence of \textit{that} tantra, along with its collection of secret teachings, has been extracted like ghee from yoghurt and abbreviated—the auspicious essence of the essence."

Underlying what Brv\textsuperscript{a} transmits as dadhna\textsuperscript{I} conjecture to be an ablative, dadhnaḥ, formed from the thematized stem dadhna, for dadhita (“yoghurt”).

\textsuperscript{118} Commenting ad \textit{Netratantra} 19.8. This passage is quoted by Peter Bisschop and Arlo Griffiths, “The Practice Involving the Ucchusmas (Atharvavedapariśiṣṭa 36)” (forthcoming), 3–4.

\textsuperscript{119} Tantrasātra 4.45: tasmāt vaidīkāḥ prabhṛtya pārameśvarasiddhāntatantrakulocchusmādīśāstroko ‘pi yo niyamo vidiḥvā nisēkhvā va ‘tra yāvad akīṃcīkārava eva iti siddham | (“Therefore, starting with Vedic revelation, any regulation, whether a rule or prohibition, stated even in the scriptures—the \textit{Pārameśvara} Siddhāntatantra, the \textit{Ucchusmatantra} of the Kula, etc.—is in this case inoperative. So it is established”).

\textsuperscript{120} Quoted in the \textit{Svaśchandoddyota} ad \textit{Svaśchandatantra} 8.249 and 11.927, and in the \textit{Śivasūtraśvarūpaśi}, kṣentr edition, p. 8:

\begin{verbatim}
yādaun na vedāk ete tātvedyāḥ katham priye |
vedākam vedāyam ekaṃ tu tatvītī nāsty aśiṣic tātah ||

"As long as they are not knowers, how can there be objects of knowledge, my dear? But the knower and object of knowledge are one; therefore ‘impurity’ is not something real
orientation, the Buddhist author Advayavajra quotes a verse from the *Ucchusmatantra* which speaks of the bliss of the union of Śiva and Śakti as the supreme nonduality (*paramādvaya*). It would however be a matter of considerable surprise if a *bhairavatantra* antedating the *Bṛya* exhibited developed nondualism of the gnostic variety, to the extent of being singled out for this by Abhinavagupta. This raises the possibility that the *Ucchusmatantra* referred to in the *Bṛya* is distinct from the text of this name cited by later authors.

As for the title, the term *ucchusma* occurs in the *Taittirīyasamhitā*, and is presumably related to *śusma* or *śusman*, words connected with heat and light. One of the *pariśīṣṭa* texts of the *Atharvaveda* bears the name *Ucchusmakalpa*, on which Peter Bisschop and Arlo Griffiths have just contributed a study. This text opens with an invocation of the *ucchusmas*, here apparently a class of minor male spirits. The *Tantrasadbhāva*, moreover, describes a class of female spirits called *ucchusmikās*. Buddhist tantric sources attest a deity called *Ucchusmamajbhala*, a form of the *yakṣa*- (tattva)."

Cf. Bisschop and Griffiths, “Practice Involving the Ucchusmas,” 4, to which my interpretation is indebted. See also the entry *ucchusma* in *Tantrikabhidhanakosa*, vol. I, 225–26.

Advayavajrasamgraha, part iv, p. 50. Remarking upon the verse, the (anonymous) editors identify the *Ucchusmatantra* with the *Bṛya*, on the authority of Goudriaan and Gupta, “Hindu Tantric and Śākti Literature,” 42. I am grateful to Isaacson for providing this reference.

The *Tantrasadbhāva* uses both the terms *ucchusma* and *ucchusmikā* for this variety of female spirit. In a passage Kṣemarāja quotes in commenting on *Netratantra* 19.55, the *ucchusmikā* is described thus:

> rātrāv bhūtāv vīvastrā vā mātrayitvā pradakṣiṇān
> kṛtvā tu prāsāyad raktanā muktakoṣā tu karaṇāty||
> ucchusmikā tu sā ājęgā śāhakair vīranāyikā||

> “A woman who at night becomes naked, urinates, then circumambulates, and would consume blood—and then with hair unbound, would subdue—she śāhakair should know to be an *ucchusmikā*, a heroine.”

This corresponds to 16.187–88ab in Dyzckowski's collation/draft edition. Aside from several probable corruptions, the Nepalese MSS collated attest two substantive variants: *prāsāyate* for *prāsāyed*, and *vīravatsala* for *vīranāyikā*. The syntax is ambiguous, for either *prāsāyed* or *karaṇāty* lacks an object. Cf. the interpretation of Bisschop and Griffiths, “Practice Involving Ucchusmas,” 5.
In Śaivism, a rudra by the name Ucchusma is known from early Saiddhāntika sources such as the Kiranatānta. Ucchusma the rudra appears to have developed into a bhairava and acquired his own cult, for the Ucchusmatantra or Ucchusmabhairavatantra must have expounded a pantheon headed by Ucchusma-bhairava. Similarly, the BraYa’s Kapāliṣa appears also to have begun his career as a rudra, heading the list of one-hundred rudras in the Niśāsaguhya before achieving his place among the eight bhairavas in the maṇḍala of Svachchanda.

The BraYa associates Ucchusma with the groups of goddesses forming the maṇḍala of Kapāliṣabhairava, which suggests the possibility that the BraYa’s Kapāliṣa has inherited his pantheon. The association seems particularly strong between Ucchusma and the Mothers, who are referred to as “the Mothers arising from the Ucchusma[tantra/bhairava?],” or simply, “the Ucchusma Mothers.” A female counterpart to this deity, Ucchusmā or Mahocchusmā, has an important position within the maṇḍala of Kapāliṣa and Aghoreśvari, as the last—but perhaps highest—of the Four Dūtis. Ucchusmabhairava himself makes an appearance only in the maṇḍala of Kapāliṣabhairava, while in the Kiranatānta, Ucchusma is listed among the rudras at the tattvas kāla and niyati (8.129a).

Note in particular the following passages from BraYa IV:

\[ \text{raktā karāla candāksya mahocchusma tathāvatu ca} \]
\[ \text{ucchusmatantre namāni guhyakānām na sapīṣayāḥ} \]

\[ \text{And,} \]
\[ \text{rākṣīyās tu karāla syāt karālyāyas tu dantārā} \]
\[ \text{bhūmaṣakārā tu candāksya uccusmāyā maḥābhālā} \]
\[ \text{guhyakānucarāḥ hy etāḥ kīṃkaryocchusmasambhavāḥ} \]
\[ \text{kārālā [em.; karālaṃ Byā candāksya] [conji.; candāksī Byā] etāḥ [corr.; etā Byā kīṃkaryocchusmasambhavā] em.; kīṃkaryoctusmasambhavā Byā} \]

See also the text and annotation to the translation of BraYa I.8-9, and BraYa LXXV.77:

\[ \text{ucchusmasambhavam tantram devyas cocchusmasambhavāḥ} \]
\[ \text{tvayoktam tu maheśvaro sutradibhi maheśvaro} \]
\[ \text{devyas [em.; devyā Byā]} \]

“O Mahādeva, with sūtras, you have taught the tantra arising from Ucchusma and the goddesses arising from Ucchusma, O Mahēśvara.”

The high status of Mahocchusmā is suggested by her position in cosmology: in descriptions of the “pervasion” (vyāpti) of the tattvas by the mantra-deities, Mahocchusmā is placed at the level of Sādāśiva, above the other goddesses (Table 4.7c-e).
dağala of Picubhairava, in a configuration of male counterparts to the eight goddesses of the manḍala of Kapalīśa. On several occasions, ucchusma is however used as a synonym of the supreme Bhairava.

The BraYā's appeal to the authority of the Vimala establishes its link with the earliest canonical scriptures of the Mantramārga. Whether or not its contents bore a relationship is another matter. A distinct possibility exists that the Vimala, assuming the text in fact existed beyond lists of the canon, had been lost by the time of the composition of the BraYā, continuing nonetheless to command considerable prestige. Its actual contents largely forgotten, it remained nonetheless an empty signifier of canonical authority on which to inscribe the pedigree of the BraYā. In contrast, the Ucchusmabhairavatantra is more likely to have been a text contemporaneous to the BraYā, perhaps lying in its immediate cultic background. Its manḍala appears to have consisted of primarily female deities, headed by Ucchusma and perhaps his consort Mahocchusmā. Furthermore, the BraYā posits a close connection between the Vimala and Ucchusmabhairava, describing the Vimala as “the tantra originating from Ucchusma.” There could conceivably be substance to this link, given Ucchusma’s early history as a rudra and the Vimala’s presence in some lists of the rudra-division scriptures. According to the Mrgendragama, one of the sources listing the Vimala in its account of the canon, Śiva only indirectly teaches the rudrabhedascriptures; these

---

131 BraYā lxviii, especially verse 21.
132 BraYā lxxvii:96cd: nirīcāra[ḥ] sa evātra ucchusmaṃ purīkṛtitam (“That very [state of the supreme Bhairava known as] ‘beyond conduct’ (nirīcāra) is here called ucchusma”).
133 It might also be possible that the notion of a mythic Vimala contributed to the inclusion of a text by this name in lists of the canon.
134 This perhaps bears comparison with the phenomenon of “replacing” forgotten but authoritative scriptures, passing off the new as the ancient so as to authorize contemporary practice. Such is best attested in the case of the South Indian Saivasiddhānta, in which case texts were duly provided to fill in gaps between extant scripture and authoritative accounts of the canon. See Goodall, Bhaṭṭa Rāmakan-ṭha’s Commentary, xxxvi–xlvii. As mentioned in the introduction, the BraYā itself appears to have been “updated” in later times in both east India and Nepal, besides South India.
135 BraYā 1.4b. The opening of chapter xxvii, moreover, announces it will teach the “Vimala-division” (vimalam vibhagam) “brought forth by the lotus [mouth?] of Ucchusma, revealed by Ucchusma:”

atah param pravakṣyāmi vibhagam vimalam dhruvam |
ucchusmakamalodgTrnam ucchusmendvataritam ||

136 Mrgendragama 1.46.
are "brought forth by rudras who have been possessed/entered into by Śiva—not [brought forth] from their own intellects."137 It might be possible that the historical Vimala had as its speaker the rudra Ucchusma, in which case its link with the Ucchusmatantra would be based upon the shared figure of Ucchusma, as a rudra and bhairava, respectively. What can be asserted with more confidence is that through its appropriation of the figure of Ucchusma, the BraYā projects a pedigree rooted in earlier layers of the tradition: both the early canon of Siddhāntatantras, through a Vimalatantra purportedly spoken by the rudra Ucchusma, and the bhairavatantras, through the cult and scripture of Ucchusmabhairava.

Conspicuous by their absence are the Vimala and Ucchusmatantra in the extended account of the Śaiva canon in BraYā xxxviii, despite their importance in the revelation narrative (śāstrāvatāraṇa). Understandably so given its status as the “mass/totality of scriptural wisdom” (jñānaugha), the Vimala finds no place in the list of twenty-eight Saiddhāntika scriptures; but neither does Ucchusma figure among the eight bhairavatantras.138

The possibility seems substantial that the BraYā has in the form of the Vimalatantra and/or Ucchusmatantra woven historical texts into its genealogy and identity, although our knowledge of these sources remains vague. That this scenario is plausible finds support in the authorizing strategies of later scriptures, which offer insight into the processes of legitimization the BraYā itself might have employed in relation to older literature. Adding new layers to the palimpsest of revelation, subsequent literature claiming to belong to the tradition of the BraYā continues the prac-

137 Mygendraśāma 3.43ab: rudrā rudraś śivāstiṣṭair udgirṇā na svabuddhitah.

138 The eight Bhairavas, who correspond to the eight bhairavatantras of the Vidyāpīṭha, are Svācchanda, Krodha, Unmatta, Ugra, Kapali, Jhānakāra, Sekharā, and Viṣaya. BraYā xxxviii.33cd–35ab:

svacchandabhairavom devi krodhabhairavom eva ca || 33 ||
unmatihairavom devi tathā caīvograbhairavah ||
kapaliśhairavom caīva tathā jhanārabhairavah || 34 ||
sekharah ca tathā caīva viṣayābhairavom eva ca ||

Perhaps closest to this list of eight bhairavas is that of the Śrīkāntīṭha, quoted by Jayaratha commenting on Tantrāloka 1.18: Svācchanda, Caṇḍa, Krodha, Unmatta, Asitāṅga, Mahoccuṣma, and Kapāli. See also Svacchandatantra 2.117cd–19. Note in the passage quoted above free alternation of the nominative and accusative cases, the sense being nominative.
tice of self-identification with authorizing sources. Thus the final colophon of the *Matasāra*, "Essence of the [Picu]mata:" 139 "Thus ends the thirty-third chapter within the *Matasāra* in the Vidyāpīṭhā, in the *Tantra of Twelve-Thousand*, within the Great Scripture numbering 125,000 verses." 140 Here the ambiguity of the locatives is meaningful: the passage may in part be read as a hierarchy of texts within texts, from the origi-
nary wisdom of 125,000 verses down to the *Essence of the [Picu]mata*, or it may be read as a series of identifications: the *Matasāra* which "is" the *BraYā* which "is" the *Tantra of One and a Quarter Hundred-Thousand*. And so continues the perpetual descent of the scriptural wisdom into the multiplicity of texts.

139 While the text refers to itself simply as the *Matasāra*, Sanderson suggests that this means "Picumatasāra." Personal communication, May, 2004. Given the text's close relationship with and appeal to the authority of the *BraYā*, this seems quite plausible.

140 iti laksapāṭalihāke mahāsaṃhitāyān devāsasiṣṭhātras’ vidyāpīṭhe mataśāre trayosmiśatimāḥ pataḥ. *NAK* 3-379, f. 161v. Transcription courtesy of Somadeva Vasudeva.
A significant concern of the present thesis has been to position the BraYa relative to first-millennium textual and other sources concerned with yoginīs. With this aim in mind, chapters two and three have surveyed early evidence for the cult of yoginīs, attempting to establish a chronology of sources and important developments within which to situate the BraYa. It has been shown that, although a Śaiva cult of yoginīs must have developed prior to the eighth century, it is in this period that yoginīs begin to come into prominence, a trend which continues with the emergence of a public temple cult in the tenth century. I have argued that the BraYa in all likelihood belongs to an early stratum of evidence: being mentioned in the old Skandapurāṇa, predating the Buddhist Laghuśaṃvara and (most probably) the Śaiva Tantrasadbhāva, making no obvious reference to Kaula literature, showing no awareness of traditions of sixty-four yoginīs, having an archaic model of the Śaiva canon, and being a well-established authority by the mid-tenth century—at the very latest—the BraYa shows notable signs of archaism. It has not yet, however, been possible to date the text with any precision.

Likely as the BraYa is to be one of the oldest surviving bhairavatantras—and perhaps among the older extant works of tantric Śaiva literature—the text nonetheless presupposes a wide variety of Śaiva cults and tantric scriptures. With roots in the cults of Rudra/Bhairava, Mother goddesses, the Sisters of Tumburu, dākinīs, and
bhūtas, the BraYā and other Vidyāpīṭha sources synthesize a range of esoteric traditions and sacred figures, our knowledge of which has significant gaps. Furthermore, while the BraYā represents, in ritual terms, a radical and highly esoteric tradition, its roots in aspects of earlier Śaivism are notable, as suggested by comparison with the Nīśaśatattvasamhitā in particular—a text the BraYā appears in one case to draw from. In the figures of Svachandabhairava, Kapālīśa the rudra, Ucchuṣma, and the Sisters of Tumburu, traces in the BraYā of past cults point toward it being the product of complex historical layering. This picture becomes all the more complex when the BraYā’s own textual development is queried; it has been suggested that the text as we have it possesses two or more strata, and contains chapters potentially drawn from or otherwise connected with independent Śaiva works. “Layering” is a theme in the BraYā’s reflexive vision as well, for in articulating a model of scriptural revelation, the text positions itself at multiple levels: it is but one of several yāmalatantras, yet also the Root Tantra of the entire bhairava-stream, itself a contracted form of the Tantra of One and a Quarter Hundred-thousand Verses—scripture in its primordial linguistic form.

A key development in the BraYā and Vidyāpīṭha sources lies in the figure of the yoginī: a malleable goddess typology which comes to encompass cult deities, every manner of female spirit and demi-goddess, and even female tantric adepts, all of whom become linked in a hierarchical matrix of clans (kula) emanating from the Supreme Śakti herself. While it has been shown that Śaiva conceptions of yoginis have roots in Mother goddesses and figures such as the vidyādhari, aspects of the formation of this category of sacred figure in Śaiva tantric literature remain murky. This undoubtedly has much to do with chronic losses in tantric Śaiva literature; indeed, the BraYā makes reference to numerous other Vidyāpīṭha sources, few of which are extant. On the other hand, it appears possible to map the emergence of the yoginī

1 BraYā IV:3–19 describes a hierarchy of nine principal goddess clans, correlated with nine tattvas: mātrs, yoginīs, dātīs, rudradākinīs, dāmarīs, dāvīs, śītīs, bhaginīs, devīs, and their “genetrix” (prasīti), the supreme Śakti, which exists at the level of the sīvātattva. Human practitioners enter into the hierarchy of clans through ‘initiatory kinship’ with the Mothers, goddesses who exist at the level of the prakṛtitattva.
or ḍākini in Buddhist tantric literature, on which subject chapter three has attempted to contribute. The relationship between these two textual corpuses—and more importantly, the religious traditions which produced them—remains a significant area for future research. Concerning the case of the BraYā, evidence has been adduced in support of Alexis Sanderson’s contention that it is a source for material redacted into a Buddhist yoginītantra—the Laghucakraśāṃvaratantra.

Despite the efforts documented in the present thesis, study of the BraYā remains at an early stage. The endeavor to critically edit the text—a prerequisite to deep understanding—remains a project of significant proportions. It is expected that data gleaned from the close study entailed by further critical editing will lead to revision of some claims I have made, while opening up new avenues of investigation as well.
Part II

The Brahmayāmala: A Critical Edition and Translation of Chapters i, ii, lv, lxxiii, and xcix
The late T. Gaṇapati Śāstri, the distinguished first editor of, among a great many Sanskrit texts, the Maṇjuśrīmālākalpa, offered in his preface the following apology for reproducing the text precisely as found in the only manuscript available to him:

This is a holy work of the Buddhists and deserves to be placed along with the Vedas. As the non-observance of the rules of Vyākaraṇa in regard to gender, number and case, found throughout this work is becoming of its sacred character, and as no second manuscript has been obtained, the text in this edition is adopted exactly as it is found in the original manuscript.¹

It is not clear which of the two points weighed more heavily in Śāstri’s decision: the text’s holiness, or the paucity of manuscript evidence. In either event, the choice spared him considerable trouble, for cases such as the BraYā or Maṇjuśrīmālākalpa, in which the language is non-classical and manuscript evidence very limited, present special problems.

The approach of the present edition might be faulted as representing the opposite extreme, for the critically constituted text of the BraYā introduces numerous emendations and conjectures. But to avoid the “risk” of emendation would, in this case, be to embrace unintelligibility, for the readings of the oldest codex—from which, I contend, the other extant mss are descended—are with vexing frequency incomprehensible. Furthermore, in the absence of corroborating evidence, I have erred in favor of normalizing potential linguistic irregularities. Considerations of sense, coherence, and context have served as the principal bases for emendation, with attention to the

¹ Gaṇapati Śāstri, preface to ĀryaMaṇjuśrīmālākalpa, vol. 1, 2.
paleographic plausibility of scribal error as well as intra- and intertextual parallels (as adduced in the annotation to the translation).

The present edition is a work in progress; although it seems unlikely that valuable new manuscript evidence will surface, I presume that further reflection, the identification of additional parallels, and the insights of other readers will make possible considerable improvement in the constitution and interpretation of the text, prior to its eventual publication.

THE MANUSCRIPTS

NAK 3-370 (reported in the critical edition as “A,” and as “Bya” in part I). NGMPP microfilm reel no. A42/6. Palm-leaf, 358 folios. Dated Sunday (ādityadina), the 8th of Māgha (waxing fortnight), Nepal samvat 172—i.e. Sunday, 12 January, 1052 C.E. Copied by Jayākaraṇīva, a resident of the Paśupatinātha temple area of Kathmandu.2 This codex was cataloged more than a century ago by Haraprasād Śāstrī, who notes: “the MS. is marked with letter numerals on the left and with Newārī figures on the right. They agree up to the 129th leaf, and from the 130th the Newārī figure make a mistake of 10, and the mistakes on the right side continued to be added to and subtracted from till last leaf (358) becomes 364 in the Newārī side.”3 The text-final and scribal colophons are as follows:

\[
\text{iti bhairavasrotasi mahātantre vidyāpīṭhe brahmayāmāle navāksaravidhāne picumate}
\]

\[
dvādaśasāhasrake ekottarasatimāḥ paṭalāḥ samāptāḥ || || samvat a cī 2 māghaśuklaś-
\]

\[
tamāṇī ādityadine rājādhirājaparameśvaraśribaladevarājye | śrīpaśupatiśāstavya | śrī-
\]

\[
\text{jayākaraṇīvena brahmayāmālaṃ nāma śāstraṃ likhitam.}
\]

NAK 5-1929 (reported as “B”). NGMPP microfilm reel no. A165/14. Paper, Nepalese

2 Cf. Luciano Petech’s discussion of this colophon in Mediaeval History of Nepal (circa 750–1482), 2nd ed., 44.

Nāgārī script; undated and unsigned. Complete in 353 folios. The first portion of this ms appears to have been copied from the same highly corrupt exemplar as C (see below). However, the latter sections of the text appear copied from a different, superior exemplar, on the basis of which corrections are introduced into the earlier portion of the text as well. This second exemplar appears to be A itself. However, the scribe frequently emends the text, "correcting" some of its most glaring linguistic aberrations. Thus far no evidence suggests that its departures from A reflect anything more than the editorial activity of the scribe. Although hence of little value in constituting the text of the Brāhmaṇa, the readings of this ms reflect the interpretive activity of an educated reader, and are reported in all chapters of the critical edition.

**NAK 1-143** (reported as "C"). NGMPP microfilm reel no. A166/1. Paper, Nepalese Nāgārī script; undated and unsigned. Complete in 440 folios. Descended from A, but hopelessly corrupt, this ms offers little to reward the labor of its transcription. Its readings nonetheless are recorded in the apparatus of chapters I and LV in the critical edition.

**NAK 1-286** (reported as "D"). NGMPP microfilm reel nos. A165/13 and A1178/1 (filmed twice). Paper, Newari script; undated (the word "saṃvat" appears in the colophon, but with no number) and unsigned. Complete in 248 folios. Ff. 210-233 are written in Nepalese Nāgārī, perhaps replacing damaged or missing leaves. This ms is closely related to E, and it seems likely to descend from A, for in the sections collated, none of its variant readings appear to have independent value. Its readings are reported in all chapters except LV of the critical edition.

**NAK 6-2608** (reported as "E"). NGMPP microfilm reel no. A1319/4. Paper, Nepalese Nāgārī script; undated and unsigned. Incomplete, with 136 folios. The readings of this ms, written in a Newari-influenced Nāgārī, are very close to those of D.
The two might share a (lost) exemplar descended from A. E’s readings are reported for chapter 1 alone.

As alluded to, it is the working hypothesis of the present editor that codices D and E, and to a lesser degree B and C, are closely related, all furthermore being descended from A. While further collation is necessary to rule out other possibilities, I believe that the manuscript evidence for BraYa 1, collated fully in the critical edition, is sufficient to sustain the premise that neither B, C, D, nor E provide variants not attributable to scribal error or, in the case of B, editorial activity. I will argue this in greater detail with the publication of the critical edition.

Although not utilized in the present edition, there exists another codex of Nepalese provenance transmitting BraYa IV–VII, housed in the Sanskrit manuscript collection of Viśvabhāratī University, West Bengal. Being written on paper in Nāgarī characters, this is of no particular antiquity. Further collation of the ms is required to determine if it offers readings independent of A; the sample studied so far suggests otherwise. In addition, S. N. Ghoshal Sastri has published chapter xlii of the BraYa based upon an untraced ms transcribed by the late Haradās Mitra. The text transmitted is tantalizing, for it departs from A more significantly than the other extant mss. However, there is no conclusive evidence that it represents an independent transmission. Whether or not Ghoshal Sastri’s ms descends from A, it appears to

---

4 Sanskrit Manuscript Section, Vidyā-Bhavana, Viśvabhāratī University. “Old collection;” no accession number.
5 See chapter 1, section 2.
6 Although containing almost identical material, the order of verses in Sastri’s ms differs significantly from A. Its readings also vary frequently, containing a comparatively large number of obvious corruptions. However, variants are also plentiful. Some of these are synonyms, giving no indication of the relationship between the mss. Many of its readings which differ from A’s appear to be products of secondary editing. Note for example the crude attempt to correct A’s kanisthadānīkobhau tu angusthopari samsthita, which contains what appears to be a non-standard contraction of kanisthadānīkau ubhau. Sastri’s ms reads kanisthadānike dev tu angusthopari samsthita, which provides the correct feminine dual in the first pada; but this still agrees with the masculine samsthita. However, angusthopari appears likely to be the original reading, in whatever manner it was arrived at. Note also the pada transmitted by A as ubhayo hastayo [’Jfigulya (31c in A, 37a in Sastri’s ms). Here A’s text arrives at the correct meter by non-standard sandhi, viz. hastayoh + aṅg → “yo aṅg” (rather than → “yor aṅg”). In the ms used by Sastri, there appears the grammatical but hypermetrical hastayor aṅgulyah, with “correct” sandhi, as well as the correct plural aṅgulyah. While the BraYa allows this sort of hypermetricism (cf.
represent a complex transmission. The degree of corruption and apparent reorganization of the verses suggest the possibility that the text—perhaps contained in an anthology—passed through numerous copies.

In the edition presented below, the critical apparatus is positive: the readings of all the mss used are reported, including their lacunae. Several normalizations are however silent: those of anusvāra (śīvan, for instance, when it occurs before a dental consonant, is normalized to śivam), and cases of degemination (e.g. tattva for tātva) and gemination (e.g. pūrva for pūrva). However, when the mss are reported, their readings are reproduced exactly. The most doubtful readings appearing in the critically constituted text, whether or not emendations, have been identified through wavy underlining. In the apparatus, parentheses enclose poorly legible syllables, with those wholly illegible represented by hyphens. Syllables which have been corrected or marked as erroneous by the scribe appear in parentheses, followed by the superscript "corr." and "err.," respectively. Short interlinear and marginal insertions are enclosed within a pair of plus signs. The upadhmaniya, which occurs numerous times in A, is rendered as f. Asterisks mark folio changes in A, the numbers for which are reported in the first level of the critical apparatus, along with occasional notes on lacunae, marginal insertions, and so forth. Among the mss, only A’s readings are reported as unmetrical, when this is the case.

the annotation on BraYa 1.20), there are several other cases where Sastri’s ms violates meter in favor of grammar—quite the reverse of the language of the BraYa, in which meter overrides grammar. Note for example the unmetrical “correction” of bandhayet to badhmyat (44d in Sastri, 47b in A). In some cases Sastri’s ms contains better readings which could but might not reflect later editorial activity. Note e.g. kim cād umamatus karau (19b) for A’s * umamatau * (19d), and saramudrā (37c) for A’s suramudrā (32a). The two mss do however share obvious corruptions, an indication of possible affinity: note in particular tarjanīkuśarāpiṇī (98d in A) or tarjanīkuśarāpiṇī (Sastri 29d) for, presumably, tarjany ankuśarāpiṇī.
yat tattvam mantragarbham sakalaśīvatmaṁ hetu nirvānabimbaṁ
dūtnaṁ padmaṣaṇḍe 'samasukhīvīlaśīlīgarūpam bibharti |
nānabhogādhīvāsair vividhalayapadaiḥ śaktirāvardhadhakande|
tat tattvāṁ viṣvagarbham bhavanagadalanam bhairavam vah punātu || 1 ||
śrutvā śāstraṁ purā devi mūlatantraṁ mahodayam |
mudrāmaṇḍalamantraughaṁ vidyāpīṭhopalaksitam || 2 ||
sahasrāṇī daśa dve cete catuṣpīṭhaṁ tu bhairavam |

CODICES: ABCDE A: f. 3v

Maṅgalam: om namaḥ śivādibhyo gurubhyo yogiśvarīnām ] em.; śvar(i/ā)p(ā) A (aksara tops missing; bottoms consistent with D and E from guru²); final anusvāra possibly lost); om namaḥ śīvāya B; erasure ī² (before correction, perhaps om śrīganesāya namah); om namaḥ śivādibhyo gurubhya yogiśvarīnā DE 1a tattvam ] ABCE; tatva D 

vimalān nirgataṃ yat tad aghorī bhamavikramā |
pratyuvāca mahādevaṃ bhairavaṃ mantraśvaramahā |
yat purā sūcitaṃ deva tantram ucchusmasambhaṃvam |
vimalahvety yat proktāṃ jñānaughāṃ śaktipūrvakāṃ |
yasmims tu smāṣṭhitaṃ hy etac catuṣṭpithaṃ tu bhairavaṃ |
yasmā hi nirgataṃ sarvaṃ mantraśvihama mahodyamaṃ |
catuṣṭpithasya sāṃbandhe yaṃ tavya coiditaṃ mama |
tantrāvatārasaṃyuktam ādyaṃ yat siddhikāraṇaṃ |
sarāhasyaṃ mamācakṣva jñānaughocchārapuṇītam |
śivaśaktīvibhedaṃ ca bindubhedāṃ tathāva ca |
navaśaktīvibhedaṃ ca śṛṣṭibhedāṃ svuṣtrām |
ekākinī yathāsaktit navabhedāṃ vyavasthītaḥ |
guhyākākimkāriḥḥīṃ ca kimkaryocchusmasambhavāḥ |
yogino lākinināṃ tu bahubhedāṃ vyavasthītaḥ
eka eva mahāvīryā vyāpini śakti cottamān |
tasyā yāgam aśeṣam tu kriyate surāpūjita |
yathā tatha mahādeva yogiśiddhikāṅkṣīnām || 10 ||
guruśūrṣuṣanirāte vāmamārgānuvartine |
advaitabhāvaṇāvasthe nīr vănkelā mane sthīte || 11 ||
siddhir yathā bhaved deva tadvidhānām vada prabho |
yogināḥ svalpabuddhyas tu alpacittālpaśāttvikāḥ || 12 ||
bhartuḥ śūrṣuṣanaparā gurubhaktīsamāvitiḥ |
tāsām siddhir yathā deva bhavate ca samāsataḥ || 13 ||
Īśvara uvāca ||
sādhu sādhu mahādevi yat tvāyāhaṃ proccitam |
nikhilām tat pravakṣyāmi sarvasaṃdothaḥ kalakṣṇam || 14 ||
yathā ca tantrasadbhāvam bhavahmaṃ guḍhavikramam |
sarahasyaṃ mahābhāgā śṛṣṭivekāgrāmanasā || 15 ||
purā d-d akasmād deveśi kriḍāmanasaṃ svasthitau |

A: f. 1v

10a eka | ABCD; eko E ṭviryā | ABD; tviryo CE 10b vyāpini | BC; vyāpini ADE śakti cottamā | ACDE; śaktir uttamā B; śaktis cottamā Bw 10c tasyā | em.; tasya AD; tan me BC; 
tāṃsya E yāgam | em.; yogam ABCDE 10d surāpūjita | em.; surāpūjita ABCDE 10e kāṅkṣīnām | BCDE; kāṅkṣīnām A 11a śūrṣuṣa | corr.; sūrṣuṣa A; sūṣuṣa B; sūṣoṣa B; 
sūrṣoṣa C; sāntoṣa D; mantroṣa E nirate | ABP; nirate BC 11b 
mārgānuvartine | ABC; mārga tu varttine DE 11c advaita | AB; advaita C; ardvai? a D; ardheta E bhāvana | ACDE; bhāvana B 11d nirankaṇā | nirankaṇā A; nirankaṇā BC; santosanaparo D; santosanaparo ABCDE 12a bhaved deva | em.; bhaved eva ABCDE 12b vidhānām | ADE; vidhānām BC 12c yoginyaḥ | B; yoginyo ABcDE svalpa | ABC; alpa DE 12d buddhayas | em.; buddhās AB; buddhās C; buddhān DE 12e cītalpa | ACDE; cītā + lpa; sāttvikāḥ | ABCD; sotvikāḥ E 13a śūrṣuṣanaparā | corr.; sūrṣuṣanaparā A; sūrṣuṣanaparā BC; santoṣanaparā ABcDE; santrōṣanaparo DE 13b samāsataḥ | A; namo namo BC; samāsata BC 14b yat tvāyā | BH; yatvaya ADE; yatvaya C praccitam | em.; praccitā ABCDE 14c nikhilaṃ | ABC; nīśitā DE pravakṣyāmi | ABC; pravakṣyāmi DE 15a tantra | ACDE; tantra DE 15b bahvāma | BC; bahvāma A; bahvāma DE 15c bhāge | ABC; se BC; se BC 15d aikāgrāmaṇasā | corr.; aikāgrāmaṇasā ABCDE; aikāgrāmaṇasā B; purā d-d akasmād | conj.; rodakasma A; purodaka(?) B; purodakamanyā C; purodakasmā DE 16b kriḍāmanasa | ADE; kriḍāmanasa Bw C
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yadi yāgaviññātā syām icchā yāvan mamotthitā || 16 ||
icchāya preritenaiva śrīkaṇṭho bhaktavatsalah |
dīvyaṃ varṣasahasram tu iyyāṅjali puruḥsaram |
ārādhito mayā devi bhaktyāviṣṭena cetasā || 17 ||
śrīkaṇṭhena tato mahāyām parākarunayā mahat |
jñānaugas tu samākhyātaḥ padabandhakramena tu || 18 ||
śrīkaṇṭhasya prasādena* sarvo 'yaṃ pariṇato mama |
matsamparkāt tvāyā caiva aśeṣaś cāvadhāritaḥ || 19 ||
tatas tvāyā hitārthāyā ādeśena vinā priye |
parijanasya samākhyātaḥ prārabdhaṃ bhaktihrṣṭayā || 20 ||
viplāpyamāṇaṃ taṃ drśtvā mahātantraṃ mayā punaḥ |
krodhāviṣṭena śaptāsī jñānaṃ te nāśītaṃ yayā || 21 ||

A: ff. 1v–2r
तताः त्वया महाभागे त्रस्यां कंपमानयाः

साःरुलोकनाय चाव्यं बुङ्यां गतवाढ़ा दान्दवतः || २२ ||

करण्यालिप्तां कृत्वा बिषायां ज्ञानविपलावे |

विज्ञाप्तो 'हम महादेवि सोकाधिशिष्टयाः पुनः || २३ ||

तताः त्वम विहवाण द्रेष्टः ग्रिहतः करुणायः ह्य अहमः

प्रवम उक्तेः करुण्यां महामन्युभृष्टेन तु || २४ ||

भूरलोकम गच्छा देवसे अवतारम् कुरुश्या 'था |

ब्राह्मणस्यां ग्रहे देहम अपरम् ग्रन्था सुव्रते || २५ ||

तत्राश्चायस् तताः तु भुज्यां भक्त्यां हार्म सम्प्रजोताः |

अनुग्रहां करिष्यां तवाह शक्ति-र-अज्ञाया |

मयाः सार्धम पुनस् तव आयम प्रप्यस्यां प्रीये || २६ ||

ततो वतिर्ना मद्वाक्यं प्रयागस्या समिपाताः

A: f. 2r
kaṇavīre mahāgrāme meghadattagṛhe śubhe || 27 ||
chandogasya mahādevi utpannā laṅsaṅāṅnvitā |
sattikā tatra saṃjātā tava nāmaṃ na saṃsayaḥ || 28 ||
tato mahā tvāya bhaktyā buddhisampannayā hy aham |
āraḥdhi mahādevi satataṃ lingapujayā || 29 ||
tatra trayodaśe varṣe siddhā tvam śāktyanugrahāt |
khecaratvam avāpnośi samprāptā ca mamāntikam || 30 ||
sā śaktis tvam mahābhāgē ya śaptā viplave kṛte |
purā mayā smanātmānam aghorī nāma te 'dhunā || 31 ||
madiyā tvam mahāśaktiḥ sarvānugrahakārikā |
tat pravakṣyāme te jñānām yad bhraṣṭaṃ viplave kṛte || 32 ||
śrīkaṇṭhāna mahāḥ proktam bhūtvā sadāśīvāt padāt |
sarhasyaṃ mahādevi śrūṣvekāramānasā || 33 ||
acintyasya paraś śaktiḥ śivasya paramātmānaḥ |

A: f. 2r
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icchā nāmena saṃjñātā tāyā binduḥ prabodhitaḥ || 34 ||
prabuddhasya tato bindor jñānaugaḥ niskalamaḥ tataḥ ||
abhivyakto mahādevi akasmān mantravirghaḥ ||
jñānasampūrṇadehas tu sadasīvapade sthitaḥ || 35 ||
tasmāt sadasīvānūjā tataḥ sṛṣṭir abhūt punaḥ ||
hūḥukāntāvadhūtaḥ tattvamālā svabhāvataḥ || 36 ||
lokasya hitakāmyā -m- amṛtākhyena suvrate ||
nibaddham tu samāsena jñānaugaḥ vimalātmakam || 37 ||
anuṣṭhupchandabandhena sapādena mahātmane |
lakṣasamkhyaṇa śāmkṣepān mantrajñānakriyātmakam || 38 ||
nirācārapade bhūtvā punaś cobhayaadarśanāt |
parāparesa devena śrīkāṇṭhāya prabhāṣitam || 39 ||

A: ff. 2r-2v
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asmāj jñānān mahādevi śrīkaṇṭhena hitāya vai |
koṭiṣṭhapravistāraṁ lokānāṁ hitakāmayaḥ || 40 ||
prcchakāśrayabhedena kriyābhedavibhāgaṁ āḥ |
śuddhāśuddhena mārgena asattvena ca suvrate |
viṣṭāritiṁ tantrāṁ jñātvā sadāśīvāt padāt || 41 ||
ayaṁ tu jñānasandroham svarūpāvasthitam priye |
sapādalaksasamkhyātaṁ mayā jñātaṁ yathārthaṁ || 42 ||
tavāpi jñānabhraṣṭāyaṁ sampravaksyāmi sāmpratam |
sapādalaksasabhedena ślokānāṁ samsthitam tu yat || 43 ||
asmād vinirgatam sarvam traṅkṣyam sacarācaram |
tvayāpi kathanāyaṁ hi lokānāṁ hitakāmayaḥ || 44 ||
divyādiyāsvabhāvena sthitāyā śāktyanuṣṇayaḥ |
krodhabhairavadevasya siddhasayaiva śīvaceṣāyā |
sapādalaksasamkhyātaṁ evaṁ vai bhāravo 'bravīt || 45 ||
sapādaṁ caiva laksāṇa ca krodhahairavasamjñākāt |
kapālabhairavasyaiva kathayisyasi suvrate || 46 ||
brāhmaṇasya kurukṣetre utpannasya mahāmate |
śrīdharetyabhidhānasya adhikārasthitasya vai || 47 ||
śākyādhiśhitacittasya asiddhasya na saṃsārayaḥ |
kapālabhairavo devi lakaṇaḥ caiva sapādakam || 48 ||
caturvinśatībihi caiva sahasraḥ saṃgharisyati |
mūlāpantravidhānam tu svarūpeṇa vyavasthitam || 49 ||
lokānām alpacitānām catuṣṭihādīvarjitaṁ |
asmīn eva hy asau tánre siddhim prāpsyatā nānyathā || 50 ||
kapālabhairavāt siddhād asiddhasyaiva vakṣyasi |
padmabhairavasamjñasya evam vai bhairavo 'bravīt || 51 ||
oḍradeśe tu jātasya devadattasya saṃjñayaḥ |
caraṇā bahvrcaśyāthā ādeśena na saṃsārayaḥ || 52 ||
asiddhas tv eva deveśi padmabhairavasamjñakaḥ |

A: f. 2v
caturviṃśatisahasraṃ granthaṃ dvādaśabhiḥ punah || 53 ||
saṃghāraṃ tu sahasrais tu kariṣyati śivecchāya |
anenaiva tu tantrena tathā siddhīṃ prayāṣyasi || 54 ||
etat tantram asiddhasya sakāsāt tava eva hi |
śrūṇvīṣyanti mahābhāge śīṣyāḥ caiva caturdaśaḥ || 55 ||
raktabhāravako nāṃnā jvālābhāravako 'paraḥ |
helābhāravakaḥ caiva trayo 'py ete mahāyaśe |
madhyadeśasamutpannaḥ caranāthaḥrvaṇaṃ tathā || 56 ||
vāmabhāravako devi vijayabhāravako 'paraḥ |
saurāśṭrāyāṃ samutpannau śū drau jātyā prakṛttitau || 57 ||
bhūbhatsabhāravo devi gajakarṇas tu bhāravāḥ |
cāndabhāravakaḥ caiva sindhuviṣayasaṃbhavāḥ || 58 ||
ksatriyau rājaputrau tu caṇḍabhairavakah punah |
brāhmaṇo 'tharvaṇo devi caraṇena na saṁśayah || 59 ||
yajñasomasuto bhavyo brhodariviśabdite |
grāme jāto mahādevaevi nātra kārya vicāraṇāt || 60 ||
grāmabāhye tu deveśi tatra devī brhodari |
tasyā nāmena sa grāmo brhodari prakṛtiḥ || 61 ||
ārādhayitvāsau vipras tato devīm brhodarīm |
vidyāmātraṃ tu samprāpya japam tatraiva suvrate || 62 ||
karisyati mahāsattvas tatas tasya bhaviṣyati |
ādeśaś cāṣya sāstrasya śravāṇāya na saṁśayah || 63 ||
śrūṇvīṣyati mahādevi padmabhairavapārśvataḥ |
tatra siddhas tv asauvipras tantrakartā bhaviṣyati || 64 ||
gālayitvā imaṁ cārtham śatair aṣṭādaśaṁ mitaiḥ |

A: ff. 2v−3r
sanmharisyati tattvajñas tathā caiva trayodasāhī || 65 ||
saptabhiṣ ca tathā caiva saṃgharisyati suvrate |
lokānāṃ ca hitārthāya nātra kārya vicāraṇāt || 66 ||
nādhikārād yataḥ kṛtvā jñānaprāptir na jāyate |
vidyāmātravidhānaṁ tu saṃkṣepena hitāya vai |
srāvayisyati lokānāṃ tatra tritayakena tu || 67 ||
kumārabhairavo devi āśādāsātataḥ tathā |
candabhairavakāṣṭha śrutiḥ viṣṭārādyayati || 68 ||
krodhabhairavako devi trayodasātataṁ tathā |
candabhairavakac' caiva jñātvā viṣṭārādyayati || 69 ||
tejabhairavanāmānas tathā saptaṣataṁ punaḥ |
candabhairavakac caiva śrūtvāsau viṣṭarīṣyati |
avatāre tu samproktam śisyāṇāṃ tritayaṃ tathā || 70 ||
bhaviṣyakīrtitā hy atra ye caturāsāmadhyataḥ |

A: f. 3r
karālabhairavo nāma tathā ucchusmbhairavah
mātaṅgajātisāmbhūtau padmabhairavasīyakau || 71 ||
yamabhairavakaś cānyāḥ kāṁśre saṁbhūvīṣyatī
chandogo brāhmaṇo devi tathā anyo bhavīṣyatī || 72 ||
vīṣṇubhairavanāmāno lampāyāṁ viṣaye tathā
vājimadhyamāṇo vipro bhavīṣyatī tathāpāraḥ || 73 ||
dakṣinabhairavaḥ kāśyāṁ utpanno brāhmaṇaḥ tathā
bahrvaś cāparaḥ śiṣyo bhavīṣyatī na saṁśayāḥ || 74 ||
oddīyāne mahādevi tathā śekharabhairavaḥ
brāhmaṇaḥ taittīrīkaś ca apastambho bhavīṣyatī || 75 ||
caturdaśa samākhyātāḥ padmabhairavaśīyakāḥ
jñātvā dvādaśasahasrang śiddhiṁ prāpsyanti suvrate || 76 ||
vyākhyāṁ caiva kariṣyanti śiṣyānāṁ śiddhiṁ śekharāṅkṣīnāṁ
śākyādhiśthitacittāṁ caturdaśa tu saṁjñākāḥ || 77 ||
padmabhairavakam caiva saṣṭhām vai sthānam āśritaḥ |
vacchandabhairavāḥ śrutvā sakāśat krodhabhairavāḥ || 78 ||
atha dvādaśaśahasram sahasrair daśabhiḥ punaḥ |
samhāriṣyati deveśe śaṅkyādhiṣṭhitacetasā || 79 ||
tantrāvatāravicchinnāṃ yoginiṃ prabhāvataḥ |
kathayāṣyati lokānāṃ daśaśahasarasāṃ* priye || 80 ||
uijainyāyam tu samjāto viprajo ṯukaputrakaḥ† |
deikā tasya vai mātā bahugarbhprasārītā || 81 ||
śnātacāmati māṭṛṇāṃ purataḥ putrakāṃkṣiṇī |
japtavādyo mahāvīryāḥ samayalanghaprabhāvataḥ || 82 ||
kṣipiṣyanti hy asiddhatvān mātaraḥ śaṅkicodītāḥ |
tasyā garbhe mahāḥāge amantrināmakas tathā || 83 ||
tatas tasya mahādevi tāṣāṃ caiva prabhāvataḥ |

A: ff. 3r-3v
vidyām prāpya japam kṛtvā tataḥ śāstraṁ sa vetsyati || 84 ||
tato nibaddhagranthaḥ ca divyasāṅgānubhāvataḥ |
daśasāhasraṇārtham aśeṣaṁ kathayasyati || 85 ||
tatas tenaiva jñānena paścāt Siddhīṁ sa lapsyati |
canḍabhairavanāmānaḥ sahasraḥ saptabhiḥ punaḥ || 86 ||
tad eva daśasāhasraṁ kariṣyati mahādhipe |
dvādaśaiva sahasraṁ kartuvaṁchā bhaviṣyati || 87 ||
na cārthām divyaśisyānāṁ samhartum saḥ kariṣyati |
saptabhiḥ ca sahasraṁ tu vighnaṁ tasya bhaviṣyati || 88 ||
anayā vāṁchāyā devi bindubhairavasaṁjñakāḥ |
saptabhiḥ ca sahasraṁ tu tasya vighnaṁ bhaviṣyati || 89 ||
anayaiva mahādevi vāṁchāyā daśasāṁjñake |
māyābhairavanāmāno na ca Siddhīṁ prayāsyati || 90 ||
saptabhiṣ ca sahasraṁ tu vighnaṁ tasya bhaviṣyati |
anantabhairavaś caiva vistaram kauṭuvaṁchāyā || 91 ||
sahasraḥ saptabhiṣṭ caiva vighnaṁ tasyāpi suvrate |
bhaviṣyati na sandeho evaṁ vai bhairavo 'bravīt || 92 ||
sadāśivena devena dvāpare bhasītaṁ mahān |
tato divyena mānena tasmāt saptatime yuge |
tava devī mayākhyātaṁ tantram bhairavapūjitam || 93 ||
kalau yuge na sandeḥaḥ śrīkaṇṭhasyājñaya tathā |
asmād vai saptame caiva kaṇḍīśasya suvrate || 94 ||
tvam vakyasya mahādevi tretāyām bhairavo 'bravīt |
dvāpare kalisandhau tu padmabhairavasamjñakaḥ || 95 ||
sapādalakṣaṇaṁkhyātaṁ samgharisyati nānyathā |
kalau caturthaṁ te tathā svacchandaṁbhairavah || 96 ||
samgharisyati deveśi evaṁ vai bhairavo 'bravīt |
caṇḍabhairavakaś caiva tathā ca vibhubhirvairavah || 97 ||
māyābhairavakaś caiva vistāram kartuvāṁchaya |
kalau caturthapādante bhaviṣyanti varānane || 98 ||
anantabhairavāś caiva kalpante vistaram sādā |
na śaknospayati vai kartum bhaktyādhiṣṭhita cetasaḥ || 99 ||
caturvimsātāsahasram mānayisyati suvrate |
candrabhairavako devi vibhubhairavam eva ca || 100 ||
māyahairavakaś caiva tathā cānantam eva ca |
etad apāscimā vīrās tantrāṃ jñātvā na saṃsārayaḥ || 101 ||
siddhiṃ prāpsyantī deveśi kalpante bhairavo 'bravīt |
etac chāstrāṃ kalau cānte yo'gīnayaḥ śakticoditaḥ || 102 ||
apahṛtya prayāsyantī sansāradayaṃ ca suvrate |
śaktyantam nātra sandeḥa evam vai bhairavo 'bravīt || 103 ||
kṛte yuge mahādevi tretāyam dvāpare tathā|
nāvataro 'syā sāstrasya sūcito bhairavena tu || 104 ||
kalau yuge punaś caiva evam eva mahādhipe |
avatāro 'syā sāstrasya kariśyasi na saṃsārayaḥ || 105 ||
dvādaśaiva sahasrāṇi nādhikāni manāg api |

A: ff. 3v-4r
kathayiṣyasi deveśī lokānām hitakāmyayā || 106 ||
kumārīdvīpavāstavyā ye lokāḥ saṃsthitāḥ priye |
teṣāṁ śastraśya nānyasya prāptiś caiva bhaviṣyati || 107 ||
kalāpagrāmaṇe devi tataḥ saḥ saṃgharshiṣyati |
kaliyugasya ādau tu avataram kariṣyati |
dvādaśiṣva sahaśrāṇi nātra kārya vicāraṇāt || 108 ||
sapādalakṣaṃ deveśī kathayiṣyasi suvrate |
svacchandabhairavasyaiva evāṁ vai bhairavo 'bravīt || 109 ||
dvādaśiṣva sahaśrāṇi saṃhṛtāni mahādhīpe |
yena tasya mahābhāge nātra kārya vicāraṇāt || 110 ||
daśabhis tu sahasrais tu -m- uktīvīracaṭuṣṭayam |
tato 'sau codito devi tvayāva varavarnīni || 111 ||
kalāpagrāmaṇe sthitvā viśṇubhairavakasya tu |
asiddhaś caiva deveśī śastraṃ dvādaśāsammitam || 112 ||

sahasraś caiva sahadehaḥ kathayiṣyati suvrate
viṣṇubhairavako devi kumārīdvipavāsinām || 113 ||
kathayiṣyati lokānām śaktyādhīśhitacetasām |
sahasrāni daśa dve ca evāṁ vai bhairavo 'bravīt || 114 ||
grhe grhe mahādevi yathā saptasatāni ca |
tathā dvādaśasāhasro bhaviṣyati na saṃśayaḥ || 115 ||
śaktyādhīśhitacittanāṃ nātra kārya vicāraṇāt |
grhe grhe mahādevi ye puṃsāḥ siddhibhājanāḥ || 116 ||
striyo vā siddhibhāginyas teṣām api grheśv atha |
pracariṣyati devesi evāṁ vai bhairavo 'bravīt || 117 ||
asiddhibhājanāḥ ye tu puruṣo 'tha striyo 'tha vā |
vidyāmātram api caiva na prāpsyantī mahādhipe |
sarahaṣyāṃ mahādevi jñāsyante siddhibhājanāḥ|| 118 ||
etat tantrāvataṁraṃ tu śrīkaṇṭhaṇa yathāsthitaṃ |
kathitaṁ mama devesī tathāpi kathitaṁ mayā || 119 ||
sāmpratām sarahaṣyām tu sarvasandohalakaṇaṁ |
mahābhairavānāmaṇaṃ śṛṇuṣvekāgramānasā || 120 ||

A: f. 4r
yā śāktīḥ puṟākhyaśaṁtādāyāṁnatasambhavaḥ |
tasyā bhedaṁ mahābhāge kathayāmi yathākramam || 121 ||
yo ’sauc acintyam ity āhuḥ śivaḥ paramakaraṇah |
niḥsaṁjñō nirvikāraś ca vyāpī śantas tathaiva ca || 122 ||
niḥsvabhāvo mahādevi kriyākāraṇavarjitaḥ |
niśkalo nirvikalpaḥ tu arūpo guṇavarjitaḥ || 123 ||
nirmamo niḥraṁkāraḥ advaitapadasamsthitaḥ |
yogināṁ dhyānagamyo ’sau jñānārūpo mahāyaśe || 124 ||
nirācaraṇadāvasthāḥ samjñāmātraḥ prabhuh parah |
tasyāparājyotirūpam sarvānugrahākāraḥak || 125 ||
vyāpī hy avyaktarūpi ca amanasko mahātmanaḥ |
tasya śaktir mahādevi svabhāvothā akṛtramā || 126 ||
jyotsnārūpaṁ svārupena śpāṭikasyevasa raśmayah ||
tasyeccha nirgata śaktir jñānarūpā manonmanī || 127 ||
pravartate nirābhāsā avadhūteti sā smṛtā |
prabodhayati sānánta bindunādau kṣaṇena tu || 128 ||
kuṇḍalāṅktisamsthānā svarādau samyavasthitā |
caturbhāgavibhaktā sā caturbhāgavibhājita || 129 ||
evaṃ kuṇḍalini śaktiḥ svarāḥ śoḍasabhiḥ sthitā |
catuṣṭakapathakopetā pañcavyoma-alāṃkṛtā || 130 ||
evaṃ pañcavidhā sā tu śaktir ādyā manonmanī |
navaṅśaravidhānena punaś caiva prajayate || 131 ||
svaravyānjanasamyuktā pañcāśakṣarasamyutā |
advhūtā mahādevi navabhedīr vyavasthitā || 132 ||
atra devyo 'tha dūtya ca yoginyocchusmamāta-raḥ |
samastān śṛjate devi śivechām anuvartīnī || 133 ||

iti mahābhairave tantrā
dvādaśāhasrake picumate navāṅśaravidhāne

sambandhapāṭalāḥ prathamaḥ || 1 ||

A: f. 4v

127c tasyeccha nirgata[| AB;| tasya dvāra mahā[| B;| tasyaccha nirgata D śaktir J B; sakti ACD 127d [rūpā | B; [rūpa AD; [kayā? B]; [kayā C 128a pravartate[| AB;| prava(n/t - a?) B]; pravattana C 128b avadhūteti sā[| AB;| avadhūta(a - mā?) B]; avadhūtabhuma C 128c sānanta[| AB;| sārān (tu?) B; sārān tu C 128d kṣaṇena[| AB;| kṣa( - )na B ]; kṣaṇena C 129a [sāṃsthānā | A; [sāṃsthānā B; [sāṃsthānā C 129b vibha( - a sā?) B ]; vibhayānā C 129d vibhājītā[| AD;| vibhā+ā+jītā B; vibhājītī C 130a [śaktī[| J ACD; [śaktī+h B 130b sthita[| em.;| sthitāḥ A B C D 130c catuṣṭakapathakopetā[| AB;| catu (- - )thako(-)tā B ]; catuṣṭhayathakoṣāṭ C; catuṣṭkapathako(- -)yuṣm D 131a paṅca[| AB;| paṅca C 131b pa(nya?)[ C 132a samyojukta[| AD;| sam(yo)jukta AD; sam(pu/pa - a?) B ]; samprekṣya[| B;| sam(yo)jukta C 132b paṅcaśā[| corr.;| paṅcaśā B; paṅcaśā (sā?) B; paṅca sā C 132c saṃ psychya[| B;| saṃ(yo)jukta ] conj.; sampratām A B C D 132d [bheda[| A;| [bheda C; [bheda D 133a devyo[| tha[| AB;| devyātha B C D 133b yoginyocchusma[| AB;| yoginyocchusma C 133c samastān[| AD;| samastān+ C 133d śivechām anuvartīnī[| A;| śive( - āma -?)vartini B ]; śivekāmene varttini B ]; śivechā sa(-?)varttini D
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II

BRAHMAYĀMALE
MANTRODDHĀRAPAṬALĀṆA DHITĪYAṆA

athātaḥ sampravakṣyāmi aghoryarcanam uttamam |
nirācāro yadā mantri avadhūtataṇuḥ sthitaḥ || 1 ||
tadā tu kurute pūjām yogeśināṁ śivasya ca |
avadhūtā tu sā śaktir nirācārapadaḥ śivah || 2 ||
eteṣaṁ tu vidhiṁ jñātvā tato mantri prasidhyati |
atas teṣaṁ pravakṣyāmi mantroddhāram anukramat || 3 ||
śulkāmbaradharo mantri śuklagandhānulepanah |
bhūpradeśe śucau divye divyapuspairo alamkṛte || 4 ||
tatra devyaś ca dūtyāś ca yoginyo mātaraś thātah |
uddharetā sādā prājñāḥ kapāliśapuraḥsaraḥ || 5 ||
ādīmaṁ tu dūtīyasya prathamam tu vyavasthitam |
esā devī śṁrta raktaṁ bindumastakayojita || 6 ||

Codices: ABD

A: f. 4v

1b aghoryarcanam] cor.: aghoryarcanam AD; agh(# - ?)rccanam BD; a(ghosyāncça?na)ma B; ut-
ttamā] AB; B; B; B; B; 2a tu AD; tu BD;

2c avadhūtā] AB; avadhūtā BD; avadhūtā B; sā AD; +sā+ B sāktir J B; sākti AD 2d

3c anukramat] AB; tayoh B; 3d anukramat BD; (a - ?)rkkamāt BD; 4a dhara] AD; dhā(ro)ma BD; 4b nulepanah] AB; nulepanah BD; nulepanah BD; ( - ?) B 4c divye] conj.; divyai AD; 4d devyaś] B; devyaś BD; dūtysa] AD; 5a devyaṁ] B; devyaṁ BD; puraḥsaraḥ] BD; 5b puraḥsaraḥ B; 5c sadā prājñāḥ] A; mahāprājñā+ B; sadā prājñā D 5d kapāliśa] A; kapāliśa BD; 6a ādīmaṁ tu AD; ādīmaṁ tu BD; ādīmaṁ B; ādīmaṁ B; ādīmaṁ AD; 6b vyavasthitam] AB; vyavasthitā B; vyavasthitā BD; 6c esā] AD; (e)ma B raktā AD; 6d ādīmaṁ tu AD; (e)ma(a) BD; 313
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त्र्ययोष्या त्र्ययम् तु सवारकाधाशब्धुषितम्
एसा देवी स्मृता गहोः करलिति च विशृता || 7 ||
अदिमम् तु द्वित्येना उर्ध्वहनादेना योजितम्
एकविम्शत् पराः योनिः द्वित्यसवारयोजिता || 8 ||
अष्टाविम्शा त्र्ययेना विम्शामति तु तथापुनाः
द्वात्रिम्षाकुन्त्रित्रिम्षेना उर्ध्वहनादेना योजितम् || 9 ||
हम्सा एसा द्वित्येना प्रणवदिसामनवितम्
एतद गुहयाम मयां प्रकोपम् मन्त्रव्यवहारव्यवस्थितम् || 10 ||
ाधाता ध्वारपक्ष्यामि योगेन्नांम तु लक्षणां
प्रणवदिनमासकाराम विद्यांम सायोज्या यत्नात् || 11 ||
एसा ते प्रथमां प्रकोपं क्रोञ्जुकी च महोदयः
स्वाहक्षांसामयुक्तम् द्वित्याः योगी स्मृताः || 12 ||
हुम्कारेन त्र्यया तु वाशाकारे कतुर्थिका
पाञ्चम् वाशाकारे प्रहकारे शात्हिकाः भवेत् || 13 ||
sad yoginyaḥ samākhyātā aghoryāṅgaviniḥṣṭāḥ

athāto mātarāḥ vakṣye tantrē ucchūsmasambhāve \| 14 \|

pranāve tu sthito devo binduke tu mahēśvarī |

ekāre tu sthītā brahmī ākāre caiva vaiṣṇavī \| 15 \|

akāre caiva kaumārī īkāre ca vivasvātī |

īkāre vāsāvī devī svākāre caiva caṇḍikā \| 16 \|

hākāreṇa parā śaktir etā yasyā vinirgātāḥ |

mātaras te mayā proktā yāge ucchūsmapūjīte \| 17 \|

yā sā eva mayā proktā māṭṭhān caiva pūraṇī |

tasyedaṁ kathitam sarvam yaṁ jñātvā nāvasīdati \| 18 \|

iti mahābhairave mūlatantra dvādaśasāhasrake picumate

navāksaraavidhāne mantroddhārapaṭalāḥ dvitiyāḥ \| 2 \|

A: f. 5r

14a sad yoginyaḥ | AD; sa(-?)yoginyaḥ B\(^{ac}\); sa(-?)sinya B\(^{ac}\) 14b aghoryāṅga\(^{e} \) | corr.; aghoryāṅga\(^{e} \) A; aghoryā(-?) B\(^{ac}\); aghā(-?)rśhī B\(^{ac}\); aghoryā(-?)t ca?\(^{e} \) D viniḥṣṭāḥ | corr.; viniḥṣṭāḥ AB\(^{ac}\); viniḥṣṭāḥ B\(^{ac}\); viniḥṣṭāḥ D 14c athāto | AD; athā(ha)?\(^{ac}\) B\(^{ac}\); athā(ha)?\(^{ac}\) B\(^{ac}\) mātarāḥ | em.; mātarāṁ AD; mātaram B\(^{ac}\); so(tta?)rām B\(^{ac}\) 14d tantrē | AD; tantra B ucchūsma\(^{e} \) A; ucch(ūsma)\(^{e} \)corr. B; ucchūnma\(^{e} \) D 15a sthīto | em.; sthītā ABD devo | em.; deva ABD 15b binduke | AB\(^{e} \)D; bindukan B\(^{ac}\) 15c ākāre | AB\(^{e} \)D; ākāre\(^{e} \) B\(^{ac}\) brahmī | AD; brāhmī B 15d ākāre | AD; onkāre B\(^{ac}\); (ānkāra?) B\(^{ac}\) 16a ākāre | AB; ak(-?)re D 16b ikāre | A; ikār+e+ B; ikāre D 16c ikāre | AD; ikāre B 16d svākāre | AB; svokāre D 17a śaktī | em.; saktī ABD 17b etā yasyā | conj.; etasya ABD; (e?)\(^{ac}\) te yasya B 17c mātaras te | AD; mātara(ha)\(^{e} \) B 17d yāge | A; yoga B; yoge D "pūjite | AB\(^{e} \)D; "pūjītā B\(^{e} \) 18a yā sā | AB; yo nā D mayā | AB; ma(yo)? D proktā | AB\(^{e} \)D; pre B\(^{e} \) 18b māṭṭhān | AB\(^{e} \); māt(-?)s B\(^{e} \); (-?)tṛṇām D 18c sarvam | BD; sarvam\(^{e} \) BD; sarvam A 18d yaṁ | A; (ma+j+?) B; ya D nāvasīdati | B\(^{e} \); nāvasīdati A; nava(-?)dati B\(^{e} \); nāva(m?)śiddati D COLOPHON: mahābhairave | AD; mahābhairava\(^{ac}\) B "vidhāne | AD; "vidhānam B
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devy uvāca  ||
cchommakāh kīdrśā deva kulānām sādhakasya ca  |
prajñāyate yathā bhrātā bhaginī vā viśeṣataḥ  || 99  ||
caryāyuktasya deveśa yathā jñāsyanti yoginiḥ  |
parasparaṇ ca virāṇām ekatantrasamāśrayām  |
ālāparaṭhe mahādeva kathayasva prabhāṣataḥ  || 100  ||
bhairava uvāca  ||
śṛṇu devi pravakṣyāmi chomakānām tu lakṣaṇam  |
yena vijñāyate bhrātā bhaginī vā maheśvari  || 101  ||
jñātvā ca yoginīṁ maṇtri śivechācodyātmavān  |
sādhakas tu tato dadyād vācikaṃ mudralakṣaṇam  || 102  ||
potaṅgety abhīvādanāṁ pratipotaṅge pratyabhīvādanam  |
yoginīṁ tu virāṇāṁ nāriṣety abhīvādanam  |

CODICES: ABC

pratīnārśasabdena procyan tēvatānan | 103 |
ēkāŋgulidars'anāt svāgataṃ dvābhyaṃ susvāgataṃ |
koṣṭhapraviṣṭenānguṣṭhena kṣemamudrā vidhiyate | 104 |
śīraṃ darṣayate yā tu vārtāṃ sā tu samihate |
tāṃ diśaṃ vikṣya dātavyā madrā deśāgamā tu yā |
āṅgulāḥ saṃspraṣṭā pādaṃ kathā tu na saṃśayah | 105 |
laḷaṭāṃ darṣayed yā tu kutra pāṣyasi -m- ādiṣeṭ |
vikṣya sūryaṃ sprśed vaktraṃ yathēṣṭaṃ kīrtitaṃ bhavet | 106 |
sīkhaṃ darṣayate yā tu kutra sūto 'si susvrate |
anusmṛtya bhavaṃ līngaṃ yonim sprśtva śivatmakam | 107 |
vaktraṃ darṣayate yā tu gotrama te kīḍrīṣaṃ giri |
smṛtvā devim sprśaṇa bāhum vāmaṃ vāmaṇa pāninā |
vāmācāras tu me gotrama śaktaya vardhamānajāḥ | 108 |
daśanaṃ darṣayed yā tu kīṃ pūrvaṃ te niketanam |
anusmṛtya sīvam so hi sprśate -m- udaraṃ priye |
māyodaraṇ idaṃ prāptaṃ dvitiyaṃ tu śivāśrayam | 109 |
karṇaṃ darṣayate yā tu kīṃ śrutaṃ tu samādiṣeṭ |
nabhaṃ saṃv'vikṣya hastaṇ ca paṇcasrotasamāgamam |
visṛṭāngulikəṃ kṛtvā darśayec tchataṁ pāninā || 110 ||

jihvām darśayate yā tu rasitum sā samihate |

mṛtuṇjayaṁ smaritvā tu darśayita kamaṇḍalum || 111 ||

grvām darśayate yā tu supriyo 'si mahātmana |

ātmane tu paṛṇ mūrtiṃ smṛtvā tv atyanta me priyā || 112 ||

skandham darśayate yā tu svasthānaṁ kutra cādiśet |

svagotrasasyrayam jhātvā sa diśam avelakayet || 113 ||

bāhum samśprasate yā tu bhrātāsi mama suvrate |

vāmāng asta yād vaktre prakṣipyān tu pradarśayet |

tadā sā bhojanam sveṣṭam prāthayed vīrapunγavam || 115 ||

tenāpi paṇcabhūtātmaṁ yuktam sarvārthasaṃyutam |

nānāvidham rasaṁ vaktre smartavyaṁ tu navātmakam |

bhuktvi triptā tu sā bhūtvā vāmena parivartate || 116 ||

hrdayaṁ sprṣate yā tu ṭhannāmetaḥ mahāvratam |

tryodaśaṅgaviṃ svṛtvā atmaliṁgam anusprṣet || 117 ||

stanaṁ nirikṣate vamaṁ sprṣate vā yadā priye ||

A: f. 234v

prasārya sādhako vaktraṃ putro 'haṃ te prabhāsitam || 118 ||
jaṭharaṃ sprṣate yā tu rakṣitavyo 'si suvrate |
sārasena praṇāmaṃ tu kartavyaṃ tv atmarakṣaṇaṃ || 119 ||
nābhiṃ sāṃsprṣate yā tu mahāmelāpaṃ ādiṣet |
madhyadeśe mahāvīra kulasaptādaśasya pi || 120 ||
kaṭiṃ sāṃsprṣamānā tu yāṃ dīśāṃ cāvalokayet |
tatkulasya samākhyāti melakaṃ tu na saṃśayaḥ || 121 ||
guhyāṃ sāṃsprṣate yā tu sā tu putra kṛtātmavaṃ |
manasā cintya svamā yāgaṃ tvatprasādāt kṛtam bhavet || 122 ||
ūruṃ sāṃsprṣate yā tu kṣiṇāham sā samādiṣet |
anusmṛtya tu manthānāṃ tasyā dehe niyojayaḥ |
tanniyogāt suvīrāntā manthāniśa vimardanaṇāt || 123 ||
jānu sāṃsprṣate yā tu kriyāksūnaṃ tu sā bhavet |
kroñcabijāṃ tatocārya aksaṣūtṛaṃ tu sāṃsprṣet |
lakṣajāpād vimucyeta kriyāksūnaṃ tu yoyayet || 124 ||
janghāṃ ca sprṣate yā tu sā priyān tu niyacchati |
vimocayet tato muṣṭīṃ vāmahastasya mocane || 125 ||
पादम सांस्प्रस्ते यां तु पदाभ्रान्तां तु सादितेः

नास्थात्यां तदा तेन तस्मिन स्थाने विपास्तिः

प्राणावम् तु सामुच्यर्यां गंतायम् नान्या मे गतिः || 126 ||

नाक्षे पादस्यां या देवी स्रेष्ठव्या याति परांमुक्ति

क्षेवतावचिरेनायेः कथाते सादहकस्या तु

tataḥ prabhrī so 'py evam nityaṁ vai saṁyato bhavet || 127 ||

अत्मपादात्लम् यां तु सामुक्प्रया प्रदर्शयते

पातालासिद्धिर विरसया कथाते सचिरेना तु || 128 ||

आकाशे स्थैयं द्वूत नुसते तच्छा स्वका तनुम्

तादा तु स्वर्गवासिनः ज्ञेमलक्ष्यस् तु साम्युतामः || 129 ||

उर्ध्वम् सामव्यक्तया या पश्चादि दिशालोकनम् अचरे

कत्त्राण्मि मेलकाम् सां तु कथयेक सर्द्धारातिताः || 130 ||

नितंबास्थायुं तु या हस्तायु ग्रात्वार प्रहसायते

मेलकाम् शात्कसाग्रहस्या द्वयंधायमेण 'ति सा कथेत || 131 ||

नासाग्रे तु यादा हस्तायु ग्रात्वार चालयेत सिराम्

नवाकस्या ताथाक्षयेत मेलकाम् तु महावाने || 132 ||

अधोमुखः तु या हृत्तव्य भुमिलेखनम् अराब्धः

पातालनारिनिनाम् तु मेलकाम् मात्रमंडः || 133 ||

A: ff. 234v-235r
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svajihvālokanām yā tu kṛtvā paścāt prakampate
jalāntavāsinīnāṁ tu melakāṁ kathate tu sā
ā pādān mūrdhaparyantāṁ kṛtvā hastaprampanam
yā sā śivādītattvasthā tatstham melakāṁ ādiṣet
so 'pi mudrāpātiḥ pūjya tathā manthānabhāravam
bhaktyā paryātanaṁ kuryād yathātantarprabhāṣītam
nāmo 'stu digbhṛyo devebhṛyaḥ pūrvasiddhavīnāyakān
dattvārghaṁ parayā bhaktyā tato melāpakaṁ bhavet
tatsāmāyaṁ mahādevi sarvakalyāṇasampadaṁ
sādhakasya pravadvīyāmi maunasthasya yadā bhavet
aksūnaṁ tu mahābhāge śrūṣvekāgramānasā
.tarjanyāṅgūṣṭhakāgṛte tu puspamudrā prakṛtītā
mūlaparvabhackmaṅgūṣṭhe prarthitām tu vālepanam
uttānahaṁ sollole dhūmpamudrā suṣobhane
adhomukhapraacālena angulīn arghaṁ ādiṣet
kumbhamuṣṭir jalam vindyād dhūpaṅgārodhvagāṅguliḥ
dṛghbhramāṁ mārjanaṁ viddhi jīhvā lōlopalepanam

A: f. 235r
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hastamātreṇḍhanānām tu jānukurparasangamāt
naivedyaṇ ca vijāṇīyād uttānādhomukhaṁ karam || 142 ||
kanyāsāprasṛṭā muṣṭir adhovakṛc tu sastraṅaṁ
muṣṭiṁ badhvā khagālokāt khadgaprārthanaṁ ādiṣet || 143 ||
tīryakprasādadesīnyā darbhamudrā prakṛtītā
mrgrī tilāṁ yavāñān tu sūkṛi praśṛṭiḥ punaḥ || 144 ||
dhānyānāṁ bilvapadmānāṁ sarvāṅguliprasāraṇāt
bilvamadhyāstraṅgulya dvitiye praśṛṭaṁ talaṁ || 145 ||
pāncāṅgula° samāgrās tu ārdhva vakra phalātmakam
|mṛstu-yārdhātmasaṭmuḍrā tu rjuṣ tīrīyakprahāraṇe || 146 ||
samhatāṅgūṣṭhayogena matsyākān tu vinirdiṣet
proktaṁ lokavisargaṃ tu svaṉāsāgraniṁrīkṣanāt || 147 ||
nāsāghrāyaṇarūpeṇa krṣṇādyā madirāsaṅavāḥ
vāmakaraṃ sprāṣan devi guḍājyamadhu kṛtitam || 148 ||
sīraṁśaṁprasāraṇāt proktaṁ phala-raṁ tu mahāsaṅavam
ghṛtaṁadadu duṅdhānāṁ sruvaṇo yathāvatram || 149 ||
muṣṭiṁ mūrdhni vinikṣepād bhasamudrā varāṇane

A: ff. 235r̥-235v

142a °mātreṇḍhanānām B; °mātreṇḍhanānām A; °mātreṇḍhanānām C 142c vājāṇīyād B; vājāṇiā C
143a kanyāsāprasṛṭā A; kanyāsāprasṛṭā C 143b sastraṅaṁ B; sastraṅaṁ A; maṃṣṭrīka C
143c °ālokā B; °ālokā A 143d khadga° A; kha° C
144a °desiniyā B; °desiniyā A 144b prakṛtiā B; prakṛtiā C
144c prakṛttitā B; prakṛttitā C
144d praśṛṭiḥ B; praśṛṭiḥ A; praśṛṭiḥ C
145a °āṅgula A; °āṅgula C 145b °āṅgula mragla B; °āṅgula mragla C
145c °āṅgula mragla B; °āṅgula mragla C
145d dvitiye B; dvitiye A 145e prāṣṛṭaṁ B; prāṣṛṭaṁ A 145f prāṣṛṭaṁ C
146a °āṅgula A; °āṅgula C 146b °āṅgula B; °āṅgula C 146c °āṅgula B; °āṅgula C
146d prakṛtiā B; prakṛtiā C 146e prakṛttitā B; prakṛttitā C
146f prakṛttitā B; prakṛttitā C
147a °sāṅgatāṅgūṣṭharā B; °sāṅgatāṅgūṣṭharā A 147b vinirdiṣet B; vinirdiṣet A 147c vinirdiṣet A; vinirdiṣet B
147d °nirikṣanāt B; °nirikṣanāt A
148a °karnasprṣan B; °karnasprṣan A 148b° karnasprṣan C 148c° karnasprṣan C
149a °śrāv A; °śrāv C 149b° śrāv C 149c° śrāv C 149d° śrāv C
150a muṣṭi A; muṣṭi C 150b muṣṭi C 150c muṣṭi C 150d muṣṭi C
prṣṭhasaṃsparśanāt proktam yogapāṭhakam adiṣet \(150\) 
spicasaṃsparśanād devi āsanaṁ ca vinirdiṣet |
anāmāmadhyamāṅguṣṭhacālanaṁ cākasūtraṃkam |
kākasaṃsparśanaṁevaiva sṛṣṭo ṭbokānakoṭ 'naghe \(151\) |
mūrdhṇādikātiparyante haste mudrāsu paṇcakam |
bhṛtāṁ kamaṇḍālanuṁ devi cāmaraṁ rocaṇāpi ca \(152\) |
adhomukhaprakampena vāmena tu kareṇa tu |
ghaṇṭamudrā vinirdiṣṭā vīṇā vīṇākṛtīṁ karaṇa \(153\) |
etānyam api vīrāṇāṁ saṅketaṁ śāstraciditam |
svecchāyā vā prabodhyādau paścān maunāṁ samācaret \(154\) |
lokasaṅgaviraktatāṁ maunā dhyānapāraṇaṁ|
ekāntarataśīlas tu sidhyate vigatāmayāḥ \(155\) |
anyonyasaṁmataṁ jñātvā vākyālāpam tathaiva ca |
cchommakāṁ bhāṣamudrābhir yojaṉīta vicāksaṇaṁ \(156\) |

iti cchommādhikāras paṇcapanācātāmah paṭalāḥ \(55\)
bhairava uvāca||

athātath saṃpravakṣyāmi chomakānāṁ yathā vidhiḥ |

rūpalakṣaṇakarmaṇaḥ ca kulācāraviceṣṭitam || 1 ||

yathā vijñāyate viro yoginī vā kulodbhavā |

siddhāsiddhāviḥbhaṅga tu samaṇ cottaśādhhakaṁ |

yāgacaryāviṣeṣasthais tan me nigadataḥ śṛṇu || 2 ||

nā pumān striṇākāraṇaḥ bhū śmaśānam kṛ ṇākiṇī |

bhrū lāmā raudrīkā ghrū ca khiḥ syān māṭrākulodbhavā || 3 ||

akāratritayenaiva śivānāṃ kulāja smṛtaḥ |

deti dāmarīkā prakta hiś ca dāvyā varānane || 4 ||

sāmṛtaṃ brūś ca vāmākhyāṃ heti māṃsaṃ varānane |

yo bhāryā bhagini yena makārotptattir ucyate || 5 ||

likāreṇa smṛtaṃ bhakṣam vakārāt pānakam priye |

him appā bhājanāṃ kena gena vācyāṃ tu bhojanam || 6 ||
phakārena vijānīyāt suratārthe prabhāṣaṇam
raktaṁ vasā tathā sukraṁ šeṣavarṇāḥ krameṇa tu II 7 II
kṣakārenāti tām proktām jakārena vivarjītam
pakārad dhṛdayam proktām vāsanaṁ saktisamgame II 8 II
nakārena tu naivedyaṁ puṣpadānaṁ tasaṁjñāyā
yācanaṁ tu dakārena thakārena pratiśthanam II 9 II
kapālam tu tāṁ utkāṁ ṭhaḥ spha ro vai varānane
śastriko dāksarenaiva pheti pāṭādivandanaṁ II 10 II
mudrālaṅkaraṇaṁ nena ceṇa proktām tu cumbanam
viruddha karaṇaṁ sena jhakārena tu karaṇaṁ II 11 II
jpaṅcanaṇṭ tu dakārena gheti ghatanam ādiśet
vyomavīrāsimaṁjñānāṁ yathākālaṁ kṣakārakam II 12 II
kulaśoḍaśa kasyoṭkāḥ svarādyāḥ kramakalpitāḥ
vireśabhairāvināṁ tu aṁsimaṁjñāśvāsapūrvakam II 13 II
evaṁ caikaśarāḥ saṁjñāḥ proktā yāḥ saṁkhyāya yutāḥ
svāṁśadevāṭaṁvānāvāṇidvībhāgena suvistarāḥ II 14 II
devy uvāca
jñāta vānṇātmikāḥ saṁjñāḥ tathāṇyā yāḥ śubhā vibho

A: ff. 278r-278v 15 jñāta...uvāca [inserted in lower margin in B]
vāda tattvena deveśa śārīrāvayavātmikāḥ || 15 ||
bhairave uvāca ||
śrṇu devi mahābhāge samjñā yā dehasambhavāḥ |
virayogikulānām tu ihitārthapradāyikāḥ || 16 ||
sērasaṃsparṣanenoktaṁ vandanaṁ prativandanam |
sīkhāsaṃsparṣanenaiva lalāṭena tu svāgatam || 17 ||
susvāgatam apāṅgasya sparṣanāt sampratiyate |
kasmād deśād ihāyatāḥ prṛchito hi bhruvāḥ spṛṣăn || 18 ||
dakṣottarasabāḥyaṁ tu sparṣād deśāṁ tadātmakam |
nāsāgrām prāgbhavam deśaṁ paścāḍdeśaṁ kṛkāṭikā || 19 ||
spṛṣaṁ samdarṣaṇyaṁ mudrāḥ prativārttāvidhāyinaḥ |
gantavyaṁ svṛṣṭhasaṃsparśaṭ kṛte taddiśi vikṣaṇāt || 20 ||
kṛtām bhavati suśrōṇi pratiṣṭrāvīdhānakaṁ |
kJśīṇā svabhūjasaṃsparśaṭ ūrvoḥ sparṣāt tu viśrāmat || 21 ||
upāviśya jānusaṃsparśaṭ sphericenaiva karomy aham |
na karomi tādā yāyā spṛṣṭā jaṅghā tu bhāṣitaṁ || 22 ||
kārnāsakulkāṅgulyā śrutaṁ te mātrmanḍalam |
tatpārśvasparśanāt siddham sphutamelāpakāśrayah || 23 ||
na caivāmocayen muṣṭim gaganāṭstvāhyaṃgametā |
hrdayaṁ tu spṛṣed yā tu vāmahastena bhāvīta || 24 ||
bhaginī sā vinirṛṣṭā sādhakānām phalapradā |
vāmahastgrasāṃsparśan mātrmadhye tu nāyikā || 25 ||
garuḍasya tu sāṃsparśāt dākiniṁ vinirṛṣīte |
tiryakcakṣusvadṛṣṭyā tu rudraḍākinīlakṣaṇam || 26 ||
vāṃsaṛdeśākaraṇaiva dāmaritvam tu sādiśet |
krkṛṭīkākaraṇaiva dākṣīṇena varāṇane || 27 ||
kulaṁ tu sādhaka-cāryaṁ dāvyātmānaṁ tu sā kathet |
nāsāgradṛṣṭirodhena utṛdhva-vāśvāna sā śivā || 28 ||
samastadehabhāṅgena svahastabhramanena ca |
miśrāṇām lakṣaṇām devī svarūpkathane śmṛtam || 29 ||
māṃsaṁ kapolahastena jihvāḍṛṣṭyā tu matsyakam |
daśanāṅgūliyogena bhākṣyaṁ bhūjyaṁ tu cehitam || 30 ||
nāsāparsānayoṇaiva gandhiḥ proktā tu mudrayā ||

A: f. 278v 30d–31a: AD repeat 30d and 31a, reading bhākṣyaṁ for bhākṣyaṁ the second time. After 30d, B inserts nāsāparsānayoṇaiva bhākṣyaṁ bhūjyaṁ tu cehitam in the upper margin, resuming with 31a
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vāmasṛkvinikā jihvā bhaved vāmāṃtṛtam tu tam |
*dakṣiṇāsṛkvinīyogād vijñeyāṃ dakṣiṇāṃtṛtam || 31 ||
vasā hastatalasparśānāṃ majā kurparadarśanāt |
jaṭhāre tu krte haste dakṣē putratvam ādiṣet || 32 ||
vāme tu duhitā proktā pitā mūrdhā nīrlkṣayet |
mātā tu kathitā să tu vāmakaṣipradarśanāt || 33 ||
saṃgrhitāṃ śṛtāṃ nābhau pṛṣṭhe kṣiptāṃ tu lakṣayet |
bhāryā nītambahastena vāmena pati dakṣīne || 34 ||
dūtaḥ pādasprṣṭāt siddho mitro vāmabhujāṃ spṛṣet |
prakūṭaṃ kgraḥenaiva kulaṭābhāvam ādiṣet || 35 ||
guptāṃ kaksākenotkām na guptaṃ digalokāt |
siddhaṃ vāmāṅkṣaṃkocāl luptacāram tu dakṣiṇāt || 36 ||
sadākārapade vāme pūrvo kṣiptāṃ tathottaram |
dakṣīne tu vijñānyān melakaṃ vāmake kare || 37 ||
evāṃ yogēśivirāṇāṃ saṃmatottarasādhakam |
mudrālāpaṃ saṃkhyātāṃ yadaṇantaravistarāt || 38 ||
anyonyasaṃmatāṃ kṛtvā vākyālāpātha vā priye |
svamudrālāpayogād vā gopayed vāmāśasanam || 39 ||
devy uvāca||
caryāyogakriyāyogāc chivecchā sādhakasya tu |
yadā drṣṭivaśan yātā yoginyo martyasamgatāh |
kathāṃ jñeyāḥ svarūpeṇa rūpaṃ tāsāṃ tathā vada || 40 ||
bhairava uvāca ||
atāḥ param pravakṣyāmi yoginīnāṃ tu laksāṇam |
yena viṃśatiṃtraṇa trailokyam vāsagaṃ bhavet || 41 ||
vijnāyate sudure 'pi kṣetramārga viśeṣataḥ |
bhūtale caiva vartante śivecchāśvādhikārikāḥ || 42 ||
caryāyuktasya deveṣi drṣṭer āyānti gocaram |
tasmāj jñeyaṃ tu vīreṇa yogesīnāṃ tu laksāṇam || 43 ||
tisro rekha lalāte tu ārdhvasīmantam āśritoḥ |
gaurī campakagandhī ca brahmacaryaratā sadā || 44 ||
vedaghoṣapriyā nityam āksobhyā satyavādinī |
daṇḍam kamaṇḍalunī caiva ajinaṃ yogapatṭakam || 45 ||
srucīdarbhopavitam tu padmaṇ ca likhitam grhe |
laksitavyā prayatnena brahmānyamśā varānane || 46 ||
tadarcanaṃ tu vīreṇa khecaratvajīgūtyā |
brahmāṇikulajā devi svāṃśasiddhipradāyikā || 47 ||
gandayoḥ kūpake yasyāḥ kuṇḍalāgrāgrakesīnī |
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protāṇaṃ sa tu pāṇḍugaurī sulocanā || 48 ||
trīṣūlaṃ ṭisulalāṭeṣuḥ laṭāṭiduḥ bhūsinī |
trīkālajñānasampānaḥ śūlaṃ ca likhate grhe || 49 ||
vrṣaṃ kapālam atha vā anyaṃ vā yad varāyudham |
daśanaisyāṃ cātiṣyotsnābhārahmacaryaparāyaṇā || 50 ||
śivārādhanaśasānyuktā śivaliṅgīṃ vatsalā |
aśṭamyāṁ sā caturaḍāṣyām upavāsarātā bhavet || 51 ||
idrśiṃ pramadāṃ dṛṣṭvā sādhakāṃ vīraśādhanī |
lakṣayet svāṁsāsaṃyuktā māheśvaryāḥ kulodbhavā |
śanmāsārāḍhyamāṇā tu yogamokṣaphalapradā || 52 ||
krṣāṅgī raktagaurā ca haripīṅgalalocanā |
suvarcā dīrghaṃsaṃgrīvā romaṣā barbaroruhā || 53 ||
bālakṛḍārātā nityaṃ hasate gāyate muhuḥ |
dhāvate valgata caiva akasmāc ca prakupāyate || 54 ||
danḍahastā bhaven nityaṃ śaktiṇī ca likhate grhe |
kaumārikulasābhūtaḥ lakṣayet sādhakottamaḥ || 55 ||
ārādhyedād viḍhānena bhūtale siddhikāṅkṣayaā |
yat kiṃ cit prārthitam bhogamāṃ sādhakasya dadāti sā || 56 ||
chattrākāraṁ śiro yasyā dṛṣṭaye laṅkānānvitā |
krṣṇendivāravānābhā śūlāsyadaśanā tu yā || 57 ||
vāmenācāraēṣṭā ca caryā tasyāḥ svārūpam |
caκramudrā likhet sā tu dṛṣṭiś caiva dhāravartini || 58 ||
śaṃkhamudrā gāda caiva svāgrhe likhate sadā |
sā tene laṅṣayed vidvāṁś caryāśilenā cetasa || 59 ||
māyārupadharā kanyā vaisṇavī caryāśilinī |
sevanāt svakuḷāṇāṁ tu siddhidā sādhakṣevarāṁ || 60 ||
lambōṣṭhi ca viśālaṅkī pīṅgaḷāgrāṅkṛaṇinī |
citākarmapriyā nityām nṛtyagandharvapeśalā || 61 ||
māṃśaśavapriyā nityāṃ lotupā ṣaṛvāṣāttvikā |
svāgrhe dāṃṣṭrāmudrā tu daṇḍāṣṭrikhalam eva vā || 62 ||
liṅkate ca tathā ghoṇaṁ koṇaṁ vātha śmaṇakam |
padmaṁ vā karpāraṇ caiva ubhe pakṣe tu parvaṇi || 63 ||
dvādaśī tu vijāṇyāt tasyāḥ sā varavarṇini |
vārāḥi vaisṇavī caiva ekaparvaratā sādā || 64 ||
jaṭāvīyā śaṭdakṣendreṇa mantrāviṣṭena cetasā |
idṛṣṭam laṅkanāṁ dṛṣṭvā pratimudrāṃsārinā |
māsaikāt siddhidā devi caryāyuktaśasya mantriṇaḥ || 65 ||

A: f. 279v
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syāmā vaigandhini caiva dirghagṛivāṅguli† tathā |
dasaṇāś cātikāntabhā nayane cātivartule || 66 ||
raktavastrapriyā nityaṁ skandhavastrāvalambini |
gandhapuşpapriyā nityaṁ dhanādhyā ca prajāyate || 67 ||
hasate ramate caiva yogayogānusārataḥ |
vajramudrá likhet satu ṛṣeyu eva hi || 68 ||
sūrpaṁcchapaṭaṇaḥ caiva likhate 'nyayaḥ mahāyudham |
indrāṇikulajātānāṁ etad bhavati lakṣaṇam|| 69 ||
śaṁmāśāraṅdayānāṁcaiva siddhā dāsyanti melakam |
vicapratay akhilam lokān sarvāṅcaryapravaratakaḥ || 70 ||
śuṣkāṇḍa bhaganaśa ca koṭarākṣi ca daṁśtriṇī |
pingalāgrāgrakesi ca úrdhvardṛtiṣ ca bhīsāṇā || 71 ||
mṛte raṇe kathā nityaṁ brahmacaryaratā sādā |
śmaśānāikakathā nityaṁ sādhakānāṁ kathārata || 72 ||
svaṅrhe likhate devi kapalaṁ paṭṭiśaṁ tathā |
madyaṁāmsapriyā nityaṁ sā jñeya māṭṛnāyikā || 73 ||
pratimudrāvidhānajña sādhake dhyānatapare |
melakam sampradāyaḥ ca varaṇ ca dadate sādā || 74 ||
saptaiā māṭarāḥ khyātā yāmale siddhidāyikāḥ |

A: ff. 279v-280r

66a syāmā ] em.; syāma° AD; syāma° B 66c daṇāś ] em.; daṇā ABD 67b skandha° ] AB; 
śkaṇṭha° D 67c gandhapūspa° ] AB; gan(- ?)spa° D 68a
hasate ] AB; hansate D 68b yogayogānusārataḥ ] conj.; yogayogānusārataḥ AB; yogayogān
tu sārataḥ D 68c likhet ] AB; likhen D 69a sūrpa° ] corr.; sūrpa° ABD 69b likhate ] em.; 
likhete AB; likhyate D 69c "jātānām ] conj.; "jāyātā AB 70a śaṁ ] B; śaṭ AB 70c
vicaraty ] AD; vica(red)ovem B akhilam lokān ] corr.; akhilam lokān AD; akhilam lokān B 70d
sarvāṅcarya ] AB; sarvaṇāṅcarya° D 71b daṁśtriṇī ] B; daṁśtriṇī (unmetrical) AD 71c
"kesi ] B; "kesi AD 71d "dṛṣṭiṣ ] AB; "dṛṣṭiṇ D 72b "ratā ] AD; "ratāḥ B 72d
sādhakānām ] AB; sādhakānām D 73a devi ] B; devi AD 73b paṭṭiśaṁ ] B; paṭṭiśaṁ AD
73c "māṁsa° ] AB; "māṁsa D 74 melakam ] AB; melakam D 75a māṭarāḥ ] BD; māṭarā+h+
A 75b "dāyikā ] corr.; "dāyikā ABD
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vimiśralakṣaṇāḥ devi etadrūpavimiśritāḥ || 75 ||
siddhāsiddhavibhāgās tu tadicchāyā tu sādhakah |
vetti lakṣaṇato devi bodhāl lingavivecaṇāt || 76 ||
tantrasya sārabhūtam tu siddhivāram varānane |
kathitaṁ sādhakendrāṇāṁ prayākṣakaraṇaṁ sadā || 77 ||

iti picumate chomṃādhikāro nāma

trisaptatimah paṭalāḥ || 73 ||
BRAHMAYĀMALE
NAVANAVATIMĀṬAṬALĀṬ

bhairava uvāca||
melāpakaṁ mahēśāni yathā vṛttam kulātmakaṁ ||
tathā te -m- abhidhāsyāmi śṛṇuśvāyatalocane || 1 ||
caryayā niyamasthasya japato homataparāh ||
dhyānasthasya varārohe kulamelāpakaṁ bhavet || 2 ||
kadācic carumārgena jñānasamāmbodhanena vā ||
mantravīryapradhānena dehaśuddhibhavena vā || 3 ||
kulācārapradānena svasaṃskāreṇa vā kvacit ||
anugrahāṁ prakurvanti kṛtvā melāpakaṁ priye || 4 ||
yadā tu kulasiddhināṁ bhājanas tu mahaujasah ||
tadāvalokanaṁ kṛtvā harate prākṛtaṁ bhayam || 5 ||
vīrasattvavātasyāya dhṛṣṭer āyanti gocaram ||
nānyathā tu mahādevi kiśṭasyāpi kadācana || 6 ||
samayo hy eṣa yogīnāṁ mandasattve na darśanam ||
nā vādaṁ snehātā devi na ca bāhye prakāśanam || 7 ||
jahmanahinapasyagas tirsakare na manita
nabhimanaṃ svavijñāne nāśivecchā tv anugraham
samayair navabhir yuktāh kriḍante svecchāyā priye
dadanti sādhakendrāṃ kāmān śivapadāntikān
melāpakās tathānye ye hāthāf proktā varānane

te tu dākinivindanāṃ na sūdhanāṃ niyojayet

evaṃ melāpakāṃ prāptāh sādhakendrā varānane
prāpnuvantīpsitān kāmān vilomat tu viparyayam

yathā devipadam prāptā vilomād dākinī bhavet

sādhako 'pi tathā devi tanmadhye paṣutāṃ vrajet

kiṃ tu tenaiva mārgena saktiviṣṇānagāhātanāt

prabhāvena kūlanāṃ tu so 'pi sāmānyatāṃ punaḥ

muktvā deham avāptoti jātiṇās ca prajāyate

yathā melāpake siddhāḥ prabhutvam vrajate priye

na tathā paśumārgena krūrasattvas tu suvrate

puspadhūpasugandhādyāiḥ pūjayan vā śivādhvare

nityodayād avāptoti sāktimelāpakaṃ param

evaṃ tu vyaktāsaktīnāṃ sputamelāpakāṃ vinā

kulasaṃptaśaṣāṃ cakramaṃ samabhyasān guhāṃ priye

A: ff. 353v–354r
yāḥ kāscit siddhayo devi adhamā madhyamottamāḥ |
melāpake tu tāh sarvā labhate sādhakottamaḥ || 17 ||
bhūtaṃ bhavyaṃ bhaviṣyaṃ ca ātmano ‘tha parasya vā |
sarvāṃ jānāti deveśe kulacakram anusmaran || 18 ||

iti bhairavasrotasi brahmāyāmale dvādaśasāhasrake

navanavatimāḥ paṭalāḥ || 99 ||

A: l. 354r

17a yāḥ kaścit] om.; yā kaścit ABD 17c tāḥ sarvā] B; tā+ḥ+ sarvāḥ A; tā sarvāḥ D
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I

THE CHAPTER OF THE CONNECTIONS

OM

Homage to the Gurus, who begin with Śiva;
to the Yoginis.7

That reality principle (tattva) which, consisting of Śiva-with-differentiation (sakala-
śiva), is the source of mantras, (♀) the [supreme] cause, the embodiment of lib-
eration (?), and bears the form of the linga sporting with unequalled pleasure
in the many lotuses of the Dūtis; (♀) ...... with various points of yogic absorp-
tion (layapada), in which reside manifold supernatural experiences (?); may that
Bhairava-tattva, which renders asunder the mountain of saṃsāra, sanctify you.8

7 A is damaged beyond reconstruction until śv, although the aksara bottoms visible agree with the
readings of D and E from guru or perhaps ṣhv in śvādhibhyo. A final anusvāra may have been lost.
A's poor state of preservation here probably accounts for the fact that B has the generic OM NAMAH
śivāya as its opening benediction. C has had its benediction blotched over in black; but the space
allotted, and the vowel ligature visible around the position of the fourth aksara, suggest that it read
OM Śrīganēśāya NAMAH. These two late, closely related devanāgarī mss appear to be copies of an
exemplar descended from A. As the present and other lacunae suggest, this lost exemplar reflects A
in a condition not unsimilar to its present state of preservation—hence the improvised benedictions in
some of its descendants. A's vowel ligature to the right of śv, the top of which is broken off, could be
either ā or i; the latter appears more likely, as there is no indication of the leftward curvature which
appears at the top in other examples of rā. It seems highly likely that D and E preserve something
close to A's original reading, given the appropriate number of missing aksaras in A, and their shared
endings. On the language, note use of the genitive yogītvanīnām for the dative yogītvaniḥbhyaḥ. Cf., e.g.,
1.6b and 7a.

8 This verse presents several difficulties of text and interpretation. Its meter is sragdhara, and A
writes daṇḍas after each pāda. Particularly obstruse are what A transmits as hetunirvānāvisvānuñ (?)
in pāda a) and śākṭītīvōrdādhakāṇḍe (in pāda c). This verse is repeated as the mangalasloka of another
"Brahmayāmala," an abridged redaction which also appears to draw material from the Tantrasadbhava.
This survives in a single and incomplete Nepali manuscript, NAK 1-1557 (NGMPP Reel A165/16). The
present benediction also serves as the model for the mangala verse of one of the two texts entitled
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Yoginiviaptavastu, both of which ascribe themselves to the *BraYā*. One of these survives in a great number of Nepalese manuscripts, e.g. NGMPP Reel 1758/10 (private collection). Its opening sragdhara benediction ends, *sakalaśisnamayam bhairavahāk punātu*. The other *Yoginiviaptavastu* opens with a long series of sragdhara verses beginning with the present one. This unfortunately seems to survive complete in only a single late and corrupt manuscript, NGMPP Reel 2212/7 (private collection). The short *BraYā* mentioned above preserves two significant variants for the present verse: "kāndam where A reads kānde, and "haranam (=haranam?)" for "dalaman. The latter is clearly secondary, reflecting confusion between h and d in later Newār; note also the dental r rather than y.

Regarding A's *hetunirvānāvisesān, the final lexical element could as readily be hitma as viśa, given the fluidity of s and ś in A, and the similarity of s and m in old Newār manuscripts. B's hesitation over the ending might derive from the fact that A is no longer securely legible here; an anusvara might just faintly be visible. D and E, which appear also to be descendants of A, support this in reading viśa. For this half-pāda, one somewhat plausible text, here adopted, might be sakalaśisnamayam hetu nirvānābimbaṃ. Note that *BraYā* xxxvii 3 appears to describe Sakalaśiva (kalatmakam śīśāṃ). "Siva in the state of differentiation, as both kāraṇam (cf. hetu) and sīmavāyam. As for nirvānābimbaṃ, i.e. mokṣaśāpam, this is certainly an uncommon expression, and no clear parallel is evident. Another possibility might be to take *hetunirvānāvisesān* as a dānavasā: "[that tattva which is] the [supreme] cause, liberation, and the universe." We do once find Śiva described in the *BraYā* as viśva and kāraṇa (śīmāṃ sāntam aṣṭam viśaṃ kāraṇavāyam vibhub aryaḥ, lxxi.58ab); this might also be corrupt for viśvākāraṇam. One could also consider the possibility, perhaps remote, of hetu nirvānāvīśe: "the cause of both liberation and the universe [perhaps =śiddhi?]" Cf. the compound bhogānirvānāvetum in the Śaiva pāddhati Vimalāvati, in 6.1d (f. 103v, NAK 1-1576, NGMPP Reel 826/7); this, incidentally, is also a sragdhara verse.

In pāda b, as the subject is neuter, one need not read "viśaśāt" in compound with "liṅgaśāpam, although it seems preferable to do so. The mss' sama could be interpreted in three manners: 'sama', 'sama', or 'sama' (i.e. asama). In the first case, this compound could mean "sporting with the pleasure of tranquility" (sama). Cf. the description of Vajrārāhi as prakāsasukhasanāydaḥ in the so-called Śādhanaśrīlā (vol. II, p. 426). It might be possible to interpret sama similarly, in the sense of "equanimity." But if the latter reading is correct, the more natural interpretation would be ["sporting] simultaneously/equally in the so-called many lotuses of the consorts." The third possibility, 'sama', suggested to me by Sanderson (personal communication, January 2006), is probably to be preferred: ["sporting] with unequalled pleasure." Cf. pada four of the benediction to chapter 16 in Keśarājā's commentary on the Netratantra: stumah śārām netrāṃ tadasanasaṃkhaḷasaṃsarasm.

Note that in the same pada, we find the variant liṅgasakāyam for "rāpam in B and C. This seems to be mere paleographic confusion, for we find the same variation in 41b, with B and C reading svarāpāvāshtīlam where A reads svarāpāvāshtīlam.

The interpretation of what A transmits as "śaktirāvadarākāndē remains an intractable problem. If the text is correct, then the compound might modify padmaśaṅde, if kāndā is here a plural-marker. But it appears unlikely that pada c construes closely with pada b, for after a verb and caesura, one would more readily expect a noun. One should keep in mind the possibilities of reading "kāndam or "kāndal as well as "kānde (and kāndā, etc., too). Following the short Nepalese *BraYā* in reading "kārdam, the following interpretation might be possible: ["the Bhairava-tattva?" which is present (or "which has") a flourishing rddhā) multitude (kānda) of sounds (rāta) of the śakti." This set of lexical possibilities is less than convincing, however, especially rddhā and kānda. There is a significant possibility that this problematic passage pertains to the subtle sounds (rāta) associated with the yogic ascent of the śakti, a subject treated in *BraYā* xcvi and c. Further study of this material is required. This possibility is reinforced by the prior mention of "resting points" (layapada) in the śakti's yogic ascent in the compound which precedes this. Alternatively, śaktir could be nominative, perhaps construing with a locative ārādhakāṇḍe—or ārādhakahāṇḍe?—suggesting that this verse praises the bhairavatattva as the union (yāmala) of Sakalaśiva and the Śakti. A satisfactory interpretation is not presently apparent, however.

The possibility that rddhā reflects normal consonantal gemination after r should be kept in mind, which could suggest words such as vardha, etc., instead of rddhā. It might also be borne in mind that the language of the *BraYā* allows for vowel hiatus-breaking r in compounds; see the annotation.
2-3 Of old, the Goddess listened to the scripture, the glorious Root Tantra,\(^9\) containing a great multitude of mudrās, manḍalas, and mantras,\(^{10}\) characterized as a seat (pīṭha) of vidyās,\(^{11}\) having twelve-thousand [verses], a Bhairava[\textit{tantra}] containing [all] four divisions,\(^{12}\) which had come forth from the \textit{Vimala[\textit{tantra}]. Afterwards, the fiercely brave Aghorī replied to the Mahādeva, Bhairava, whose body is mantras:

4 O god, of old [you] had revealed the \textit{tantra} arising from Ucchusma[bhairava], called by the name the \textit{Vimala}, a great mass of scriptural wisdom, preceded by the \textit{śakti};\(^{13}\)

\(^{9}\) \textit{ab} is largely illegible in \textit{A}. This surely accounts for the spurious readings of \textit{B} and \textit{C}, as well as the lacuna in \textit{E}, illustrating the dependence of the extant Nepalese mss on \textit{A}. Given that \textit{mu} or \textit{su} is clearly visible as the first akṣara of 2b in \textit{A}, it seems reasonable to follow \textit{D} and \textit{E}, but reading instead the accusative \textit{mulatantram mahodayam}.

\(^{10}\) In 2c, it is quite possible that \textit{A}'s spelling \textit{\"mantrogham\"} was original; but as \textit{A} also preserves more correct spellings, e.g. \textit{jāhnaughas} in 18a, this has been corrected. It should nonetheless be borne in mind that, if \textit{A} is a reliable indicator, the original text is likely to have been inconsistent in such matters. However, distinguishing spelling irregularities from common scribal corruptions seems impossible, given that \textit{A} is the primary witness in a closed recension. It hence seems preferable to error on the side of a degree of regularizing. Cf. Torzsökö, \textit{“Doctrine of Magic Female Spirits,” xxvii.}

\(^{11}\) Consistent with other passages, including 3b, 2cd implies that the Root Tantra belongs to the Vidyāpīṭha in particular, but contains within itself the other three divisions or “mounds” (pīṭhas) of the \textit{bhairavatantras} as well—viz., those of mudrā, mandala, and mantras. See the discussion in chapter 5, section 4.

\(^{12}\) Cf. xxxviii.19cd, \textit{catu[s]pīṭhasamunpamman tantran bhairavasnamjhitam}. In the latter passage, \textit{“Bhairava”} refers to the \textit{Ur-scr}ipture containing the totality of the \textit{bhairavatantras}—the \textit{daksināsrotas} (cf. xxxviii 2oa, daksināsrotasamapātī [em. (Isaacson); \textit{sanmārtīmad} cod.; \textit{samārtīmad} cod.]) vinirgatam).

\(^{13}\) \textit{śaktipūrvakam} in 4d perhaps conveys the idea that the “flood” or mass of scripture (jāhnaugha), in its prelinguistic form, emerges from the \textit{śakti}—for the \textit{śakti} “awakens” bindu, from which emerges scriptural wisdom. See 33–34 below, and the discussion in chapter 5, section 4, in part \textit{1} of the present thesis. On the \textit{Vimalatantra}, \textit{Ucchusmatantra}, and \textit{Ucchusmabhairava}, which the \textit{BraYa} connects intrinsically, see chapter 5, section 6.
in which was present this Bhairava [tantra] with four divisions, and from which all of the glorious Mantra-division emerged; 14

which you had revealed to me concerning the four divisions [of scripture], together with the narrative of its revelation; 15 [and] which is the primordial cause for siddhi. 16

7-8ab Together with its secrets, teach me that which is revered (?) as the utterance of the great mass of scripture (?); 17 and [teach] the divisions of śīva and śakti, and likewise the divisions of bindu, the division of the nine saktis, and the division of creation, in detail; 18

---

14 5b in A is partly illegible, reading yasmā....(ṛvam?). The text of B and C, yasmāḥ pīthaṁ tu tat sarvam, reads as an awkward attempt to remedy a lacunose exemplar. D’s reading appears more probable: yasmād hi nirgatam sarvam; E differs only in reading yasmādi, a case of confusion between the writing of h and d in later Newārī. Assuming that A read as does D, the question remains as to whether yasmā hi is a corruption—for either yasmād dhi nirgatam or yasmād vinirgatam. The former appears paleographically unlikely, and indeed, elision of the final -t—not only in the ablative of the masculine a-stem declension, but also in the optative and other common forms—is frequent in the BraYa. Although many apparent instances could arise from scribal negligence, a great many must certainly be original. Expressions such as kuryātha (=kuryād atha) in xxi.3b and XLIV.30c confirm this. Most probably, the final consonant was seen as desirable, yet optional, perhaps considered a feature of spelling, but not necessarily pronunciation.

15 Note in 6b the use of the genitive in the sense of the dative, which is more normal than exceptional in the language of the BraYa.

16 Here the syntax is somewhat uncertain: one could interpret 6c, tantrātārasanyuktam, as a separate description of the múlatantra, or else construe it in close connection with either 6d or 6ab. The latter seems slightly preferable, for the narrative of the pedigree of the tantra—its sāstrātāra—might well set out to establish its relation to the four divisions of scripture.

17 As transmitted, 7b seems unintelligible. It is likely to be a corruption for jānaughoccarapujitam, a compound which occurs in the closing verses of BraYa xxx. The interpretation of this is however uncertain; in the latter verse, the compound seems to express praise of what has just been taught as the highest of scriptural teachings. BraYa xxx.63-64:

etaj jñanam mahādevi jānaughoccarapujitam |
aṣṭaṁśrāpyabhedena munibhir jñānabhadvitaṁ || 63 ||
vistārītāṁ śastraṁ śivarudrabhedataḥ |
nāndtampravistārāṁ śivojñānam mahodayam || 64 ||

63a etaj[ ]em.; eta A 63b jāhanu" ] corr.; jñāna" A 63d munibhir ] em.; munibhi A 64a śastra-
ni ] corr.; sāstraṁ A 64d śivajñānam ] em.; śivajñāna" A

“This wisdom, O Great Goddess, is honoured as the utterance (uccara) of the great mass of scripture. Because of the varieties (bheda) of impure recipients, sages cultivated in wisdom have made manifold the scriptures, with the divisions of Śiva, Rudra, and so forth—the glorious Śaiva wisdom, with its multitudes of tantras.”

18 It is possible that bheda, “division,” here rather refers to sections of the text. But as this is certainly not the case in 8d and 9d, bheda here too has been interpreted in the sense of “division.”
8cd-9 [teach] how the sole šaktī exists with nine divisions: the attendants arising from Ucchūṣma[bhairava], with the attendants of the guhyakās; [and how] the yoginīs for their part exist with many divisions of lākinīs.¹⁹

10 O you honored by the gods,²⁰ [teach] how the complete rite (yoga)²¹ of the one,²²

¹⁹ The syntax of 9abcd leaves room for doubt. Were it a single unit, it seems the subject should be yoginīḥ; but šaktīḥ could also carry over from 8cd as the subject. This would require emending to yavasthitā, as seems required in 8d. It seems preferable, however, to construe 9ab with 8cd, and 9cd separately, for 9ab seems to elaborate upon the nine divisions of the šakti mentioned in 8d. The case endings in 9b remain unclear; āsambhavāṃ seems implausible, and should presumably be emended to the feminine nominative plural, āsambhatāḥ. As this verse intimates, the principle šaktīs are divided into two groups of four: the four ṛtvīs or guhyakās (Ṛktā, Karāḷī, Cāndākṣā, and Mahācuṭām) and the four dūṭīs or kimkāris (Karāḷā, Dantuṇa, Bhūmavaktra, and MahāBALā), with the addition of the supreme Goddess, Aghoreśvarī, to make nine. This is clarified in iv.252cd-254ab:

rāktā karāḷī caṇḍākṣāty mahācuṭām tathaiva ca || 252 ||
ucchūṣmatantraḥ nīmāni guhyakānām na sansārāḥ ||
karāḷā dantuṇa caiva bhūmavaktra mahāBALā || 253 ||
guhyakānucarāḥ hy etāḥ kimkārye ‘nukrāmena tu ||
254 caṇḍākṣāya || em.; caṇḍākṣāya A 254b ‘nukrāmena | corr.; nukrāmena A

“Ṛktā, Karāḷī, Caṇḍākṣā, and likewise Mahācuṭām: these are undoubtedly the names of the guhyakās in the Ucchūṣmatantra. Karāḷā, Dantuṇa, Bhūmavaktra, and MahāBALā: these are the kimkāris, the servants (anucara) of the guhyakās, in sequence.”

9ab has another close parallel in iv.263ab, following a list of the four dūṭīs: guhyakānucarāḥ hy etāḥ kimkāryaḥ uccūṣmaḥ, presumably to be corrected to guhyakānucarāḥ hy etāḥ kimkāryaḥ uccūṣmasambhavāḥ (“These kimkāris arising from Ucchūṣma are the servants of the guhyakās”). (Most probably, this contains an example of double sandhi, viz. kimkāryaḥ uccūṣmaḥ = kimkāryaḥ uccūṣmaḥ → kimkāryaḥ uccūṣmaḥ). It is somewhat suprising that lākinīs should be listed with such prominence in 9d, given their otherwise near absence in the Braṇṇa. Chapter ii mentions a set of six lākinīs, but does not list the individual goddesses. Note that while here yoginīḥ has a broad sense, the term is also used in reference to a specific set of six goddesses. Cf. Braṇṇa lxxixviii.43cd: guhyakānīś caiva yoginīḥ kimkāryaṃ mātāras tathā (“the guhyakās, and yoginīs, kimkāris, and Mothers”). This particular list refers to the four guhyakās, four dūṭīs, Seven or Eight Mothers, and six yoginīs: Kroṣṭukī, Vījāyā, Gaṇakārṇā, Mahāmukhī, Caṃkavṛgā, and Mahānāsā (all members of these groups being listed together in iv.252-57, quoted above, in part).

²⁰ Here the implausible nominative is emended to the vocative suraṇjīta. This also occurs as a vocative for Bhairava in xxv.3d, where A transmits suraṇjītam. The feminine vocative appears multiple times.

²¹ In 10b, the masculine tasya is surely a corruption for the feminine tasā[ḥ]. Moreover, the ms’ yogam seems likely to be a corruption for yāgam, an emendation trivial enough on paleographic grounds. Here, the neuter yogam or yogam appears to occur for the masculine, for avoiding vowel sandhi with aśeṣam. Although yogo constitutes a topic of considerable importance in this text, it is certainly less prominent than yaga, for which the description aśeṣa seems especially appropriate. Moreover, aśeṣayoga appears to be the name of a specific yaga taught in Braṇṇa xxxiv, the aśeṣayogamābhavanapatalaḥ. This is probably alluded to here. Incidentally, the expression yaga kriyate (=yagaḥ kriyate) also occurs in xv; cf., e.g., Netratantra 16.88c.

²² The non-application of external vowel sandhi in 10a, viz. ekā eva, appears to be metri causa. In 10b, the reading saktī cottomāḥ for saktī cottomāḥ is not implausible, reflecting metri causa ellision of the visarga. Cf. xxvii.17d, where A reads madhyamā saktī cottomā. However, it is also possible that underlying this is saktīr uttāmā, to which the scribe of B appears to correct his text in 10b. Cf. lxxviii.83b, jollinti dāttīr uttāmā (with metri causa shortening of dāttī). It is worth bearing in mind that in writing similar to that of A, c and r might easily be confused.
highly powerful, pervasive, and supreme Śakti is performed, O great god, for those aspiring to siddhi connected with the yoginīs.23

11–12ab When one is devoted to serving the guru,24 following the Left Way,25 in a state of non-dual meditation, the mind remaining without dualist thought;26 tell me, O lord, how there would be siddhi for such people, O god. 27

12cd–13 And yoginīs who have very little intellect, small minds, and little sattva guṇa, [but are] intent on serving their husbands, possessing devotion to the gurus;28 O god, [teach] in brief how they attain siddhi.29

The Lord spoke:

14 Excellent, O Mahādevī, excellent! I shall expound the entirety of what you have requested me,30 with all its multitude of characteristics;

---

23 Note the possibility of reading the instrumental singular "kāṅkṣīṇā rather than the genitive plural.
24 In 11a, "śuṣrūṣānapāratī is plausible, with śuṣrūṣā as the feminine śuṣrūṣa. One might also keep in mind the possibility of emending to śuṣrūṣānapārata; cf. śuṣrūṣānapāratah in 12c.
25 Although it could be corrupt, anuvartine in 11b appears to be locative (for classical Sanskrit anuvartini), a case of optional thematization of -in stems to -ina. Cf. tat[a] ekamano bhūttā laksāmārgānuvartināḥ (xviii.2ab); here note the thematization of manas as well, with *manah as nominative (for *manah). Cf. mane in 11d.
26 Apparently, mane should be considered locative, for manasi, formed on the basis of a thematized stem mana for classical manas. Cf. anuvartine above. It seems preferable to emend the mss' nirvikalpaṁ to nirvikalpe, although it might be possible to interpret the former in a similar sense.
27 Although yaṁ bhaved eva is plausible, as read the mss in 11c, it seems more likely that the original reading was yathā bhaved deva. At the end of pādas, bhavet plus the vocative devi is extremely common in the BraYā. Moreover, before a like consonant, A frequently drops a final i, d, etc., when this does not affect the meter. Cf. bhavete devi, as reads A in x.177c. The presence of a second vocative prabho in 1:1 does not speak against this emendation. In the same pāda, one might also consider emending tadvidhānāṁ to tad vidhāhānāṁ, as reads B.
28 It might be possible that here guru refers to parents or elders, given the reference to husbands (bhartr).
29 This verse appears to refer to female practitioners—in fact householders, according to 13a. Cf. the opening verses of BraYā xiv; the present question probably intimates the contents of the latter chapter. 12abcd occurs as BraYā xiv.1, as well as 1.7 in the short "Brahmāyāmaṇḍal" preserved in a single Nepalese MS, nak 1-1557; both contain the variant sculpobuddhaṁ where here the mss read "buddhas. What is intended is presumably an irregular plural of *buddhi (for *buddhayah). While *buddhaṁ is a possible reading, *buddhyas seems marginally preferable, by analogy of the feminine i-stem declension. Note the non-application of external vowel-sandhi across the pāda boundary of 12ab, and that 13a possesses a correct metrical variant (vipulā). The non-classical bhavate, in 13d, occurs with great frequency in the BraYā, an irregular atmānepada indicative alternating with bhavate. In 13d, the latter would be unmmetrical, yet use of bhavate is not confined to cases of metrical exigency. The plural bhavante occurs in xiv.123d (and, by emendation, l.xxxvii.201b).
30 In 14b, A transmits the apparently masculine ya [tvayaṁ] pracodito. However, pracodito is likely to have been influenced by the corruption of yat tvaya to ya tvaya; note the poor sandhi, were the latter
and [also] what the true essence of the *tantra*, which has many meanings and concealed power, is like, together with its secrets; Listen, O fortunate one, with single-minded attention!\(^{31}\)

16 O queen of the gods, once in the past, while I was sporting in my own abode,\(^{32}\) suddenly\(^{33}\) \((?)\) there arose in me [the thought], “if only I could know worship \((yāga)\)” \((?)\).\(^{34}\)

17 Propelled by this wish,\(^{35}\) and preceded by offerings and libations, I worshipped Śrīkanṭha, who is affectionate to his devotees,\(^{36}\) for a thousand divine years, O

---

\(^{31}\) The weight of evidence from A suggests that the spelling *ṣṛṣṣekāgra* is original, with simplification of the diphthong *ai* to *e*—clearly a Middle-Indicism. This stock phrase occurs at least 29 times in the *Bṛha*, with, in this respect, no orthographic variation in A.

\(^{32}\) svasthiti in 16b might have more metaphysical connotations: “my [true] state/condition”?

\(^{33}\) 16a is not fully legible in A, but the latter might have read as do D and E (purodakṣaṇa). The text conjectured involves the minor emendations of puro to purā, and kāṣmad to kāṣma. Between these, the -d- appears to be a hiatus-breaker, which is extremely common in the language of the *Bṛha*. Cf. *nai[ṛ]te-d- acyutesvaram* in xxx.44b, and *ketot-d- etat*, in xxx.44b. Note, in contrast, that Törzsők finds no conclusive evidence for -d- as a hiatus-breaker in the *Siddhayogesvarimata*. “Doctrine of Magic Female Spirits,” xxxiv.

\(^{34}\) 15cd presents several difficulties. Although there is considerable uncertainty concerning the text, the approximate sense, at least, seems to be that the desire to learn yāga arose in Bhairava. As transmitted, no subject is present for the likely predicate *ūtthinā or utthinah* in 15d. One possibility is that a nominative *iciha* underlies *icchaya*. This might have become corrupt under influence of *icchayā* in 16a. The basic construction would then be, “as I was sporting, desire ... arose for me.” However, ca in 15d is problematic, for this suggests that 15ab and 15cd should contain separate clauses. If the correct reading is indeed *iciha*, one might conjecture *yadat* for what A reads as *yā ca*, viz. *iciha yaven mamotthid*.

---
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Then, because of his supreme compassion, Śrīkanṭha taught me (I) the great (?) mass of scriptural wisdom,³⁸ in the sequence of its verbal composition.³⁹

All this was (I) was absorbed by me (?) by the grace of Śrīkanṭha.⁴⁰ And you too, through contact with me, learned it in its entirety.⁴¹

Then, my dear, without authorization, you had commenced to teach it to your attendants, desiring their good and being exhilarated with devotion.⁴²

³⁷ Note the non-application of sandhi across the pāda boundary of i6cd.

³⁸ mahat is difficult to construe. If correct, it could be adverbial, "greatly, a lot," but what it modifies remains unclear. Perhaps one should rather construe it in agreement with jñānagāthā in 17a, despite the gender disagreement, or even emend to the masculine. It seems that the mass' kāraṇāya is a corruption. If it is instead original, this would suggest confusion between the abstract noun kāraṇa and kāraṇī. But note the correct instrumental kāraṇāya in 24b. Emended thus, the compound purāṇaśāsya still seems poor, as though purāṇā kāraṇāya. Perhaps purāṇa should be considered nominative, in the sense of the instrumental; cf. "anujñā below in 36a.

³⁹ The sense of i8d is perhaps that the scripture was taught entirely, exactly as it was composed.

⁴⁰ In 19b, purāṇa is not entirely convincing. That it makes the pāda hypermetrical poses little concern (see the annotation ad 2ocd); but the sense of the word, "transformed, digested, etc." seems awkward. Nonetheless, it might yield a plausible sense, and no emendation seems obvious.

⁴¹ One should consider emendation to the adverb aśeṣam, "entirely," probably the more natural usage. Note the non-application of vowel sandhi across the pāda boundary of 19cd.

⁴² 20c's pariṣāṇasya, for which A has the unlikely pariṣāṇasya, seems best construed as a collective singular. It is of course possible to take it as a true masculine singular. The mass's two past passive participles samākhyātaṃ and prārabḍhaṃ, in 20cd, seem impossible to interpret, as the syntax otherwise suggests a single sentence. However, the infinitive samākhyātaṃ would construe smoothly with prārabḍhaṃ, constituting also small enough a corruption.

20c is hypermetrical by one syllable. Such hypermetricism occurs frequently in the Brahma. Generally, 9-syllable pādas meet the following two criteria: the "cadence" pattern of the final four syllables should not be compromised; and there should be multiple short syllables preceding the cadence. Cf., e.g., grahayagapurvakam nyasant (xxxix.gc), with three of the first five syllables laghu. Very commonly, hypermetricism occurs in pādas with strings of three short syllables, as when are present such common words as dāmaru, smarana, and pranava. Cf., e.g., dāmarukam pujayen mantrā (1IV.796C). Such is the case in both 19b and 20c. One could think of this phenomenon as a principle by which three laghu syllables are metrically equivalent to two guru, or to one guru and one guru syllable. As in 20c, this overrules the requirement that syllables two and three not both be laghu. Hypermetricism may also be found in metrically variant (tripūḍa) pādas; cf., e.g., caturākṣaṃ tu hṛdayaṃ (xiv.141a). Although these observations are based on the language of the Brahma, they seem relevant to similar Saiva texts. Note for example the following verse, Kaulajñanānirnaya 6.5, with hypermetrical odd-pādas: paramāṇaṃ ucyaṭe niśthā sa śīva vyāpakah parah | sa jīvah parataraṇaḥ tu sa haṃsaḥ śakti pudgalah (NGMPP A48/13). Here, the visarga is omitted from śaktih, metri causa. Cf. the remarks of Dominic Goodall on the constitution of Purāṇaṇaṃ 1.14 (karanāṇy etati tatākārtū): “note that this pada has too many syllables; but this particular type of hypermetry, in which the first two short syllables are probably intended to be read rapidly together and must count for one, appears to be not uncommon in this sort of writing” (p. 143, n. 18.).

Note also the possibility that underlying the hypermetrical pariṣāṇasya samākhyātaṃ could be pariṣāṇasya mā tīkhyaṃ, with hiatus-breaking m—a frequent source of corruption. We would then have the metrical fault of laghu syllables in the second and third positions, however, which in the language of
But on seeing that great tantra being violated,\textsuperscript{43} I was filled with anger and cursed you, by which your scriptural knowledge was destroyed.\textsuperscript{44}

Then, O fortunate woman, terrified and trembling, and with tears in your eyes, you prostrated on the ground;\textsuperscript{45}

folding your hands, terrified about your violation of the scriptural wisdom, you entreated me,\textsuperscript{46} O Mahādevī, overcome with sorrow.

After this, seeing you agitated, I was overcome by compassion.\textsuperscript{47} I spoke to you thus—out of compassion, but filled with great anger:\textsuperscript{48}

"Go to the mundane world (bhūrloka), O queen of the gods; incarnate yourself.\textsuperscript{49}

Take on another body in the house of a brahmin, O pious lady.

\textsuperscript{43} In 21a, the original text probably read viplapyamanam (or the more correct viplavyamanam), which results in a variant metrical pattern (vipula). "Correction" of this vipula to the standard (pathya) pattern accounts for the ungrammatical viplapyamana transmitted in the ms.

\textsuperscript{44} The feminine instrumental pronoun yaya in 2id, apparently in the sense of "such that, by which," is irregular; this usage is generally reserved for the masculine yena, which would here be unmetrical. One might consider emending to yatha.

\textsuperscript{45} Although here broken up for purposes of translation, the string of intraments in 22-23ab construe as a unit with vijhaptah in 23c. The sense of 22d seems more or less clear, but the same cannot be said for the text of its fifth syllable. A appears to read bhūmyam gatva padandavat, and concerning its fifth syllable, only B varies in reading pra (a diagnostic conjecture?). It might be conceivable that padandavat is used in the sense of dandavat ("like a stick," i.e. prostrate in obeisance), though this is unattested. The conjecture here preferred is however gatvatha. In A, the syllable in question is damaged, and could in fact possibly read thu.

\textsuperscript{46} A's vijhaptato might well be original, in the sense of vijhaptah, influenced by ā in the formation of the indicative (cf., e.g., vijhāpayati).

\textsuperscript{47} Emendation of grhttam to the masculine appears necessary, although given the fluidity of masculine and neuter in this material, one can never be certain.

\textsuperscript{48} In 24b the adjective "bhṛtena agrees with an unstated maṇḍa. Note that this pada is hypermetrical, possessing nine syllables, including the string of three light/short ones in karunaya. Cf. the annotation ad 1.20.

\textsuperscript{49} It seems kuruṣattha, if correct, would have to be metri causa for kuruṣatthu, the imperative plus atha. A parallel for this is present in the Yoginisāntarāprakāraṇa of the Jayadrathayamala: bhedāṇaṁ taṁ chṛṣṭaṁ tha (6.6d; text courtesy of Alexis Sanderson). Note the absence of vowel sandhi across the pada boundary of 25ab.
“Then, impelled by your devotion while you dwell there, I shall bestow my grace upon you, by command of the sakti. Oneness with me again—you will obtain all this, my dear.”

Then, by my order, you took incarnation near Prayāga in the large village Kanavira, in the good home of Meghadatta.

O great goddess, you were beget of chāndogya [brahmīns] and possessed the marks of auspiciousness. Born there, undoubtedly, your name was Sattikā. Then, endowed with intelligence, you paid reverence to me through constant linga worship, with (? great (?) devotion.  

50 I.e. bestow initiation.  
51 One might question the syntax of 26abcd. The grammatically preferable interpretation seems to be thus: tava tatrasthaya bhaktaya sampracoditah, alam tubhyam [=te] anugraham karisydmi—assuming that tatrasthaya, as reads A, should be the genitive tatrasthāya. It is possible, though, that tatrasthāya is corrupt for the feminine dative tatrasthāyai, or the masculine dative tatrasthāya, in the sense of the feminine. This interpretation requires some leniency with the word order. What we could possibly have is instead agreement between the genitive or dative tatrasthāyai and dative tubhyam, both in the sense of the genitive and construing with bhaktayā; the genitive āna would then express the recipient of anugraha. Such casual treatment of the oblique cases is not improbable in the BraYa.  
Note that sakti-r-djhayā in 26d should be considered a compound, i.e. saktijnaya. In the BraYa, we not infrequently encounter r inserted between component words in compounds to prevent internal vowel sandhi, especially after an i or u. Cf., e.g., gati-r-dgatiyogena for gatydgatiyogena (LXIX.71C), and prabhu-r-icchaya for prabhvicchaya (LXXVIII.100D). Cf. also dvi-r-astavarsdkrtir in Kaulajnananirnaya 10.21. Metrical concerns seem to influence this type of formation.  
52 What A reads as madvākyo, emended in B to agree with avatirnd, surely is a corruption from madvākyat, an ablative of cause. This presumably arises from omission of the final consonant of the ablative, followed by corruption of ā to ā.  
53 It has not been possible to identify this village, assuming the name has been transmitted correctly.  
54 A’s chandogya could be original, in the sense of chāndogya; I have tentatively retained this orthography. Note the non-application of vowel sandhi across the pada boundary of 28ab.  
55 There is some doubt concerning the name A transmits as Sattikā or Santikā, for tt and nt are frequently indistinguishable in this ms. This might be Prākṛta for saktikā, or even sāntikā. Santikā also seems to occur as a name in Divyāvali 13 (108.1). It could also, theoretically, be a Prākritization of sattikā, with simplification of the consonant cluster to tt, and shortening of the preceding vowel to prevent a double-guru syllable. The latter rule would also apply if sattikā is formed from sāntikā.  
It is difficult to decide whether A’s nāman (=nāma) is original, or whether to follow B, D, and E in emending to nāma. Both possibilities are plausible, considering the frequency with which masculine -an stems such as karman are thematized.  
56 Interpretation is difficult for what A seems to read as mahā tvaya, or perhaps mahātvaya—although the instrumental pronoun seems necessary. If an adjective, mahā (=mahān?) lacks a modificand. Cf. the problem in 18b, parākārya mahā, where mahā occurs with no noun in clear agreement. Here mahā in fact appears to construe with the proximate bhaktayā, in relation with which it could be explained as split compound.
There, in [your] thirteenth year,\(^{57}\) you attained \textit{siddhi} by the grace of the \textit{sakti}. You attained the state of a Sky-traveller,\(^{58}\) and reached my proximity.

You are that \textit{sakti}, O highly fortunate one, whom of old I had cursed when a transgression was made. Remember yourself!\(^{59}\) Your name is now Aghorī.

You are my Great Śakti, the agent of grace for all. I shall teach you that knowledge which was lost when you made a transgression, (¿) the great [\textit{tantra}] spoken by Śrikanṭha, after it came into being from the \textit{sadasiva tattva} (?),\(^{60}\) together with its secrets, O Mahādevī; listen with single-minded attention.\(^{61}\)

From the inconceivable Śiva, the Supreme Self, arose the Supreme Śakti, called

\(^{57}\) It is not entirely clear whether \textit{trayodase varse} expresses the duration of worship, which we would expect in the accusative, or rather the age of the goddess when she attained \textit{siddhi}. The latter seems probable; note a similar expression in xiv.267: \textit{parijñānavatī mātā nādiṅkārti piṭā smṛtah | sā bhava[ī] tu kuloṭpannā mātā tasyās tu kāreyet | karṇajīpatan tu jātajī[ṇ]i] sādām asam kulavadhyā | catuṛṇi[ṃ]ṣlatīme varṣe jñānam tasyāḥ prajāyate} (“[If] the mother fully possesses the scriptural wisdom, [while] the father is considered unentitled, she [their daughter] would become a Clan-born [yogirū]. When she is born, her mother should perform \textit{japa} in her ear using the clan-\textit{vidyā} for six months. In [her] twenty-fourth year, the Wisdom arises [in her].”).

\(^{58}\) Note the use of the present indicative \textit{avāpniṣi} in the sense of past tense, perhaps best considered a sort of narrative present.

\(^{59}\) A’s \textit{ātmānāṁ} in 31c has been emended to the normal accusative reflexive pronoun, \textit{ātmānāṁ}. Nonetheless, \textit{ātmānāṁ} is conceivably original, perhaps influenced by the gender of its referent.

\(^{60}\) Several aspects of 33ab are unclear. In 33a, A’s \textit{maha} presents the same difficulty as in 29a: it seems to be a form of \textit{mahat}, but has no obvious referent. On might conjecture the masculine nominative \textit{mahān}, given the tendency of A to drop final consonants; however, this would have to agree with the neuter \textit{jñānam}. This might well be acceptable, for later in the chapter we seem to have, in a similar context, \textit{mahān} in grammatical agreement with the predicate \textit{bhasitam} (cf. \textit{proktam}, 33b), modifying an unstated \textit{jñānam} or \textit{tantram}: \textit{sādāsivena devena dvāpāre bhasitam mahān} (i.93ab). In 18bc, we seem also to have \textit{mahāt} \textit{jñānaughuś}, unless the gender of one word has been garbled in transmission. Note also e.g. xxxix.1b, \textit{al śādāśīvat̥at̥am mahān}, and xix.59d, \textit{sādāśīvapadam mahān}.

The text and interpretation of 33b, \textit{bhūtvā sādāśīvah padat} in most of the MSS, are uncertain. It could simply mean that Śrikanṭha redacted and taught the \textit{Tantra}, after learning it from Sadasiva. Such indeed appears to be the implication of 41d, transmitted as \textit{jñātvā sādāśīvah padat}; but, as with 33b, this too requires emendation for grammatical sense to emerge. Perhaps the most probable text is \textit{sādāśīvapadat}, in both cases; cf. the compound \textit{sādāśīvapada} in 35d. It is difficult to explain why both verses would transmit the nominative \textit{sādāśīvah}, however. Another possibility, although paleographically unlikely, could be \textit{bhūtvā sādāśīve pade}. This would fit the pattern of 39a, \textit{nirācārapade bhūtvā}, which has a similar context. A final possibility is to understand \textit{sādāśīvapadat} as a compound; the \textit{visarga} could represent a sort of metrical lengthening, necessitated because \textit{sādāśīvapadat} would be unmetrical. In any case, the meaning seems to be, “coming into being from the level of the \textit{sādāśīva tattva}.” See below from 35. The undifferentiated mass of scriptural wisdom (\textit{nīśkalām jñānaugham}, 35b), emerging from \textit{bindu}, manifests (cf. \textit{bhūtvā} in 33b) at the level of Sadasiva (\textit{sādāśīvapade śhītaḥ}, 36b), from whence Śrikanṭha redacts and reveals the scriptures. It incidentally seems equally correct to say that Sadasiva teaches the scripture to Śrikanṭha, and that the scripture emerges from the \textit{sādāśīva tattva} or \textit{pad}.

\(^{61}\) On \textit{ṣrṇusvakāgra}, see the annotation ad 1.15.
iccha.62 By her, bindu was awakened.

35 Then, from the awakened bindu63 (؟) [emerged] the undifferentiated mass of scriptural wisdom. From this, (?) O Mahādevi, suddenly became manifest a body of mantras at the level of the sadāśiva [tattva], its body completely filled with the scriptural wisdom.64

36 (؟) From this, with the authorization of Sadāśiva (?),65 the creation then took place again,66 according to its nature, as the series of tattvas situated at the [supreme śakti] avadhūtā down to [the rudra] Hūhuka.67

---

62 Understanding the genitive śīcasya in the sense of the ablative, śīvat, as below with bindoh in 35a. Otherwise, the sense would be, “Śiva’s śakti arose.” Note the non-classical instrumental nāmeva, formed from the thematized stem nāma for nāman.

63 The genitive [prabuddhāsya] bindoh clearly has the sense of the ablative in 35a.

64 tātāḥ occurs in both 35a and 35b. In 35a, this surely has the sense of “next, then,” but its meaning is less clear in 35b. It could be redundant, or corrupt for tathā or yatāḥ, or perhaps ablative (= tasmāt) referring to jñānaughaḥ. The latter text could mean, “from the awakened bindu [emerged] the undifferentiated jñānaughaḥ; from that (tātāḥ) became manifest a body of mantras.” The translation reflects this interpretation. However, reading yatāḥ seems grammatically superior, as one can construe 35 as a single sentence. In either case, the interpretation requires one to supply the predicate nirgatam, and implies that scripture first emerges in an undifferentiated, nīskala form, afterwards taking on a manifest, i.e. sakala form at the level of Sadasiva, a body consisting of mantras. Cf. Bhairava described as mantravigraha in e.g. 1.3d. This generates the sequence parama śīva → iccha śakti → bindu → nīskala jñānaughaḥ → sakala jñānaughaḥ. A clear parallel for the jñānaughaḥ having a nīskala and sakala form is not presently evident. In the Uttarāśūtra of the Niṣṭikāśāstra, for example, the primordial śāstra emerges from parama śīva in the form of nīda; Sadāśiva then teaches this to Iśvara, who creates from it individuated tantras (1.22–25).

Should jñānaughaḥ instead constitute the subject of a single sentence, with the second tātāḥ redundant, the doctrinal problems are fewer; but we would have a neuter nominative agreeing with a series of masculine adjectives, beginning with abhivyaktah in 35c. This might not be impossible, however. In this case, one could translate, “Then, from the awakened bindu, the undifferentiated mass of scriptural wisdom suddenly then became manifest, O Mahādevi, as [or “having”] a body of mantras at the level of the sadāśiva [tattva], its body completely filled with the scriptural wisdom.”

65 As transmitted, it would seem that ‘anujñā (36a) agrees with srṣṭi. One could interpret this as a hetugarbhaśīkṣesana, an adjective of cause: “[the creation took place] insofar as it had authorization from Sadāśiva.” This seems unlikely, however. More probable is that ‘anujñā is nominative for instrumental, metri causa. Indeed, elsewhere we find similar feminine nominatives having an instrumental sense. Cf. śīvābhakti in LXXII.41b, and several occurrences of the same in LV.

66 tasmāt in 36a would refer to the jñānasampūrṇadvedaḥ, the embodiment of scripture and mantra. With Sadāśiva as instrumental cause, this embodied, sonic manifestation of the awakened bindu appears to function as the immediate material cause for the creation, the central constituents of which are the tattvas and mantra, and by extension of the latter, scripture.

67 It seems impossible to construe the MSS’s feminine accusative tattvamālam and its adjective hūhukāntādvihdhaṭtāḥ as. Most probably, the nominative underlies these, agreeing with and describing srṣṭī in 36d. It seems that hūhukāntādvihdhaṭtā tattvamālam refers to the series of tattvas beginning from śakti—i.e., the entire creation below paramāśīta. In the system of the Brahma, aṣṭavādāṭa is a common epithet of the supreme śakti; see 1.128 below. By extention, this is also a term for her mantra; cf. XIXII.47ab (avadhūtāḥ nyasat pūrvaṁ śīvādyamaniyoyakām). As for Hūhuka, Kubjikāmata 22.8a lists
37 For the good of people,68 O pious lady, the great mass of scriptural wisdom, consisting of the Vimala, was set down in abbreviated form with the name Amṛta.69

38–39 And the parāpara god [Sadāśiva],70 moreover, expounded to Śrīkanṭha [the scripture] consisting of mantra, doctrine, and ritual, after emerging from the state beyond observances,71 because of viewing both [the pure and impure] paths.72

---

68 Evidently, what A transmits as *kāmyāyāṃ must be understood in the sense of kāmyagyā, the instrumental. The expression lokāṇām hitaḥkāmyagyā, an even-pāda, is extremely common; cf., e.g., Svachchandatantra 10.484d, Tantrasadhbhava 24.236b, and thrice below (1.40d, 44d, and 106d). Although one could interpret *kāmyāyāṃ as locative in the sense of the instrumental, perhaps it is better to consider it as an instrumental singular with metrical lengthening, followed by hiatus-breaking –m-. Cf. xxxi.1, yayā viṣṇātmanātārāyā dē[ṣ][u] karma pravartate; here we have an instrumental with metrical lengthening, but no hiatus-breaking m. See also, e.g., icchāyā in iv.33c and lxxiii.76b, and hitakāmyāyā–m- in i. This variety of feminine instrumental occurs in the Siddhayogesvarimata so frequently that Törszók remarks, “Stems on -a usually have “āya instead of “a in the singular instrumental.” “Doctrine of Magic Female Spirits,” §§2.2 (p. xxxvii). The same cannot be said of the language of the BraYā, however, in which these are exceptions.

69 In the text as transmitted, there is a syntactical problem insofar as no predicate is explicit until prabhāṣītam in 39d. The most probable solution seems to be emending nyāpandhas to ni[bbuddha, agreeing with jñānasūya in 37d. Cf. the expression nibaddhagranthasya below in 1.85a. The question arises whether to take 37 and 38 together, or rather 38 and 39, as has been preferred here. In favor of the latter, samāsena (37c) and samkṣepa (38b) would be tautologous; but otherwise, it might seem preferable that the instrumentals in 38 construe with nibuddhan in 37c. In any case, the three verses seem to form a unit.

70 parāparya devena, 39c, refers to Sadāśiva, who is intermediate with respect to para śiva and īśvara. Cf. xxviii.84, which specifies Sadāśiva as the teacher of the primecordial scripture to Śrīkanṭha: adimo jñānasandaloḥas tribijṣ triotraṇaḥ vinirvataḥ | sadāśivanena devena śrīkanṭhyāḥ prabhāṣītāḥ[.]

71 In the BraYā, nirūcārapada ("the state beyond conduct") signifies the condition of the supreme Śiva, with avadhūtī as the corresponding term for the supreme Śakti. These terms are discussed in the annotation on BraYā II.1.1c–2. Normally, these terms find application less in cosmology than in ritual: e.g. the sādhuca is to perform māla of the avadhūtī, that is, create for himself a śakti-body (avadhūtī, and remain in the meditative condition beyond ritual activity (nirūcārapadavasītha). The implication here seems to be that Sadāśiva emerges from the state of non-dual yogic absorption.

72 In 39b, the elliptical ubhaya appears to mean ubhayamārga; Sadāśiva is described as ubhayamārgaravartin in xxxii.323d. The two "paths" are the "pure" and "impure" (śuddha and aśuddha), and by extension the śuddhāsuddha or mixed (mīra). These are categories relevant to the classification of scriptures and their corresponding practitioners; it is unclear whether they also pertain to the cosmological division between the pure and impure 'courses' (adhyāņa). Much relevant material from the BraYā is quoted and discussed in chapter 5, section 4.
He did so by composing in the anusthūbḥ meter,\(^7\) abbreviated, with [verses] numbering one and a quarter-hundred thousand, O great woman.\(^7\)4

40-41 From this scripture,\(^7\)5 O Mahādevi, seeking the good, Śrīkaṇṭha made manifold the tantras, learnt from the state of Sadāśiva,\(^7\)6 with millions and millions of elaborations for the good of all, because of differences in the interlocuters and recipients,\(^7\)7 on account of the divisions of types of ritual, because of the pure and impure paths,\(^7\)8 and because of lack of sattva,\(^7\)9 O pious lady.

42 But this mass of scriptural wisdom,\(^8\)0 existing in its true form, my dear, numbering one and a quarter hundred-thousand verses, was learnt by me as it really is.

43 I shall now also teach you, whose knowledge of scripture was lost, that which was arranged by division into one and a quarter hundred-thousand śloka-verses.\(^8\)1

44-45 From this emerged the entire universe, animate and inanimate. Out of desire

\(^7\)3 Compare 38a with 1.24ab of the Uttarāsūtra in the Nīṣvātstantra: anustupchandabandhena devebhyaḥ pratipādiṁ. Note in both instances thematization of chandas as an a-stem; chando0 would be unmetrical.

\(^7\)4 If correct, mahāttmaṇa in 38b would have to modify deveṇa, despite its syntactical distance. However, it seems more likely to be a corruption of the vocative mahāttmane, for classical mahāttman, based on a thematized feminine stem atmaṇa; mahāttmane occurs at the end of even pādās no fewer than thirty-seven times in the BraYā.

\(^7\)5 40a in A is damaged. From what can be discerned, and from the readings of D and E, it seems A would have read asmā jhānā mahādevi, presumably meaning (and perhaps originally reading) asmaj jhāṇān mahādevi. Even if A elided the ablative endings, it seems impossible to know whether this is original.

\(^7\)6 prcchakāśraya seems to mean “interlocuters and recipients”; it might otherwise be a karmadhāraya compound meaning, “the interlocuters who are recipients [of the tantras].” The phrase prcchakāśrayabhedena occurs as xxxvm.i4a and 30c as well. Note also that 40c occurs again as XXXI.29c and xxxviii.96a.

\(^7\)7 On the division suddha and asuddha, see the annotation ad 39.

\(^7\)8 Evidently the masculine ayam must be understood as neuter, in agreement with "sandoham, although the latter should in classical Sanskrit be masculine. It seems evident that jhānasandohajjhānaugha.

\(^7\)9 In the BraYā, sattva ("spirit" or "heroic spirit") is a quality of vital importance for carrying out extreme rituals. Cf. especially BraYā xiv.212ab-219ab, quoted in chapter 1, part 1 (n. 44). What appears relevant here is that not all tantras teach such rituals, since many practitioners lack sattva.

\(^8\)0 The feminine instrumental tayā transmitted by the mss in 43a seems implausible. What underlies this is likely to be tava, i.e. tavoti. This would agree with "bhraṣṭaḥ (bhraṣṭaḥs in A) and express the indirect object of sampravakṣyati in 43b.
for the good of people and with authorization from the Śakti, (¿) abiding with a nature semi-divine (?), you too should teach the [tantra] numbering one and a quarter hundred-thousand [verses] to the venerable Krodhabhairava, who attains perfection by the will of Śiva. Thus did speak Bhairava.

After the one named Krodhabhairava (?), you shall speak the [Tantra of] One and a Quarter Hundred-thousand to Kapalabhairava, O pious lady.

He is a brahmin named Śrīdhara born in Kurukṣetra, O intelligent woman, who possesses entitlement to the teachings and whose mind is empowered by the śakti, and who has not reached perfection, undoubtedly.

Kapalabhairava, O goddess, will contract the [Tantra of] One and a Quarter Hundred-thousand using twenty-four thousand [verses], for [the good] of people.

---

82 Here, sthitaya has been construed with tvaya, with °kamyaya and °anujhaya taken separately as instrumentals of cause. The expression divyadhivyasvabhavena elsewhere finds application in classifying deities. BraYa iv categorizes divine beings and their ritual icons into the categories of divyadhika, divya, divyadivyasvabhava, and aditya. In the divya category fall the Yoginis, guhyakas, Mothers, and kimkarls, along with their consorts (patayāḥ), the sixty-eight rudras, yoginis of sacred fields (kṣetrasamśhitāḥ, and lokapālas. In the divyadivyasvabhava category come the hundred rudras, the lāmūs, and rākṣasas. Perhaps in the present case, the implication is that the Devī should remain among mortals in a merely semi-divine state, teaching the tantra for the good of humankind.

83 Although he is referred to as deva, this is an honorific, for “Krodhabhairava” is likely to be the initiatory name of an individual and not a deity; and likewise with Kapalabhairava, Padmabhairava, and so forth. BraYa xxxiii (on abhiseka) describes a system of naming based upon clan or gotra affiliation as determined by where lands a flower cast into the mandala. Male initiands receive names in the pattern of mandala deity + bhairava, e.g. Raktabhairava, should the flower land upon the goddess Raktā. A total of 23 (male) names in this pattern occur in the present chapter. Many, but not all of these, are based upon the mandala of the BraYa, as presented in xxxiii in the context of abhiseka. Female initiands, it seems, append the designation sakti rather than bhairava: nārīnā yada pātah sthanesv etesu jayaṃ | tena gotraṃ lāṃ nāman śaktisamśijyaṃ tadā bhuvet (BraYa xxxiii.199oc–200ab).

84 It is difficult to interpret the ablative krodhabhairavasamjhaṃkāt, 46b. The context suggests a temporal sense, perhaps, “after [teaching] the one called Krodhabhairava, [you shall teach Kapalabhairava].” However, it is possible that this is short for krodhabhairavasamjhaṃkāt jñātva; but this would have the goddess learning the same 125,000 verse scripture she had herself taught. Note the parallel construction in 51, with the syntax being kapalabhairavattā padmabhairavasamjhaṃkāya vakṣyasi.

85 It seems almost equally likely that mahānāte in 47b is a vocative addressing the goddess, as has been adopted, or a corruption from the genitive mahānātē, modifying kapalabhairavasamjhayā. As a vocative, mahānāte seems to occur only once elsewhere in the BraYa, in xvii.14b.

86 This alternation primarily pertains to saṃhāra / saṃghāra and the verbal forms of saṃ /hr, but also e.g. śīṃha and śīṃgha (the latter preferred; e.g. śīṃghānti, xxix.137a and iii.59c). Note in
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of little intelligence, but with the ritual procedure of the Root Tantra remaining in its essential form, without the four divisions [of mudrā, māndala, mantra, and vidyās], etc.

50cd–51 (♀) He will obtain siddhi in this very [tantra], not otherwise. After Kapala-bhairava reaches perfection (?), you will teach [this] to the one named Padma-bhairava, who has not attained perfection. Thus did speak Bhairava.

52 He is born in the land of Odra with the name Devadatta, (♀) with authorization [to hear the scripture] (?); his Vedic branch is bāhucā. ⁸⁸

The term carama, "Vedic school," sometimes otherwise unattested in the feminine. Here it has perhaps taken on the gender of its predicate—bāhucā, as reads A, a term that doesn’t match any of the major Vedic schools. This is almost certain to be corrupt for the name of a school of Rgvedins, bāhucā, the vulgate Rgveda being bāhucā. In 74de, we probably have reference to another brahmin who is bāhucā; in this case too, A is corrupt, reading bāhucā.

The string atha iśeṣa na sansāṛaḥ in 52cd is syntactically ambiguous. Although its pāda-final position does not suggest such, one might expect atha in 52c to point forward, as sentence-initial. But despite the difficulty of construing it with the sentence beginning in 51a, coming as it would near its end, it appears preferable to take it this way. This provides better distribution of sense units with pāda boundaries, and also avoids the problem of an otherwise unusual initial position for expression na.
35-54 Then, no doubt, this very Padmabhārava, though he has not reached perfection, will once again reduce the *Tantra of Twenty-four Thousand* using twelve thousand verses, by the will of Śiva.\(^90\) You will then reach siddhi with this very tantra.\(^91\)

55 In the presence of the unperfected one [and] you yourself, fourteen disciples will listen to this tantra, O woman of great fortune.\(^92\)

56 One by the name Raktabhairava, another one, Jvalabhairava, and also Helabhairava: O woman of great fame, all three of these are born in Madhyadeśa, and [their] Vedic branch is atharvana.\(^93\)

57 Vāmabhārava, O goddess, and another, Vijayabhārava,\(^94\) are said to be śūdras by caste, born in Saurāstra.

\(^{sāṃśaya:}\) Moreover, if adesa construes with 53-54ab, it would have to be an instrumental of cause, and hence redundant given śivecchaya (54b). Also, the most probable sense for adesa in this context is adesa 'ṣya śāstrasya śrutābhya; cf. 63cd, which states this meaning explicitly. It hence seems best to construe this as an associative instrumental with 52abc, meaning, "[he is a brahmin born in the land of Oḍra], with authorization [to learn the scripture]." It is also possible that adesa means śaṭyādeṣa; cf. xxxiii.192d. Note incidentally the absence of vowel sandhi across the pada boundary of 52cd.

\(^90\) It seems that with Padmabhārava, we finally obtain the Dvadasasahasra, i.e. the BraYa.

\(^91\) It seems probable that in 54c, mantreṇa is corrupt for tantiṃeṇa; referring to a textual redaction as mantra seems unusual. In 54d, A's prayāṣayasi arouses the same suspicion as prayāṣayasi in 50d, as reads A: it might be corrupt for the third person. Here however there is no grammatical compulsion to read thus. In fact, there is also some reason to retain the second person, for 55a still refers to Padmabhārava as asiddha. We would not expect this had he attained siddhi according to 54d, unless the point is that he was asiddha when the text was redacted.

\(^92\) The syntax of 55 leaves room for doubt, with sakāśti construing with either or both of the genitives (asiddhasya and tava). It is hence unclear whether the fourteen disciples (55d) learn the tantra from Padmabhārava or the Goddess—or perhaps both, as I have tentatively conjectured. Whichever be the case, the fourteen are later described as disciples of Padmabhārava, from whom, in 64b, Candābhairava is specifically said to learn the tantra. The form śr炯ṣyanti in 55c is unusual, apparently the third person plural future of śru, in the active voice (equivalent to classical śroṣyanti). In 55b, note the (metri causa) absence of sandhi between tava and eva.

\(^93\) 63d, which A transmits as caraṇam paraṇam tathā, should provide the Vedic sākha of these three disciples. But there seems to be no Vedic school referred to as paraṇa. Most probably, this is a corruption from atharvana; cf. 59cd, referring to Candābhairava as an atharvana brahmin. Confusion between tha and pa is unsurprising in old Newāri writing. An emended text for 56d might be caraṇo 'tharvanam tathā, or else caraṇa'atharvanam tathā. In the second case, which has been adopted, we would have metri causa elision of the case ending, or else the feminine caraṇ, as in 52c.

\(^94\) Note that 57b is hypermetrical, and has three initial short syllables. See the annotation ad 1.20. In both names provided in 57ab, as with others below, the final ka has no meaning and merely accommodates the name to the meter.
Bhībhatsabhairava, O goddess, Gajakarṇabhairava, and Caṇḍabhairava, originate in the territory of Sindh.

The [first] two are Rājput kṣatriyas, while Caṇḍabhairava is, no doubt, a brahmin, an atharvāna by way of Vedic school, O goddess.

He, the excellent son of Yajñasoma, is born in the village named Brhodari, O Mahādevī; in this matter, there is no need for deliberation.

O queen of the gods, there outside the village is [a temple of] the goddess Brhodari. Because of her name, that village is known as Brhodari.

That brahmin of great spirit, after worshipping the goddess Brhodari and then

---

95 The orthography bhībhatsa occurs consistently for bibhatsa in A, with one exception (xxi.210c).
96 It seems that sindhuvisayasambhavah must be emended to the plural, for following the pattern of this section, 58d should convey the origins of all three individuals mentioned in 1.58. Note that this pāda has the metrical fault of short syllables in the second and third positions, and is likely to be original.
97 brhodari is probably Middle Indic for bhṛhadudari, “She of the Massive Belly,” formed with a thematicized a-stem bhṛ for bhṛ.
98 60d, nātra kārya vicārānā, is one of the stock phrases most prevalent in the BraYā. It stands for what would in standard Sanskrit be nātra kārya vicārānā—a phrase common in the epic literature and purāṇas. In its well over one-hundred occurrences, the “correct” form does not appear a single time in A; nātra kārya vicārānā does occur twice, however (iv.179b and xxiv.44b). The phrase appears in the same “incorrect” form several times in the Tantrasadbhdva and a few other Śaiva sources. Although the reason for kārya dropping its case ending is unclear, in vicārānā, we see at work the dual linguistic tendencies of dropping some final consonants, influenced by Middle-Indic, and the addition of ungrammatical final consonants in a sort of Sanskritic hyper-correction. Loss of a final consonant occurs most frequently with the -āt of the optative third person singular and masculine ablative singular. Correspondingly, the addition of a spurious -t seems comparatively common after -ā. Cf. yaḍrccchayāt for yaḍrccchayā in xxii.3d. At some point, the feminine vicārānā must have been suspected of being ablative, and its spelling ‘corrected’. This situation seems best explained by final -t being widely omitted in pronunciation, but nonetheless considered a defining feature of Sanskrit spelling, to such an extent that -t, and likewise anusvāra, was added as a sort of Sanskritic hyper-correction. On the influence of pronunciation in this matter, Edgerton’s observations concerning Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit seem quite relevant: “Word-final consonants which would be dropped in all Middle-Indic are often written. But a careful study of the metrical structure of the verses has revealed the fact that in some respects, at least, this Sanskritized spelling is a mere window-dressing, and misrepresents the actual pronunciation, which was Middle-Indic.” Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit, vol. 1, p. 5. What distinguishes the language of the BraYā is misapplication of this orthographic “window-dressing” to the point of grammatical absurdity. Of course, only one layer of this is likely to be authorial, while much is surely scribal.
99 It seems evident that the masculine tasya would be corrupt for tasya, referring to Brhodari. It is conceivable that A’s so grāmo is original, although here the correct sa grāmo in B has been followed.
100 It has not yet been possible to identify this village of Sindh, or other references to it. Note that while no corruption is evident, 61b has the metrical fault of “syncopation:” the pattern “- - - - - -” in the final six syllables.
obtaining the *vidyā*-mantra alone,101 O pious lady, will perform *japa* in that very place.102 And then, he will receive authorization to learn this scripture, no doubt.

64 He shall learn from Padmabhairava.103 Having reached perfection there, that brahmin shall become (?) an author of *tantras* (?).104

65-66 And (?) melting down this subject matter (?),105 this knower of the *tattvas* will contract [the *tantra*] using [verses] measuring eighteen-hundred, and likewise he will contract using thirteen and seven [hundred verses].106 O pious lady, for the good of people.107 On this matter, one need not deliberate.108

67 (?) Since acting without authorization (?),109 attainment of scriptural wisdom does not come about,110 he will teach people the ritual procedure of the *vidyā*-mantra alone, in a brief form, for the good [of people] through a group of three among...
68 And Kumārabhairava, O goddess, after listening to the [recension of] eighteen-hundred [verses] from Candābhāiraṇa,\(^{112}\) will then cause it to spread.\(^{113}\)

69 Likewise, O goddess, Krodhabhairava will learn the [recension of] thirteen-hundred [verses] from Candābhāiraṇa, and cause it to spread.\(^{114}\)

70 And Tejabhairava, moreover, will listen to the [recension of] seven-hundred [verses] from Candābhāiraṇa,\(^{115}\) and he will spread it.\(^{116}\) In [this narrative of] scriptural revelation, the Group of Three disciples has been taught thus.\(^{117}\)

71–72ab Now,\(^{118}\) among those fourteen [disciples] who will be famous in the fu-

\(^{111}\) In 67d, it seems one should understand \textit{tatra as teṣāṃ lokaṇāṃ madhye}. If this is correct, then Kumārabhairava, Krodhabhairava, and Tejabhairava, mentioned in the next verses, comprise the \textit{tritayaka} mentioned in 67d. It might otherwise be possible that \textit{tritayaka} refers to the three scriptures Candābhāiraṇa prepares; but this is unlikely, since 70c specifically refers to \textit{sīgāṇāṃ trihayāṃ}, “a threesome of disciples.” Note that with \textit{ṛtaṇaṃ,} as reads A, we have evidence that \textit{ṛ} was considered equivalent to \textit{ṛ}; these alternate with great frequency in A. It seems impossible to reconstruct the degree to which this was original to the text.

\(^{112}\) In 68c, the genitive \textit{candabhairavakasya} has been understood in the sense of the ablative; note the ablatives (by emendation) in the parallel positions in 69c and 70c.

\(^{113}\) The three verses 68–70 appear to have parallel structures, although the case endings transmitted in the mss are inconsistent. It seems most probable that the first \textit{pāda} of each verse should contain a nominative, although the mss appear to transmit accusatives in 68a and 70a. If we were to understand these as accusatives, they would have to be indirect objects of \textit{sravayisyati}, continuing from 67c, with the second \textit{pāda}s’ \textit{āśūdāśasaśataṃ}, etc., as additional direct objects. But this is extremely awkward, for then Kumārabhairava, etc., must be understood as unstated subjects of the verbs in the fourth \textit{pāda}s of 68–70.

The interpretation of \textit{vistarayisyati} (68d, 69d) and (the apparently equivalent) \textit{vistarisyati} (70d) is uncertain. This appears to mean “will cause to spread,” i.e. disseminate. However, it could instead have the sense of “will expand/elaborate upon,” or even “make larger,” i.e. expand the size of the recension.

\(^{114}\) Here A’s \textit{krodhabhairavako} is emended to the accusative, following the pattern of 68a and 70a. A’s \textit{candabhairavakāś caiva} in 69c appears to be a corruption of \textit{bhairavakāś caiva}, with the ablative. Neither the singular nor plural nominative seems plausible contextually, and \textit{sc} is a relatively minor corruption from \textit{cc}. Precisely the same emendation must be made in 70c.

\(^{115}\) Here, \textit{tejas} is thematized as \textit{teja}. Note also the occurrence of \textit{nāmanah} (by emendation) in the sense of the singular, though this would be plural in classical Sanskrit. Cf. 73a, 86c, etc., below.

\(^{116}\) In 70d, \textit{vistarisyati} appears to be identical in sense to the causative \textit{vistarayisyati} in 1.68d and 69d. Cf. \textit{vistaram kartuvātḥchaya}, 91d, which appears in sense identical to 98b, \textit{vistaram kartuvātḥchaya}, assuming the text is correct.

\(^{117}\) Here, it seems \textit{avyātare} might have the sense of \textit{asmin śāstrātātare}. Only A reads thus; the other mss transmit \textit{avātaram}, which seems implausible, unless one understands this to mean \textit{avātaram samproktam, sīgāṇāṃ trihayāṃ proktah ca}.

\(^{118}\) \textit{hy atrā} in 71a brings us back to the enumeration of fourteen disciples of Padmabhāiraṇa, among whom Candābhāiraṇa was eighth.
ture are two disciples of Padmabhairava, named Karālabhairava and Ucchusma-
bhairava, born in the mātāṅga caste.

72 And another one, Yamabhairava, will take birth in Kāśmīra; and [this] other one
will be a chandoga brahmin, O goddess.119

73 And likewise, there will be another named Viśṇubhairava in the territory of
Lampā, a vājimadhyāṇudina brahmin.

74 And the brahmin Dakṣiṇabhairava,120 born in Kāśi, shall be another disciple, a
bahvṛca [brahmin], no doubt.121

75 And in Oḍḍiyāna, O Mahādevī, there shall be a taittirīya- and apastambha-brahmin,
Śekharabhairava.122

76-77 The fourteen disciples of Padmabhairava have been stated. After learning the
_Tantra of Twelve-thousand_, they shall attain siddhi, O pious lady; and the ones des-
ignated “the group of fourteen” shall write commentaries for disciples desirous
of siddhi,123 whose minds are empowered by the sakti.124

78 And, resorting to the Sixth Place,125 (ि) Svacchandabhairava, learning [the _tantra_]

---

119 A syntactical problem begins in 72: four disciples of Padmabhairava are listed in 72–75, one per
verse, but there are present five future forms of bhū announcing them, one of which must be redundant,
it seems. 72d, _tathā anyo bhavisyati_ (note the omission of vowel sandhi), would be redundant in light
of _citrayah ... sambhavisyati_ in 72ab, and should hence begin a new sentence. But this would make
73d likewise redundant, which in turn would make likewise 74d, leaving us with a redundant 75d.
Instead, the pattern of 73–75 seems to be that of having sentence-final verbs (_bhavisyati_)
in the fourth pádas, which suggests that the problem lies in a clumsy redundancy in 72 itself. Accepting this as the
solution, there is still present, however, the comparatively minor redundancy of _tathā_ twice in 73b and
73d.

120 A’s _dakṣiṇabhāraṇa_ is unmetrical, and one might emend to _dakṣiṇābharaṇa_; cf. _dakṣiṇāmūrti_,
the form of Śiva. However, some metrical flexibility is to be expected in the case of proper names, and,
furthermore, A is elsewhere inconsistent in the spelling of _dakṣiṇ[ā]_.

121 In 74c, A’s _bahvṛya_ is likely to be corrupt for _bahvṛḷa_; on this emendation, see the annotation ad
52 above. B instead emends to the implausible but at least intelligible _bahvṛḷa_.

122 Note the absence of vowel sandhi across the páda boundary of 75cd.

123 Here, _vākhyām kariṣyanti_ could also mean, “they will explain [the _tantra_],” rather than “they will
compose commentaries.”

124 78b, _caturdasa tu samjhakah_, appears to be poor Sanskrit for _caturdāsasamjñakah_, which would be
hypometrical. One could account for this as a split compound, perhaps. But grammatically preferable,
one could consider emending to _samjñitāh_.

125 It seems that _saṣṭham śūnanam_ refers to the _brahmadoṣa, brahmabila_, or _brahmaraṇdha_, the pinnacle
of the subtle body and portal through which ascends the soul of the departing yogī. Cf. _Kubjikāmata_
of Padmabhairava in the presence of Krodhabhairava (?).\textsuperscript{126}

79 shall next once more contract the \textit{Tantra of Twelve-thousand},\textsuperscript{127} using ten thousand [verses], O queen of the gods, (?) with his mind empowered by the \textit{sakti} (?)\textsuperscript{128}

80 He shall teach people the \textit{Tantra of Twelve-thousand} by the power of the yoginis, with its narrative of revelation cut out, my dear.

\textsuperscript{126} The syntactical problems are considerable in 78abcd, which might construe together, continuing into 79 with \textit{samharisyati} as the primary verb. Here, A transmits no fewer than three apparent nominatives: \textit{padmabhairavakas} (78a), \textit{svacchandabhairavo} (78c), and \textit{krodhabhairavah} (78d). That 78ab does not construe with 77 is suggested by an apparently sentence-connective \textit{ca} in 78a; otherwise, \textit{padmabhairavakas} could describe \textit{caturdasa}, perhaps in the sense of “disciples of Padmabhairava.” One should then also emend \textit{aśritāḥ} to the plural. In that case, the phrase \textit{sastham vai sthanam aśritāḥ} might describe the mode by which they create commentaries for disciples.

Otherwise, taking 78a-79 together, a plausible solution might be as follows: \textit{svacchandabhairavah}, a correction from "bhairavo, should be taken as the subject, in agreement with \textit{aśritāḥ}; and \textit{sakāśāt} \textit{krodhabhairavah} should be understood as \textit{sakāśāt krodhabhairavasya}, with nominative for genitive, \textit{metri causa}. Construing \textit{krodhabhairavah} with \textit{sakāśāt} is suggested by their proximity, just as on the same basis \textit{srutvd} seems more likely to construe with \textit{svacchandabhairavah}. That Svacchandabhairava is the subject of \textit{samharisyati}, i.e. that he abbreviates the \textit{Dvādasasahasara}, also appears confirmed by 1.110. As for \textit{padmabhairavakas}, this could potentially be emended to \textit{padmabhairavakah}, meaning, “the text redacted by Padmabhairava.” This term could be quite appropriate, for the scriptural redaction in question is the \textit{Dvādasasahasara} (see 79a), which Padmabhairava is responsible for redacting from twenty-four thousand verses (1.53-54). This reading has been tentatively adopted. But a more paleographically likely emendation is the ablative \textit{padmabhairavakac}; cf. 69c and 70c, where identical emendations have been made. In this case, \textit{dvādasasahasram} in 79a should be the object of \textit{srutvd}. One final solution, requiring more emendation and liberty with the word order, involves emending \textit{padmabhairavakas} \textit{caiva} to \textit{padmabhairavakasya}, meaning, “Padmabhairava’s \textit{Tantra of Twelve-thousand},” with \textit{dvādasasahasram} the object of \textit{srutvd}. This might work better if one reads \textit{atha} instead of \textit{artham} in 79a (see below).

The question arises as to which Krodhabhairava is referred to here: a Krodhabhairava was the first pupil of the goddess, while another one, apparently, was one of Candabhairava’s three pupils. Neither appears to have learned the \textit{Dvādasasahasara}, and here we could well have a third Krodhabhairava.

\textsuperscript{127} A might in 79a read \textit{artha dvādasā}; but the possible \textit{repha} is unclear. In any case, this should probably be corrected to \textit{atha dvādasā}, as read the other \textit{ms}. However, note also the construction \textit{arthālām galayitva} in 65a, where \textit{artha} apparently refers to the \textit{sāstra} or its content. This lends some plausibility to the emendation \textit{artham dvādasasahasram}, perhaps in the sense of “the subject matter which is the \textit{Tantra of Twelve-thousand}.”

\textsuperscript{128} Whatever the correct reading, its sense, and perhaps text, is probably similar to that of \textit{saktyavistena cetasā}, which occurs as LXXX.155b. Cf. also \textit{saktyadhishthitacetasām}, 1.114b, and \textit{bhaktyaśistena cetasā}, 1.17d. I have tentatively adopted the conjecture \textit{saktyadhisht Hitacetasā}.
81–82a. Born in Ujjainī to brahmins,\textsuperscript{129} who, as she has had many miscarriages, bathes and ritually sips water, [then appears] before the Mother goddesses, desiring a son.\textsuperscript{130}

82cd–83. The Mothers,\textsuperscript{133} impelled by the sakti, cast into her womb one who had chanted the vidyā-mantra and was full of power, named Amantrī (“not possessing a mantra”)\textsuperscript{134} because of not having reached perfection on account of violating the Pledges (?).\textsuperscript{135}

\textsuperscript{129}This passage appears to provide further pedigree for Svacchandabhairava, rather than introduce someone new; cf. the description of Candābhairava, 1.59b–67. See also the annotation ad 83 below. In 81a, A’s ujjainīyaḥṛṣaḥ is likely to be original, Middle Indic for ujjainīyaḥ (cf. modern ujjain). Ujjainī occurs also as the name for one of the eight smaśānas of the manḍala in III.17d. Locatives on -I ending -yaḥṛṣaḥ occur frequently in the Brahī; cf., e.g., uṣṭhāyaḥṛṣaḥ (III.17a), saṃpūṭhyaḥṛṣaḥ and anāmasyaḥṛṣaḥ (III.18c and 18d, respectively), tarjasyaḥṛṣaḥ (xiv.103b, iv.77c, and v.83a), and nihyāyaḥṛṣaḥ (xiv.54a, etc.), to name a few. One might account for these as first involving formation of bases on -ṛṣaḥ, e.g., uṣṭhāyaḥ for uṣṭhāḥ; feminines on -ṛṣaḥ for -I indeed occur frequently in the Siddhāyogesvarīmata (see Torzok, “Doctrine of Magic Female Spirits,” xxxviii).

\textsuperscript{130}There is considerable uncertainty concerning what A reads as ukapuṭraka in 81b. If correct, this should mean “the son of Uka;” but the name seems both unusual and improbable. Parsing differently, one could perhaps readvipro jukapuṭrakaḥ: “a brahmin, the son of Jouka;” but this would be an unusual Middle-Indic name. Moreover, there is a strong possibility that this compound should communicate the individual’s Vedic sākha or caraṇa, for such information is present in the case of almost every other brahmin mentioned as such in this chapter. No known sākha or caraṇa is readily discernable in ukapuṭraka. Underlying putraka could conceivably be pautraka or potraka; pautra and potra can apparently refer to the office of the potr, one of sixteen officiants of the Vedic sacrifice. The expression uktapattraka, “having verses as wings,” occurs apparently in the Vaiṣṇavacarya Samhitā (Monier-Williams, Sanskrit-English Dictionary, 172), and Apte claims this can mean both “sacrifice” and “sacrificer” (yajamāna). Practical Sanskrit-English Dictionary, 395. Rather improbably, uktapattraka could denote a Vedic branch of those specializing in uktitas (“praise hymns”), counterparts of the udgātr or chandoga brahmin (cf. 1.72c). Note that if viproota is correct, and the next compound begins -u, this would reflect non-standard sandhi.

\textsuperscript{131}The name Deikā is Middle Indic for Devikā. As with Sattikā (28c) and the goddess Brhodarī (60–62), Middle-Indicisms, incidentally, seem especially frequent with female names.

\textsuperscript{132}The plural jñānanti transmitted in 82a seems improbable, and has been emended to the singular. Presumably, the idea is that Deikā performs jñānanti prior to appearing before the Mothers, rather than “in front of the Mothers,” as the text suggests.

\textsuperscript{133}mātarāḥ in 83b is probably original, formed from a thematized stem mātar for mātr. The possibility is of course present that mātarāḥ is corrupt for the “correct” mātarah, which occurs frequently enough; yet sufficient evidence exists for considering A’s reading plausible. Note for example the plural genitive mātarānām (iv.56d, lxxvii.191c, xlii.2cd and 26b) and accusative mātarāḥ (11.14c), as well as numerous other occurrences of the plural mātarāḥ. We even find an instrumental plural mātarāḥ (lxxvii.53b) formed from a stem mātara.

\textsuperscript{134}kṣipṣyantī in 83a (corrected from kṣipṣyantī) seems to be an irregular third person future of kṣip, for classical kṣipyantī. This reflects influence from simplified Middle Indic verbal systems based on the present indicative, with kṣip / kṣipṣati formed here on analogy of the type bhavati / bhavyantī.

\textsuperscript{135}In 82a, it is difficult to decide whether to retain the masculine jptacaydo mahatēvṛtya which A transmits, referring to amantrānmakas (83d); this might also be corrupt for the feminine, referring to Deikā. Gender confusion is not improbable here; note the mss’s tasya for tasāYa in 83c below. If the masculine is correct, then ‘nāmakas is probably original, a nominative which is accusative in sense as the object of kṣipṣyantī. From the standpoint of grammar, the most satisfactory text would involve emending to the
Afterwards, O Mahâdevî, by their power he shall attain the vidyâ-mantra and perform its japa, and will then learn the scripture.\textsuperscript{136}

And then, having set down the text through the power of divine contact,\textsuperscript{137} he shall speak the scriptural matter entirely, using ten thousand [verses].\textsuperscript{138} Afterwards, he shall subsequently achieve siddhi through this very scriptural wisdom.

O queen of the gods, the one named Candabhairava shall again [re-]fashion this very Tantra of Ten Thousand using seven thousand [verses]. [In him] shall arise the aspiration to fashion [a tantra of] twelve thousand.\textsuperscript{139}

\textsuperscript{136} A's bhavetsyati in 8qd is rather bizarre; while this could potentially be a corruption of bhavisyati, it seems preferable to adopt the conjecture sa vetsyati (or perhaps ca vetsyati) proposed by Isaacson (personal communication, November 2005).

\textsuperscript{137} divyasânga must refer to the yogic mode by which Svachchandabhairava learns the scripture, referred to in 78. This is by no means a well-attested expression. One might wonder whether anubhâvâ is used here in the sense of anubhava, meaning "perception;" but cf. prabhavatvâ in 84b, with which it might rather be synonymous.

\textsuperscript{138} A syntactical problem is present in 85, insofar as the referent of the genitive transmitted in 85a, and subject of the verb in 85d, are unclear. The former, nibaddhagranthasåya, could be the object of kathayisyati; but this could also be corrupt for nibaddhagranthatå ca, and hence contain the subject. Only the latter offers a clear interpretation: "[Amantri], by whom the scripture had been assembled/composed (nibaddha) due to the power (anubhava) of divine contact (divyasânga), will speak the scriptural material (artha) entirely, using ten thousand [verses]." This interpretation has been adopted.

\textsuperscript{139} In 87d, A's unintelligible karttå is probably corrupt for kartu" (as emends B); cf. kartvacchâyå in 91d and 98b. These are unusual formations, for in classical Sanskrit, the compounding of infinitives (here kartum) is, I believe, restricted to the cases of -kâma and -manus.
And he shall not (♀) allow his divine disciples to contract the scriptural material (?). Of course, the causative kāryaṣyati would in this case be expected. Cf. constructions with / da + infinitive / x, meaning “to not allow to X.” It is not impossible that so is original. Although in classical Sanskrit, the visarga in saḥ is expected to drop before any consonant, this is not always the case in the BraYā, wherein saḥ frequently takes ordinary sandhi. Note e.g. the metrically required so in the odd pādasa ṣambharaṇaḥ bharoṣe so hi (xxi.94a) and vīro bharoti so devi (xliv.691a).

The meaning of divyaṣīṣyaṇam in 88a is uncertain, but in light of the meaning of divya in 87b, the point might be that Candabhairava had disciples to whom he transmitted the teachings yogically.

It is not entirely clear what the vighna, “obstructing force,” is an obstruction to: both the redaction of scripture and the quest for siddhi seem possible. It might be equivalent to saying na siddhim prayāṣyati (cf. 9od).

It is difficult to interpret the mss’s dasasamjñakah in 90b, which appears to agree with māyābhairavanaṁ, in 90. 90d does not specify in respect to what or through what Māyābhairava fails to attain siddhi. Such information elsewhere finds expression with an instrumental; cf. 86ab, . . . tenaiva jñānena . . . siddhim sa lapṣyatī. It is just conceivable that an instrumental dasasamkhyayā (“through a text of ten-thousand?”) underlies dasasamjñakah, possibly corrupted under the influence of samjñakah in 92b. Another possibility is the locative dasasamjñake: “with respect to the tantra called ‘Ten-[thousand]?” The latter has been tentatively adopted, although neither possibility seems compelling.

On the interpretation of 91b, see the annotation ad 68d, 70, and 87.

It would seem that mālaḥa, masculine, must be a substantive agreeing with the neuter prabhāṣītan. See the annotation ad 1.32–33. The masculine prabhāṣito would here also be metrically acceptable; but the fluidity of the masculine and neuter suggest caution in emending.

The number saptatīma is non-standard Sanskrit for saptatīma, “seventieth.” On the formation of ordinals, see the annotation on the colophon of BraYā tv (n. 89).

In the Dvāparayuga, the great [tantra] is spoken by Lord Sadāśiva. Next, in the seventieth age after this, by way of divine reckoning, in the Kaliyuga, O...
goddess, from him. I speak to you the tantra that is honored by Bhairava.

94b–95ab And likewise, in the seventh [age] after this, no doubt, you shall by the command of Śrīkāṇṭha speak [the tantra] to Kapāliśa, O pious woman, in the Tretāyuga.

95cd–96ab In the Dvāpara age, on the cusp of the Kaliyuga, the one designated Padmabhairava shall contract the Tantra of One and a Quarter Hundred-thousand, not otherwise.

96cd–97ab In the fourth quarter in the Kaliyuga, Svacchandabhairava shall likewise contract [it]. Thus did speak Bhairava.

98 Both Caṇḍabhairava, and likewise Vibhubhairava and Māyābhairava, shall appear at the end of the fourth quarter in the Kaliyuga with the aspiration to spread [the scripture], O fair lady.

99–100ab And Anantabhairava, at the end of the kalpa, shall never truly be able to spread [the scripture], his mind being overcome with devotion. He shall cause it to measure twenty-four thousand [verses], O pious woman.

100cd–102ab Caṇḍabhairava, O goddess, Vibhubhairava, Māyābhairava, and likewise

---

146 taṣmat in 93b appears to refer to Sadasiva. This somewhat problematic construction with the ablative is similar to those of 46, 51, and 94–95ab.

147 In 95a, A's tvam vakṣyāmi must surely be corrupt for either tvām vakṣyāmi or tvām vakṣyasi. Although the former would be a more trivial correction, the latter is probable; confusion of m and s is in any case easy enough to account for. The Goddess had already learned the tantra in 93, and should hence be its next teacher.

148 In 95d, padmabhairavasamjñakau must stand for the singular—an unusual corruption. Were it a dual, one would of course expect a dual verb. (Note, incidentally, dctv.7ab: lepālepau na yaṣyaṣi sa tu viro niṣahjanaḥ; here the third person singular verb asti appears to agree with a dual noun, lepālepau.)

149 Underlying what A reads as sakṣosyati in 99c is probably a verb form from √sakṣ, "to be able." One possibility is that this was originally sakṣosyati, future singular for classical sakṣyati. This seems in principle similar to other future verbs formed from a stem based on the present indicative; cf. ksipisyanti from √ksip-ksipati in 83a. The difference lies in hesitation over treatment of o in saknoti, which here has been retained as part of the future stem.

150 cetasah in 99d appears to be a nominative singular, formed from a thematized stem cetas (from cetas). Although syntactically difficult, it might also be possible that "cetasah is plural and refers to all the four beginning with Caṇḍabhairava in 97c. In this case, one could also emend the verb in 99c to the plural.
Ananta: having learned this *tantra*, no doubt, (2) [these] final heroes shall attain *siddhi* at the end of the *kalpa* (?), O queen of the gods. Bhairava has spoken.

And at the end of the Kaliyuga, the yoginis, impelled by the *sakti*, shall snatch this scripture and its tradition of transmission and depart to the limit of the *sakti* [tattva], O pious woman, no doubt. Thus did speak Bhairava.

In the Krtayuga, O Mahādevī, and in the Tretā- and Dvāparayugas, Bhairava has not spoken the revelation of this scripture.

But in the [next] Kaliyuga, O great queen, in this very manner you shall engage in the revelation of this scripture, no doubt.

You shall teach twelve thousand [verses], not even a little more, O queen of the gods, out of desire for the good of people.

Those people who reside on the Island of Maidens, my dear, shall attain...
[this] scripture and not another, in the little village Kalāpā;\textsuperscript{159} he shall then contract [it], O goddess. He shall reveal the \textit{Tantra of Twelve-thousand} in the beginning of the Kaliyuga.\textsuperscript{160}

109-110 O queen of the gods, you shall speak the \textit{Tantra of One and Quarter Hundred Thousand} to Svacchandabhairava himself, O pious woman\textsuperscript{161}—thus did speak Bhairava—he by whom, O great queen, the \textit{Tantra of Twelve-thousand} was contracted,\textsuperscript{162} O woman of great fortune. In this matter, one need not deliberate.

111-113ab (¿) After speaking [the \textit{tantra}] to the group of four heroes using ten thousand [verses] (¿),\textsuperscript{163} then, O goddess, having been taught by you, fair lady, and being located in the little village Kalāpā, he, not yet fully perfected,\textsuperscript{164} shall teach Viṣṇubhairava the scripture measuring twelve thousand [verses], O pious

\textsuperscript{159} kalāpagramake in 108a could as easily construe with 107 or 108b. Looking ahead to 111-14, it seems somewhat more correct to call Kalāpā the site of the scripture’s dissemination, rather than its abbreviation; the site of the latter is not specified in 110-11, which mention its abbreviation. Reference to \textit{kalāpagramaka} as the site of revelation in the beginning of the Kaliyuga occurs in Jayaratha’s commentary \textit{ad Tantraloka} 1.8, quoting Śivadrsti 7.108 (the \textit{kṣṣētra} edition prints \textit{kalāpagrama}). It is also mentioned, for instance, in the opening of the \textit{Vimalaprabha} commentary on the \textit{Kālacakratantra}. Cf. chapter 4, n. 104, in part i.

\textsuperscript{160} The referent of \textit{sah} ("he") in 108b, which is also the subject of \textit{karisyati} in 108d, is not evident. This might refer to Svacchandabhairava, who teaches Viṣṇubhairava the scripture in Kalāpā (111-12). There is a syntactical problem as well: it would appear that \textit{avatāram karisyati} must be understood as a compound verb, with \textit{dvidasaiva sahasrā} (108e) as its object. Normally, one would expect \textit{avatāra} to construe with a genitive, e.g. \textit{śaktasya}; cf. 105cd. Note also the non-application of vowel sandhi in 108a, viz. \textit{"yugasya adau}, and its unmetrical opening, \textit{kaliyugasya}, with \textit{laghu} syllables in positions two and three; cf. 1.101c.

\textsuperscript{161} Note that 109a possesses a variant metrical pattern (\textit{vipula}).

\textsuperscript{162} The feminine \textit{tasā} in transmitted in 110c must surely be corrupt for the masculine, referring to Svacchandabhairava.

\textsuperscript{163} The reference to a group of four heroes in 111b is not entirely clear, nor is the syntax of 111ab. A \textit{vīrācātusṭāya} is not elsewhere mentioned in the \textit{Bṛḍya}; it is rather a group of eight heroes which has importance in this text. \textit{Bṛḍya} xxiii, which teaches a \textit{vīrācātavādbhī}, also teaches a group of three heroes (from verse 27). This raises the possibility that 111b might read \textit{vīrācātusṭāya}, if perhaps by “four heroines” could be meant the four Devis of the mandala, Rakta, Karali, Candāksi, and Mahocchusmā (see the annotation \textit{ad} 1.9). The term \textit{vīna}, however, seems applied primarily to Aghoresvarī herself. Contextually more probable, \textit{vīrācātusṭāya} should refer to the group Candābhairava, Vibhubhairava, Māyaḥbhairava, and Anantabhairava, mentioned in 97-102; this interpretation has been adopted.

Grammatically, \textit{muktaś vīrācātusṭāya} could mean \textit{vīna vīrācātusṭāya}, “excluding/leaving aside the Four Heroes.” Another option might be to read \textit{muktaś} as hiatus-breaking -\textit{m} plus \textit{uktva}, construing 111ab with 111-13ab. This interpretation has been adopted.

\textsuperscript{164} It is possible that \textit{asiddhiḥ cāta} in 112c is corrupt for \textit{asiddhásya}, which would hence agree with \textit{visnubhairavakāasya}.
woman;\textsuperscript{165} no doubt about it.

\textsuperscript{113cd-114} Vi\ṣṇubhairava, O goddess, will speak the ten and two thousand [verses] to people residing on the Island of Maidens whose minds are empowered by the śakti. \textit{Thus did speak Bhairava.}

\textsuperscript{115-116ab} O Mahādevī, just like the \textit{Seven Hundred [Verses]},\textsuperscript{166} the \textit{ Tantra of Twelve-thousand} shall be in home after home, no doubt, of those with minds empowered by the śakti.\textsuperscript{167} In this matter, there is no need to deliberate.

\textsuperscript{116cd-117} In home after home, O Mahādevī, whether they be men fit for \textit{siddhi},\textsuperscript{168} or women fit for \textit{siddhi}, it shall spread (¿) to all their homes (?).\textsuperscript{169} \textit{Thus did speak Bhairava.}

But those who are unfit for \textit{siddhi}, whether a man or women,\textsuperscript{170} shall not attain even the mere \textit{vidyā}-mantra,\textsuperscript{171} O great queen. Those fit for \textit{siddhi} shall learn this secret, O Mahādevī.

This narrative of the \textit{tantra}'s revelation, exactly as it was spoken to me by Śrīka-

\textsuperscript{118} This narrative of the \textit{tantra}'s revelation, exactly as it was spoken to me by Śrīka-

\textsuperscript{119} This narrative of the \textit{tantra}'s revelation, exactly as it was spoken to me by Śrīka-

\textsuperscript{120} Now, listen with single-minded attention to that named the \textit{Great Bhairava[tantra]},

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
  \item It seems contextually required that \textit{sāstram dvādaśasānamitiṣam | sahasrāraï ... (112d–113a) should mean \textit{dvādaśasāhasrakam sāstram}—perhaps “the scripture measuring twelve, by way of thousands.”
  \item It seems possible that the \textit{saptasatani} here mentioned is none other than the \textit{Durgāsaptasattī}, i.e. the \textit{Devīmadhyamam of the Mārkandeya Purāṇa}. See the discussion in chapter 4, section 3.
  \item Cf. \textit{Kaulajñānāmīrṣaya 22.10cd, kāmarūpya imam sāstram yoginīmīrṇ grhe grhe.} 115 could perhaps be interpreted as a complete sentence, with 116–17 construing together; but the phrase \textit{nātra kārya vicāraṇaṁ} (116b) seems most frequently to occur at the end of a syntactic unit.
  \item In 116d, A’s \textit{puṇḍrī}, i.e. \textit{puṇḍrīḥ}, could well be original, an irregular nominative plural based on a thematized stem \textit{puṇḍra} for \textit{puṇḍra}.
  \item The subject of \textit{pracarīṣati} appears to be the text itself. If taken as causal—cf. the apparent equivalence of \textit{vistārāyāṣyati} (68d, 69d) and \textit{vistārāṣyati} (70d)—the subject could instead be Viṣṇubhairava, viz. “he shall propagate [it] in home after home.” A’s unintelligible \textit{adhiḥkṛṣṇo atha} in 117b is probably a corruption \textit{api grheṣṇo atha}, an emendation suggested by Isaacson. Another possibility might be to read \textit{adhiḥkṛṣṇo atha}, referring to those possessing \textit{adhikāra}, the entitlement to scripture and ritual practices bestowed by initiation (see \textit{Tāntrikabhidhānavakṣa}, vol. I, 105).
  \item Use of the singular \textit{puṇṣāḥ} for the plural in 118b seems triggered by metrical exigency.
  \item There is a serious metrical problem in 118c, with a poor four-syllable cadence of “” (\textit{api caiva}). The text seems semantically plausible, however, and no alternative is obvious. It might be conceivable, though unlikely, that the text originally read \textit{apiṣ caiva}, with a \textit{visarga} added \textit{metra causa} and subsequently removed in transmission.
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
together with its secrets, which possesses the qualities of the entire mass [of scriptural wisdom].

That Śakti which has been described earlier, infinite and primordial, arising from the infinite one, O highly fortunate woman, her divisions I shall now teach in sequence.

The one who is called “beyond conception,” Śiva, is the supreme cause, without appellation and without transformation, pervasive and quiescent, without an inherent nature, O Mahādevī, devoid of action and cause, undifferentiated, without conceptualization, formless, devoid of the gunās, without [notions of] “mine” and “I,” and situated in the state of non-duality.

He is approachable to yogins [alone] through meditation, having wisdom as his form, O woman of great fame, abiding in the state beyond activity as consciousness (samjñā) alone, the Supreme Lord. He, the agent of grace for all, has the form of the supreme effulgence, and is pervasive, with form unmanifest, beyond mind, and great.

172 It seems that sarvasandohalaksana would mean sarvajñānaughalaksana. Cf. the expression jñānasandoh in 42a, referring to the Tantra of One and a Quarter Hundred-thousand.

173 anantasambhavā probably means anantat paramasivat sambhavo yasyaḥ sānantasambhavāḥ, as translated above; but it might conceivably mean anantasāya jagatāḥ sambhavo yasyāḥ sānantasambhavāḥ. Note that LXXXIII.2 closely parallels this verse (yā sa śāktīḥ samākhyāntyādyāntasambhavāḥ | tasyāḥ bhedam pravaktayāmsmīr yugyate māyāt). Note that LXXXIII.2 closely parallels this verse (yā sa śāktīḥ samākhyāntyādyāntasambhavāḥ | tasyāḥ bhedam pravaktayāmsmīr yugyate māyāt).

174 Note that 122a occurs also as Timirādghātana 4.44 (NGMP A35/3), e-transcription courtesy of Somadeva Vasudeva), quoted below in the annotation ad 127. In 122a, the masculine yo’sau agrees with acintyam, which is declined in the neuter to avoid hiatus with the subsequent iti. Note also the non-application of vowel sandhi between asau and acintyam.

175 Although here not a bahuvrīhi compound, paramakāraṇah (in 122b) appears to have taken the masculine gender of sivah, whom it describes. Cf. the “correct” expression sivah paramakāraṇam, e.g. Netratantra 8.36b. It is of course possible that the text has become corrupt.

176 On this rather Buddhist-sounding epithet, cf. the description of parābrahman as nīhilvāttauttakatām in Kālikākukūkāsīkātikā 6.

177 Cf. BraYā lxxix.44ab, describing the supreme reality (vīra jñātavai): nistarānyāṁ nirālokāṁ kriyakāraṇavatītām.

178 yoginīṁ, as reads A in 124c, is surely corrupt for yogināṁ. Cf. Rudrayāmala [Uttaratantra] 2.28c, yoginibhir dhyanāgamye [cakre].

179 It is possible that mahātmanah (126b) is genitive and agrees with tasya in 126c; however, it seems more likely to be nominative, agreeing with other adjectives in 126b. Cf. the nominative cetasah in 1.99d, and the probable feminine vocative mahātmane in 38b.
126cd-28  His Śakti, O Mahādevī, arising by its own nature, is not produced.\textsuperscript{180} She has by her nature the form of moonlight, like crystalline rays.\textsuperscript{181} His icchā śakti, emerging in the form of wisdom as the Transmotional [śakti],\textsuperscript{182} is without semblance;\textsuperscript{183} she is called Avadhūtā.\textsuperscript{184} She, the infinite one, awakens bindu and nāda instantaneously.\textsuperscript{185}

129-30ab  Shaped like a coil situated in [the alphabet], beginning with the vowels, she is divided into four sections, (çı) [each] divided into four sections (?).\textsuperscript{186} The colied (kundalinī) śakti exists thus [as a cakra] with the sixteen vowels.

\textsuperscript{180} Regarding 126d, cf. Netratantra 21.39cd-40ab, defining the kriyā śakti: evam kriyeti sa proktā ekānāmasyahāvāja [[svabhāvāhā vāhābhāvāhā svā svatāt svadā śiva]].

\textsuperscript{181} Sphātikasya in 127b has been emended to sphātikasyeva, since a comparison appears intended.

\textsuperscript{182} Although here an epithet of the supreme Śakti, manonmani, like icchā, rūpa, śiva, etc., appears also as the name of a specific śakti; cf., e.g., Malinīvijayottaratantra 8.64c and Svachchandatantra 2.71ab. The translation "transmotional" is Vasudeva’s (2004, 219) for manonmana.

\textsuperscript{183} 127c is syntactically uncertain. A final -r has most probably been lost from śakti in A, which in any case must be nominative. Presumably, tasya refers to Śiva and is possessive in sense; but if so, tasyecchā śakti seems redundant in light of tasya śakti. Construed with nirgata, it is possible that the genitive could have the sense of the ablative. But cf. 34, where icchā nāmena parā śaktiḥ constructs with an apparently possessive genitive. Note the parallel passage Timirodghatana 4.4, a condensed version of BraYā 1.122–28: yo sau acintyam ity āhu[h] śivam [em. śivaḥ?] paramakāraṇah | tasyelchā nirgata śakti [em. śaktir?] nādabinduprabhedini [em. "prabodhini"] (NGMP Reel A35/3). Note that the text of 127c also occurs in the Kularatnamūlā, quoted by Jayaratha commenting ad Tantraloka 1.274 (adṛṣṭavigrahas caiva sa śanta iti ghyate | tasyečchā nirgata śaktis taddharmagunasamyutā).

A central question concerning the interpretation of 126cd–133 is whether the verses describe the one para śakti, or a progression of her manifestations. The latter seems unlikely, for the various epithets and descriptions provided, viz. icchā śakti, manonmani, avadhūtā, kundalinī, etc., are consistent with description of the supreme śakti. It could just be possible that tasyečchā is non-standard sandhi for tasyādh icchā, and might even have the sense of tasyādh icchādh, if indeed the intention is to provide a progression from a para śakti to icchā śakti, and then to e.g. jñānasakti. But then we would have the jñāna śakti awakening bindu, which cannot be the case, for in this role the śakti is elsewhere referred to as icchā (cf. 34cd) or avadhūtā (here, in 128, and in Lxvii.33ab: sā śaktir avadhūtā tu parabindau layam gata).

In 127cd–128 there appear to be as many as four predicates, viz. nirgata, pravartate, smṛtih, and prabodhayati. The syntax suggests taking nirgata as adjective of the subject, with pratartate as "exists," although it could perhaps mean "arises."

\textsuperscript{184} See the annotation ad 1.36 on the avadhūtā śakti.

\textsuperscript{185} What A transmits as sānantaṃ bindunādau in 128cd seems likely to be corrupt for sānantaṃ bindunādaau. It is not common that compounds cut across pada boundaries in this material, although cf., e.g., 121ab. In any case Ananta is unlikely to be grouped with nāda and bindu, and ananta occurs above in 121ab as an epithet of the supreme śakti. If the text were correct and this is a compound, it might mean, "[She awakens] bindu and nāda, together with Ananta." The only connection discernable between these three would be cosmogonic functions.

\textsuperscript{186} 129a and 129b seem redundant, unless the point is that the four divisions are also each divided into four, presumably accomodating the sixteen vowels as mentioned in 129b.
Possessing four pathways, and decorated by the Five Voids, she is thus

fivelfold, the primordial transmental [sakti], and she furthermore arises as

ninefold through the ritual procedure of the Nine-Syllable [Vidyā].

Conjoined with the vowels and consonants, (?) and possessing the [entire alphabet of] fifty letters (?), the Avadhūtā, O Mahādevī, exists with nine divisions.

The reference to the sakti as catuskāṭaḥkopaṇī (130c) is not especially transparent. It seems probable that catuskāṭaḥkopaṇī is supposed to mean catuspāṭha, “cross, crossroads.” This could well suit the man­
dala context suggested in 129–30. Note in particular the bhautika cakra taught in BraYa xix, a man­
dala constructed beginning with a circumscribed catuspāṭha (cross). In the center (stāhī) is installed the

snarasya-mantra (śrūm), around which are the sixteen vowels in the four mandala sections, followed by

the remaining alphabet and devī Raktā, Karālā, Caṇḍākṣi and Mahocchusma—the devīcatusṭaya,

“group of four goddesses,” so called in xxvi.10b. It is possible that this particular alphabetical cakra of

the four goddesses is precisely what 129–30 refers to.

The notion of Five Voids (vyomaśāñcaka) is taught in BraYa lxxxix, in the context of yoga, where they appear as constituents of the subtile body (sūkṣmaśāñcaka or puruṣaśāñcaka). The supreme Śiva lies at the end of this series of voids, which are once referred to as devīṃany vyopaḥśaṣṭiṣṭa[laṃ (lxxix.26b), although their precise relationship to the goddesses of the BraYa eludes me. Reference to a vyomaśāñcaka occurs also in other Śiva sources, e.g. Kauṭiyānāmīrapata 4.9 (where they are the locus for visualizing the śakti in the form of a stroke of lightening), and Netrataṇtra 7.1, 7.27, where commenting Kṣemarāja provides the synonym śaṇyapāṭha. On the complex topic of the Voids in Śiva yoga, see the admirable study of Vasudeva, Yoga of the MaJetīnīvatottaratantra, 256–92 (chart on 269).

In 130d, note absence of internal vowel sandhi with pañcāryaṃla-alamkṛtā; this is likely to be original, necessitated by meter. Cf. sīkha jīyā kuracana sasra-aṅgikam (xix.67). In cases when the first of the two vowels is -u or -i, an hiatus-breaking -r- is often inserted between the two; see the annotation ad 26. One also finds insertion of m to break hiatus between elements of a compound; cf. xix.31ab, voṣāyakåraṇamāddini karmāṇi kuru svarte.

The text of 131b, śaktir adya manonmanī, occurs in a number of Śiva scriptures, e.g. Bhairavamārtyāla (1.9), Kuśāra (f. 78v), Kuṭjāma (5.8g, 6.109, 25.89, and 25.165) and several times in the Tāntrasadbhūta.

The syntax of 128–132, particularly its sentence division, has ambiguities. In the translation, samayeśāh (129b), sthī (130b), praṇīyate (131d), and vyavasthā (132d) have been interpreted as sentence-final verbs. This is not especially satisfying in the case of 130–31ab. Another possibility, in this case, would be to divide between 130cd; the Śakti being catuspāṭhaḥkopaṇī (130c) could then be a result of her being divided into four sections (129cd), which makes it easier to understand how she is fivefold, adorned by five voids. One could then take 131cd–132ab as a sentence, construing 132cd independently.

It does not seem possible to interpret what is read as 132b, pañcāśākṣarasāṃpratam. The form pañcāśa is irregular Sanskrit for pañcāśa, “fifty.” It is possible this pāda is metri causa for pañcāśaśārdhā sāṃpratam, the sense perhaps being that now (sāṃpratam), she being conjoined with the vowels and consonants, all fifty letters of the alphabet are present. But the likelihood seems high that the text is corrupt. One possible emendation might be pañcāśākṣarasāṃpratam. This could arise from fusion between the post-consonantal ligatures for -ś and -u, and subsequently p and y. Slightly more difficult, one could consider the possibility that “sāṃpratam is a corruption from “sāṃpratam, also perhaps arising from confusion between -śa and -u. Most commonly, sāṃpratam refers to the framing of a mantra with syllables in its beginning and end, e.g. hiṃ ... svāhā. Commenting ad Netrataṇtra 8.11, Kṣemarāja provides such an explanation, quoting an unnamed source: mantra dūru likhīd vidvān abhilādeyaṁ atah pāram | mantra asya likhīt paścāt sāṃpratam pariśītām (“A wise man should write a mantra in the beginning, the substantive matter [abhilādeya] afterwards, and should write a mantra at the end; this is known as sāṃpratam”)

However, the implication would perhaps be that the navākṣari śakti is surrounded or enclosed, sāṃpratam, by the entire alphabet, perhaps in a cakra as suggested above in 130.
In her exist the Devīs, the Dūtīs, the Yogīnīs, and Mothers of the Ucchusma-
tantra\textsuperscript{192}—she creates all, O goddess, following the will of Śiva.

Thus ends chapter one, the “Chapter of the Connections,”
of the Great Bhairava Tantra, the Tantra of Twelve-thousand Verses,
the Picumata, the Method of Nine Syllables.

\textsuperscript{192} atra seems to refer to the Śakti; it could however refer to the alphabet, pañcāśāksara, the point being that phonemes are the constituents of the deities. yogīnacchusmamatarāḥ seems to mean yogīna uccusmatatārāḥ ca. The same expression, except with the more correct mātaraḥ, occurs as LXXXVIII.244d. As mentioned ad 8ab–9, this particular list refers to the four devīs (Raktā, Karalī, Cāṇḍākṣi, and Mahocchusmā), four dūtīs (Karālā, Dantuśa, Bhimavaktra, and Mahābalā), Seven or Eight Mothers, and a set of six Yogīnīs (Kroṣṭukī, Vijayā, Gajakarnā, Mahamukhī, Cakravegā, and Mahānāśā). That uccusmatatārāḥ means uccusmatatārāḥ ya mātaraḥ [proktāś] tiḥ is suggested by iv.253ab, from a passage quoted in full above (ad 8cd–9): uccusmatatārāḥ nāmāni guhyakāṇāṁ na saṁṣayaḥ (“These, no doubt, are the names of the guhyakās in the Ucchusmatantra.”). On the irregular nominative plural mātaraḥ, see the annotation ad 1.83.
The Extraction of Mantras

II

Now, I shall next teach the highest worship of Aghori.¹

When the mantrin is [in the state] 'beyond conduct' (nirācāra),² abiding with a body [empowered by] the Avadhūtā [Sakti],³ he then performs worship of the yogīnīs and of Śiva.⁴ 'Avadhūtā' is the Śakti, while the state beyond conduct

¹ This chapter teaches the nine-syllable (navaśkaṇa) vidyā of Aghori, the central mantra of the system of the BraYā and the sonic embodiment of its core deity maṇḍala. The full exposition of the mantra-goddesses constituting this vidyā, with their ancillaries, along with variations of the vidyā used for different applications, occurs as the tenth chapter, devinām mantroddhārapāṇā. Here are provided only the bhaja-mantras of the deities. Note the non-application of sandhi across the pāda boundary of 1ab. In 1b, A's arghoryārccanam is probably an error for aghoryārccanam. But this sort of sandhi is found frequently in A; cf. 14b below, where it reads Śiva's name as accented.

² The text of 2d as transmitted seems implausible: nirācāraparāḥ śivaḥ. Since A frequently drops visarga before labials, we might interpret this as nirācāraparāḥ śivaḥ. Cf., e.g., XXXVIII.96cd, nirācāraḥ[ḥ] sa evātra uccuṣṇam parikṛttam (“In this context, that very ‘nirācāra’ is said to be Ucchusmabhārava”); and Bhairavamangalā 242c, nirācāraḥ śīvah jīyaḥ[ḥ] (“Śiva is known as ‘nirācāra’”). It seems more likely, however, that one should rather emend the text to nirācārapadāḥ śivaḥ; the expression nirācārapadā occurs nearly twenty times in the BraYā, and ra for da is a minor corruption. Both readings would be plausible, but the latter is better attested and has accordingly been adopted. On the meaning of nirācāra, see the following note. Saying that the practitioner “is nirācāra” seems to be equivalent to saying he is nirācārapadāvaṣṭhān or nirācārapadāvaṣṭaḥ, both common expressions in the BraYā (see the quotations in n. 5 below). Note, incidentally, the absence of sandhi across the pāda boundary of 1cd.

³ B’s reading anadhīttanunāḥ sthitāḥ—a correction, it seems—has been accepted in 1d. A, which reads “tanuṣṭhitāḥ, frequently drops visarga before sibilants, and this bahuvrihi compound is in several cases transmitted with the visarga (e.g. III.202d). On its interpretation, see n. 5 below. One cannot be totally certain in correcting sakti nirācāra in 2cd to saktir nirācāra. In its extremely numerous occurrences, the nominative sakti more often than not omits the visarga in A. Only before vowels and semi-vowels does A transmit śakti, with one exception (I.126c). It may hence be possible that -i, sans visarga, is in this text optionally considered an acceptable feminine nominative singular ending, or else is an acceptable sandhi before a voiced consonant.

⁴ yogesī or yogesvāt is synonymous with yogini; cf. the title Siddhayogesvartinātā, and note TorszöK's discussion thereof (“Doctrine of Magic Female Spirits,” iii–iv.). Here the expression must be broad, for it includes the Mother goddesses as well as a group of six yogīnīs; cf. the annotation verse 11 below.
The clarity of the supreme deity, the state hence refers to presumably refers to installation of the yogimtantras, dual state of mind" and bhutvd, sense, distinctions between 'pure' and 'impure' are transcended. The expressions it rather represents meditational absorption, the transcendence in ritual of dualist conceptualization in the present chapter. Perhaps the most comprehensive abide in the i.e. beyond, codified practice (dcdra). Parallel material may be found in dls, cf. I.i.13-14: 

| 394a "pade | em. | "padair A | 94b "tanub | corr. | "tanu A | acadhütatanu kṛtya bhosmoddhiśīlātavigrāhaḥ | nirācārapadāuso dhiṣyed bhīmaḥ kapālāyaṃ || (III.50)
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

This pair of terms occurs in several Śāiva sources of the Vidyāpīṭha; cf., e.g., Tantrasadbhava 2.27cd-28ab. According to Sanderson (personal communication, 2004), nirācāra occurs in this sense also in the Yoginisāhara of the Jayaprabhāyaṇāla. For avadhūtā, Bhairavamangalā 394–396ab provides a niruktī (etymology): acadhūtā is that which "shakes off" (dhūtate) 'atra’—glossed as ajñāna ("ignorance"), pāpa ("sin"), adhojati ("going to hell"), and duḥkha ("sorrow"): dhūtate tu malān sarvān ārdhacāmārgānucartini | acadhūtāte śa pṛktā nityānugrahāśīlāni || 394 || avam aḍhānām ity uktām ava pāpaṃ prakīrtītām | avam adhojati jñāṇām avsa duḥkheti kirtītām || 395 || tat sarvān dhūtāte yasmat tasmāt avadhūtā ucyaite |

394a malān sarvān | em. | malān sarvān ms | 395c "gātir jñeyam | conj. | "gati(r vi)?jñeyam ms | 395d duḥkheti | corr. Vasudeva; duḥkheti ms | 396a tat | em. Vasudeva; tā ms | yasmāt | corr. Vasudeva; yasmāt md

NAK 5-687; electronic transcription courtesy of Somadeva Vasudeva. The expression acadhūtatanuḥ sthītaḥ refers to having the mantras of the Supreme Goddess installed onto the body through nyāsa. This presumably refers to installation of the navakṣara vidyā and its extended pantheon, the deities delineated in the present chapter. Perhaps the most comprehensive nyāsa is that of xi. 35-72. References to installation of the acadhūtā on the body emphasize the homology of its mantra-deities—the goddesses—with the tattva-series of reality levels (tattvanāta), a homology taught in e.g. xxx.225–33, xviii.47b, for example, refers to the acadhūtā as śivāyaśantigopakā, while iv.456d uses the expression śivāyaśantimāntika (presumably non-standard Sanskrit for śivāyaśantimāntaka, with an internal hiatus-breaking -m-).

Note, incidentally, that Bhairavamangalā (from 385) teaches a system of sixteen principal internal nāḍīs, with acadhūtā homologized to the central, supreme (pārd) nāḍī extending through the brhmamardhā (brahmarandhra vinirgata, 392d)—hence the description of acadhūtā as ārdhacāmārgānucartini in 394b above. This is noteworthy in light of avadhūtī being the name for the central nāḍī in some Buddhist yoginītantras, e.g. the Heravijñānatarā; cf. li.13-14: 

| 395c advātram śādayāḥ | ...tesāṁ madhye tirā nādayāḥ prādhānāḥ | lalanā rasanā avadhūtī cetā | ...acadhūtī madhyadeśe grāhyagrahakavargāti |

Parallel material may be found in Sanv(on)dajñātantra 7, especially 7.21cd (acadhūtī madhyadeśe tu grāhyagrahakavargāti).

The term nirācāra derives its significance from ritual: the nirācāra practitioner is one who is without, i.e. beyond, codified practice (acāra). But this does not represent disavowal of ritual, for the injunction to abide in the nirācāra state occurs as a preliminary to performance of the most complex of observances. It rather represents meditational absorption, the transcendence in ritual of dualist conceptualization (dvātānubandha or vikalpa), and in more concrete terms, transcendence of orthodox purity norms. In this sense, nirācāra is cognate to advaitācāra, the "nondual ritual conduct" in which dualist (dvaita) distinctions between 'pure' and 'impure' are transcended. The expressions nirācārapadā sātihā, nirācārapadya bhūtā, and nirācārapadyavasthāḥ, etc., appear to be equivalent to advaitapadasaṃśhitāḥ (BṛhYd 11.131d). The Bhairavamangalā explains nirācāra in ideational terms: nirācārakriyā means ritual "based in a nondual state of mind" (advaitam bhāvan aśīrīta) while sācāra ritual is the opposite. Entering into the nirācāra state hence refers to avikalpaṭa, in which the practitioner’s affective state reflects the ontological singularity of the supreme deity, the nirācārapada. Bhairavamangalā 245–251:
After learning the procedure for their worship, the mantran then attains siddhi. I shall hence teach the extraction of their mantras in sequence.

Wearing white clothing, smeared with fragrant white ointment, the wise mantran, on a pure, beautiful place on the ground decorated with beautiful flowers, should there always extract [the mantras of] the Devīś, Dūtīś, Yoginīś, and Mothers, headed by Kapālīśabhairava.

The first [letter ca] of the second [varga, with] the first [vowel a] set in place;
with the bindu attached on the top, this, [CAvM.] is known as the Devī Raktā.

7 The third [letter da] of the third [varga], decorated by the eleventh vowel [e], this [PE] is called Ghorā, and well-known as “Karāli.”

8 The first [consonant ka] conjoined with the second [vowel ā], the “upper sound,” the twenty-first, (?) supreme consonant (?) [pa] conjoined with the second [vowel a].

9 The twenty-eighth [consonant la] with the third [vowel ṭ]; the twentieth [consonant na] also likewise [with ṭ]; the thirty-second [consonant sa] conjoined with

in meaning to prathamamś contradictions or the like; cf. 7b and so on.

12 I.e. the anusvara (m).
13 It seems svarīkālāśa means ekādhamāssara.
14 Because of the possibility of vowel sandhi, one could here understand the name to be either Aghorā or Ghorā. The latter is more probable, and a common epithet of “non-dual” goddesses; it seems however elsewhere unattested as a synonym of Karāli.
15 I.e. ā, Candākṣi. The meaning of ārdhanāda in 8b is uncertain. It seems probably to signify the syllable ā. Although in 8ab dvīṭyena by itself could alone stand for dvīṭyena svarena, i.e. ā, cf. 9cd below, where ārdhanādena must refer to the syllable ā in order for the syllable svā to be “extracted.” Note also the occurrence of the term in x.202a and x.214b, where its syllabic content is not explicit. The pair ārdhanāda and adhona da occurs in chapter 19 of the Sārdhatrisatikalottara, drawn it seems from the Mālasūtra of the Nīśāśantra. This describes a series of eight divisions of Śiva, which appear to be sonic and have syllabic content. It is not clear however what ārdhanāda (19.7a) and adhona da (19.9a) signify there.
16 I.e. pā, Mahocchusmā, fourth among the Devis. In 8c, yoni signifies “consonant,” the opposite of bija, “vowel,” a usage common enough in Śaiva texts. Cf. Mālīntvijayottaratantra 3.10-12ab:

dvijāh ca navadāh caiva parāsadāh ca malinī ||
bijaṇyatiḥmarkād bhedaḥ dvijā bijaṁ svārā matāḥ || 10 ||
kālābhīṣa ca smritī yonir navadāḥ vargabhedaḥ ||
prthug vāyavibhedena satārdhakarṇojaivalā || 11 ||
bijaṁ atrā śivaḥ saktir yonir ity abhidhāyate |

“The [alphabet goddess] Mālinī is twofold, ninefold, and fifty-fold. She is twofold because of the division bija and yoni. The vowels are considered ‘bijā, and ‘yonī’ is defined by the consonants. She is ninefold because of the division of letter-groups (varga). Through separate division of the letters, she shines with the radiance of the fifty. Among these, bija are called ‘śiva’ and yoni ‘sakti.’”

If ekavimśat pārā in 8c is correct, as A probably reads, there is some uncertainty concerning the interpretation of pārā. No basis is apparent by which pārā should be singled out as the “supreme” (pārā) consonant, and the epithet hence probably has no such connotation. In the same pāda, it seems that ekavimśat, a non-standard cardinal number perhaps formed by analogy to trīṃśat, etc., is equivalent to the ordinal ekavimśa, “twenty-first.” The form of the ordinal which normally occurs in this text is however ekaviṃśatam. Cf. xxviii.5 cd, ekaviṃśatam caiva dvīṭyenaścaraṇasyatam. (On the formation of ordinals, see the annotation on the colophon of Brahma LV, as well as n. 19 below.) Given these difficulties, one might consider the conjecture ekaviṃśatam yonir.

17 Le. l, Karālī, first of the Dūtis.
18 Le. ni, Danturā, second of the Dūtis.
the twenty-ninth [consonant va], with the “upper sound” [ā].

10 the ‘hamsa’ [Ha] with the second [vowel a], it possesses the praṇava at its begin­
ning. I have spoken the secret arrangement of the divisions of mantra.

11–12ab Now, I shall next teach the characteristics of the [Six] Yogēśis. After care­
fully making the vidyā-mantra conjunct, having om at the beginning and namah [at its end], the first [yogini] is taught to you, the glorious Kroṣṭukī.

12cd–13 When conjointed at the end with svāhā, the second yoginī is taught. With

---

19 I.e. svā, Bhūmavaktra, third among the Düttis. As mentioned above ad 2.8, the expression ʿurdhvaomā for ā seems difficult to explain. What A transmits as dvaṭrimsākonātrimsena (sc) could perhaps be a corruption of dvāṭrimsākāṇātrimsena, i.e. dvāṭrimsā ekāṇātrimsena. However, the text is more likely to have read either dvāṭrimsākāṇātrimsena or dvāṭrimsā kāṇātrimsena: in the BraHY, ekona (“minus one”) appears entirely replaced by Middle-Indic ekina and kina. The latter is less common, but has seven occurrences in xvii. There is also another possibility—that A’s reading dvāṭrimsā konātrimsena is original, with kona for ekona. But there is no evidence for kona occurring elsewhere. It is difficult to decide between reading dvāṭrimsākāṇātrimsena and dvāṭrimsā kāṇātrimsena. In favor of the latter, the former involves emending two syllables; in favor of the former, kiṇa” seems elsewhere to occur only after consonants, or as pada-initial. The former has tentatively been adopted. Notice, incidentally, the non-application of vowel sandhi across the pada boundary of 9cd.

20 I.e. ḫa, the fourth Dütti, Mahābalī.

21 Most probably, this refers to the practice of prefixing of om before the vidyā.

22 There is some ambiguity concerning the interpretation of 10cd. 10c, pranādīsamanvitam, has been interpreted as an independent sentence, referring, grammatically loosely, to the vidyā as a whole. Concerning the compound mantrabhedavyavasthitam (10d), vyavasthitam seems most likely here to mean vyassthitam or vyassthitī, “arrangement,” a possibility suggested by Isaacson (personal communication, December 2005). Cf. xxx.gbcd-^ya, where vyavasthitam might also carry this meaning:

mulayāge mahādevi yat tvaya pračito hy aham || 56 ||
kathayāmi yathāyānāṃ saktibhedavyavasthitam
56d yat tvaya cor; yatvaya A

“O goddess, with respect to the core pantheon (mulayāge), I shall teach what you have asked me, as is befitting: the arrangement of the divisions of the sakti.”

More frequently in this material, however, vyasthitam seems to mean “situated” or “arranged.” Inter­
preting along these lines, one could perhaps translate 10cd as follows: “I have taught the secret situated in the divisions of mantra.” Cf., e.g., xxi.4ab, ete navaratā proktā vidyābhede vyavasthitā—perhaps, “These nine vratas have been taught, which are situated within the divisions of the vidyā-mantra.”

23 Although yogēśi in 2c perhaps possesses a broad sense, referring to all of the female deities of the maṇḍala (see the annotation ad 11.2), here it clearly refers to a specific set of six yoginis. This set of yoginis has a central position in the maṇḍala of the BraHY, insofar as they comprise the aṅga­
mantras or “mantra-body” of the supreme goddess Aghorī. Here, it is stated merely that Kroṣṭukī or Kroṣṭukī heads the Six. For the list of names, one must look elsewhere; these Six are listed, along with the Four Devis, Four Düttis, and Mothers, in e.g. BraHY IV.133 (quoted partly ad 1.133): kroṣṭukī vijayā caiva gajakarna mahāmukhī cakravegā mahānāśā sa(d) yoginīyah prakṛtītāḥ (“The Six Yoginis are Kroṣṭukī, Vijayā, Gaṇakarna, Mahāmukhī, Cakravegā, and Mahānāśā”).

24 It seems ca is redundant, or else sentence connective, despite its position near the end of the sentence.
HUM [at the end], the third [yogini]; in the case of vaṣaṭ, the fourth.  
With vaṣaṭ [at the end], the fifth; in the case of phat, there would be the sixth.

The Six Yoginis who emerge from the body of Aghori have been taught.  

I shall teach the Mother goddesses [taught] in the tantra arising from Ucchuṣma- 

The God [Kapaliṣa] exists in the pranava, while Maheśvarī is in the bindu [aṃ].

25 In 13b, A reads caturthakā. Normally, the feminine ordinal should be caturthikā, as reads B after correction. Since A transmits this “correct” feminine in three instances, and caturthakā only here, this has been emended.

26 Note the presence of a correct metrical variant (vīpadī) in 13c.

27 That is, the Six Yoginis have the following mantras: om [vidyā] namah, Kṛṣṇaḥkā; om...svāhā, Vijayaḥ; om...hums, Gajakarnāḥ; om...vaṣaṭ, Mahāmukhāḥ; om...vaṣaṭ, Nakravāḥ; and om...phat, Mahānāśāḥ, respectively. See Table 5.1 in part I. What is not made clear here is what form of the vīḍyā the mantras of the yoginis frame. Although it could perhaps be the full, nine-syllable form, it might however be merely the “name” or sādhya portion, “cāndey kāṇālini.” Further study of the mantrarādhā material of x-xii should elucidate this and other questions.

28 The reference to the Six Yoginis arising from the body/limbs (aṅga) of the Goddess refers to their status as aṅga mantras, six in number. Their full treatment is found in x. Presumably, the long ā the mss transmit in 14b, viz. aghorāṅga", is in error for aghorāṅga". Cf. aghorārcanam in 1b, and see the annotation thereon. In the same pāda, A transmits vinīśiraḥ for classical Sanskrit vinīśrtaḥ. Elsewhere we find the same spelling (I.xi.3b; cf. samvinīśtam in I.iv.52b), as well as vinīśrta (xlii.11d). Although the prefix nīḥ- frequently appears as ni- in A, one finds however numerous instances of the “correct” nīḥ- and nī-. Note for example nīḥ-sāmyaḥ in I.122c; but also nīsvābhāvo in I.123a. (A difference between the two cases, incidentally, is that dropping the visarga in the latter case would make the first syllable laghu.) Although uncertainty remains, 14b has tentatively been corrected. If the reading vinīśrtaḥ is accepted, one will have to consider r equivalent to ri for metrical purposes, though this is common enough.

29 Here the feminine accusative plural mātarāḥ, for classical Sanskrit mātī, is formed from a thematicized stem mātrā. See the annotation ad 1.83. Note also the “correct” forms in 17c and 18b. The mantra-syllables which follow in the subsequent verses are the mūla bijas, “root syllables” of the Mother goddesses, whose full mantras are provided in the latter portion of patala 10. On Ucchuṣmabhairava and the Ucchuṣmamāndana, see the discussion in chapter 5, section 6.

30 Although pranava most frequently signifies om, there is uncertainty in this case. The seed mantra of the supreme deity Kapaliṣa is, in the Brahma, hüm, the smarana-mandana, on which see chapter 5, section 3, in part I of this thesis. Commenting ad Svacchandatantra 4.203, Kṣemarāja glosses pranava as niṣkalanimātha, which as Isaacson points out to me refers to hüm, the niṣkala form of Bhairava in this system (personal communication, January 2006). It is hence possible that pranava signifies hüm in 15a as well. That the term can indeed have multiple applications is evident also in the teaching of paśca pranavaḥ or five pranavas in Svacchandatantra 6, discussed by Kṣemarāja beginning ad Svacchandatantra 6.3. It seems that these five involve permutations of the five constituents of om, along with the hamsa (ṣa). In the Brahma, there is a single reference to a hāṃravākhyen pranava, in 12.62cd: sākṛtāṃḥ pranavaṃ nāṣya hāṃravākhyen na samāyatoḥ. This probably stands for hüm, for the context is the installation onto the body of the primary manda dāties of the nānikṣaraṇa vṛddhi, beginning with Bhairava.

A transmits devo in 15a for the nominative, which with correct sandhi should here be devo. This seems likely to be a corruption, for one expects such instances to be confined to cases of metrical exigency.

31 On am as the bija of Maheśvarī, cf. x.183:

ādircinge sthitāṁ caiva bījāṁ pañcādoṣam tu yat

nūtyantaṁ pranavaḥyā pānāhṣavayāḥ prakīrtiṁ || 183 ||
Brahmi is in the letter e,\textsuperscript{32} and Vaiśnavi in the letter ā.\textsuperscript{33}

16 Kaumārī is present in the letter a, and Vivasvati in the letter I.\textsuperscript{34} In the letter 1 is Vāsavi,\textsuperscript{35} while Cāndikā is in the syllable svā.\textsuperscript{36}

"That bija which is in the fifteenth position in the first letter-group, [the vowels,] when having Nāmaḥ in the end and om in the beginning, is known as [the mantra] of Mahēśvarī."

Note that the spellings Mahēśvarī and Māheśvarī occur in A with comparable frequency, the latter being slightly more common.

\textsuperscript{32} The spellings “Brahmi” and “Brahmi” are attested in the BraYa in near-equal measure in A; “Brahmi” for instance occurs twice in iv.

\textsuperscript{33} Note the non-application of sandhi across the pada boundary of i5cd, and also in i6ab below.

\textsuperscript{34} It might seem as though Vivasvati is the female counterpart of Vivasvat or Surya, the sun god. It would be highly unusual, however, for a sakti of the solar deity to be included among the Mother goddesses. “Vivasvati” is instead synonymous with “Yāmī” or “Yāmā,” the female counterpart of Yama. The latter, as the mythical child of Vivasvat, bears the patronym Vaivasvata, and in the BraYa, “Vivasvati” seems interchangeable with “Vaivasvati,” i.e. Yāmā. The spelling “Vaivasvati” occurs frequently in A, e.g. in x.199c, xxii.36b, and xxxii.182c. That “Vivasvati” is not a corruption finds confirmation in meter: here in 16b, “Vaivasvati” would be unmetrical. Note that in the context of initiation, should the flower be cast upon the mandala-area of Vaivasvati, the initiatory name engendered is Yamabhārava (34.182cd: vāivasvastvay prapātē tu yamabhāravaṃvayā).

This set of Eight Mothers is common in Śaiva sources; cf., e.g., Mālinīvijayottaratatantra 3.14, listing the Eight Mothers as Māheśī, Brāhmanī, Kaumārī, Vaiśnavī, Aindrī, Yāmī, Cāmunda, and Yogēśī (māheśī brāhmanī cāvē kaumārī vaiśnavī tathā | aindrī yāmī ca cāmūndā yogēśī ca tīmātī; but it is common, in place of Vivasvati, to find instead the Mother goddess Vārāhi. Cf. Netratattana 19.56: brāhmi māheśvari cāvē kaumārī vaiśnavī tathā | cāmūndā ca tathāndrī cāmūndā saptānūtraḥ ("Brahmī, Māheśvarī, Kaumārī, Vaiśnavī, Vārāhi, and Cāmūndā are the Seven Mother goddesses"). Curiously, one also finds in the latter half of the BraYa several lists which include Vārāhi at the expense of Vivasvati, with no further references to the latter except in the kalpa of Mahākālī (1.1v). Note especially the list of eight Mothers in lxxviii.9cd-92ab: māheśvari ca brāhmanī vaiśnavī ca kaumārī | aindrī cāmūndā aghorī ca kīrtītā (Here, cāmūndā reflects metri causa shortening of the final i). However, Vaivasvati finds place in the most doctrinally and ritually important sections of the text: in the navaśaṅkara vidyā, in rites of yojana, and the initiation mandala, etc. Cf., e.g., xxxii.178a, xxxii.182cd, and xxxvi.29a & 33b.

\textsuperscript{35} Vasavi is synonymous with Indrani, Aindrī, Māheśvarī, and Cāmunda, and in the context of initiation, should the flower be cast upon the mandala-area of Vaivasvati, the initiatory name engendered is Yamabhārava (34.182cd: vāivasvastvay prapātē tu yamabhāravaṃvayā).
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This set of Eight Mothers is common in Śaiva sources; cf., e.g., Mālinīvijayottaratatantra 3.14, listing the Eight Mothers as Māheśī, Brāhmanī, Kaumārī, Vaiśnavī, Aindrī, Yāmī, Cāmunda, and Yogēśī (māheśī brāhmanī cāvē kaumārī vaiśnavī tathā | aindrī yāmī ca cāmūndā yogēśī ca tīmātī; but it is common, in place of Vivasvati, to find instead the Mother goddess Vārāhi. Cf. Netratattana 19.56: brāhmi māheśvari cāvē kaumārī vaiśnavī tathā | cāmūndā ca tathāndrī cāmūndā saptānūtraḥ ("Brahmī, Māheśvarī, Kaumārī, Vaiśnavī, Vārāhi, and Cāmūndā are the Seven Mother goddesses"). Curiously, one also finds in the latter half of the BraYa several lists which include Vārāhi at the expense of Vivasvati, with no further references to the latter except in the kalpa of Mahākālī (1.1v). Note especially the list of eight Mothers in lxxviii.9cd-92ab: māheśvari ca brāhmanī vaiśnavī ca kaumārī | aindrī cāmūndā aghorī ca kīrtītā (Here, cāmūndā reflects metri causa shortening of the final i). However, Vaivasvati finds place in the most doctrinally and ritually important sections of the text: in the navaśaṅkara vidyā, in rites of yojana, and the initiation mandala, etc. Cf., e.g., xxxii.178a, xxxii.182cd, and xxxvi.29a & 33b.

\textsuperscript{35} Vasavi is synonymous with Indrani, Aindrī, Māheśvarī, and Cāmunda, and in the context of initiation, should the flower be cast upon the mandala-area of Vaivasvati, the initiatory name engendered is Yamabhārava (34.182cd: vāivasvastvay prapātē tu yamabhāravaṃvayā).

The seventh Mother possesses no fewer than four names in the BraYa: Cāndikā (e.g. here, and lxxv.55d), Carcā or Carcikā (e.g. xxv.183c), Cāmunda (e.g. lxxviii.91cd-92ab, "Cāmūndī"), and Bhairavi (e.g. xlv.30cd-31). The latter name could create confusion, for Aghorī can also be called “Bhairavī.” In practice, this results however in little confusion, for the Seven Mothers rarely find mention separately in this text, and usually appear in sequence. As the eighth of the Mothers, Aghorī is also referred to as Parā or Paramā (in e.g. x.210-14, xxvi.133a), and Yogēśī, Yogēśvarī, or Yogēśvaresvarī (cf. xlv.32b, and below). Cf. lxxv.1:

\textsuperscript{1a} sā sāktī purākhyātā vidyāvasthā maheśvari |
aghorī purā devī śiva yogēśvaresvarī || 1 ||

1a sāktī | corr; sāktī A purākhyātā | em; parākhyātā A | bh maheśvari | em; maheśvari A

"O Maheśvarī, that Sakti described earlier as having the condition of the [navaśaṅkara] vidyā is called Aghorī, Parā, Śiva, and Yogēśvaresvarī, O goddess."
With the syllable हा is present the Supreme Śakti, from whom these emerge. I have taught you the Mothers in the yāga honored by Ucchusma [Bhairava].

And she, the very one I had taught, completes the Mother goddesses. (?) All this is taught of her (?), having learnt which one does not lament.

Thus ends chapter two, the “Extraction of Mantras,”
of the Great Bhairava Root Tantra, the Tantra of Twelve-thousand,
the Picumata, the Method of Nine Syllables.

37 Le. Aghori herself. That हा is the bija of the supreme goddess finds support in xi.79cd-80ab:

```
hansākhyah paramo devah sasthasvaraviyojitah || 79 ||
dvitiyasastraanyuktah para śaktih prakrititah |
79a "khyah | em; "khye A 79b "svara" | "śvara" A 80a "svara" | "śvara" A

“The hamsa [HA], disconnected from the sixth vowel [i], is the Supreme God. The Supreme Śakti is taught to be [the hamsa] conjoined with the second vowel [i].”
```

The expression sasthasvaraviyojitah refers to the fact that conjunction with the sixth vowel is the default form of the god, as the smarana-mantra, Hūm. See chapter 5, section 4 in part 1. The Mother goddess-bija sequence here taught is hence एम ए ए ए ए ए ए हा. This rather loosely maps to the vowels of the vidyā: in the vidyā, there is present no short-a nor long-i. Note that the bija-mantra of Cāṇḍikā overlaps with that of Bhīmavaktra (svā), and Aghorī’s with Mahābālā’s (ḥā).

38 What A transmits as etayasya seems impossible to interpret. Most probably, this is corrupt for etā yasyāḥ, i.e. etāḥ yasyāḥ, with the ablative.

39 Cf. LI.14ab, sād yogyino maṇḍakhyatā yāga ucchusmapujite. It could be that in these cases, yāga means “pantheon” rather than “rite.” But the expression seems very close to that of 1.4d, tantre ucchusmapamahave, which comes down to meaning Ucchusmalbhairavalantre. Similarly, yāga ucchusmapujite probably amounts to “the ritual worship of Ucchusmahairava.”

40 This probably refers to the discussion of the Supreme Śakti in the latter portion of Brayā 1.

41 It seems that tasyedam in 1.8c must be non-standard sandhi of tasyah idam. It is unclear how one could interpret a masculine tasya, for yāśa [śaktiḥ] seems the only plausible referent. Nonetheless, uncertainty remains, for the meaning is not entirely clear; perhaps the sense is that one who masters the vidyā-mantra of Aghorī suffers no longer.

42 1.8d, yam jītāvā nīcatisāt, has a degree of similarity probably not coincidental to the fourth pāda of a verse attributed to Bhartṛhari:

```
ālayam hi manasyāḥmaṁ sarīraṁ maṁātipuḥ |
nāṣṭa udvayaṁsmasāh binduṁ kriyā yāṁ nīcatisāt ||

“Laziness is truly a great enemy of human beings, residing within. There is no friend like endeavor, engaging in which, one suffers not.”
```

This occurs as Satakatrayam 1.61, or verse 216 in D. D. Kosambi’s critical edition of the Epigrams.
The Goddess spoke:

99-100 O god, what are the secret signs (chomma) of the [goddess] clans and sadhaka like, such that one may specifically recognize a brother or sister; such that one carrying out the observances (carya) recognizes yoginis; and for the mutual conversation of heroes who follow the same tantra? Tell me, O Mahādeva, with explanation.

Bhairava spoke:

101 Listen, O goddess; I shall teach the characteristics of chommas, by which a brother

---

1 The spellings chomma, chomā, chomaka, and chommakā are all attested in A. I have chosen to normalize these to chomma and chommaka in the text, and I use the form chomma in discussion. However, as -omm- forms a “double-heavy” syllable alien to Middle Indic, this should probably be understood as chōmā, with a light/short medial vowel. Cf. Prakrit chauma, which R. Pischel argues derives from the Sanskrit Chadman. A Grammar of the Prakrit Languages, translated by Subhadra Jha, §277 (cf. §139). The word sanjhā (“designation”) is used as its synonym in Brahma lxxiii (14a, 15a), and sanketa as well (lv.154b).

2 Emending yogini to yoginīḥ, 100ab appears to express what in better Sanskrit might be caryayuktaḥ yathā jñayati yoginiḥ sadhakāḥ prabhō. Perhaps the simplest way to interpret the syntax is considering jñayanti passive, metri causa, and yoginīḥ nominative plural; the latter usage finds attestation in Siddhāyogesvaratīrtha 22.5a and 22.20c. Alternatively, one could consider this a case of mixed active and passive constructions: jñayanti yogīnīḥ, an active plural verb with its object in the accusative plural, presupposes an active plural subject, caryayuktaḥ. Yet we have rather the subject genitive of the passive construction, caryayuktasya.

3 In place of the MSS’ “samāśrayām, I have conjectured an irregular masculine genitive plural “samāśrayām (for “samāśrayaṇām), agreeing with caviṇām. Should this prove incorrect, ekatantrasamāśrayam would presumably be adverbial, but perhaps have a similar sense—possibly “[communication between heroes] with recourse to a single Tantra.”
or sister is recognized, O Mahēśvarī.

Having recognized a yoginī, himself propelled by the will of Śiva, the mantra-bearing sādhaka should then give a verbal message characterized by mudrā [names].

"potanga" [conveys] salutations, [and] "pratipotanga" return salutations, for yoginis. But for heroes, "nārīṣa" [conveys] salutations; by the word pratinārīṣa, one states return salutations.

By showing one finger, "welcome;" by two, "most welcome!" One makes the "peace" (kṣema) mudrā by enclosing the thumb.

She who shows her head (?) seeks tidings (?). Gazing in that direction, one should give the mudrā (?) that comes from [that] place, which is taught to be, undoubtedly, when one touches the foot with a finger (?) .

---

4 Laghuśamvaratantra 22.1cd is almost identical to 101cd, except that viśeṣataḥ occurs in the place of mahaśvarī: yena vijñayate bhrātā bhagīni vā viśeṣataḥ. Cf. also BraYā lXXIII.2ab, Siddhayogesvarīmata 29.21, Laghuśamvaratantra 20.1, Abhidhānottaratantra 42.1, Hevajratantra lvii.1, and Sanvavādayatantra 9.1.

5 mantrin and sādhaka are both normally used as substantives, but in this case the former appears adjectival, or else redundant.

6 The syntax of 103 is unclear; I have tentatively construed tu in 103c as being bhūmakrama, as though it followed vṛtāmaṇ. The sense is perhaps that in encounters with yoginis, the salutation potanga/pratipotanga is used, while nārīṣa/pratipotanga is used for encounters between male practitioners. Parallels for this problematic verse, and the next, are provided in chapter 4, n. 92, in part 1 of this thesis. The term nārīṣa, presumably a mudrā, appears to occur in the BraYā only in this passage, and I am unaware of its attestation elsewhere. It might be possible that this is a corruption of nārīca, the "iron arrow" mudrā found extensively in Śaiva sources, including the BraYā (cf., e.g., xlIV.22a). Here, however, a mudrā associated with expelling obstacles (vighnoccaṭa) would seem out of context.

7 The accusative sirāṃ reflects thematization of śīraḥ as an a-stem. Having two nominatives in differing genders and a passive verb, it is difficult to interpret 105b as transmitted in the mss: vṛtā mā tu mānīyate. One might however conjecture samīhate, and avoid also the shift in pronoun gender, reading vṛtāṇiṃ sā tu samīhate: "She [who shows her head] seeks tidings." Just conceivably, one could consider the conjecture vṛtāṃ srotum samīhate, which would provide for an infinitive + samīhate, as in 111b. On tidings as part of the chomma exchange, cf. BraYā lXXII.20; there too, "tidings" seems to refer to the goings-on of lands in various directions.

8 105cdef is difficult to interpret with certainty. A probably reads deśāgamaṇyaḥ, perhaps to be emended to deśāgama tu yā. If deśāgama is the name of a particular mudrā, it appears otherwise untested. I have instead conjectured this to mean "[the mudrā] coming from [that] place." Other possibilities include deśāgamaṇyaḥ and deśāṇya tu yā, which could be interpreted along similar lines. I have interpreted 105ef as defining the mudrā, emending kāthāsa to kāthā, agreeing with yā mudrā. I have also followed S in reading saṃprṣet for A’s sa sprṣet. The string kāthätāḥ (aḥāḥ) tu na sansāyaḥ and similar expressions occur multiple times in the BraYā in defining a practice or mantra. Alternatively, one could interpret 105ef as a separate chomma made by the sādhaka, reading sa sprṣet: perhaps, "He should touch the foot with a finger; she is spoken to, undoubtedly." This seems to disturb the pattern of chomma and
She who would show [her] forehead would indicate, “where are you going?”

Having looked at the sun, one should touch the face; [by this] would be proclaimed, “as [you] like.”

She who shows [her] topknot [indicates], “where were you born?”, O pious woman.

Having reflected on Śiva as liṅga, one touches the vagina, [and indicates,] “made of Śiva.”

She who shows [her] face [indicates], “Of what sort is your clan (gotra), O sādhaka?”

Having meditated on the Goddess, one who would touch the left arm with the left hand [indicates], (“) “The Left-handed Way (vāmācāra) [is my practice?]; [my clan] is saktis that arise from Vardhamāna (?).”

She who shows her teeth [communicates], “where did you dwell before?” Meditating on Śiva, he touches the belly, my dear, [indicating,] “[all] this has come from the womb of māyā; it secondly has shelter in Śiva.”

She who points to her ear would indicate, “what have you learned (kiṃ śrutāṇi)?”
Looking at the sky, he should extend the fingers and show his hand, [indicating] "the confluence of the Five Streams" (?), with ... hand (?).\footnote{15}

She who shows the tongue wishes to taste [something]. Having meditated on the mṛtyunjaya [mantra],\footnote{16} one should show the water-pot [mudrā].\footnote{17}

She who shows [her] throat [indicates], "you are very dear, O great one."\footnote{18} (?) Meditating on the Supreme Form in oneself (?),\footnote{19} [he indicates,] "you are extremely dear to me."

And she who points to her shoulder would indicate, "Where is your own place?"

Having ascertained the place of [his] own kin, (?) he would look [in that] direction

\footnote{15} "Five streams" (pahcasrotas) probably refers to the scriptural canon of Tantric Śaivism. (While the notion of a five-fold canon is normative in latter Śaivism, note however that the BraYā's own model posits three primary streams, extended also to ten; see chapter 5, section 4.) One apparently communicates knowledge of the fivefold canon by holding up five fingers. The syntax is not entirely clear though, nor is the first element of the compound satapānīna or chatapanīna. If corrupt, one possibility that comes to mind is natapanīna, i.e. "with the hand lowered." The cluster ccha would be difficult to account for as a corruption of na, however. Other possibilities include chanapānīna, "with the hand hidden," or else chatrapānīna, "with the hand [held up like] an umbrella."

\footnote{16} Note that smaritva in 111c, which in classical Sanskrit would be smrītā, reflects gerund formation based on the present stem. The BraYā's mṛtyunjaya mantra is explicated in chapter xxm.

\footnote{17} A procedure for binding the kamandalu or water-pot [mudrā] is taught in Tantrasadbhava 8.20-22, which associates it with the mother goddess Brahmāni.

\footnote{18} The yogini's [chomma] appears to depend on an association between the throat (kanyā) and affection (cf. ukhandhate, "longs for"). The form mahātmama, dropping the mess visarga, is vocative singular for mahātmā. This reflects thematicization of ātman, with ātmanā as a new stem. The same vocative occurs also in BraYā xxv.25b (there too transmitted with a visarga), and the feminine vocative mahātmā occurs profusely. We find as well the nominative singular ātmanāḥ (e.g. 2.126c: tvāḥ api atyakṣottarataḥ ca amatānāko māhātmanāl), instrumental singular ātmanena (xvi.45b and xx.116d); the genitive singular ātmanasya (ātmanasya parasya tvā, c.45d and 89d); and the instrumental plural ātmanāḥ (xxi.120d). Side by side, one finds forms based on the regular stem ātman, but with frequent confusion of its strong and weak stems. Especially frequent is ātmanam for the accusative singular ātmanam. Such stem alternation is by no means restricted to cases of metrical exigency.

\footnote{19} ii2c d poses several problems. The precise referent of parāṃ mūrtim, "the supreme form," is unclear. This could possibly refer to the vidyāmūrti (an extremely common expression in the BraYā) of Kapalīśa Bhairava. Its nāsa is assigned to the "crest lotus" (śikhi padmā) of the subtle body in BraYā iv. Would the text read parāṃ mūrtim, this might refer to the para śaktih, Aghoreśvari herself (cf. BraYā lv.4ab: yā sa śaktiḥ paraśvatāḥ mahaśaktiḥ | agorīri paraśa deśāḥ śiva yogeśvarāḥśvarī). Presumably, ātmane is locative; see the previous note.

\footnote{20} Underlying 112b's corrupt tudyatane is probably tv atyanta me, the meaning of which suits the context well. Confusion between the writing of tvā and tv might have occasioned this corruption, a confusion of which traces are occasionally apparent in A. As the sādhaka does not apparently gesticulate in any way, it seems possible that atyanta me priya is a verbal utterance. Although possibly stimulated merely by metrical exigency, the genderless atyanta indeed has a vernacular quality; cf. the case of 126d's nāmya me gatiḥ[.].
114 She who touches her arm [indicates], “You are my brother,” O pious woman. By touching of the left hand, [he] would indicate, [you are my] “sister.”

115 When she would show the left finger,22 while putting it in the mouth,23 she requests the manly hero for the food she likes.24

116 (?) He should meditate on the Ninefold [and] furnish in [her] mouth a relish (rasa) of the five elements, connected with all aims, consisting of many varieties (?).25 Having eaten and become satisfied, she turns around leftward.

117 She who touches her heart [would indicate,] “......Great Observance.”26 Having meditated upon the thirteen-limbed form of Śiva,27 one should touch [his] own liṅga.

21 This chomma seems to depend upon slesa between amsa, “shoulder,” and amsa, “portion.” An initiate, as well as yogini, belongs to the clan of a particular Mother goddess, and partakes of a portion (amsa) of that goddess. See chapter 2, section 1, in part 1 of the present thesis. In this chomma, if the emendation of sā to sa is correct, the yogini gazes at her shoulder, and the sādhaka responds by determining the direction of his clan, based upon the deity mandala, and looking in that direction.

Incidentally, the slesa between amsa and amsa contributes to the impression that in the spoken language of the author(s), there was no distinction between sā and sa. The weight of manuscript evidence certainly points in this direction, with constant but inconsistent confusion of the two.

22 Perhaps vāṁaṅgulī is a collective singular; it is also conceivable that the original reading was vāṁaṅgulī.

23 The mss transmit the masculine present participle prakṣipyant (for prakṣipyant?) in 115b, although the subject should be sā [yogini]. I have tentatively interpreted this thus. Emending to the absolutive prakṣipya would yield better grammar, but would violate the meter (creating the syncopated sequence “——”). The nasalization might have been added precisely to avoid this.

24 It seems the “food” requested would be vāṁaṅgulī, “the left-handed nectar,” especially male fluids; note the yogini’s cue using the left hand. It seems preferable to break up the compound bhojanasvēṣṭam, but it is possible that this is loose Sanskrit equivalent to bhojanasvēṣṭam.

25 The text and interpretation of this verse are problematic, and what I have proposed is conjectural. I have understood 116abcd as conveying two actions: the “hero” should provide (tena yuktam, “by him is furnished”) the yogini his “rasa” (in response to 115cd) and meditate upon the “Ninefold.” The latter might refer to the nine-syllable ćidgā, or perhaps even the nine saktis. Another possibility is that the rasa itself is to be envisioned/meditated upon as consisting of the Nine (saktis?).

26 It is difficult to reconstruct 117b, hannāmeta mahāvratam in A and B, the message the yogini conveys by touching her heart. Conceivably, one might consider the text of BraYā lxxv.247d, citīyaṃ etan mahāvratam ("this Great Observance has been performed"). It is unclear what relationship this would have with the sādhaka’s return-chomma.

27 It is not evident what form of Śiva is in question. In the kalpa of Mahākāla, BraYā liv, there are mentioned tralypadāṅga mātrās and rudrās. tryodāsa appears to be a metrically shortened form of tryodāsa, “thirteen.” Cf. trodāśāṅga in lrv.168, probably a corruption for the same. Note also the non-application of vowel-sandhi across the pada break of 117cd. It is evident that in the language of this text, a hiatus-breaker across pada boundaries is optional.
When [she] gazes at or touches [her] left breast, my dear, the sādhaka opens his mouth, [by which] is stated, “I am your son.”  

She who touches her belly [would indicate], “you must be protected,” O pious woman. One should do obeisance using the “crane” [mantra], by way of self-protection.

She who touches her navel would indicate, “O great hero, [you will have] the highest melāpa in the Middle Country, with all seventeen Clans.”

While she touches her hip, she undoubtedly informs [him] of melaka with the clan of the direction she would gaze in.

She who touches her private parts [indicates], “O son, you’ve achieved self-mastery.”

Having mentally contemplated his own pantheon (yāga), [he indicates,] “[Only] by your grace could [this] be accomplished.”

She who touches her thigh would indicate, “I am weary.” Meditating on the Churning Stick, he should employ [it] on her body. She is well-rested through its

---

28 The syntax of 118cd is poor: the nominative subject sādhakaḥ must apparently be understood as agent of the past passive participle prabhāṣitam, or else yena or the like should be supplied. I interpret the sense of 118cd as though it were, in better Sanskrit, prasārya sādhako vaktram putro ‘ham iti cādiṣeṣṭ.

29 The syllabic content of the sārāsa (“crane”) mantra is unclear, though the mantra finds multiple applications in the BraYa. Lxxvi.85 mentions this alongside the krohca (“heron”) seed-mantra (on which see the annotation on 124 below).

30 The meaning A and B’s atmakṣaṇaṁ would carry is uncertain. I have hence conjectured atmarākṣaṇam, in the sense of atmarākṣa (“[rite of] self-protection”), normally performed with six astra (“weapon”) mantras taught at the end of BraYa xi. One might also consider atmarākṣane; cf. lxxxi.74d, lingasyātmāna rakṣane (= lingasyātmānaḥ ca rakṣane).

31 In 120d, pi occurs for api, reflecting optional, often metri causa use of Middle Indic forms. This particular particle is common enough in the BraYa; c.f., e.g., xxxi.356d (dīkṣito bhairavena pi). The yogini’s chomţā seems to depend on association between the navel as “middle,” and the “middle country” (madhyadeśa).

32 The directional clan associations are presumably based upon a deity mandala, the kulasaptādaśa-cakra. Both dīśam and dīśaṁ would be acceptable emendations of A’s dīśis; the former has been adopted, since corruption from a to i seems more probable.

33 The syntax and sense of 122ab are not completely clear. In similar verses of this section, the correlative sā is usually omitted when the verb is absent; but here we have both the relative and correlative pronouns, with ellision of the verb.

34 Note that cintya = cintayitvā. The language of the BraYa allows for considerable flexibility in gerund formation, including use of the suffix ya in the absence of a prefix (cf. Törszők, “Doctrine of Magic Female Spirits,” xlv–v).

35 The emendation of āru to ārum is not certain; though loss of anusvāra would be trivial enough, the word might here be treated as neuter rather than masculine.
application, by the thumping of the Lord of the Churner (Manthānīṣa). 36

124 She who touches her knee (♀) would possess kriyāksūna (?). 37 Having then uttered the “heron” seed-mantra, 38 one should touch his rosary. After a hundred-thousand repetitions of the mantra, (♀) [it] should be released, [and] he should employ kriyāksūna (?). 39

125 She who touches her upper thigh offers endearments. One should then release a fist, while opening the left hand. 40

126 She who touches her foot would indicate, 41 (♀) “[you will] fall from [your] position” (?). 42 He, being wise, should not then remain in that place. Having uttered om, [he indicates,] “I must go; I have no other recourse.” 43

---

36 This verse is somewhat obscure. BraYāXLV is devoted to the “churning” or “churning stick” (manthāna) rite of Manthānabhairava or Manthānīṣa, “Lord of the Churner,” who is named here in 123d. In XLV, the Sakti is visualized as a ritual vessel (sthali), and Manthānabhairava as the churning stick used therein (manthānabhairavam devam saddha prayatnāyam cinten manthānaraśītam, XLV.49). This appears relevant here, as 123d links the use of a “churning stick” to the deity himself. As it seems clear that the manthāna is employed (ni^/yuj) on the body of the yoginl, I have emended tasya to the feminine in 123b. Though elliptical, the allusion to churning appears sexual.

37 See below.

38 The krofiembre is mentioned several times in the BraYā, but its syllabic content is not apparent. Given the uniformity of its orthography in A, this Middle-Indicized spelling has been retained in favor of kraunca. Note that tatoccarya reflects double application of sandhi, viz. tata uccarya → tata uccarya. Cf. Törzsök, “Doctrine of Magic Femal Spirits,” xxxi-ii.

39 A’s kriyāksūna in 124b are problematic. In 138e, there occurs aksūna as a non-classical word unattested in Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit; Edgerton interprets this as meaning “not faulty.” Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit, vol. 2, p. 3, 200-1 (the latter for ksīna). Cf. Prakrit aksūna (Pāṇisaddhānayya, 15). However, aksūna is evidently a noun in BraYā IV,138e, and also in 124f—assuming, in spite of A reading kryaksūna, that it is the object of yojayet. Most probably, kriyāksūna should be understood as kriya+aksūna; if an adjective of the yoginl in 124b, this should be emended to kriyāksūṇam, while 124f should read kriyāksūṇam. However, the meaning remains uncertain. The context of 138 suggests the possibility that aksūna refers to non-verbal codes performed in silence—the language of signs elaborated after that verse. This would have little connection to attested Middle-Indic meanings of aksūna, however. Note that 124cde is suggestive of expiation: perhaps “having uttered the heron-mantra, he should touch his rosary; after a lakh of repetitions, he is freed [from ritual fault?]”

40 Though not made explicit, perhaps the sadhaka first casts his left fist, then opens it, or perhaps casts his right fist while opening the left. It is not clear what this exchange signifies.

41 In 126b, it seems probable that tumādiset (A) should be emended to tu stādiset; cf., e.g., 123b. However, it is possible that this should be interpreted as tu -m- ādiset, with a hiatus-breaking -m-. Precisely the same dilemma is posed by lxxiii.27b.

42 It is difficult to derive an appropriate meaning from the mss’ padabhramśā in 126b. It seems pada might be a corruption of pada, influenced by pada in 126a. As a negative prognostication, padabhramśā yields appropriate sense.

43 The mss read nāmya me gati for nānyā me gaiity (unmetrical). This suggests not mere gender fluidity, but its elision, an impression (perhaps coincidentally) reinforced by the absence of a visarga after gati in
She who touches her toenails and goes, looking away, tells the sādhaka [he will obtain] the state of a Sky-traveller before long.44 Henceforth, he should always have [self]-control.

She who lifts up the sole of her foot and shows it tells the hero,"before long, [you shall have] the power of entering the underworlds."45

[If she] would release her fist into the air, and shake her own body, then (♀) [she indicates] melaka with beings dwelling in the heavens . . . (?).46

And she who gazes upwards, and afterwards proceeds to look in the directions, would tell [him], "after half the night, [there shall be] melaka with the Four."47

She who puts her hands on her hips and laughs repeatedly (♀) would indicate

"[you will have] melaka with the Group of Six after two and a half watches of the night" (?).48

When [she] puts her hands on the tip of the nose and moves her head around,
she in that way relates "melaka with the Nine in a large forest."49

the mss. Cf. 112d, which also involves a spoken utterance.

44 khecaraścirenaiva = khecaraścirenaiva, with elision of the case ending m, metri causa. The grammatically correct khecaraścirenaiva would be unmetrical. Note also the treatment of the root √ kath as if it were of the sixth ganga, viz. kathate for kathayati; cf. kathet in 131d (by conjecture).

45 Although the mss' pātalasiddhir vīrasya, with elision of the visarga, creates a standard (pathya) śloka foot and is therefore plausible, the grammatically correct pātalasiddhir vīrasya has an acceptable metrical variant (vipula); cf. 127a below.

46 i29cd appears corrupt as reads A (sārvavāśāh). One possibility is to emend this to svargaśāhām (=svargaśāhām, metri causa). Isaacson points out the possibility of reading sārvavāśāhām (personal communication); this indeed seems plausible given passages in the Brahma connecting heavenly bodies with the goddesses/saktis. The contrast in sense with 128, promise of entry into the underworlds, and the yogin’s act of striking at the sky, could support either conjecture. More difficult to restore precisely is i29d; the sense is probably something to the effect of melakam ādīśet.

47 The “four” in question would comprise the Four Devis of the primary mandala, Rākta et al. Note use of the masculine caturtām for the feminine.

48 131d is garbled in the mss. A reads dya(dha(dha)yamedimekathe, underlying which I conjecture to be dya(yam)me kathe. The basic sense and structure of 131d would in this case be parallel to 130d (sā kathayec ardhuratrat). dya(yam)me(k) seems paleographically plausible, and dya(yam)ha occurs for two-and-a-half repeatedly in the Brahma. The optative kathet is moreover attested (cf. lxxii.28b). Far less secure is the conjecture for syllables 4-6, iyāmle ‘ti sā for yāmedime(k). This would reflect double application of sandhi: yāme iti → yama iti → yāmety. Cf. tatoccarya in 124a above. Closer to A’s dyme might be dine; perhaps, “[melaka with the six] in the day, in the middle of the third watch”—an unlikely time for melaka, perhaps. The goddesses in question are the Six Yoginis of the mandala, Krostukl et al.

49 The “nine” in question would comprise the Four Devis and Four Dūtis, plus Aghori herself.
She who would look down and begin to draw on the ground [indicates], “[you will have] melaka with female beings of the underworlds, in a temple of the Mothers.”

She who gazes at her own tongue, and afterwards trembles, tells of melaka with female beings dwelling in the waters.

She who shakes her hands from feet to head would indicate melaka [with the goddesses] at the reality level she abides in, the Śiva-tattva, etc.50

He, (?) a master of mudrās, should thus devotedly worship Manthānabhairava (?), and then wander about in the way explained by the Tantra.51

[Saying,] “Be there homage to the deities of the directions!,” and offering argha with the highest devotion to the perfected ones of yore, and to Vināyaka,52 melaka then takes place—which, O great goddess, bestows all things salutary, and makes one equal to the [yoginis].53

50 It is difficult to make sense of the mss' kṛtvā hastaprakampane. Two conjectures appear plausible: hastaprakampanam, which has been adopted, and hastam prakampate. Both would supply an object for kṛtva, and the latter a completive verb, creating a structure similar to those of most passages in this section. Cf., e.g., hastau kṛtva in 131 and 132, and prakampate in 134b. One might expect the yogini to indicate a point along her vertical axis that corresponds to one of the reality levels, prognosticating melaka with yoginis of that tattva. Similar is the principle involved in the chomū section of Svacchandatantra 15, from verse 24, in which the yogini indicates points along her body corresponding to the reality levels of the universe—bestowing corresponding siddhis, according to the commentator Ksemarāja (ad 20ab).

51 The text and syntax of 136 have a degree of uncertainty. A has the unmetrical reading so ‘pi mudrāpatiḥ pujyah tatha mañthanabhairava. In order to yield a plausible syntax, I suggest emending pūjyaḥ to the gerund, pūjya, for pūjayītva. This form is well attested in the BraYā; cf. evam pūjya yathānāyāyaṁ vinyāktaṁ tu vinayaset (xii, f. 259r). One must also emend to either the nominative mudrāpatiḥ (following B) or the accusative mudrāpatiḥ. In other words, mudrāpati could modify either the subject (sādhaka), or object, Manthānabhairava, or else be a substantive, the second object of pūjya. The syntax, with tatha, might point to the latter: “He should worship the Master of Mudrās, and likewise (tatha) Manthānabhairava.” This seems unlikely, though, as mudrāpati does not seem to be a common epithet of any deity. The expression does occur as an epithet of the practitioner in Sarvatathāgatatattvavamsgraha 1.170.278, and I have adopted this interpretation. An alternative syntax for 136a would be to interpret it as a nominative sentence: so ‘pi mudrāpatiḥ pūjyaḥ tatha [=yathā?] mañthanabhairavaḥ. Speaking against this possibility is bhaktiḥ would have to modify paryāṇaṁ kuryād, rather than pūjya, which seems unlikely.

52 I37abc appears to stipulate in abbreviated form worship of one’s lineage or gurupākṣī. Worship of the gurupākṣī is mentioned in BraYā vii.51-53, involving honoring Vināyaka, the puṃsiddhas, the directional goddesses (digādevi), “the gurus, beginning with Śiva” (śīnādguravah), and one’s own guru. Cf. Tantrālokā 16.10. Note that 137a has a correct variant metrical pattern (vipulā).

53 It is unclear what the mss’ tātsāmīṁge in 137e would modify. I have emended this to the accusative tātsāmīṁge, understanding it as an instrumental bahu-vr̥ti modifying melāpakaṁ, viz. “by which one [becomes] equal to the [clan yoginis].” Cf. BraYā viii.33b: vratā ca yogīsāṁyāṁ caryāmelāpakaśāyānāṁ.
I shall teach what the akṣiṇa (?) should be for the sādhaka when he remains in silence.\textsuperscript{54} Listen, O highly fortunate one, with single-minded attention.\textsuperscript{55}

With the index finger on the tip of the thumb, this is called the “flower” mudrā.\textsuperscript{56}

He solicits ointment by movement of the thumb to the base digit.\textsuperscript{57}

When he has hands raised, moving with agitation, this is the “incense” mudrā, O beautiful woman.\textsuperscript{58} By downward movement of the fingers, one indicates the argha offering.\textsuperscript{59}

(“an observance by which there is equality to the Yogi[ṇa]ś (?), which bestows the [clan] conduct and melaka”).

\textsuperscript{54} The problematic word akṣiṇa (or perhaps ksīṇa) occurs above in 124. Here, it appears to be the object of sampravakṣyāmi, as though it is the subject matter taught in the remainder of this chapter. The section beginning here teaches chommas by which the sādhaka silently signals his desire for various objectives. These largely pertain to the material culture of the Yoginś cult: elements of worship, and substances of the class referred to as siddhadravyas, “magically empowered substances” (cf. Tantrasad-bhava 9.80). In the following section of BraYa, such substances are solicited through mudrās, many of which are homonymous with what is sought. We unfortunately learn little here concerning the context for such solicitation. One possibility is that the sādhaka, having obtained melaka with yogins, solicits various empowered cult articles through the application of chommas. This idealized conception does not exclude, however, the likelihood that such mudrās served for ritual communication between practitioners. It also might be worth mentioning that some of the “substances” sought are themselves siddhis: that is, there are eye-ointments (aṅjanas) one might manufacture for ritual use, as well as magical aṅjana, swords, and so forth one supposedly obtains divinely as a fruit of ritual. Such is the intention of expressions such as aṭṭjanasiddhi, khadgasiddhi, and so forth; see for example the entry on “khaḍga” in Tantrikabhidhanakosa, vol. II, 163.

\textsuperscript{55} Concerning 138d, see the annotation on 1.15.

\textsuperscript{56} In 139a, the instrumental tarjanya seems likely, but not certain. Perhaps the tips of the thumb and index finger meet, as though holding the stalk of a flower. One could also consider tarjanyajñigusthāgāre (“in the case of/when the tip of the thumb is on the index finger?”). That the description of puspamudrā in the Sarvadurgatiparipāśasanatantara differs: according to this source, one cups the hands in aṭṭjali and releases them downwards (aṭṭjāler aṭṭhokṣeṣpayā ḍhīpamudrā ṭasyā evṛdhiḥkeṣepā puspamudrā). According to this source, the “incense” mudrā involves the opposite, with the cupped hands released upwards. In this too the BraYa differs; note ḍhīpamudrā as described in 140.

\textsuperscript{57} The action described by mulaparvabhramāngusthe is not clear: does the tip of the thumb slide to the base of the index finger? It is uncertain whether 139cd consists of an inflection of the puspamudrā, or rather an independent action. Similar is the case of 140cd.

\textsuperscript{58} See above on ḍhīpamudrā. As provided in the ms, the syntax of 140ab seems unsatisfactory: uṭṭānahastā sollolā ḍhīpamudrāśusobhane. Minimally, one must emend to the nominative āhastaḥ sollo, presumably modifying the practitioner; this incidentally results in a correct variant metrical foot (cūplā). Syntactically, one might prefer the locative absolute uṭṭānahastā sollole, with its vipulā possibly contributing to the corruption. This reading has been tentatively conjectured. A more paleographically plausible emendation might be uṭṭānahastam uḷolāṃ.

\textsuperscript{59} In 140d, aṅgulīrghaḥ has been emended to aṅgulī arghaḥ, the accusative plural as object of “practica” in 140c. However, it might be worth considering the possibility that aṅgulīnarghaḥ is a contraction for aṅgulīnām arghaḥ, metri causa. In this verse, note also the non-application of sandhi across the pada boundary of 140cd, which appears more as the norm than the exception. On argha, see the entry for arghya in Tantrikabhidhanakosa vol. I, p. 140-41; however, in the BraYa, the constituent substance would be rather more “non-dual” than this suggests.
Having the fist [like] a pitcher, one should understand “water,” fingers upwards, “incense coals.” By one’s gaze roving, understand “immersion.” A rolling tongue [indicates] “anointing/unguent” (?).

(?) [There is indication] of kindling sticks the length of a hand (?) by bringing the knees and elbows together. [When] the hand is raised, facing down, one should understand “food offering (naivedya).”

The fist facing downwards, with the little finger extended, [indicates] “weapon.” One indicates entreaty for a sword by making a fist and then gazing at the sky.

With the index finger (?) as though bestowing favor on animals (?), the garbha-grass mudrā is taught. The “doe” [mudrā] is for sesame seeds, the “sow”

*vindyāt* appears from context to be an optative from *vid* in the sense of “to know,” although the form technically belongs to *vid* conjugated in the third class (“to find, meet with”). Cf. *Bṛaya* xxxvii.9a (ādiyaṁ tu rajam vindyāt), and ṣad as well.

It seems 141a should teach two separate chommās, but the syntax and sense are elliptical. In 141a, *jalam* should be the object of *vindyād*, which suggests interpreting *kumbhamuṣṭi* as nominative, i.e. *kumbhamuṣṭi*. The sense of 141b, *dhūpaṅgārordhaṅguli* in A, seems to be, “the fingers pointing upwards indicates ‘charcoal for [burning] incense’.” The precise text and syntax are less clear, however. There appear to be two feminines—dhūpaṅgārā and ardhaṅguli—in apposition, or else a compound, yet both possibilities seem implausible. Perhaps “ṅguli” should be understood as ṅgulīḥ, accusative for nominative, with dhūpaṅgārā reflecting loss of case-ending or double-sandhi, metri causa.

141d appears garbled in the mss: jhīvdollolopalepana. The probable lexical elements are jhīvā, lola (or ḫola, ullola?), and upalepana. Presumably, the latter is the object sought through an action involving the tongue, if 141d teaches a chommat separate from that of 141c. Tentatively, one might conjecture jhīvā lolopalepanam (i.e. lola+upalepanam)—as adopted—or, retaining the final -e, jhīvā lolopalepane (“a rolling tongue [is used] in the sense of ‘anointing/unguent’”).

In 142a, syllables 4-5 in A are uncertain, though undamaged; B’s “endha” is a plausible interpretation. The genitive, with no nominative, seems syntactically unusual in this passage.

The first element of 143a, anuyāsāprakṛtā, is certainly corrupt. It seems probable that it should contain an adjective of muṣṭir. The most plausible emendation which comes to mind is kanyāsāprasṛtā, reflecting confusion between initial a and ka, and kṛ and sr.

The mss read muṣṭi adhovakṛtā, omitting the expected case ending r at the pada boundary of 143b. It is possible that the reading is original, reflecting non-standard sandhi.

Presumably an ablative underlies the mss’ khagālokā in 143c, viz. khagālokāt. The nominative khagālokoh could also be possible.

There is uncertainty concerning the interpretation of tiryakprasāda in 144a. No plausible interpretation of prasāda seems evident if one understands tiryak in the sense of “crooked”—“by the index finger, slightly prasāda?” It hence seems preferable to understand tiryak as “animal,” as seems likely in 146d. This is not entirely convincing, however. Alternatively, it is perhaps conceivable that in copying, the vowel sign was omitted from prasṛta, hence prasāta, then emended to prasāda. It might also be possible also that the text originally read prasārya, although this construes less smoothly with the instrumental.

Understand tilāṃ as genitive plural for tilānāṃ. These chommās and the following several convey
for barley; but prasṛṭi is for wheat. By extending all the fingers, for bilva fruit and lotuses.⁶⁹

145cd-146 (i) ...... and the palm extended onto a second;⁷⁰ by the five fingers facing upwards with level tips (?), [one indicates, "an offering] consisting of fruit."⁷¹ (i) Fist. ...... mudrā, straight, for an animal offering (?).⁷²

147 By uniting the thumbs together, one indicates "fishes."⁷³ From staring at one's nose, "emission of person" is stated.⁷⁴

the sādhaka’s request for materials offered in the fire sacrifice, homa.

⁶⁹ Saucchandatantra 2.287 (=Tantrasadbhava 2.135ab) mentions a bandha called mṛgī associated with homa of sesame seeds (mṛgīṁ baddhī tv laiḥ homāḥ pumabāvītāv adiviṣṭoḥ). According to Kṣemarāja, commenting on this passage, one binds the mṛgī by extending the index and little fingers, with the tips of the thumb, middle finger, and ring finger touching (prasṛṭatarjanīkaniṣṭhāङ्गुलिर निगुणस्थामाद्यसंधायं निर्मलसंधायं सत्ताम च mṛgībандhaḥ). The ms’ prasṛṭi should probably be emended prasṛṭī; there is apparently a mudrā by this name involving extending the hand with the palm cupped (Apte, Practical Sanskrit-English Dictionary, 1118). It is possible that the long i ending is original, reflecting a tendency to change short -i stems to long -i. As for the "sow" mudrā, no description of this is known to me presently. By bilva is meant the bilva fruit, for a gesture involving bilva signifies "fruit" as the sacrificial offering in the next verse. It would appear that both the fruit and leaves are used in homa: Tantrasadbhava 2.125, as well as Bhratrawanāgīlā 142cd, mention bilva and bilvapatra as homa offerings.

⁷⁰ 145cd is problematic. As transmitted, 145c would appear to mean "having fingers extended (śriṇa) on the middle of a bilva." Perhaps the fingers are to be positioned as though grasping this fruit. This is difficult to relate to 145d, however. One possibility would be to emend to bilve mādiṇa, and connect this passage with 145a, understanding 145c and 145d to elaborate upon the cases of bilva and padma, the latter being the "second" option (dvitīya). The actions specified are however unclear to me.

⁷¹ No intelligible syntax is evident from A’s reading in 146ab: pūrṇāṅgulām samāgra(h/t) tu uṛddhavaktra phālāhakam; B and C read samāgra. It might be possible to interpret this by emending to form a compound in the nominative: pūrṇāṅgulaṁsamsaṅgaḥ—perhaps "having the tips of the five fingers level" and [curled?] “facing upward” (uṛddhavaktraḥ), 146b).

⁷² 146cd presents several problems. Pāda c appears corrupt, with no plausible interpretation or emendation evident to me presently. It might provide the name of a mudrā. The lexical elements involved include muṣṭi, possibly in the instrumental, and arda—either ardhāḥ or ardhātma. Were "fish" not already indicated in 147, one might conjecture muṣṭijārāṇāṁ matsamudrā tu. matsamudrā might also be conceivable, however improbable. Pāda d has its own difficulties, reading rūjātiryakprāharanaḥ in A. It might conduce with pāda c, but could also constitute a separate chommd. Suitable to the context is interpretation of tiryak in the sense of "animal," and prāharanaḥ in the sense of "an offering," or perhaps "striking" (=prahāra?). The emendation prahārape seems more probable than B’s prahārantiḥ. Also, note that although non-application of external vowel sandhi is common, especially across pada boundaries, in the case of tu rjus, sandhi is avoided probably because r is treated as r—the same is written as such in most of the ms.

⁷³ A’s samghata in 147a is presumably for samhata, “joined together.” Such is the reading of B. The orthography samghāta is perhaps original; cf., e.g., samghātra for samhātra in Brahma x.1.101cd in A: jñānasaktiḥ[s] samkhyāyam raudrāsanghārāpaḥpiṇī.

⁷⁴ lokavisarga in 147c is obscure; perhaps seminal emission? Given that the referents of several chommds in this section suggest a sacrificial context, lokavisarga might instead have the sense of “dispatching a person,” i.e. human sacrifice.”
By appearing to sniff with the nose, [one indicates] “spirituous liquors, dark ones and so forth.” While touching the left ear, O goddess, “liquor of jaggery and ghee” is declared.

From touching the head, one states, “great spirits made from fruit.” Use of the oblation-ladle, as though in ritual observance, [indicates,] “ghee and other dairy liquors.”

By casting the fist toward the head, there is the “ash” mudrā, O fair lady. By touching the back, one would indicate “yoga strap,” it is declared.

And by touching the buttocks, O goddess, one indicates “seat,” and because of moving the ring finger, middle finger, and thumb, “rosary.” O sinless one, just by touching the girdle (kakṣa), (?) “sack” (?) is taught.

When the hand [moves] from the head down to the waist, [this indicates] “the Five Insignia;” (?) a full water pot (?), O goddess, a damaru, and also India

---

75 The interpretation of nāsāgārāyanaṇārūpya seems doubtful. It appears probable that āghāryaṇa means āghāryaṇa; the form occurs also in 1.42a.

76 It appears necessary in 148b to emend A’s “āśavat” to the nominative plural. What exactly constitutes “dark” (kṛṣṇa) liquor remains unclear; BraYa refers to this as a specific fluid. Note xcv.7ab: nṛṣṭhīṃsādhīyāṇaḥ kṛṣṇanāmaḥ kṛṣṇanāmaḥ (nāṃkām apparently genitive plural). This suggests it consists of liquid offerings (argha) containing incense [made with?] human flesh. Cf. BraYa xcvii.43, referring to kṛṣṇoṣāntāṃṛtaṇā.{

77 It seems preferable, although unnecessary, to emend sprṣan to the present participle sprsan, viz. vīmukṣaraṃ sprṣan. This certainly improves the syntax. This apparently occurred to the editorially-inclined scribe of B, who writes sprṣan, perhaps emending after having already copied the amustvāna of his exemplar.

78 It is by no means certain whether one should accept B’s śīraḥ, where A reads śīraḥ. In the BraYa, one finds the thematized stem śīra as well as the regular stem śīraḥ, and A frequently drops a visarga before s.

79 This sentence has a second, redundant predicate: proktam as well as adiset.

80 It is likely that the mss’ sphica is original, reflecting thematization of sphic to form a new base sphica. Cf. the instrumental sphicena in BraYa lxxxi.22b. As above, A’s frequent elision of a visarga before a sibilant makes this difficult to ascertain.

81 The referent of what the mss read as bokānako remains elusive. From the context, it would seem to denote a material cult item. Cf. bokkāna, “a horse’s nose-bag (which contains his food)” (Apte, The Practical Sanskrit-English Dictionary, 1172). It could hence conceivably denote some sort of sack.

82 It seems that mūrḍhīna or mūḍhīna—A usually reads the latter—is preferred as the base for classical Skt. mūrḍhīna. The declension of this word shows great variety in the BraYa.

83 As transmitted by the mss, the syntax of 152cd seems odd: mudrīṣau pācoukam apparently means pācucoudrāḥ. Perhaps the locative plural has the sense of genitive plural.

84 As given in the mss, 152c seems corrupt: bhṛtakamandale devi. This has the metrical fault of light syllables in positions two and three—and in any case seems unintelligible. A good chance exists that
yellow (rocana).\textsuperscript{85}

\textbf{153} By the left hand shaking, facing downwards, is taught the “bell” mudrā. The viṇā mudrā [is when] the hand has the shape of a viṇā.

\textbf{154} Having in the beginning communicated [with] these and other signs revealed in the scriptures,\textsuperscript{86} or else [improvising] as one pleases, afterwards one should observe [a vow of] silence.\textsuperscript{87}

\textbf{155} Unattached to the company of people, observing silence, intent on meditation, devoted by nature to solitude, he achieves siddhi, free from illness.

\textbf{156} After understanding the mutually agreed [code of signs to be used], and likewise [the code of] verbal communication, a wise person should employ the chommās, using speech and mudrā.\textsuperscript{88}

Thus ends chapter fifty-three,\textsuperscript{89} the section on chommā.

---

\textsuperscript{85} The substance rocana, perhaps to be identified with “India yellow,” finds frequent mention in the BraYa, especially as a medium for the drawing of yantras. Apte identifies it as a yellow pigment (ibid., 1349). That this is a biological product is apparent from the BraYas mention of both gorocand and nararocana.

\textsuperscript{86} etanyam api in 154a appears to represent etam anyam api. This might reflect formation of a new pronominal base eη, although this would be an isolated occurrence in the BraYa.

\textsuperscript{87} I am grateful to Isaacson for suggesting this as one possible interpretation of 154 (personal communication, July 2006).

\textsuperscript{88} The syntax of 156b has a degree of ambiguity: vākyādpaṃ appears to be a second object of jñātvā, as the placement of tathāva can suggests.

\textsuperscript{89} Note that tripančastiṣāṇa = tripančaṣattama. The formation of ordinal numbers in the language of the BraYa follows non-classical lines: those nineteen and higher are regularized such that all end in ima. Hence, numerals viṃśati, pāśṭhi, saptati, aṣṭiti, and navati become bases for e.g. viṃśatīna (twentieth), ekāṃśatīna (thirty-first), catuḥśaṣṭihina (sixty-fourth; A almost invariably reads sastośi° for ṣastośi°), ekāṃśaptaṭāna (sixty-ninth), aṣṭīna (eightieth), and navanavatīna (ninety-ninth). On the other hand, trimśat, catvāriṃśat, and pañcaśat become e.g. ṣaṭtrimśatīna (sixty-third), catucatvārīṃśatāna (forty-fourth), and pañcapancaśatāna (fifty-fifth). The formation of i-stem bases follows the analogy of viṃśati, etc. Some deviation in formation also occurs: for example, in BraYa xvii, one finds instead catucatvārīṃśa (fortieth), and pañcapancaśam, ekapaḥcaśam, saṇapaḥcaśama (fiftieth, fifty-first and sixty-fifth), etc. With the exception of catucatvārīṃśa, which might omit the suffix metri cauṣa, all these forms share the suffix mu; cf. the ordinal suffix tama in classical Sanskrit.
Bhairava spoke:

1 Now, I shall next teach the manner of making secret signs (chomma), and the conduct of the clan observances (kulācāra), with their appearances, characteristics, and actions,¹

¹ This verse presents several ambiguities of syntax and interpretation. Metrical necessity suggests that the accusative °karmāḥ is original, thematized as an a-stem. In 1b, A's yathā vidhiḥ also seems to be original. Cf. Tantrasadbhāva 15.162:

śṛṇu devī pravakṣyāmi anśākānāṃ yathā vidhiḥ |
kathayāmi na sandehas tvatpatta surasundari || 162 ||

However, the common adverb yathāvidhi merits consideration as well; B in fact emends thus. Cf., e.g., BraYa iv.1ab: athathaḥ sampravakṣyāmi pratimākarnaṃ yathāvidhiḥ (hypermetrical). In the present verse, an adverb does not seem probable, however; chomkānāṃ would have to be an object of sampravakṣyāmi, or construe with rūpalakṣaṇakarmaḥ in 1c. The former possibility seems unlikely. Note for instance the expected possessive genitives in closely related verses, e.g. Tantrasadbhāva 18.4ab (athathaḥ sampravakṣyāmi chomkānāṃ tu laksanām) and BraYa lv.101ab (śṛṇu devī pravakṣyāmi chomkānāṃ tu laksanām). The possibility that chomkānāṃ construes with rūpalakṣaṇakarmaḥ is stronger, in which case the verse could mean, "Now, I shall next teach the forms, characteristics, and actions of chommaḥ, according to precept (yathāvidhiḥ), and the activities/endeavor of/w ith respect to clan-based post-initiatory conduct (kulācāra)."

Concerning the expression rūpalakṣaṇakarman, rūpalakṣaṇa is fairly common in the BraYa. Note for instance Lxxvii.24cd: ity evaṃ kathilāṃ nyāśaṃ rūpalakṣaṇasamasyatam, "thus has been taught mantra installation, together with its forms and characteristics." Note also the parallel in vii.1:

atadi parama pravakṣyāmi svadhyāyam devataṇī tu |
rūpalakṣaṇakarman ca sādākānāṃ hitāy caiva || i ||

The grammar here is opaque. One possibility is that devataṇī should somehow be understood as genitive, construing perhaps with both svadhyāyam and rūpalakṣaṇakarman—"Now, I shall next teach the deities' own visualization, and their forms, qualities, and actions, for the the welfare of sādhakas." Another possibility is that svadhyāyam and perhaps even °karmaḥ be understood, loosely, as adverbs: "I shall teach the deities, by way of their visualization, and [by way of?] [their] forms, characteristics, and ritual." Neither possibility seems satisfactory. rūpalakṣaṇakarma occurs once elsewhere as well, in Lxxvii.157–58a, the context and grammatical problems similar. In 1b, if we read yathā vidhiḥ, it seems likely that rūpalakṣaṇakarman agrees with kulācāraviceṣṭitam as an adjective; this interpretation has been tentatively adopted. Regarding the meaning of kulācāraviceṣṭitam, note the expressions samayācāraveṣṭi
the way a hero or a clan-born yogini, divided into those perfected and those not perfected, is recognized, along with assistants to the sādhu kā abiding by special rituals and observances; listen while I speak this.

3 'nā' is [the syllable for] man; by 'ni', woman; 'bhū' for cremation ground, 'bhṛ' (XCl.38a) and samatačara fans are based upon vague phonetic similarity to actual words, even though many of the correspondences are not evident, as pointed out to me by Isaacson (personal communication, May 2005). This term occurs in the Uttarasūtra (4.34d) and Guhyasūtra (3.10b) of the Niḍūśanarṭantra, and seems common in Tantric Buddhist sources. It also occurs elsewhere in the Braṇya, for instance thrice in chapter sixty-three. However, the more common term for an assistant in this text is sakhi, "companion," most often thematized as sakha. Although samačottarādāhakaś is a plausible text, note the occurrence of samačottarasādhakā in 38b below; this suggests the possibility that 2d should instead read samačottarasādhakā, meaning "along with the sādhaka-assistants with whom their is accord/agreement." Supporting this conjecture is the difficulty of interpreting ca in 2d otherwise. It could conceivably be meaningless, added to avoid the fault of laghu syllables in the second and third positions.

The possibility seems strong that retroflection in ni- in 3a has been triggered by the -r- in strī, a scribal confusion over word division. Cf. III.151b, where the MSS read uttarayātra samśayah for what should be uttare nātra samśayah.

It seems that in the present chapter, a number of single-syllable chommas are based upon vague phonetic similarity to actual words, even though many of the correspondences are not evident. 'nā', for example, appears to suggest nara, while ni, if this is correct, could relate to nāri ('woman'), or even niśambinī, "beautiful woman." Laghusaṃvaratantra 24, in prose reconstructed from Bhavabhūṣaṇa's Vivṛti commentary, the Tibetan translation, and Sanskrit parallels, also provides nā as the verbal chomma for "man" (naraḥ). Bhavabhūṣaṇa comments,

\[
\text{nā iti naraḥ iti} | \text{nāsakhaḥ purusavatcī strīlingaḥ} | \text{nṛśabda iti kocī} |
\]

'\text{nā} is [for] nara ('man'). The word 'nā' is of feminine gender and conveys 'male'. According to some, the [underlying] word is 'nr'."

Sarnath edition, 128. Cf. Laghusaṃvaratantra 15.1ab:

\[
\text{dā iti puruṣaḥ smṛtaḥ dī iti strīpyaṇaḥ tataḥ} |
\]

"'dā' is said to be 'man'; 'dī' is hence for women."

In this case, the verbal chommas dā and dī probably imply dāka and dākini.

5 The chomma 'bhū' suggests bhū/bhumi, "ground," probably in the sense of maśānababumī, "creation ground." However, in Laghusaṃvarara 15.5c, 'bhū' is instead the verbal chomma for melapaka, suggesting "ground" in the sense of melāpātsthāna, the place designated for encounters with goddesses.
is lāmā, and ‘ghru’ raudrikā; ‘khi’ would be one born in the clan of Mothers,6 ‘kr’ for dākinī.7

4 [She] is considered born in the clan of sīvās by three a’s.8 ‘dā’ proclaims her a dāmart,9 and ‘hi’ a dāvi,10 O fair woman.

5 (¿) ‘sā’ is nectar, and ‘brū’ [the nectar] called ‘Left’ (?);11 ‘hā’ is for meat. ‘yo’ is wife, ‘ya’ is sister; ‘ma’ is said to be for ‘birth’.12

6 By the syllable ‘li’ is taught food; from the syllable ‘va’, drink, my dear.13 (¿) ‘hi’

---

6 The nasal in ghruh seems to be a spurious addition, given the implausibility of the accusative. The -ā could however be a corruption of -ā. If words are implied by ‘brhru’, ‘ghru’, and ‘khi’, these are not presently apparent. Although raudrikā could mean “female rudra,” this does not seem to be an attested classificatory category. One might wonder whether in fact this refers to the rudradakinī, which appears often in goddess lists in the BraYA. Cf. 26d below. In IV.67, reference is made to rudradākṣā, but this seems to mean nāheśvarikulasamābhāvat yogīnt.

7 The chomma kr suggests the verbal root √ kr (krnoti-krnte), “to injure.” This would accord well with the violence associated with dākinīs in Śaiva sources. Note that kr could be corrupt for kri, for no other verbal chommas in this section involve vowels other than a, a, i, or u. In any case, rī and r appear largely interchangeable in the BraYA, presumably because of equivalent pronunciation.

8 The expression aṅkārtirītaya appears to mean three repetitions of the vowel a. This seems oddly incongruent, however, with the other chommas.

9 deti in 4c is a conjecture for devi. A phonetic unit is expected, and in the absence of further clues, this possibility requires the least emendation. If correct, deti is more likely to represent dā iti than da iti, since the latter chomma-syllable also occurs in 9c, and could moreover be expressed by dena. What the referent of dā might be is uncertain.

10 Note that dārya appears to be feminine singular, although the latter is more commonly and “correctly” dāvi. Cf. dārya in IV.45a, again nominative, as well as Netratantra 2.13d in its Nepalese mss. Sanderson, “Religion and the State: Śaiva Officials,” 243 (n. 33). See Törzsök’s discussion of the extension of -r stems to -ā in the Siddhayogāvatārīnāta (“Doctrine of Magic Female Spirits,” §11.8.4, pp. xxxviii-ix). The chomma hi might suggest the word himsā, “violence.”

11 In 5a, it is difficult to construe the sa or sā in sāmrta. One possibility is that sāmrta is a separate chomma, and that the pada means sā iti daksināmṛtam [proktam] brūs ca vāṃkhyam [jāmṛtam]. The position of ca supports this possibility, and the same pairing of nectars occurs explicitly in 33 below. This would be rather elliptical. vāṃkhyam amṛtam, or vāṃmṛta, “Left-handed nectar,” refers to impure fluid substances used in the rituals of this system, especially alcohol, but perhaps also blood and sexual fluids. The ‘pure’ liquid offerings of Saiddhāntika worship comprise daksināṃṛta. Referents of ‘sa’ and ‘brū’ are not evident.

12 makārotpattir reflects double application of sandhi for makāraḥ utpattih. It seems possible that utpattih here stands for “mother.” Cf. Laghuśamvaratantra 15.3ab: mā iti mātā vai smrtaḥ yo iti bhūryā tu vai (Baroda codex). The chomma ‘go’ suggests yeṣīt (“woman”), while ‘ga’ perhaps yāmi (“sister”), and ‘ma’ māt (“mother”).

13 The chomma li suggests the dhātā lī (“to lick, taste”), while vā might suggest vārī.
By the syllable ‘phā’, one should know that conversing is for sex. By the remaining syllables, in order, are blood, fat, and semen.

Through the syllable ‘kṣa’, “wandering” is declared; through the syllable ‘ja’, “excluded.” (?) The heart is taught through the syllable ‘pa’, dwelling together with companions (?).  

14 What the mss transmit as hisappā in 6c appears corrupt. It might hold place for a complete verbal chomnā, as what follows, bhajana kena, itself appears complete. It could conceivably describe the vessel or plate (bhajana), however. The phonology of appā or appakā is evidently Middle-Indic. A parallel appears moreover to exist, with the occurrence of appakā as a verbal chomnā in Laghuśanvagatāntātra 24, where the text reads appakā iti rājaspaśe rāja-purusaḥ: “appakā means a royal spy, a royal functionary” (Sarnath edition, p. 127). This meaning ill suits the context of lxxiii.6. Still, this occurrence of appakā suggests that appā in 6c could be the correct lexeme, perhaps in a different sense. We would have to emend, however, to hir appā or him appā. The latter is more paleographically probable, and has been tentatively adopted. Alternatively, if we ignore the parallel, one might conjecture hriṣaya, with sayya used in the sense of “sitting place,” i.e. where one sits to eat. Less probable semantically, but requiring no emendation, would be hriṣaya, appā being Middle-Indic for sarpa, “snake.” Note that all of these possibilities involve a second application of the syllable hi, which already occurred in 4d.

15 Words that ka and ga might imply are not evident. Although bhōjana could mean “food,” it has been understood as “eating,” given the presence of bhakṣa in 6a. However, bhakṣa and bhōjana could both refer to types of food; cf. bhāksya and bhōjya in lxxii.30cd.

16 The expression sesavarnaih kramena in 7d might suggest a patterned arrangement of verbal chomnās not yet readily apparent. The idea could be, however, that the first syllables of rakta (blood), vasā (marrow or fat), and sukra (semen) form their respective (kramaṇa) verbal chomnās. This possibility was suggested by Isaacson (personal communication, May 2005).

17 Here the mss’s unintelligible ksakarenaditam has been emended to the phonetically similar ksakarenittam, with aṭṭita as an action noun, “wandering.”

18 The interpretation of 8cd is unclear, and the text perhaps suspect. “Heart” appears incongruent with the referents of other verbal chomnās, which in this chapter include clan identities, substances, ritual paraphernalia, kinship relationships, and actions. Barring serious corruption, 8a appears to elaborate upon the chomnā pa’ in 8c. Both cāsana and sukhasamgamā are difficult to understand, however. One possibility might be emending to sukhasamgamā, while understanding “cāsana in the sense of “dwelling”—i.e. “dwelling in the company of friends/assistants.” This might suit the context suggested by 8ab: we would then, it seems, have the options of “wandering,” being “excluded” [from human company?], and “dwelling in the company of sakhis.” Note that sakhī is the normal term in this text for the assistant/companion to the sādhaka; see the annotation ad l.v.2. On the meaning of varjita, cf. lxxiii.4ab: vanasthā sādhakā ye tv āsāṣṭhā vātih varjitaḥ. This appears to mean, “those sādhakas dwelling in the forest, whether in homes or ‘devoid’ (varjita) . . .”. However, none of this appears to clarify the interpretation of hṛdaya in 8c.

Alternatively, sukhasamgamā might relate to the expression sukha-yogisaṃgamaḥ in Tantrasadbhāta 18.30:

kulaḥṣekeṣaiḥ tāṇām kulaḥbhaktiparāyanam ||
melaṁ ca prajñacchanti sukha-yogisaṃgamaḥ || 30 ||

“And [yoginis] bestow melaka, a pleasant union with the yoginīs (sukha-yogisaṃgama), upon those who have been anointed into the clan consecration, intent on devotion to the clans.”

Cf. also Tantrasadbhāta 16.36cd. One might on these grounds emend to sukhasamgamā in the sense of...
By the syllable 'na', there is the food offering; (?) by the designation ‘ta’ (?), the offering of flowers. There is entreaty [of the deity] through the syllable ‘da’; empowering [of the image] by the syllable ‘tha’.

‘ta’ is said for skull; ‘tha’ indeed for shield, O fair woman. A weapon by the syllable ‘dā’, ‘phā’ is paying respects by prostration and so forth.

priyamelapa, “pleasing union,” on this subject see chapter 4 of the dissertation. 2d’s vāsana might in this case refer to perfuming (vāsana) oneself “for the purpose of a pleasing union” [with yoginis]. However, note that one could instead divide this as vā ṣānam—perhaps meaning, “by ‘pa’ is stated ‘heart’, or a seat (āsana) for pleasing union [with the yoginis?]”. These possibilities do not seem at all compelling.

It seems problematic that the nāivedya or food offering should go “by the designation ‘offering of flowers’ (puṣpadanam tu samjñayat),” as A’s reading suggests. It seems more likely that a second verbal chomma underlies tu samjñayat, with flower offerings as its referent. Perhaps the simplest emendation would be tasamjhayd, i.e. takarena. Note that ta does not otherwise occur as a verbal chomma in this chapter, and that the preceding and subsequent verbal chommās belong to the ta-varga. This conjecture has hence been tentatively adopted.

Suiting the pūjā context of this verse, yācana here presumably refers to ṣāthana, invoking the presence of the deity. pratiṣṭhana, i.e. pratiṣṭhā, refers to the consecration or empowerment of the divinely inhabited image. The verbal chomma ‘tha’ suggests perhaps ṣṭhā.

10 ṭa departs from the pattern by occurring in the accusative, most probably to simplify its sandhi with the following vowel. In 10b, A reads ṭhampharo. One could divide this as ṭham pharo, but given the frequent confusion between sa and ma, one should probably read ṭha spharo, i.e. ṭha spharo, a possibility suggested by Isaacson (personal communication, May 2005). This provides a suitable lexeme, “shield.” In the former case, phara could perhaps be equivalent to phala in the sense of blade or arrow point. See Turner’s Comparative Dictionary, 508.

Somdev Vasudeva (personal communication, February 2006) has drawn my attention to the possibility that the visual forms of the letters ṭa and ṭha might have suggested the meanings “skull [bowl]” and “shield,” respectively. This appears plausible, and suggests an additional line of inquiry concerning the correspondence of verbal chommās and their referents.

21 The verbal chomma expressed by ṭākṣara could be either ḍa or ḍā; the latter is somewhat more likely, as ḍa occurs in 12a.

22 The verbal chomma as expressed by ḍāksara could be either ḍa or ḍā; the latter is somewhat more probable, given the occurrence of pha in 7a. pātādivandana might perhaps mean caranapātādinā vandanam, “paying respects through prostration, etc.”
There is decorating oneself with the mudrās by 'na', kissing is taught by 'ca'.

There is making hostile by 'sa', while 'jha' is for attracting.

By the syllable 'da', 'ghā' would indicate slaying. (The) syllable 'ksa', depending upon the time [it is used], stands for the terms "void," "hero," and "sword" (?)

Those [verbal chommas] beginning with vowels, arranged in sequence, are stated for the group of sixteen clans. For the lords of heroes and for bhairavīs,

---

24 mudrālakarana refers to wearing the "five insignia," pānta mudrāḥ, items of katālīka paraphernalia worn by human practitioners and appearing in the iconography of the deities. The description pāṇcamudrāvibhūṣita ("decorated by the five insignia") is common; cf., e.g., Heruka described in Kṛṣṇayāmarītā at verse 16.3b, or the practitioner in Braṇya 21.31b. In his commentary on the Kṛṣṇa-yāmarītā, Kumārachandra lists the five mudrās as cakri (perhaps "chaplet"), earrings, necklace, rucaka (bracelet), and girdle (paṇcamudrēti cakrikundalakanthīrucakamekha). Cf. Hevajra 1.i.viii.17 and ni.vi.3-4. That rucaka is a bracelet is suggested by reference to it being "on the hand" in ni.vi.17b (haste rucaka mekhā); and that cakri or cakrikā is a head ornament is suggested by ni.vi.3ab, which states it is "worn for paying homage [i.e. prostrating] to the guru, ṛcīra, and personal deity" (gurvacyestadevasya namanārtham cakrikā dhrta). Jayabhadra, however, commenting on Laghūsamvata 27.4, lists the sacred thread (yajhopavita) instead of girdle (paṇcamudrā rucakasīmālīkundalakanthīyajhopavita pānta).

The wearing or non-wearing of the mudrās is an important variable in the performance of particular observances; note for example the muktabhairava-vrata taught in Braṇya xi.xi.31-33:

muktakaśo muktaṇgo paṇcamudrāvibhūṣitaḥ |
saṃbhante nityone tathaiveha na samśayaḥ || 31 ||
desvākarna -d- Çe rātrau mudrāyaṅgaṃ tu kārayet ||
probhāte tu pūnaś caiva mudrāyuktai parivhratam || 32 ||
āṁukaṃ tathaiveha rātrau kuryāthā bhojanam |
muktabhairavanamah hi vratam etad udāhrtam || 33 ||

31b "vibhūṣitaḥ" em.; "vibhūṣitaḥ A 33a āṅukaṃ J cor.; āṅukāṃ A

"With hair unfastened, the great yogi is decorated with the five insignia, and he always wanders about here, having clothing on, undoubtedly. But except for [when performing] the rites of the deities, he should remove the insignia at night. At dawn, however, he should again wander about wearing the insignia. He should likewise in this case perform the daily rites (āṅkuṇa) and eat [only] at night. This observance is called 'The Liberated Bhairava'.'

Kuryāthā in xi.xi.33b is for kuryād atha, metri causa. See the annotation ad 1.5. Note that the orthography āṅkika for āṅkika might be original, occurring as it does with great frequency in A.

25 'ca' suggests cumbana, "kissing."

26 The verbal chomma given as sa could be a corruption for śa, implying the word śṭrau, "enemy."

27 It is unclear what might underlie the unintelligible pāntacanam in 12a. Possibilities include pāntacanam, vyāṭjanam, bhatjanam, yajjanam, and so forth, none of which seems probable. The most suitable conjecture coming to mind is aḥjanam, "anointing" [the sacrificial victim?], which might fit the context suggested by gāṭhanam ("slaying") in 12b, or "[magical] ointment."

28 Gheti could imply either gha or ghā, but the latter better agrees with gāṭhanam; gha moreover could have been conveyed by ghena.

29 The interpretation provided is tentative, for this would suggest an unusually large number of significands for a verbal chomma. Note also the application of kṣa in 8a.

---
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[these are] with anusvāra and visarga (?).

The interpretation of this verse, particularly 13cd, is far from certain. In 13ab the idea seems to be that verbal chomnās consisting of the sixteen vowels have as their significands sixteen kulas of yoginis. Note that with the possible exception of 44, the remaining verbal chomnās of this chapter begin with consonants. There is considerable doubt concerning the kulaseśākāra(cakra), an arrangement of sixteen yogini clans correlated to the vowels. The sixteen might perhaps comprise the Seven Mothers, plus the nine clans taught in patāla lv.11–19: those of mātris, dātis, rudrādākinis, deites, śivas, bhūgnīs, devīs, and the supreme kula of Aghoreśvarī. This never appears to be stated explicitly, however. There would moreover be the conceptual overlap of both a mātrīkula and multiple kulas of the Mothers. Conceivably, this alphabetical conception of the vowels as kulas is parallel to but not intended to correlate precisely with other ways of conceiving the multiplicity of the supreme Śakti. Cf. 1.129–133, where the Śakti is taught to be both sixteen-fold, as the vowels, and ninefold. There, some correlation appears posited between these concepts, but this remains opaque to me.

Elsewhere in the text, reference is made to kulaseśākāra, or seventeen clans, and to a cakra of seventeen kulas (dasiśaptadakāra cakra, xcvi.6a; and kulesparaśāmad cakra, xcvi.7a). The term kulacakra occurs also in lv.19a, xcvi.19c and 20b, and xcix.18d, by which the same cakra appears intended. Depending upon whether one counts the transcendent seventeenth kula of the central deity, the referent of all this is probably the same: the kulacakra or khecaracakra taught in BraYa xv, from verse 27, where is also taught the kulacidāya mantra. This cakra has at its center Bhairava, as the smaranamantra hōm, around whom are arranged the sixteen vowels, and then consonants. No specific correlation is stated between sixteen clans and the vowels, however. Chapter ix also teaches an alphabetical cakra, thr bhautikacakras, in which the sixteen vowels form the inner circuit around the smaranamantra (i.e. Bhaiṛava), and in which correlations are posited with the manjāla deities of the BraYa—but not with yoginikulas.

In 13d, it seems svāsa (“breath”) could mean either visarga (hā) or the letter ha: for the latter, cf. Rudrayamala 22.93a, discussing the syllables of hamsa: hām pumān śvāsanāyena (“hām [means] puruṣa, with the form of a breath”). Conceivably, hamsamājña in 13d could be corrupt for amanṣayā, i.e. anusvāra, the possibility of which was suggested by Isaacson (personal communication, May 2005). This compound is most probably adverbial, unless pūvakam is corrupt for pūvakāth. Although tu suggests a subject shift in 13c, one could also consider the possibility of construing 13ab and 13cd together. Perhaps the simplest interpretation of 13ab would involve the latter option, and the conjecture amanṣayā: “the vowels, etc., of the cakra of sixteen kulas, together with anusvāra and visarga, arranged in sequence, are stated for [i.e. stand for] the vīras and bhairavīs.”

Alternatively, 13abcd could instead describe the mantric content of the kulaseśākāra cakra. Note for example that Siddhāntaśeṣārāmarānta 31 teaches a cakra of Bhaśrava and the sixteen kālas or vowels: in this, Bhaśrava takes the form of the hamsa (i.e. hām) surrounded by the vowels, which are preceded by h- and followed by anusvāra, yielding the following forms: hām hām hām hām hām hām hām hām hām hām hām hām hām hām hām hām. Each is preceded by om and followed by namah (see Törökö, Doctrine of Magic Female Spirits, 60, 182–83, and also her remarks on kāla in Tantrikābhāhīnānaya, vol. vi, 70). It seems possible that something along these lines is suggested in 13d, if the bhairavīs could refer to vowel-goddesses, or if each kula is headed by a deity pair (yāmla). In the latter case, perhaps the cakra could consist of vīresa-bhairavīs deity pairs in the form ām ām, ām ām, etc. In the former case, reading hamsamajña, perhaps the sequence of vowels implies mantra forms such as haḥ haḥ haḥ haḥ, etc.—“haḥ, then the designated syllable (amja), then visarga.”

Another somewhat speculative possibility again presupposes the conjecture amanṣayā for hamsamajña. Perhaps the intention is that the vowels, when followed by anusvāra, designate male practitioners or vīresas belonging to the sixteen respective clans; followed by visarga (śvāsa), these indicate female practitioners (bhairavīs). In other words, this could be a syllabic code for identifying initiatory clan membership. This could account for the otherwise unusual notion of a multiplicity of bhairavīs. The idea of kulas having deities referred to as vīresas and bhairavīs does not seem evident elsewhere in the text, which might support interpreting these terms as referring to practitioners. Of course, vīresa, i.e. bhairava, is much less likely than vīra to mean “practitioner.” Cf. višayogikulānm in 16c, where vīra refers to male practitioners and yōga to yoginis, and presumably female practitioners. Alternatively, but
14 Thus have been taught the single-syllable signs, which, (1) possessing [limited] number (?), have much elaboration through the divisions of one’s clan deity, (2) akṣa (?), syllable, and so forth.31

The Goddess spoke:

15 O lord, I have learnt the phonetic signs; tell me likewise, O king of the gods, those other auspicious ones using parts of the body.32

Bhairava spoke:

16 Hear, O highly fortunate one, the secret signs produced by the body, which bestow the desired results for the clans of heroes and yogins.33

17 By touching the head, salutations are spoken;34 the return salutation is through touching the tuft (śikhā); by [touching] the forehead, “welcome.”35

18 “Very welcome!” is understood through touching the corner of the eye.36 He is

along similar lines, 13cd might assert that all the verbal chommaś should have anusvāra added when used by males, and visarga when used by females.31

This verse is again not entirely clear. In 14d, samkhyāya yutāḥ has been understood as meaning “limited in number,” although this might not be the intention. Noteworthy is the use of samjñā as a synonym of chomma, as again in 16b. 14cd has been interpreted as explaining that the single-syllable signs provided earlier are inflected in various ways to produce a much larger number of possibilities. Most unclear is the meaning of 14c, svāṁśādēvākṣāvānāṇāḥ. It seems svāṁśādeva refers to the notion of yoginis and practitioners possessing “portions” of the Mother goddess whose kula they belong to. Cf. the expression svāṁśāsiddhipradāyikā in 48b, “[a yogini] bestowing siddhi upon someone of her own [Mother]-aṁśa.” Interpreting aksavārya, however, is difficult; varṇa presumably means “phoneme/letter,” while akṣa suggests to me no interpretation presently.

Against the manuscript evidence, I have emended samjñā and its adjectives from the feminine singular to the plural, referring back as they do to ekāḥ sārā samjñāḥ in 14a. The collective singular might conceivably be possible.

33 In 16b, yogi occurs metri causa for yogini. This usage is extremely common in the Brāhmaṇa, especially the case of yogi occurring in compound for yogini. Cf., e.g., cl.27d, yogisaṁyatahi vajraḥ; and cl.28cd, adate yogisaṁghas tu kauyaṁ samayam uttanam. For a discussion and more examples of this phenomenon, see Torszók, Doctrine of Magic Female Spirits, §1.1.1.e, p. xxxv. It is possible virayogikulādān expresses the object of “pradāyikāḥ, instead of construing with samjñāḥ] in 16b. Cf. lxxxv.86ab, bhavanti sādhuḥ kundānāṁ devaḥ sādhipradāyikāḥ.

34 In 17a śīra is probably original, a thematization of śīraḥ. Cf. lV.149, and the accusative śīraḥ in lV.105. As in lV.149, it is not possible to be completely certain, since A frequently drops the visarga before sibilants.

35 An unusual metrical fault is present in 17d, with the fifth syllable of an even pada being heavy. This seems to be original. It appears that in this material, a conjunct in which a consonant precedes a semi-vowel, e.g. svā, does not automatically render the preceding short vowel heavy for metrical purposes. Cf. xxvii.47b, śīradāvaniṇyapakāṁ.

36 B’s emendation in 18a appears probable, and has been accepted.
asked, "From where have you come here?," while touching the brow.  

19–20ab  By touching to the right (/south) or left (/north), along with the outside [of the eyebrows], [one indicates] a land of that [direction]. [Touching] the tip of the nose [indicates] a land arising to the east. The neck [indicates] a land to the west. [By] touching [in this way], one would display the mudrās which give tidings in return.

---

37 It does not seem to be possible to interpret prcchito, i.e. prṣṣo, "asked," unless taṃmad in 18a is emended to the interrogative kasmād. This emendation fits well, for verse 19 appears to consist of replies to this question. In the Bhairavatantras, as well as in Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit, derivates of √ pracch are frequently based upon a stem formed from the present indicative prcchati. The participle prcchita appears to occur nine times in the BraYā, as well as in, for example, Tanirasadbhāsa (e.g. 1.33d) and Kaulajñanairāna (e.g. 4.19c).

38 One could consider emending A's sprṣāṇ, taken here as the present participle sprṣāt. In support of the present participle, cf. 20a, where sprṣān appears probable.

39 In 19a, A's sabhīyaṇ is probably an error for the ablative sabhīyaṭi, in agreement with sparsād, or for sabhīyaṃ, i.e. the adverb sabhīyaṃ. Both are plausible paleographically, but the latter seems preferable grammatically and has been adopted. It seems likely that sparsād should be construed with the genitive bhruvāḥ from 18d. The intention seems to be indication of arrival from a southern or northern country through touching the left or right eyebrows, and the area around them, keeping in mind the dual meanings of daksāṇa and uttara as right/south and left/north, respectively. A more clear and perhaps not implausible text might for 19a be daksottarasya bhyam tu—"by [touching] the area outside the left and right [of the eyebrows]," i.e. touching the temples.

40 It is uncertain how to interpret A's nāsāgrā in 19c. The meaning of 19cd seems clear: touching the tip of the nose indicates arrival from an eastern land, while touching the back of the neck (krkāṭikā) communicates arrival from the west. The improbable feminine nāsāgrā could be corrupt for the ablative, as reads B, meaning "by [touching] the tip of the nose." A indeed frequently drops final -t in the ablative before conjunct consonants. Note however the apparent nominative krkāṭikā in 19d, a pāda which appears parallel grammatically to 19c. Although it is not necessary that the construction be parallel, this possibility suggests reading the nominative nāsāgram, as has been tentatively adopted.

41 The text and interpretation of 20ab have several uncertainties. mudrā, as reads A, is surely the object of samdārasyet in 20a, and might be corrupt for the accusative singular, mudrāṃ. However, given A's tendency to drop visarga before p, the accusative plural mudrāḥ is perhaps more likely. This depends upon the text and interpretation of 20b, pratīcvarttasvadhyāminah. This could perhaps be genitive, the indirect object of samdārasyet—"while touching [in this way], one should display a mudrā to the one who offers tidings in return." This possibility would however offer no suggestion as to the nature of the mudrā in question. It seems more likely that 20b should describe the mudrā, in which case we could read the latter as mudrāḥ and understand "svadhyāminah as masculine accusative plural in the sense of the feminine. We could alternatively emend to the "correct" svadhyāminah, or perhaps read the singular, mudrāṃ pratīcvarttasvadhyātinim. In any case, the sense would be "mudrā[es] which accomplish[es] response tidings." This seems to refer to the idea of pratimudrās or "mudrās of response," which are displayed in the process of bringing about rapport with other members or deities of a clan. This concept is alluded to in lxxiii.66b and lxxiii.75a below. In Siddhāyogeśvarata 29, the sādhaka identifies the clan of a yogini and displays to her the clan-appropriate mudrā(s); she in turn displays the pratimudrā(s) to the practitioner. Identifying the marks of a yogini of the family of Kauṃārī, for example, one should display to her the śakti and ghanṭā mudrās, upon which the yogini turns leftwards and displays the pratimudrā—perhaps the same mudrās?—in return:

- uḍrśīṃ pramadāṃ dṛṣṭā āktimudrāṃ pradārasyet |
- ghanṭāmudrā ca dīvāyā dvītīyā ca pratīcvarttaḥ || 38 ||
20cd–21ab “[You] should go” [is conveyed] through touching her lips. When this has been done, making the response-mudrā is accomplished by looking in that direction, O woman of fair hips.42

21cd–22 “I feel weak” [is conveyed] through touching her arm; “[you] should rest” by touching the thigh.43 By touching the knee, (¿) “you should sit” (?); by [touching] the buttock itself [is replied] “I shall.” (¿) But she who then touches the shank states “I shall not” (?).44

23 By a finger in the ear [is conveyed], “[I have heard you [shall encounter?] a circle of the Mother goddesses.” Through touching one’s side it is established (¿) he receives manifest encounter (melāpa) [with the goddesses] (?)45

parivartanam tu vāmena pratimudrāṁ dadati hi

Siddhayogesvarīmahatā 29.38–39ab. 39ab probably involves two actions, although Törszök interprets otherwise (“to this, she should reply with turning to the left,” p. 178). In 29.24cd of the same text, we see that pratimudrās can be multiple: ajiñam kamandalum caiva pratimudrā vidhiñate (“the ’antelope hide’ and ’water pot’ [mudrās] are enjoined as pratimudrā [for the yogini of the Brāhmaṇī kula]”). This would help account for a plural mudrā in 20b.

4 The syntax of 2od–2ib and its sequence of actions are uncertain. While the eliptical gantavyam probably means “please go,” it could instead mean “I/we should go.” 2od, krte taddisi vlksanat, apparently specifies the mudrā made in reply to touching the lips (20c); it is otherwise unclear what action the response-mudrā mentioned in 21ab would entail. Perhaps the area of the lips touched—upper, lower, left corner, or right corner—indicates the direction one is supposed to go (cf. 19–2ob), to which one replies by looking that direction. krte could be absolutive (“when [touching] has been done”), as adopted in the translation, or agree with taddisi, perhaps meaning “in that direction which [the touching of the lip] was done.” One might consider the possibility that bhavati in 21a is the vocative of bhavatl, in which case susroni would also address the yogini. This would however render the syntax even more unclear, and in any case, susroni occurs five times elsewhere in the BraYa as a vocative of the Goddess, in the same position in odd-numbered verse quarters.

43 As with many of the chomma exchanges that follow, 21c and 21d describe a mudrā and response-mudrā, respectively, with the yogini initiating the exchange. The third-person optative visramet suggests use of the respectful pronoun bhavatl, which might support interpreting bhavati in 21a as a vocative.

44 Verse 22 is highly problematic. In 22b, sphic (“buttock”) is thematized as sphica, and 22ab would appear to mean, “by sitting down and touching the knee with the buttoc [is communicated] ’I shall do so’,” i.e. “I shall rest.” Assuming the unlikelihood of touching one’s own buttock to the knee, and the improbability of the yogini and vīra suddenly making such contact, an alternative interpretation is required. Isaacson (personal communication, May 2005) suggests the possibility that upaviṣya occurs for upaviṣa or upaviṣet, metri causa. This seems plausible, and allows 22a and 22b to be interpreted as separate clauses, the latter the response-mudrā to the former. Interpretation of 22cd is more difficult. I would suggest that karoti is a corruption of karomi, this clause hence providing an alternative response to the invitation to sit down in 22a. yaya in 22c is probably an instrumental, occurring for yayā, metri causa. This variety of metrical lengthening is attested elsewhere in the BraYa; see the annotation ad 1.37a. For what A reads as jaighāraubhāṣītam, I would suggest the emendation jayāḥ tu bhāṣītum, nu and tu being similar in Nepalese writing of the period. 22cd could hence mean yayā jaighā sprṣṭa tasyā tu na karoṭtī tādā bhāṣītum, as translated above.

45 23d is undoubtedly corrupt as given in A: sphaṭamelpakāṇḍāraṇam. Although an adverbial sphaṭam
24–25 (¿) One who would not open the [clenched] fist [indicates], “the sky . . .” (?) 46

One who touches her heart with the left hand, with concentration (bhāvoitā), is taught to be a Sister; 47 she bestows the fruits [of ritual] upon sādhakas. Through touching the [finger-]tips of the left hand, [she indicates she is] a leader in the circle of Mothers. 48

26 But by touching the tip of the nose, 49 she would indicate [she is a] ‘dākinī’. 50 By looking with sidelong glances [are indicated] the characteristics of a rudradākinī.

27–28 By a hand on her shoulder area, [she] would indicate the fact of being a -

dāmari. 51 O fair-faced one, by the right hand on the back of the neck, she tells

is a possibility, here we probably have reference to sphuṭamelaṭaka, an expression that occurs in BraYa xcix.16b. As discussed in the annotation thereon, this apparently refers to visible or manifest encounter with the goddesses. A possible text for this verse quarter might hence be sphuṭamelaṭakāśrayam, the half verse meaning, “through her touching her side, the place (āśraya) of manifest melapa is established.” Speaking against this is the lack of indication of how a yogini specifies places for encounter. This might suggest instead reading sphuṭamelaṭakāśrayati; 23cd could then mean “through her touching her side, it is established that he is a recipient (āśraya) of manifest melapa.” This concurs in nature with 23ab, and has been adopted, although corruption in the next verse makes certainty elusive.

46 In 24a, B is probably correct in reading “āmocayen for A’s “āmaicayen, although both read ceva” instead of caiva”. Compare with the chomnā described in lv.125cd. The corruption in 24b is less readily undone, A reading gaga+na+stvahyasamgame (with na inserted in the lower margin). This probably states the result prognosticated by the chomnā described in 24a. The lexemes gaganā (“sky”) and samgama (“confluence”) are suggestive, the latter sometimes a synonym of melapa, but the syntactical relation and intervening text remain opaque. There could conceivably be reference to melapa with khecaris, sky-wandering yoginis.

47 In all likelihood, bhaginī has the technical sense of Sister of Tumburu, the Four Sisters comprising the cultic focus of the archaic vāmanatantras. bhaginī appears to be the first in a series of goddesses identified by clan through chomnās in 25–29: bhaginī, mātṛ, dākinī (by emendation of kākini), rudra-dākinī, dāmari, dātri, āśraya, and “mixed.” Compare with the series of nine taught in the chomnā section of chapter lv, which has a different sequence and adds dūtis and the devīs, goddesses of the maṇḍala of Kapālisabhairava.

48 The expression mātrmadhye tu nayikā (“a leader/heroine among the Mothers”) appears to specify that the woman in question is a Mother goddess (mātṛ). Note however that the expression mātronayikā, “leader of the Mothers,” is used in 74d specifically in reference to the clan of Cāmurāḍa.

49 Cf. Laghuśaṃcaraṇaṭatnī 20.7ab: garudāṁ darśayet yā tu nuktāsmitī uktaṁ bhavatī. According to the commentator Bhavabhūṭa, garuda has the sense of “tip of the nose” (garudāṁ iśi nāgikāya; Sarnath edition, 117). It is unclear what other anatomical sense garuda could have. I am grateful to Isaacson for providing this reference.

50 kākini in 26b in A is almost certainly corrupt for dākinī. Although the kākini is attested as a genus of goddesses/yoginis, this would be the only mention of such in the BraYa. More importantly, the series of yogini clans mentioned from 24ab to 28 is also listed in lv.43cd–49: dākinī, dātri, rudradākinī (by emendation; A reads rudrarākinī), dāmari, and āśraya. Similar is the list in lv.11–14, although dākinī is absent, unless, quite possibly, this is the referent of krānākhyā.

51 Concerning 27b, see the annotation on lv.126b.
sādhakas and ācāryas [that she belongs to] the Clan consisting of dāvis.\textsuperscript{52} By keeping the gaze on the tip of the nose, exhaling, she [indicates she] is a śīvā.

29 By bending the entire body and twirling the hands, the characteristics of the mixed [yoginis] are declared, O goddess, for telling [their] true nature.\textsuperscript{53}

30 By a hand on the cheek, meat; by looking at the tongue, fish;\textsuperscript{54} but by the fingers touching the teeth, a variety of eatables are desired.

31 Through touching the nose, (¿) by way of mudrā, "incense" is stated (?).\textsuperscript{55} When the tongue is in the left corner of the mouth, there would be left-handed nectar.

Through [the tongue] being at the right corner of the mouth, right-handed nectar should be understood.\textsuperscript{56}

32-33 Through touching the palm of the hand, fat; through showing the elbow, narrow. When the right hand is on the belly, one would indicate the state of being a son; but when the left, "daughter" is declared. When one would gaze at the

\textsuperscript{52} Although a final anusvāra or nasal has been lost, it seems probable that the ms's sādhakācārya in 28a should be accusative plural, the indirect object of kathet.

\textsuperscript{53} On the notion of yoginis of "mixed" clans, see verse 75 and the annotation thereon.

\textsuperscript{54} In 30b, A transmits matsyakām, which could represent the feminine accusative singular or masculine accusative plural. Neither seems particularly likely, given that other ritual items are mentioned in the nominative. Most probably the final long -ā is spurious, and the emendation matsyakam has been adopted; the plural matsyakāḥ might also be possible.

\textsuperscript{55} The six pādas transmitted by A from 30c contain a serious problem, for two are repeated:

\begin{verbatim}
dasanaṁguliyogena bhaksyam bhoyoṁ tu cehitam |
nāsāsparśaṁyogena bhaksyam bhoyoṁ tu cehitam |
\end{verbatim}

Most probably the scribe has copied bhaksyam bhoyoṁ tu cehitam nāsāsparśaṁyogena twice by mistake, or inherited this mistake from his exemplar. If so, then 31ab should read nāsāsparśaṁyogena gaṁdhiṁva prokā tu mudrayā. While B and D transmit gatoḥ, A is equally likely to read gandhaḥ, "scent;" the latter would yield some sense in connection with touching the nose (31a), yet the feminine is difficult to account for, and mudrayā does not construe smoothly. Should the reading be gatoḥ, sense is even more remote, which might suggest that the two repeated verse quarters conceal the loss of two pādas of text.

\textsuperscript{56} The original spellings of what A transmits as "sṛkvinika" and "sṛkvinī" in 31c and 31e, respectively, are uncertain. B apparently corrects to "sṛkvinika" and "sṛkvinī". For this irregular word both sṛkv- and sṛkk- are attested spellings, and A's readings might be original. As for the nasal, in several other cases as well, A transmits the dental n where the retroflex Ṉ is expected, and it is unclear whether this is a dialectical feature of the Brahma's language, or corruption. Note for instance that the instrumental bhairavena occurs only somewhat less frequently than the correct bhairavena.

The distinction between the "left" and "right" nectars (vāmamrta, daksinamrta) is that of ritual purity. The latter comprise conventional offering liquids, the former being the alcohol and bodily fluids used in the radical rituals of the bhairavatantras.
head, “father;” but she is told to be a “mother” by showing the left side of the abdomen.

34 “[You are] accepted” is taught when [the hand is] on the navel; on the back, one should understand “rejected.” “Wife” by the left hand on the hip, “husband” when the right. 57

35 He is established as a consort through touching the feet; 58 a friend, should one touch the left arm. (¿) By grasping … she would indicate the fact of being un­chaste (?). 59

36 “Hidden” is stated by a hand on the loins; “not hidden” by not looking at the sky. 60 “Perfected” (siddha) through squinting the left eye; “one whose observance

57 In 35d, A’s reading pati daksine is surely original, in lieu of the “correct” patir daksine, elision of the visarga being necessitated by meter.

58 In this context of kinship and relationship, dita (“male messenger”) appears to mean “male consort,” much as ditt is a common term for the female consort.

59 35cd has several uncertainties. A’s reading in 35c (prakunca) is of unclear interpretation. “grahe” suggests the act of grasping, but it is uncertain what prakunca could mean; Apte’s dictionary identifies a prukinc as a unit of measure, about a handful. It might be possible that the chomma hence involves the gesture of cupping the hand, but this is not convincing. Note also the dental -n- rather than retroflex -n- in “grahe.” For 35d, where A reads kulatāthāthinādīset, Isaacson suggests the eminently plausible kulatāthāthinādīset, which has been adopted. Although highly conjectural, a possibility which this suggests for 35c is kucakagragrahenaiva or suvkucakagragrahenaiva, “by grasping her nipple [she conveys the state of being wanton].”

60 The significance of “hidden” (gupta) and “not hidden” is unclear. Subsequent verses suggest the context of post-initiatory conduct (ācāra) or ritual observances (tvata). In this case two possibilities present themselves: gupta and na gupta refer to whether or not the insignia (mudra) marking one as a Śaiva ascetic are to be worn, or to whether the practices are carried out in seclusion or not. Regarding the former possibility, cf., e.g., BraYa XLV.i74cd: pahcamudravratf viro guptamudr[o] ‘tha va bhavet (“the Hero would be one who carries out the observance [wearing] the Five Insignia, or one whose insignia are hidden”). On carrying out the observances in seclusion, note for example xxxi.48cd–49:

pracchanne guptadeśe tu devakarma saṁcāreṣa || 48 ||
inscriptioni ca cattāri nītīvā ca na saṁśeṣyah ||
yathā na paśyate kaś cit tīrtha saivākṣasātrākṣa|| 49 ||

“In a concealed, secret place, one should perform worship of the deities. The four daily rites [should be practiced] only at night, undoubtedly, such that no one sees the skull and rosary.”

In some observances, one might in contrast have contact with assistants (sakhi, uttaraśādhaka), or wander about by day or night.

In 36b, the negative in alokanat (“by not looking/gazing”) is suspicious; rather, one might expect the chomma indicating “not hidden” to involve looking at the sky. It is possible that the text read digavalokanat, having the variety of hypermetricism allowed in this text; see the annotation ad BraYa 1.20.
is broken off" by [squinting] the right [eye].

37 (?) . . . melaka, when the left hand (?).

38 Thus has been taught the heroes' and yoginīs' [way of] conversing through mudrās, by which accord is [also] reached with assistants to the sādhakas, (?) . . . (?).

39 Having reached mutual agreement, my dear, whether through verbal conversation or by conversing through one's mudrās, one should conceal the teachings of the Left [Way].

The Devī spoke:

40 When yoginīs who have come together with mortals become visible to a sādhaka, by the will of Śiva, because of [his] engagement in the observances, yoga, and

---

61 These appear to be prognostications, as are many of the chommas described in BraYa lv and some of those in this chapter.

62 Verse 37 is highly problematic. The expression sādhiśākapada could mean "the state of having entitlement [to the teachings/practices]" cf. sādhiśākapada in BraYa lxli.18d, and in Jayaratha's remark introducing Tantrāloka 29.35. But note also the possibility that the mss's sādhiśākapade vāme represents sādhiśākapade vāme, vāme, vāme in the sense of "left foot," with the prognostication being "[you will be?] one possessing entitlement." A normally omits the visarga before p/ph-. In the context suggested by sādhiśākapada, in the former sense, vāma could mean vāmaśāsana or vāmaṁārga, the "[teachings of] the Left [Way]." But perhaps instead is intended the vāmasrotas or "Leftward Current" of scriptural revelation—the vāmatantras of the cult of the Sisters of Tumburu—with daksiṇa in 37c representing the "Rightward Current" of the bhairavatantras. Vama and daksiṇa could also be spatial, "left" and "right," as could the pair pūrva and uttara, "east" and "north." The latter two could instead indicate sequence, "first" and "afterwards." I can reconstruct no plausible syntax, however; for instance, what noun the adjective kṣiptam in 37b modifies is uncertain. It is unclear moreover how many actions are intended, the subject-shifting tu in 37c suggesting a minimum of two.

63 Cf. verse 2; on the uttaraśādhaka, see the note thereon. On chommaśi bringing about saṃmata ("accord") with yoginīs, cf. e.g., Tantrasādhvāta 18.3ab: chommakair jāhatanaśa tu ātām tu saṃmato bhavet ("through chommaśi, as soon as they are learned, one would be accepted (saṃmata) by them [yoginīs]").

64 The meaning of yadaantaravistarāt (38d) is not at all certain, and the text might be corrupt. This could conceivably be interpreted as an adverbial compound, perhaps meaning "through/with elaboration of what follows after what." If the text is corrupt, one possibility might be to read yad anantam avistarāt, the idea being that while possibilities for mudrālāpa are endless (ananta), the subject has been taught (saṃākhyātā) only in brief (avistarāt). Regarding the adverbial avistarāt, cf. Tantrasādhvāta 20.120d, tām pravakṣayāmy avistaratā ("I shall teach that without elaboration," i.e. "succinctly").

66 siveccha in 40b is almost certainly adverbial. Although adverbial nominatives are unusual even
ritual, how they may be recognized truly? Likewise, tell [me] their forms.

Bhairava spoke:

I shall next teach the characteristics of yoginis, by merely learning which one may subjugate the three-fold universe.

[A yogini] is recognized, even at a distance, especially in the sacred fields and roads. And they exist on the earth, having their own authority by the will of Śiva.

They become visible to one engaged in the observances, a hero must therefore know the characteristics of yoginis.

A woman who has three lines on her forehead touching the hair's part, on top; in this text, they do occur, particularly with this term: cf. tv.23b, śīvecchā vyaktītāḥ vrajati—identical in context—and tv.37d, śīvecchā vā viśokhitā. Note also anuśāh in 1.36b, clearly instrumental/adverbial in sense. On yoginis more generally carrying out the volition of Śiva, see for example Tatrasisuddhata 16.48, as quoted by Kṣemarāja commenting ad Netratana 19.71:

\[
\text{tattvarūpās tu yogināḥ jñātavyāḥ ca varānane |}
\text{śīvecchānuvidhyām manovegā mahābalaḥ || 71 ||}
\]

"And, O fair woman, the yoginis should be known as taking the form of the tattvas. They carry out the will of Śiva, as swift as thought, and mighty."

In the doctrinal vision of the Vidyāpītha, yoginis, by both manifesting before mortals and functioning as the myriad controlling deities or even hypostases of the tattvas, function as extensions of the cosmic sakti, the will of Śiva and agent of grace.

The syntax of 42 is problematic. kṣetramārga ... bhūtales caiva could construe together, but the two verbs viññāya and vartante preclude taking 42 as a single sentence. One could possibly construe 42a with 41cd, somewhat loosely, as though were written yena ... trailokyam vajāyantam [yena ca yogini] viññāya sudāre 'pi. The translation adopted, however, treats 42ab and 42cd as separate sentences. Any clumsiness of grammar here could well arise from the fact that 42ab is a stock phrase; cf. BraYā Lxxxv.44ab: viññāya sudāre 'pi gehe kṣetre vyayaśthilah (whence Laghuśaṃvaratana 26.2ab). Cf. also tv.99cd, prajñāya yathā bhūtā bhūginī vā viśeṣataḥ. Note that, given that it is an adverb in 40b, one could here too construe śīvecchā adverbially rather than in compound, although this little affects the interpretation.

"os drṣṭir in 42b is surely a corruption of drṣṭer, resulting from misreading an archaic prṣthumatra medial e, as pointed out to me by Isaacson (personal communication, February 2005). We find the same passage transmitted with yet another corruption in xcix.6b: drṣṭenānti gocām, as reads A. Cf. Brahma-kathāsloka-saṃgraha 13.52b: ya drṣṭer vrajati na gocām priyā me."

"As aārya in 43b is surely a corruption of drṣṭer, resulting from misreading an archaic prṣthumatra medial e, as pointed out to me by Isaacson (personal communication, February 2005). We find the same passage transmitted with yet another corruption in xcix.6b: drṣṭenānti gocām, as reads A. Cf. Brahma-kathāsloka-saṃgraha 13.52b: ya drṣṭer vrajati na gocām priyā me."

Torszók ("Doctrine of Magic Female Spirits," 178), citing Sanderson, interprets the passage to mean, "She has three lines on her fore-
who is fair-complexioned, having the scent of the campaka flower, and ever fond of celibacy;

always fond of the sound of the Veda [being recited], unperturbable, speaking the truth; [she has] a staff, water-pot, antelope skin, yoga-cloth, ritual ladles, darbha grass, and a sacred thread; and on her house is drawn a lotus. She should be carefully noted as belonging to the clan of Brahmāṇi, O fair woman.

(?) The hero worships her out of desire to become a Sky-traveller (?). O goddess, [a yogini] born in the clan of Brahmāṇi bestows siddhi upon those sharing her own Mother-clan.

71 It seems that srucī is equivalent to sruc, "wooden ritual ladle," a usage attested in the Nīśoṣatāntara, in e.g. Mitāśīṭra 3.4b. Note the absence of vowel-sandhi across the pada boundary of 45cd.

72 Although the grammar is ambiguous, it seems unlikely that all the items listed in 45cd–46ab construe with likhitam. The articles listed from danda to upavat are characteristic paraphernalia of a Brahmīn and Brahmā, and probably constitute the accoutrements of a Brahmāṇi-clan yogini. She presumably draws upon her house the insignia of the lotus. This has confirmation in Siddhayogesvarīmata 29.28cd as well, the description concerns the Māheśvarī-clan yogini, for whom the mark of the trīśūla is especially appropriate. For the yogini of the Brahmāṇi clan, the lines are perhaps parallel and vertical instead.

73 It seems that tadārṣaṇān could be interpreted as tadārṣaṇam, perhaps meaning, "a hero attains her dārśana /vision out of his wish to become a Sky-traveller (khecara)." Isaacson, however, suggests the possibility of reading tadārṣaṇam, an emendation both paleographically and semantically highly plausible. In support of this, other descriptions of yoginis in this chapter end by exhorting the sadhaka to worship them, and stating the results thereof. Cf. especially Lxxm.52cd, 56ab, 60cd, and 70ab. Furthermore, elision of final -t/d, as would be the case with tadārṣaṇam, occurs in A most frequently when it would not affect the metrical weight of the preceding syllable.

74 Although devī, as read the ms in 47c, is not impossible, the vocative devi, ubiquitous at the end of odd padae, seems more probable. devatā is the term far more common for yoginis, who in any case are in this section referred to by words for women—pramāda, ("woman") and kāṇya ("maiden").

75 The expression svamīsāiddhipradayīkā, "bestowing siddhi to those of her own ‘portion,’" should be understood as meaning svamīsāiddhipradayīkā, "bestowing siddhi upon sādhakas who possess/partake of her own Mother-clan portion." See also the annotation ad lv.113.

Compare the description of the Brahmāṇi-clan yogini with that in Siddhayogesvarīmata 29.22–26:

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
48 One with dimpled cheeks, whose frontal locks have curly ends, with an elevated nose, fair and pale, with lovely eyes;

49-50 [having] a trident (?) on her forehead, adorned on the forehead, etc. (?); one who has attained knowledge of past, present, and future, and who draws on her house a spike, a bull, skull, or else another excellent emblem; with teeth of brightness surpassing moonlight, intent on chastity;

51 engaged in the worship of Śiva, and kind towards Śaiva ascetics; she would

\[\text{brahmeśānām ca ghorānām sidhiyate sā na samśayaḥ |}\
\[māsāsamītraṁ vīdhiṁ yatvat tātā kāmānugā bhavet | 26 ||}

Cf. also Tantrasadbhāva 16.247cd–55ab.

76 Cf. Śiddhayogesvarimata 29.34ab, gandābhyam kapakau yaṣā drṣyate vaktarasamsthitau.

77 In 48b, A’s reading kundalagrakesim seems implausible. Most probably, this should be emended to agrakesinī, on the basis of 61b and 71c: pihgalagragrakesinī and piṅgala-grārakesī ca, respectively. This finds support also in Kaulajñanaśāstra 20.14b, kutilagragrakesinī. Considering the similarity of s and g in old Newārī, and the constant confusion between s and ś in A, this is a minimal emendation. Its interpretation is not entirely clear, however: if Apte’s dictionary is correct in that agrakesa means “front line of hair” then this perhaps means “whose hair in front (agrakesa) has curly ends (kundalagra).” Presumably, the idea would be that strands of hair with curly ends fall along her hairline. Other potential meanings for agrakesa should be kept in mind however, involving, perhaps, agra in the sense of “top” and “mass.” Note that where the MSS read piṅgala-grārakesīnī in Śiddhayogesvarimata 30.1d, Torszók emends to piṅgala-grārakesī, a conjecture she attributes to Isaacson made on the basis of the iconographical description piṅgala-rākseṣa common in Buddhist sources (Torszók, “Doctrine of Magic Female Spirits,” 102). This seems unlikely now in light of the multiple parallels mentioned above.

78 49ab appears corrupt as given in A: triśulaṁ sulalatesu lalatādīsinī bhūṣiṇī. Although the precise text is difficult to reconstruct, this suggests the lexemes triśūla, lalāta, lalatādī, and bhūṣiṇī, which might allow us to interpret the verse: “[she has] the trident [insignia drawn] on the forehead, and is ornamented on the forehead, etc.” Tantrasadbhāva 16.256cd attests to the presence of the triśūla on the forehead of the Māheśvarī-clan yogini: lalāte drṣyate cordhve trayo rekha triśūla.gd. In 49b, the degree of assonance and the repetition of lalāta are, however, suspicious, and the locative plural lalatesu extremely unlikely. We might diagnostically conjecture for 49a something along the lines of triśulaṁ sulalate ca/tu. The text of 49b is plausible as given, but I consider it equally likely that this could be a corruption from lalatādīsinī. Note, however, the phonetically and contextually similar text of Śiddhayogesvarimata 20.41b (by emendation): sulalatā subḥaṁṣiṇī (“having a nice forehead, and speaking well”). This might suggest something along the lines of triśulam sulalate tu sulalatā subhaṁṣiṇī—but with the unlikely repetition of the word sulalata.

79 In 50d, A reads śālaṁ ca likhite grhe, which is implausible. Precisely the same problem is present in 55b, where A reads śaktīṁ ca likhite grhe. One could emend to likhiṭam on analogy of 46b (padmaṁ ca likhiṭam grhe). However, it seems more likely that the indicative verb likhete underlies likhīte. This finds support in the latter’s -e ending, and more importantly, from the parallel likhate in 59b and 69b (the latter by emendation from likhete).

80 It is possible that A’s spelling jotsnā for jyotsnā is original in 50c. One in fact finds both; cf. jyotsnārāpī (in 1.127a) and jotsnārāpī (v.258a). Once there even occurs jyotsnā, perhaps a vernacular pronunciation (lxviii.100b). Facuity of evidence makes it difficult to distinguish between authorial and scribal orthography, however, and the spelling has in this case been regularized.

81 Although a Śaiva goddess could in theory be, as the MSS read, śrotraṇavasamasyaktaḥ (“connected with the howling of jackals”), this would be an unusual expression. More contextually appropriate,
be one who delights in fasting on the tenth and fourteenth days [of the lunar fortnight].

52 Seeing such a woman, a sādhikā belonging to her Mother-clan, engaged in the practices of heroes, should mark her [as] born in the clan of Māheśvarī.82 After being worshipped for six months,83 she bestows the fruits of yoga and liberation.84

53 One who is lean and pinkish, with tawny yellowish eyes,85 radiant, with a long and a relatively minor emendation given the similarity of dha and va, might be śīvārādhanaṁsanyuktā, “engaged in/connected with worship of Śiva.” One finds similar expressions describing yoginīs; cf., e.g., dīhānārādhanaṁyuktānām yoginīm mantriṇām api (Mālinivijayottara 20.61cd); and yogāśvarovargajogaiṣṭhānā (em.; “śaṅgī” mss) śīvārādhanaṁyuktājā (Taittirīyasadhāna 10.544cd). Cf. also sarvadhyānyarūṭas in Siddhayogesvarvimattā 29.32d, describing Māheśvarī-clan yogini.

82 It seems that the nominative kulodbhava is original in 52c, though quasi-accusative in sense, and is described by the nominative feminine adjectives in 52ef. Cf. 55cd and 59cd-60ab. That the nominatives are original is especially clear from 59c, where appears the nominative pronoun sā.

83 The apparent masculine ablative singular or accusative plural in 52c, śaṃmāsārādhyanamānānānī, surely results from a spurious case-ending added to the feminine nominative. The expression yogamokṣahalpradā is perhaps ambiguous; yogamoksā might be a tatpurusa, “liberation through means of yoga.” Cf. Matsywapuraṇa 185.11: yogino yogasiddhā cā yogamokṣapradāṁ vibhum | upāsate bhaktiyuktā guhām dēvam sarvānām (to which my attention has been drawn by Isaacson, personal communication). However, yogamoksā finds attestation elsewhere as a dvandva, and this might be preferable here. Cf. Niśāśaśatra, Gūḍhyāṣṭra 4.6c, yogamoksāvibhāgaṁ; and perhaps yogamoksāvibhūti in 9.283d of the same text. It is possible yoga in this usage has the sense of saṃādhi, “meditative absorption.” One might also consider the possibility that yoga is corrupt for bhoga, reflecting confusion between two common idioms: bhogamokṣa[-phalaprada, etc.], and yogabhoga-, in which yoga=mokṣa/mukti. Cf., e.g., Siddhayogesvarvimattā 7.29b, sanmāsād yogabhogadām; and Śīvopāṇisad 1.35cd, viśuddānam ca kurottā bhogamokṣajigīṣāyā.

Compare the foregoing description of the Māheśvarī-clan yoginī with that found in Siddhayogesvarvimattā 29.27–33:

| lambośṭha ca viśālakṣaṇaḥ raktapīṅgalalocanām | ādhyā ca suhaḥgūḍhaṇā gaurī campakagandhinī || 27 ||
| dīrhśa dīrghakarotā ca vivritravesanapriyā | tisro lekha lañātāsthā udhānasimantam āśṛtāḥ || 28 ||
| hasate ratnate caiva brahmacaryavacavyasthitā | rnaśiṣe mṛtānāṁ tu kathāśu ratnate saṅgaah || 29 ||
| udṛṣṭiṁ pramadāṁ dṛṣṭā śālāmudrāṁ pradarsayet | akunācayet vāmaṇādōṁ dhanus caiva pradarsayet || 30 ||
| parivartanāṁ tu vāmēna pratimudrāṁ daṇḍantīḥ hi | caturdhīṣiṁ ca pariṣeṣaṁ caiva parivartanāḥ || 31 ||
| māheśvarīkulaḥ hu etāḥ sarvādhyānyarūṭatā tu tāḥ || 32 ||
| sarvādhyānyarūṭatām sarvādhyānapraddhāḥ | sarvāṅgakarśasādādhyārtham ----- nītiḥ || 33 ||

Cf. also Taittirīyasadhāna 16.255cd-61ab.

85 The apparent masculine ablative singular or accusative plural in 52c, śaṃmāsārādhyanamānānī, surely results from a spurious case-ending added to the feminine nominative. The expression yogamokṣahalpradā is perhaps ambiguous; yogamoksā might be a tatpurusa, “liberation through means of yoga.” Cf. Matsywapuraṇa 185.11: yogino yogasiddhā cā yogamokṣapradāṁ vibhum | upāsate bhaktiyuktā guhām dēvam sarvānām (to which my attention has been drawn by Isaacson, personal communication). However, yogamoksā finds attestation elsewhere as a dvandva, and this might be preferable here. Cf. Niśāśaśatra, Gūḍhyāṣṭra 4.6c, yogamoksāvibhāgaṁ; and perhaps yogamoksāvibhūti in 9.283d of the same text. It is possible yoga in this usage has the sense of saṃādhi, “meditative absorption.” One might also consider the possibility that yoga is corrupt for bhoga, reflecting confusion between two common idioms: bhogamokṣa[-phalaprada, etc.], and yogabhoga-, in which yoga=mokṣa/mukti. Cf., e.g., Siddhayogesvarvimattā 7.29b, sanmāsād yogabhogadām; and Śīvopāṇisad 1.35cd, viśuddānam ca kurottā bhogamokṣajigīṣāyā.

Compare the foregoing description of the Māheśvarī-clan yoginī with that found in Siddhayogesvarvimattā 29.27–33:
neck, hairy, and having curly hair;86
always fond of child’s play, she laughs and sings in an instant. She runs and
jumps, and becomes angry suddenly.
54 She would always have a staff in hand, and draws a spear on her house.87 The
best of sādhakas should mark her as born in the clan of Kaumāri.88
55 One should worship her according to precept out of desire for siddhi on [this very]
earth.89 She gives to the sādhaka whatever supernatural experience he prays for.90

86 barbara, as read the manuscripts, is perhaps original, but its interpretation uncertain. bar-
bara seems likely to mean “curly.” Note the iconographical description kṣṇaḥbaraḥmūrdhaja in
Śāradātilkatantra 10.17b—“having dark, barbara, hair;” the commentator Rāghavabhaṭṭa glosses bar-
baraḥmūrdhaja as kūṭilakṣaṇa, “curly hair.” Note also the iconographical description barbaraḥsūyirūduḥ,
probably meaning, “she whose hair (śūyirūduḥ) is curly (barbara) and stands upwards,” in Kubjikāmatā 2.4:

nīlākṣaṇasamprabhīyā kubjārūtapakṣāvara |
ṭatkarāvacandīnī barbaraḥsūyirūduḥ |

Kubjikāmatā 16.45c reads, also in describing a goddess, barbaraḥpāṇigāsī. These parallels point toward
understanding barbaraḥ as “having curly hair;” Isaacson (personal communication) suggests that this
should be understood as a contraction of barbaraḥsūyirūduḥ.

87 On the emendation likhate for likhite, see the annotation above on verse 49.
88 As in 52c and 59c, lākṣayet appears to take an object in the nominative feminine, here
kaumārikulasambhāti, as though the construction were lākṣayet sādhaka yat sā kaumārikulasambhāti. See
the annotation on verse 52 above.
89 56b, bhistate sādhiṃkānsayā, seems to be in contrast with e.g. pātallasiddhi, the power to enter sub-
terranean worlds, and khecaratvā, becoming a Sky-traveller. Cf. 47b, khecaratvajīgīśayā, the impetus for
worship of the Brahmanī-clan yogini.
90 Compare the description of the Kaumāri-clan yogini with that found in Siddhāyogesvarāmatā 29.33–
40:

(gandabhyam kūpaḥ yasya drṣṭey eva tva kṣamasthitau ||
rākṣagaurā yadā tu harinīgalalocana || 34 ||
kūcicāś ca saṁhā kēśāḥ pāṭaṁ dhārayate śīr ||
laṭāte tu yadā taṣṭay ekā條 rohito tu drṣṭaye || 35 ||
dīrghaḥgrīvā tu sā jīrṣya dīrghaḥgrīvī rāktaḥsā ||
nīyam hi ramate rakte pīṭhavastre tu śīle || 36 ||
hasate ramate caiva ākṣamāc ca prakṛpyate ||
calacītā bhanvā nārī kalāheṣu ca raijate || 37 ||
idṛṣṭām pramadāṁ drṣṭvā śaktimudrāṁ pradaṁsya ||
ghanādhyāra ca daśaṅgā deviṣṭā ca pratyaṅgataḥ || 38 ||
paviaśannām tu vāmnena pratimudrāṁ dadāti hi ||
śaśiḥ tu puruṣvān āsarḥ kauṁārikalājāḥ striyaḥ || 39 ||
śaddoṣaḥ siddhītāḥ sā tu kārttībēkaliyakulodgataḥ ||
sampraddāyām ca sā tuṣṭaś caiva sāraokāmakām || 40 ||

(It seems likely that the odd saddoṣa in 40a is corrupt for śaṃmāṣā; cf., e.g., Tantrasadbhāva 16.254cd:
śaṃmāṣā dharaṇā devidvijātiyamāṇaḥ sādhakā.) Tantrasadbhāva 261cd–265ab seems also to describe the
Kaumāri-clan yogini, although the name is not provided.)
A woman whose head is shaped like a parasol, who is seen to possess the auspicious marks, whose color is of a blue lotus, whose face and teeth are pointy,

whose practice of the observances is "leftward;" her ritual conduct [too] accords with her nature. She would draw the insignia of the wheel [on her house], and her gaze (?) follows after its object (?)..

She ever draws the insignia of the conch and a mace on her house. By this, a wise man with his heart devoted to the observances should mark [that] she, a maiden who magically changes form, is a [yogini of the] Vaisnāvi [clan], devoted to the observances. Through serving [her], she becomes a bestower of siddhi upon lordly sādhākas of her own clan.

The occurrence of kṛṣṇā indicarasyāmā in Siddhayogesvarātmanā 29.41c, in a parallel context, suggests possibility that here, kṛṣṇā and indicarasyāmā could be distinct descriptions.

In 58a, we should presumably follow D in emending A's senseless vamanacaracesta to vamenacaracesta. D's reading here is surely a scribal emendation, for this manuscript's dependence upon A is otherwise pervasive. The expression acaracesta appears synonymous with kulācaraśeṣṭā in 1d, discussed in the footnote thereon. vomenacaraceσtā appears to mean vānacaraceṣṭā, "one engaged in the left-handed observances." Its sense could perhaps be more general, however; cf. Laghuśaṁvaratantra 16.12ab: vāmena yāti ya nārī yoginī vānatah sātā. The same two padas occur as Abhīduḥāntirantra 39.11ab and Samvarodayatantra 9.7ab, the latter having the variant dākīṁ for yoginīḥ.

It would be simple enough to assume a lost anusvāra and emend cakramudrā to the accusative. Note however that while masculine mudrā names are in this section given in the accusative, in A, feminine ones appear consistently in the nominative. Cf. sankhamudrā and gada in 59ab, and damstramudrā in 62c, all objects of likhate. It seems preferable in light of this consistency to retain the nominatives. In parallel yoginīlaksanā material in Siddhayogesvarātmanā 29, the manuscript evidence seems to support both possibilities, and Törzsölk eneds to the accusative.

It is not clear how one should interpret 58d, drṣṭis caivarthavartiniḥ, assuming the text is correct. I have tentatively understood this to mean drṣṭis caivartiham anuvartate, "and [she possesses] a gaze that follows [its] object."

The instrumental tena in 59c appears to express causality ("by this means"), while caryāśīlēna cetasā seems to be associative, construing with the subject vidvāṁ. Concerning the quasi-accusative nominatives sa ... vaisnāvī, cf. 52c and 55c. The syntax, in other words, seems roughly to be tena vīdeśān [sādhākas] caryāśīlēna cetasā lakṣayeṣ [yat] sā kanyā vaisnāvī[kaḷa].

sādhakēśvarāṁ in 60d is a secure example of a masculine genitive plural in -ām for -ānām, metri causa. Cf., e.g., LV.100d ("samāśrayāṁ") and LV.144c (tīlāṁ). On the Vaisnāvī-clan yoginī, cf. the description in Siddhayogesvarātmanā 29.41-46:

lambastanā sujaṅgāḥ ca sulalāṭā subhaśinī |  
kṛṣṇā indicarasyāmā mudgāṣṭamathā tāḥ bhavet || 41 ||  
cipītā caiva hrasā ca sthulajangāḥ ca ya āhavet |  
pitaruṣtrā bhavena nityām skandhaṅgāvamālambinī || 42 ||  
īśrīṁ pramadānām drṣṭāḥ sāṅkham bāṣya pradarśayet |  
cakramudrānābāḥ bāṣyā dvītyayanā pariśayati || 43 ||  
parivartanām ca vāmena pratimudrānād dādātā sā |  
dvādaśī pariśti tāsāṃ cakram ca likhyate grhe || 44 ||  
vaisnāvīṁ yoginīṁ etad bhavati laksanāṁ |
[A woman] with full lips and large eyes, whose frontal locks have tawny ends, who is ever fond of the act of painting, skillful in dance and music,

always fond of spirits and meat, lusty, (¿) ... (?), she draws on her house the insignia of the fang, or else the staff or chain,

and she likewise draws a snout, an angle, or a cremation ground, a lotus, or skull. Her sacred day is the twelfth of both lunar fortnights; both Vāraḥī and Vaiṣṇavī are ever fond of the same sacred day.

She should be recognized by the Indra of sādhakas, his mind overpowered with mantra. After one sees such characteristics, following the [appropriate] response-mudrās, after one month she bestows siddhi upon the mantrin carrying out the

sādhakasyābhīhāuktasya sarvokāmasukhāhī ca || 45 ||
yoginivaśīṣṭānām tu siddhayogesvaratvam || 45-46 ||

Cf. also Tantrasadbhava 16.265cd-69ab, although the name Vaiṣṇavī does not appear.

On the interpretation of pīhkālāgrājakāsēnī, see the annotation on verse 48 above.

97 citrakarma in 61c need not refer specifically to painting, but to “a variety of activities.” The reference to dance and music suggests otherwise, however.

98 It is difficult to interpret what the mss transmit in 62b as sārvasāttvīkā. The obvious meaning, “entirely sattvic [in nature],” seems improbable in light of her being māyāsācaraṇāt and lolluṇā. Ending with -sattvīkā, this is probably an adjective describing the nature or genus of the Vāraḥī clan-born yogīṇī; cf., e.g., yaśasāttvī in Tantrasadbhava 16.123d, describing yogīṇīs of the Kaumārī and Vaiṣṇavī clans. Few possibilities for emendation come to mind, among which svalpasāttvīkā (“having little sattva guna”) is perhaps worth mentioning. Cf. svalpatītāsūttvīkāḥ, 1.12d. There, however, the meaning seems more likely to be “having very little intelligence and little [heroic] spirit (sattva).” Paleographically closer would be sārvasāttvīkā, “possessing the nature of Śiva”—but this seems little appropriate with reference to the Vāraḥī-clan yogīṇī.

99 A is remarkably consistent in writing draṇṣṭra for daṇṣṭra, as here in 62c. This might suggest that the orthography is original. However, in two cases this would engender the egregious metrical fault of a heavy fifth syllable in an even pada: III.165d, dhīṣero lohiḍadraṇṣṭarṇō, as given in A; and 71b below, kṣāraṁśi ca draṇṣṭrī, as reads A. Note also that this spelling is not restricted to A, which might increase the possibility of it being scribal: I note it in e.g. the printed edition of the Rudrayāmala Uttarākāṇḍa (26.53a and 70.10d) and in the mss of the Tantrasadbhava, as reported by Dyczkowski in 3.221b. Primarily on consideration of the metrical evidence, I have regularized the spelling.

100 A is remarkable in writing ghonāṁ in 64a seems unusual for the feminine ghonā, “snout.” However, ghonā occurs in compound twice elsewhere in the Brahma, viz. XXII.120a (in the goddess name ghonamāst) and LXXX.146c (ghonāsādakṣatītāstosam, describing Bhatraśva); in this text, the feminine ghonā seems not to occur at all. More dubious, however, is konāṁ in 63b, perhaps meaning “angle.”

101 The masculine or neuter ghonā in 64a seems unusual for the feminine ghonā, “snout.” However, ghonā occurs in compound twice elsewhere in the Brahma, viz. XXII.120a (in the goddess name ghonamāst) and LXXX.146c (ghonāsādakṣatītāstosam, describing Bhatraśva); in this text, the feminine ghonā seems not to occur at all. More dubious, however, is konāṁ in 63b, perhaps meaning “angle.”

102 Št in 64b appears to constitute with dhūhlāṇī, while 64c seems to form a separate sentence. Note the absence of the -t ending of the optative viṣāntī(t) in A, quite common when this does not affect the meter. In 64d, also note the possibility that ekaparvaratā could instead mean “devoted to a single sacred day.”
A woman dark and malodorous, who has a long neck and fingers, whose teeth have a very beautiful shine and eyes are very round;

always fond of red clothing, draping a garment from her shoulders, always fond of scents and flowers; she becomes rich in wealth.

She laughs and takes pleasure (?) ... (?).

She would draw the vajra insignia on her very own house.

And she draws a winnowing basket, tail, (?) or cloth (?) [or] another great...

---

103 The syntax of 65cdef seems problematic, for both anusarina in 65d and mantrinah in 65f appear to refer to the practitioner, despite being in different cases. One might hence consider emending to the genitive anusarinah. It is also conceivable that anusarina is intended somewhat freely in the sense of anusaratah. On the Vārāhī-clan yoginī, cf. Tantrasadbhāta 16.269cd–73ab. Siddhāyogesvarinata 29, which appears to break off after verse 51, might describe the Vārāhī-clan yogini beginning with 29.44, for the description matches that of BraYā in assigning to her the danda and danṣṭra (“staff” and “fang”) insignia:

romādā sarvagātraṇaṃ kṛṣṇapāla-lakṣaṇānāṃ | karālavākṛti-kāraṇā vātā ca sthutadāmśrānaṃ || 47 ||
lomakoṭi kṛṣṇatānaṃ ca kolaśī bhagvanāṣikaḥ | nṛtyogānāravakusālaṁ mahaśānavānāṁ || 48 ||
līḍaṁ pramadāśī dṛṣṭvā danṣṭrām satya pradarsāyet | dandaṁ vāpī tattām rasiya daviṣeṣed avvānkālaḥ || 49 ||

nayaṁ śūnasa-yogaṇaṃ kalpānte daksanāsānti || 50 ||
parināmatanaṁ tu vāmena mudrā tāśaṁ na samasyaḥ | laksanāyās tu tā nityaṁ bhūrloke kṛṣṇayanti ca || 51 ||

104 In 66a, what A transmits as śyāmacaiva-gandhinī seems likely to be a corruption of two separate adjectives, viz. śyāma caiva-gandhinī, as cato suggests.

105 yogoyogānusāratāthaḥ, as reads A in 68b, is difficult to interpret. The phrase yogoyogena does occur elsewhere in the BraYā; cf. lxxi.111b, quoted in chapter 5 of this thesis (n. 42), where I conjectured this to mean “by joining in combination.” This seems little applicable in the present case. An alternative text might be yogoyogānusāratāthaḥ—perhaps “according to whether or not it is appropriate [to do so].” This phrase could alternatively mean yogayogānusāratāthaḥ: “She laughs and sports/takes pleasure, depending upon whether [she is in] union or separation [with a lover?].” None of these options appear compelling, however.

106 svarṣa eva in 68d might suggest interpreting 68cd to mean “she would, just spontaneously, draw the vajra insignia on [her] house.” However, I suspect that gṛhe ... svarṣa eva is supposed to mean svarṣa eva; cf. svarṣe ... līkhaṭe in 59b, 62c, and 73a.

107 pata in 69a, as an insignia or item of Indrāṇī, seems problematic. This is rather unlikely to have the technical sense of a painted scroll as locus of the deity. It could perhaps mean “cloth.” Cf. pattiṣā in 73b and the discussion thereon.
emblem. These are the characteristics of [yoginīs] born in the clan of Indrāṇi.  

70 After six months of worship, successfully propitiated, they bestow melaka. [The sādhaka] traverses the worlds entirely, working all [kinds of] wonders.

71 A woman whose body is emaciated, whose nose is broken, who has sunken eyes, has fangs, whose frontal locks have tawny ends, whose gaze is upward, and who is terrifying;

72 [who] always speaks of the dead or of battle, and who is ever fond of celibacy; who always speaks solely about cremation grounds, who is fond of speaking about sādhakas;  

---

108 In 69c, A’s “kulajñatā” is clearly corrupt, and underlying this is most probably “kulajñatanām.” For 69d is something of a stock phrase, and construes with a genitive; cf., e.g., Siddhayogesvarīmatatamata 29.45ab: vaisnavānām yoginīnām etad bhavaśi lakṣaṇam. A similar construction occurs, for instance, several times in Laghuśaṃvara 19, viz. 19.5cd, 11cd, 12ab, and 25cd.

109 A’s reading in 70d, vicaraty akhilam lokāṁ, might be plausible, understanding akhilām as an adverb and lokāṁ as lokāṁ, accusative plural. This possibility has been tentatively adopted. However, the emendations akhilam lokāṁ and akhilam lokān should both be given consideration. Cf., e.g., Kubjikāmatatantra 4.28, vicaret akhilan lokān; and Mahābhārata, XIII.134.57, srjatya akhilam lokatā. Note that B’s text appears to have been emended: vicaret akhilām! lokāṁ. On the Indrāṇi-clan yogini, cf. Tantrasadbhava 16.273cd–77.

110 Regarding pīṭagātigrāgakesī in 71c, see 48b and the footnote thereon.

111 This verse has a close parallel in Siddhayogesvarīmatatamata 29.29:

hasate ramate caiva brahmacaryavasastiḥ |
raṇṭitre mṛtānām tu kathāsu ramate sūda ||

The latter passage, however, describes the Māheśvari-clan yoginī.
She draws on her house a skull and spear; she, always fond of wine and meat, one should know to be [a yogini of the clan of] the leader of the Mothers.

She ever grants melaka, the teachings of the lineage (sampradāya), and boon[s]

---

112 pattisa in 73b could be a spear-like weapon, as modern lexicons such as Apte's suggest. The word appears in lists of weapons in Śuccchandatantra 3.84 and BraYa lxv.18cd–20ab (19ab reading, in A, paraśaṃ bhindipāramaṃ ca saktionarapattisam). But note the comments of Kannapāda in his Yogaratnamālā commentary on the Floresvijñātantra, ad I.vii.4c:

pattīsam ityādi | aṅgulidvayena pataṭtambhābhūvah pattaśah | ...

“[Regarding] ‘pattīsam, etc.’: pattīsa is the gesture of fastening a cloth with two fingers...”

Note that the commentator appears to read pattaśam darsayet rather than pattaṃ samdarsayet, as is printed in Snellgrove’s edition. In any case, according to this commentator, these are probably synonyms, for pattīsa signifies the mudra for simulating the tying of a pata or patta, “cloth” (perhaps for a turban). Cf. pata in 69a. This meaning for pattisa or pattīsa seems attested elsewhere as well; note for example BraYa Iv.404cd–405ab, which seems to refer to the avagunthanakas ("covers") used in pata as nādāpattisavistara, “having a variety (vistara) of many fabrics (nāḍāpattisa)”: yathāśīvibhavatāḥ prāptair avagunthanakais tatāḥ || 404 || avagunthanayitvā mantrajñānāh nādāpattisavistaraḥ ||

Although the word can hence be used both in the sense of a weapon and a cloth, the former seems more appropriate as an emblem the yogini draws upon her home.

113 The expression mātrṇyikā refers to Camunda, the seventh of the Mothers and their “leader,” when not transcended by Yogesvari/Aghoresi/Bhairavi. Although the BraYa frequently does add Yogesvari to the Mothers, she is absent from the seven Mother-clan system presented in this chapter.

114 In scriptures of the Vidyāpiṭha and related material, “obtaining the sampradāya”—usually bestowed by yoginis—finds frequent mention as a reward for successful ritual. See for example BraYa xliv.304–05:

anena vidhiṁ devi yoginiḥ paśyate dhrutvam |
ādiśesāvahyataḥ kuryāt śiddhiyogam tu śuddhakoh || 304 ||
tam kṛte śiddhyate mantri sampradāyam ca vindati |
khecaravatam bhavet tasya cīra bhavatiśāsnavah || 305 ||
305 śāsavatāḥ corr.; śāsavatā A

“Through this ritual process, O goddess, one certainly sees the yoginis instructed by them, a sādāhaka should perform the yaga for [attainment of] siddhi. Having done this, the mantri achieves siddhi, and he obtains the sampradāya. He would attain the state of being a Sky-traveller, and becomes an eternal [i.e. undying?] hero.”

a yoginiḥ in xliv.304b appears to be accusative in sense.

b tābhavataḥ seems to be a non-standard ablative or instrumental.

c One could instead consider emending to the adverbial sātastam.

Cf. 111.231cd and 122.113ab (tatās tu jñate siddhiḥ sampradāyāt ca vindati), xliv.305ab (tam kṛte śiddhyate mantri sampradāyam ca vindati), and lxxii.143ab (anañāthā na labheta siddhiḥ [em.; siddhiḥ A] sampradāyam na vindati). Mālāśāvatāraśāvatārānta 23 describes a practice by which one brings forth the yoginis at a pīṭha or another sacred place, obtaining from them their respective sampradāyas:

tatās tatā ko ni cīt kṣetre yoginiḥ bhūmanvikramāḥ || 24 ||
śamāgyaḥ prayacchanti sampradāyam svakam svakam |
yenaśa labhamitreyāṃ sampradāyena suvrat || 25 ||
śamānāhāraḥ bhūtāḥ bhūtikte bhogān yathāpiśītān |

“Then, there in some sacred field, terrible and powerful yoginis assemble, and bestow their respective sampradāya—sampradāya by which, as soon as it has been obtained, one becomes equal to them in power, and enjoys one’s choice of surpernal experiences.”
to a sadhaka who knows the method of giving response-mudrās and is intent upon

Such promises of obtaining the sampradāya occur frequently in yoginīkṣaṇa material, as is the case in the present chapter. Cf. Tantrasadbhāva 16.260 and 282, which describe yoginīs as giving the sampradāya to practitioners of their own clans (āmsa); svakāntakā svārāya sampradāyam prajacchati; and svāhākā svārāya dādāti sampradāyakaṁ, describing the Kumārī-clan and Cāmūnda-clan yoginīs, respectively. Cf. also Siddhāntajīvaśāstra 29.40cd, describing the Kumārī-clan yoginī: sampradāyam ca sā tuṣṭi dādate sārvakānīkām.

Promises of receiving sampradāya unfortunately receive little elaboration. Note the definition Kṣemarāja provides, in the sense of an esoteric transmission given to those showing signs of divinities highest grace, commenting ad Netratantra 14.11: samyak śāntaśāntakāntaṁ vicārya tadākhyate iti sampradāyam: “Having properly (samyak) judged [there to be] a most intense descent (śāntaśānta) of sakti, it is given (ākhyate) to the one possessing this; hence [the word] ‘sampradāya’. In Brahmā 1.102cd–03, its meaning appears distinct from that of ‘scripture’ (śāstra), perhaps signifying “lineage of transmission” or even “secret teaching”:

etac chaśtram kalau cānte yoginīḥ sakti-dītāḥ ||
apahṛtya pratyāsantaṁ sampradāyaṁ ca sāvari ||
sāktyantāṁ nātra sandeha evam vai bhairavo ’bhavat || 103 ||

“And at the end of the Kaliyuga, the yoginīs, impelled by the sakti, shall snatch this scripture and the lineage of transmission (sampradāya) and depart to the limit of the sakti [tattva], O pious woman, no doubt. Thus did speak Bhairava.”

On the problems of this verse, see the footnotes thereon.

It seems likely that in 74c and in similar passages, “attaining the sampradāya” signifies communication of higher esoteric wisdom by a yoginī to the practitioner of her own clan. That these were teachings beyond those given at initiation is clear from the fact that their attainment requires intensive post-initiatory practice. Note, however, that the Buddhist author Jayabhadra, commenting ad LaghūSamvaratāna 38.8d (sampradāyaṁ ca vindati), remarks, sampradāyaṁ ca vindatī trīṣṭiyate yat sukhāṁ tad anubhavati arthāḥ (“and he obtains the sampradāya” means “he experiences whatever bliss exists in the three-fold universe.”). That receiving the ‘sampradāya’ can refer, however, to obtaining secret teachings, finds confirmation in e.g. Tantrasadbhāva 6, which classifies as threefold the mantra-practices heroes of the clans divinely receive: upadeśa (“instruction”), sampradāya (“the tradition”), and kaulika (“clan-based [wisdom]”).

pañcāryakramānyātām na ca likhīyatī pusatakā || 173 ||
kulam tu kaulikaṁ devi kulāmnāyād itiśataṁ ||
na ca labhyatī gūḍhāṁ kartān kulaṁ devi ca kaulikam || 174 ||
tadamśāntāṁ tu virāṇaṁ prāptāṁ kulajakulikām ||
sa ca prākṛtikrābdhānā bhūryate tu triṇāṁ punaḥ || 175 ||
upadeśām ca prāthamaṁ sampradāyaṁ doṣītyakām ||
kaulikām ca triṇāṁ suṣṭā kṣayaśāntāṁ nibodhata || 176 ||
ye yoginīkṛte labdāḥ upadeśā vairānāme ||
yogindēvaścām labdāḥ sampradāyaṁ śīvatītyāḥ || 177 ||
khecarārī yogindēvatāṁ kaulikākām te na śaṁśāyāḥ || 175c prāptāḥ ||

“And the [mantra-teachings] which have come down through the lineage of transmission are not written in a book.” [173] But the clan (kula) and clan-based (kaulika) [mantra-teachings] have come to this [world] through the Clan Lineage; and the kula and kaulika, which have secret meanings, are not obtained [in books?]. [174] But that arising from the kula, and the kaulika, are obtained by the heroes of their [yoginīs’] clans (āmsa). And that is threefold, divided by the ways it is obtained. [175] The first is upadeśa (“instruction”); the second is sampradāya (“the tradition”); and the third would be kaulika (“based in the clans”). Listen to what comes from whom [176]: Those obtained in the home of a yoginī [living among mortals] are ‘upadeśa’, O fair woman. Those obtained from deity yoginīs are
meditation.115

75 The Seven Mothers who bestow siddhi have been taught in the Yāmalatantra.116

O goddess, those [yoginīs] with mixed characteristics have a mixture of their forms.117

76 Divided into the ‘perfected’ (siddhā) and ‘unperfected’ (asiddhā),118 (¿) by their wish a sādhaka knows [them],119 through characteristics, by [his] enlightened awareness, [or] through analysis of inferential marks (?).120

These categories in fact correspond to primary divisions of mantra, defined first in Tantrasadbhāva 3.49-57ab.

115 For a description of the Cāmunda-clan yogini, see Tantrasadbhāva 16.278-82, where however her name is absent; but note the description lambastanT ca nirmamsd (279a).
116 Note that mādraidh in 75a is a plural formed from a non-standard stem mātr. See the annotation on 1.83.
117 A’s reading in 75cd is difficult to interpret: vimśitrākṣaṇaḥ dve etadṛṣṭaṃ paṇiṃsritāḥ. This could somewhat elliptically mean, “there are [also] mixed characteristics, O goddess: yoginīs having a mixture of these forms.” It seems preferable, however, to emend °laksanam to the feminine plural, in agreement with °vimisritah. Note that Tantrasadbhāva 16 teaches sub-sets of mixed (miśra) yoginīs connected with the Seven Mothers, beginning in 53cd:

75a

53

brahmānādī samārābhiṣa yogasāṃśatvād hy

sihīsā caikona-paricāsād ekākāh sapta saptasū ||

54


“I shall likewise teach you those existing with mixed types. Starting with Brahmanī and ending with Yogeśī, there are forty-nine [of them], seven [mixed] for each one of the seven [Mothers].”

Such sub-categories do not receive elaboration in BraYā.

118 It is not clear whether siddhāsiddhavibhagā modifies °vimśitrāh in 75d, or whether it begins a new sentence. The division into siddhā and asiddhā could indeed bear upon all yoginīs, and not merely those of mixed clans. And while 76cd might refer to the special ways by which mixed-clan yoginīs are recognized, it could also apply generally to the recognition of goddesses. The translation provided attempts to reflect this ambiguity.

119 °icchayā appears to be instrumental, for icchayā, with metrical lengthening. See the annotation on 1.37a.
120 The reading of the mss in 76d, bodhālingaviceṣaṇā, seems unintelligible. It appears probable that this pāda should modify the verb vetti, as does laṅgaṇa in 76c, or else provide a feminine accusative plural, in agreement with °vibhāgās in 76a. One might indeed make some sense of an ablative li-
O fair woman, the essence of the Tantra, the gateway to siddhi, which always produces direct perception [of the goddesses], has been taught for the Indras among sādhakas.

Thus ends chapter seventy-three of the Picumata, named the "Chommā Section."

ngavivecanāt: “[one knows them] through analysis of inferential marks.” Loss of final -t in the ablative singular is extremely common in A. It might also be possible that A’s bodhā is for bodhāt, in the sense of jñānaprabodhāt, “the awakening of knowledge.” Although the degree of uncertainty is high, these conjectures have tentatively been adopted.
ENCOUNTERS WITH THE CLANS

Bhairava spoke:

1 O Maheśānī, I shall tell you the manner in which 'encounter' (melāpa) with the clans [of goddesses] takes place;¹ listen, O woman of long eyes.²

2 O beautiful one, melāpa with the clans would transpire because of the observances of one abiding by the restraints, while reciting mantras, being dedicated to fire ritual, abiding in meditation.³

3–4 Occasionally [too], through the way of ritual gruel (caru),⁴ or the awakening of knowledge, (?) the predominance of the mantra’s potency (?),⁵ or through

¹ In 1ab, melāpakam .. kulātmakam appears equivalent in meaning to kulamelāpakā, an expression occurring in 2b below and in BraYā lv; cf. Úrnikaula 4.126c, and kulamelaka in BraYā lv.85b. This denotes transactional, power-bestowing encounters with goddesses of the clans (kula)—a characteristic aim of ritual in the cult of yoginis. Other sources more commonly use the expression yoginīmelaka (or melāpa) in this sense, which is rare in the BraYā; it occurs twice in chapter lviii.

² In 1c, A’s implausible avidhasyami should surely be emended to abhidhasyāmi, with the preceding -m- understood as a hiatus breaker.

³ This verse contains syntactical ambiguities. 2abc could enumerate five separate conditions from which—presumably in combination—ensue melāpa: the practitioner’s caryā, niyama, japa, homa, and dhyāna. However, in 2a, caryāya could depend upon the genitive niyamasthasya, as has been adopted in the translation. 2b is problematic; the ms read the nominative homatatparah, which if correct, should probably be interpreted as though genitive, i.e. tatparasya. However, one might consider emending to the adverbial “tatparam, construed with the genitive present participle japatah: “[melāpa would transpire] for one reciting mantras, being intent on the fire ritual.” 2abc may hence delineate as few as three conditions that bring about melāpa.

⁴ carunārga presumably refers to the practices of the carubhujin, “eater of ritual gruel,” third and lowest in the threefold typology of the sādhaka taught in BraYā xliv. The way of the carubhujin forms the subject of BraYā xcii. As the name suggests, consumption of substances characterizes the ritual of this sādhaka—sexual fluids in particular. Practices of the carubhujin include the sādhana of Garttabhairava, elaborated in BraYā lxix, in which sexual practices feature prominently.

⁵ The meaning of A’s mantrasvīrayapradhānena is unclear; though here it appears to be a substan-
the arising of bodily purity, through the bestowal of the clan-observances,\(^6\) or through one’s ritual purification, [the yoginīs] grace [a sādhaka] by accomplishing melāpa.\(^7\)

5 When one possessing great inner power is a fit recipient of the clan-siddhis,\(^8\) as he gazes, he looses [his] natural fear.

6 For this person, in whom the heroic spirit has arisen,\(^9\) [the yoginīs] become visible.\(^10\) But never otherwise, Great Goddess, even for one fatigued [by toil].

7-8 This is the Pledge of yoginīs:\(^11\) to [a mortal] of weak spirit, [there shall be] no giving darśana, no speaking, no being affectionate, and no appearing externally;

(?) giving up creatures of lowly birth and those unfit for sacrifice (??);\(^12\) not be-
tive, one would normally expect a word ending in pradhāna to be a bahuvrhi adjective. It is possible that "pradhānena occurs for "pradhānyena, which would be unmetrical—i.e. “due to the predominance of the mantra’s potency.” It is however tempting to conjecture "prabhāvena, i.e. “through the force of the mantra’s potency”\(^7-8\); cf., e.g., Kulārvatatantra 15.13 (upadeśasya sāmarthyāti sārūryaḥ ca prasadāthāḥ | mantraprabhāvād bhaktiyā ca mantrasiddhiḥ praṇāyate).

\(^5\) kulacarapradānena, as read the mss in 4a, is not entirely convincing. While a kulamantra may certainly be “bestown/given”—cf. BraYa L V.25C—it seems odd that kulacdrā ("observances/practices of the clans") would be spoken of thus.

\(^6\) This is the Pledge of yoginīs: to [a mortal] of weak spirit, [there shall be] no giving darśana, no speaking, no being affectionate, and no appearing externally;

\(^7\) the list of conditions for bringing about encounters with yoginīs in verses 2-4 bears comparison with Svacchandatāna i5-32cd-38; see also BraYa LXXII.40, 43. On the connection drawn in 4cd between melāpa and Śiva’s grace, cf. BraYa LV.24cd-26; BraYa LXXII.40-43 links the manifestation of yoginīs to Śiva’s will or volition (icchā).

\(^8\) In 5b, mahaujasah (as corrects B; mahojasah in A and D is also plausible) appears to be nominative singular, for the “correct” mahaujadh. One would expect ojas to be thematized as oja; however, there are other cases in which s-stems appear to be thematized by addition of -a. Note e.g. manasah as nominative in BraYa XVI.313d (tiṣṭheta ekgramanamasah sthitah). Cf. Törzsők, “Doctrine of Magic Female Spirits,” xl.

\(^9\) On the notion of “heroic spirit” (vīrasya sattvah kṛto yasmin sah).

\(^10\) In 6b, the manuscripts read ċṛṣṭāṇāṃ; this is undoubtedly a corruption of ċṛṣṭāṇi, reflecting confusion not uncommon in old Newari between n and r. Cf. BraYa LXXII.44b, where the mss read ċṛṣṭaṇi gocaraṃ—preserving the correct -r but transmitting i for e.

\(^11\) As the context makes clear, yoginām in 7a is an irregular genitive plural for yoginīnām, metri causa. This could be viewed as formed from a new feminine stem, yogī. yoginī occurs twice elsewhere, but in both cases could mean yoginī (“for/of yogins”); cf. BraYa LI.1.183ab: yam jñātavya svarṣyoginīnām kāmikā siddhi jñātate. The masculine yogī does however occur for yogint not infrequently in the BraYa; cf., e.g., XIV.110ab (melakam yogībhīḥ sārāham khecaratvum avāpnuvat) and cl.26c (dadate yogisānghas tu kaulam samaṇam uttaman). Cf. Törzsők, “Doctrine of Magic Female Spirits,” xxxviii, xli.

\(^12\) The translation of 8a is uncertain. It appears necessary that this compound, janmahinapasyagā, express two pledges, since otherwise 7b–8d enumerates only eight of the nine qa refers to. This could be interpreted as meaning, “giving up [the company of?] those low with respect to birth (janmahīna), and
Endowed with nine pledges, they sport as they please, my dear. They grant the wishes of the Indras among sādhakas, up to the state of Śiva.

And the other [types] of melāpa are called “violent” (hatha); one should employ these for the ṣākinī hordes, O fair-faced woman, but not for the pure [yoginis].

Having thus attained melāpa, O fair woman, Indras among sādhakas obtain their desired wishes; but [when] by inverse [means], [the results are] contrary.

bound souls (paśu) [i.e. the uninitiated].” However, Tantrasadbhava 7.116cd–17ab suggests an alternative possibility:

\[
\text{nāpāśaṃ bhakṣaye mantri janmahān na homayet} || 116 ||
\]
\[
\text{ṣākināṃ priyaṃ bhadre yogināṃ priyaṃ na hi |}
\]

In context, paśu here appears to mean “appropriate sacrificial victim”— one that is lakṣaṇāvatī (7.115d). One could hence interpret the passage as follows: “A mantri should not eat an unsuitable sacrificial creature, nor offer in fire sacrifice one of lowly birth. For [these creatures are] dear to ṣākinī, not dear to yoginis.” On the basis of this parallel, it seems appropriate to emend the “paśu of BraYa xcix 8a to its negation, “apośu, i.e. reading janmahinpaśutyogas: “giving up creatures of lowly birth and those unfit for sacrifice.” In this case too, it remains difficult to account for the -a ending A and D transmit; B’s ablative is presumably a scribal emendation.

It is uncertain whether tiraskara refers to the yoginis’ self-concealment, or perhaps rather their role in censuring/punishing—nigraha, as opposed to anugraha (“favoring, grace”). The implication of this pledge might however be that yoginis are agents of Śiva’s power of “obfuscation” (tiraskara), much as they are viewed as agents of his grace (cf. 4cd, 8d)—tiraskara and anugraha being two of Śiva’s “five functions” (pañcakṛtya).

One might construe 8d as a nominal sentence: “no grace that is not the will of Śiva.” However, parallels suggest that aśīvecchā is adverbial in sense, as though aśīvecchaya; see the annotation on BraYa Lxxm.40.

Note the occurrence of dadanti as the plural of /dā/, for dadati. In the BraYā, correct parasraipadā indicative forms of /dā/ alternate with irregular ones—the third person singular dadati and third person plural dadantu—while irregular ātmanepada forms are common as well: dadate and (once) dadate for the third person singular. I note no occurrence of dadante, although this occurs in e.g. the Tantrasadbhāva.

kāmān śivapadāntikān refers to supernatural powers or experiences, siddhi/bhoga, connected with the ascending series of tattvas, culminating in those connected with the śivatattva—presumably liberation itself. Cf. BraYā Lxii.26: rākṣitāṁ devatāḥ sarvāḥ dīnāḥ śaṣṭhe mahātmānāḥ | yacchanti khecarā śiddhiḥ sadāśivapadāntikā (or perhaps khecarisiddhi?). Svacchandatantra 15.23–34 presents a detailed account of melāka in which the yogini bestows or prognosticates siddhis associated with a series of tattvas.

This verse is suggestive of a distinction referred to in Śaiva sources between two varieties of melāka: “pleasing/pleasant” (priya) and “violent/forceful” (hatha). Descriptions of the “forceful,” dangerous variety are found in e.g. BraYā xiv.205–219ab and Tantrasadbhāva 16.327–357; the remainder of the latter chapter concerns priyamelāpa. For a non-scriptural source making this distinction, note Tantrāloka 28.371. However, while the BraYā distinguishes melāpa from ṣāṭhāmelāpa, it makes no reference to priyamelāpa as such. I plan to address the topic of yoginimelāka in a future publication.

It appears that 11abc concerns the desirable variety of melāpa, while 11d refers to the “forceful” (hatha) type. It might be possible to interpret the entire verse as referring to forceful melāpa; the implication would be that through this, sādhakas do obtain the desired results, but using dangerous
Just as [a woman] who has attained the state of a goddess through inverse [means] would become a ḍākini, in the same way, O goddess, a sādhaka becomes a victim (paśu) among them [ḍākinīs].

But through this very path, (¿) because of [his] slaughter by means of the [esoteric] knowledge of the saktis (?), by [their] power this person too, after giving up his body, again attains the state of belonging to the clans [of goddesses], and is reborn knowing his [past] birth.

But through the way of victims, [the sādhaka] of cruel nature does not obtain lordship in the manner of one who has become perfected (siddha) in melāpa;

nor [does one] worshipping with flowers, incense, and perfumes in ritual to Śiva (¿) from . . . one attains the ultimate melāpa with the saktis (?).
Thus, whatever various siddhis—lowly, middling, and best—[arise] while worshipping (?) . . . (?) the Wheel of Seventeen Clans\textsuperscript{25} without having a palpable encounter with visible šaktis,\textsuperscript{26} my dear, the best of sādhakas obtains all of these in melāpa.\textsuperscript{27}

Meditating on the Wheel of the Clans, O queen of the gods, he knows everything past, present, and future, whether concerning himself or someone else.\textsuperscript{28}

Thus ends chapter ninety-nine of the Brahmayāmala, the Tantra of Twelve-thousand Verses, in the Bhairava-stream [of revelation].

---

\textsuperscript{25} The kulaseptādaśacakra, or kulacakra, as it is referred to in 18d, is delineated in BraYā xiv. Its core consists of a circle of eight petals on which are installed the sixteen vowel-deities, presided over in the center by the smarana-mantra (ṛtM), i.e. Bhairava. It is also referred to as the khecaricakra (xrv.67d), and it is from this that the kulavidyā is extracted—an important mantra in the system of the BraYā.

In 16d, the mss' guham is highly problematic. It is perhaps conceivable that this is a metrically shortened form of guhyam, "secret," here perhaps "secretly;" no other possibilities worth mentioning come to mind.

\textsuperscript{26} It is unclear how the mss' vyaktišaktinām in 16a could be interpreted. More plausible is the emendation vyakti, i.e. "of the manifest [i.e. visible] šaktis." This finds support in 16b's sphutamelāpākam, which appears to mean "visible/manifest encounter;" cf. lxxiii.23.

\textsuperscript{27} Note the non-application of sandhi across the pada-boundary in 17ab, metri causa.

\textsuperscript{28} As above, sandhi is not applied across the pada-boundary in 18ab.
APPENDIX A

CHAPTER COLOPHONS OF THE BRAHMAYĀMALA IN ITS OLDEST
NEPALESE CODEX (NAK 3-370)

I. Sambandha. ff. 1v–4v. iti mahābhairave tantre dvādaśasāhasrake picumate navākṣaravidhāne sambandhapaṭalāḥ prathamaḥ.

II. Mantroddhāra. ff. 4v–5r. iti mahābhairave mālatantre dvādaśasāhasrake picumate navākṣaravidhāne mantroddhārapaṭalāḥ dvitīyaḥ.

III. Mahāyāga. ff. 5r–11v. iti mahābhairave dvādaśasāhasrake picumate navākṣaravidhāne mahāyāgapaṭalāḥ.

IV. Pratimālakṣaṇa (I). ff. 11v–38v. iti mahābhairave picumate dvādaśasāhasrake pratimālakṣaṇa caturthapaṭalāḥ.

V. Yantrakarma. ff. 38v–42v. iti picumate dvādaśasāhasrake yantrakarma pañcamapaṭalāḥ.

VI. Pratimālakṣaṇa (II). ff. 42v–43r. iti picumate pratimālakṣaṇo nāma ṣaṭṭha paṭalāḥ.

VII (labelled ix). “Devatādhyāna. ff. 43r–43v. iti picumate navamapaṭalāḥ.

VIII. Samādhiyojana. ff. 43v–44v. iti picumate dvādaśasāhasrake samādhiyojana aṣṭamaḥ paṭalāḥ.

IX. Laksabheda. ff. 44v–45r. iti picumate laksabheda navamaḥ paṭalāḥ.
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X. Devīnāṃ Mantroddhāra. ff. 45r–50v. *iti picumate dvādaśasāhasrase devīnāṃ mantro-
ddhāra daśamaḥ paṭalalāḥ.*

XI. Mantroddhāra. ff. 50v–57r. *iti picumate dvādaśasāhasre mantroddhārāpaṭalalāḥ ekādaśa-
maṇṭi.

XII. Tritattvayāga. ff. 57r–63v. *iti picumate dvādaśasāhasrake tritatvayāga dvādaśamaḥ pa-
ṭalalāḥ.*

XIII. Navayāga. ff. 63v–64v. *picumate navayāgapaṭalalāḥ trayodaśamaḥ.*

XIV. Khecarīcakra. ff. 64v–72r. *iti picumate dvādaśasāhasrake khecarīcakrapaṭalalāḥ catur-
daśaḥ.*

XV. Vetālasādhana. ff. 72r–73v. *iti picumate vetālasādhana paṭalalāḥ paścadaśamaḥ.*

XVI. Puspādhikāra. ff. 73v–75v. *iti picumate dvādaśasāhasrake puspādhikārapaṭalalāḥ ṣoḍ-
aśamaḥ.*

XVII. Vidyācakra. ff. 75v–92r. *iti mahābhairave picumate dvādaśasāhasrake vidyācakra sa-
ptadaśamaḥ paṭalalāḥ.*

XVIII. Japavidhāna. ff. 92r–94v. *iti picumate dvādaśasāhasrake japavidhānapaṭalalo [‘Iṣṭā-
daśamaḥ.*

XIX. Bhautikacakra. ff. 94b–97r. *iti picumate dvādaśasāhasrake bhautikacakrapaṭalalāḥ ek-
ūnavinsatimalāḥ.*

XX. Agnikāryavidhi. ff. 97r–98r. *iti picumate agnikāryavidhipaṭalalāḥ vinsatimalāḥ.*

XXI. Vrata. ff. 98r–102v. *iti picumate vratapaṭalaikaviṃśatimalāḥ.*

XXII. Guhyāmṛta (I). ff. 102v–07r. *iti picumate dvādaśasāhasrake guhyāmṛta paṭalalāḥ dvā-
vinsatimalāḥ.*
XXIII. Mṛtyuñjayavidhi. ff. 107r–12r. *iti picumate mṛtyuñjayavidhiḥ mantrodhārapatālaḥ trayovinsatimah.*

XXIV. Guhyāmṛta (II). ff. 112r–17v. *iti picumate dvādaśasāhasrake guhyāṃratapatāla caturvoinsatimah.*

XXV. Yāganiṃṇaya. ff. 117v–27v. *iti picumate dvādaśasāhasrake yāganiṃṇayah paṭatalah paṅcavinsatimah.*

XXVI. Mudrāmantroddhāra. ff. 127v–29r. *iti picumate dvādaśasāhasrake mudrāmantroddhārayaḥ paṭatalah sādvinsatimah.*

XXVII. Śaktitritayāga. ff. 129r–30v. *iti mahābhairave brahmayāmale dvādaśasāhasrake śaktitritayāgapatālaḥ saptāvinsatimah.*

XXVIII. Vijayabhairava. ff. 130v–32v. *iti brahmayāmale vijayaḥ bhairavapatālah aśṭāvinsatimah.*


XXX (labelled xxxi). Śivarudrabhed. ff. 139v–41v. *iti mahābhairave mūlatantre dvādaśasāhasrake śivarudrabhedapatāla ekatrinsatimah.*

XXXI (labelled xxxii). Prakriyā. ff. 141v–46r. *iti brahmayāmale dvādaśasāhasrake prakriyāpaṭatalah dvātrinsatimah.*

XXXII (labelled xxxiii). Dīkṣā. ff. 146r–56r. *iti brahmayāmale dīkṣāpaṭalas trayatrisatimah.*


XXXVIII (labelled xxxix). Srotaniṃaya. ff. 188r–90v. *iti brahmayāmale srotanirṇayapaṭalalḥ ekūnacatvāriṃśatimah.


XLI (labelled xlii). Nyāsa. ff. 192r–93r. *iti brahmayāmale nyāsapatālalḥ catvārinsatimah.


XLIX (labelled L). Kroṣṭhukalpa. ff. 218v–19r. *iti picumate kroṣṭhukalpani paṅcāsatimah paṭalāh samāptam iti.*


LI (labelled XLIX). ff. 220v–21r. *iti brahmayāmalesa vidyāśīthe ekūnapaṅcāsamah paṭalāh.*


LVI (labelled LIV). *Caturvīṁśayoginīyāga. ff. 235v–38v. iti picumate caṭuḥpaṅcāsatimah paṭalāh.*

LVII (labelled LV). *Aghoreśvarīkalpa. ff. 238v–40r. iti picumate +paṅca+paṅcāsaṭina paṭalāh.*

LVIII (labelled LVI). Kulacaryāvibhāgapaṭalā. ff. 240r–43r. *iti picumate kulacaryāvibhāgapatalahā satpaṅcāsatimah.*

LIX (labelled LVII). ff. 243r–45v. *iti picumate saḍapaṅcāsatimah paṭalāh.*
LX (labelled LXIII). Rūtakālaniṃṇaya. ff. 245v–46r. *iti bhairavasrotasi picumate rūtakālaniṃṇaya aṣṭapañcīsaṭimah pāṭalāḥ.

LXI (labelled LIX). Sūtrādiḥkārappāṭala. ff. 246r–53r. *iti sūtrādiḥkārappāṭalāḥ ekūnasāṣṭhitamaḥ.


LXXII (labelled LXX). Śaktiyāgakalpa. ff. 277v–78r. *iti brahmayāmale śaktiyāgakalpasaptatimah paṭalāḥ*.

LXXIII (labelled LXXI). Chommādhikāra. ff. 278r–280r. *iti picumate cchomādhikāro nāma ekasaptatimah paṭalāḥ*.

LXXIV (labelled LXXII). *Kūṭabhedalakṣaṇa. ff. 280r–86r. *iti picumate dvāsaptatimah paṭalāḥ*.

LXXV (labelled LXXIII). ff. 286–87r. *iti brahmayāmale trसaptatimah paṭalāḥ*.

LXXVI (labelled LXXIV). Hairambhabhairava. ff. 287r–90v. *iti picumate hairambhabhairavō nāma catussaptimah paṭalāḥ*.

LXXVII (labelled LXXV). Mahāmardakabhairava. ff. 290v–92r. *iti picumate mahāmardaka-kabhairavō nāma pañcasaptatimah paṭalāḥ*.

LXXVIII (labelled LXXVI). Yoginīprthakyāgavidhi. ff. 292r–93r. *iti brahmayāmale yoginīprthakyāgavidhi satsaptatimah paṭalāḥ*.

LXXIX (labelled LXXVII). *Devatāprthakkalpasādhana. ff. 293r–94r. *iti bhairavasrotasi mahātaṃntre saptasaptatimah paṭalāḥ*.

LXXX. Kapālakhaṭvāṅgotpatti. ff. 294r–305r. *iti picumate dvādaśasāhasrake kapālakhaṭvāṅgotpatti aśītimah paṭalāḥ*.

LXXXI. Kaṇcukīsādhana. ff. 305r–6v. *iti picumate kaṇcukīsādhana ekāśītimah paṭalāḥ*.

LXXXII. Uṭphullakāḍhikāra. ff. 307r–11r. *iti picumate uṭphullakāḍhikāro nāma dvāśītimah paṭalāḥ*.

LXXXIII. Śaktitrayavidhāna. ff. 311r–12v. *iti brahmayāmale śaktitrayavidhānā nāmaḥ tra-yōṣītimah paṭalāḥ*.

LXXXIV. Uttarādhiḥkāra. ff. 312v–19r. *uttarādhiḥkāro nāmaḥ caturāśītimah paṭalāḥ*.


LXXXIX. ff. 339v–41r. *iti picumate mahātatre ekāṇanavatimah paṭalāh.

XC. *Jhaṅkārabhairava. ff. 341r–42v. *iti picumate dvādaśasāhasrake navatimah paṭalāh.

XCI. *Ārādhakavṛtti. ff. 342v–44v. *iti picumate ekāvatimah paṭalāh.

XCII. *Carvāhārasādhkavṛtti. ff. 344r–46r. *iti picumate dvādaśasāhasrake dvānaṇavatimah paṭalāh.

XCIII. *Tālakavṛtti. ff. 346r–48r. *iti brahmayāmale dvādaśasāhasrake tirnavatimah paṭalāh.

XCIV. *Sarvātmakavṛtti. ff. 348r–48v. *iti picumate dvādaśasāhasrake caṭurnnavatimah paṭalāh.

XCV. ff. 348v–49v. *iti vidyāpīṭhe brahmayāmale paṇcanavatimah paṭalāh.

XCVI. ff. 349v–51v. *iti brahmayāmale saṅnavatīḥ paṭalāh.

XCVII. *Kulayoga. ff. 351–52r. *iti bhairavasrotasi mahātatre brahmayāmale saptanavatimah paṭalāh.

XCVIII. *Kulabheda. ff. 352r–53v. *iti brahmayāmale aṣṭāṇavatimah paṭalāh.

XCIX. *Yoginīmelāpa. ff. 353v–54r. *iti bhairavasrotasi brahmayāmale dvādaśasāhasrake navanavatimah paṭalāh.
C. *Kṣurikaprayoga. ff. 354r–57r. *iti bhairavasrotasi mahātante vidyāpīṭhe brahmayāmāle navākṣaravidhāne picumate dvādaśasāhasrake śatasaṅkhyātmakah paṭalāḥ.

Cl. *Kālavaṇcana. ff. 357r–58r. *iti bhairavasrotasi mahātante vidyāpīṭhe brahmayāmāle navākṣaravidhāne picumate dvādaśasāhasrake ekottarasatimah paṭalāḥ samāptalāḥ.
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