

To Borrow or not to Borrow? Some Remarks on *vaibhavīyanarasimhakalpa of Sātvatasamhitā*

Ewa Dębicka-Borek

Published online: 20 August 2014

© The Author(s) 2014. This article is published with open access at Springerlink.com

Abstract Some remarks on the possible methods of composing *samhitās* as hinted in chosen texts belonging to the Pāñcarātra school are presented in Sect. 1. In Sect. 2, the content and the structure of the *Sātvatasamhitā* and *Īśvarasamhitā* are compared. In fact, both texts are independent works even though in the light of some Pāñcarātrika texts they are considered to be mutually linked, the latter being considered a “commentary” of the former. In Sect. 3, the initiation (*dīkṣā*) as found in both texts is outlined. In Sect. 4, I focus on the re-use of the portions concerning *dīkṣā*: although the redactor of the *Īśvarasamhitā* borrowed almost all the *Sātvatasamhitā*'s chapters on initiation, he dealt in a very different way with the practice called *vaibhavīyanarasimhakalpa* that in the context of the latter text plays the role of a unique preliminary purification. Strikingly, the *Sātvatasamhitā*'s redactor reused the initial verses describing the *vaibhavīyanarasimhakalpa*, putting them into other contexts, not necessarily connected to the issue of initiation, whereas he totally omitted its impressive section concerning magical powers (*siddhi*).

Keywords Pāñcarātra · *Sātvatasamhitā* · *Īśvarasamhitā* · *vaibhavīyanarasimhakalpa* · Initiation · Textual re-use

The constant re-using of texts seems to be one of the most characteristic features of the literature of Vaiṣṇava Pāñcarātra.

First traces of the Pāñcarātra doctrine can be found already in the *Nārāyaṇīya* section of *Mahābhārata*. However, in the opinion of Sanderson (2001, p. 38), the form in which its most important texts, called the “three gems” (*ratnatraya*), i.e. *Jayākhyasamhitā* (JayS), *Sātvatasamhitā* (SātS) and *Pauṣkarasamhitā* (PauS), were preserved is a result of the reformation of the Pāñcarātra ritual under the influence of

E. Dębicka-Borek (✉)
Jagiellonian University, Kraków, Poland
e-mail: debicka.debicka@uj.edu.pl

the Kashmirian Śaiva *mantramārga*. In such circumstances, these three texts must have been composed around the middle of the ninth century in Kashmir. On the contrary, the younger *saṃhitās* of Pāñcarātra were most probably composed in the South of India. Due to the coexistence with South Indian brahmanical circles, the teachings they contain took a more orthodox shape approved by teachers of the Śrīvaiṣṇava tradition. These are also the texts which gave the basis for the order of worship in South-Indian Śrīvaiṣṇava temples. Among them one can enumerate the texts believed by tradition to be specific commentaries (*vyākhyā*) of the oldest “three gems”, i.e. *Pādmasaṃhitā* (PādS), *Īśvarasaṃhitā* (ĪS) and *Pārameśvarasaṃhitā* (PārS), as well as other relatively important *saṃhitās*.

That the textual borrowings happened to a great extent within the boundaries of the Pāñcarātra tradition has already been shown in the research done by Rastelli (2006) on the basis of PārS, which, so far, seems to be the best example of a text being itself a kind of compilation of the passages taken over from other sources, usually the most respected *saṃhitās* of Pāñcarātra, the already mentioned “three gems”.

However, Sanderson (2001, pp. 1, 37–39) has shown that there are also extensive parallel passages linking the Tantric Śaiva and Pāñcarātrika sources, proving, therefore, that there was also a movement from Pāñcarātrika literature toward Śaiva. This is evident in the case of the Śaivasiddhānta text *Brhatkālottara*, which in terms of the accounts of cremating initiates (*antyeṣṭi*) and *śraddhā* ceremonies draws richly from two chapters of JayS. The Śaiva redactor did not avoid some inconsistencies although he obviously attempted to eliminate the traces of the Vaiṣṇava material.

Another example, again examined by Rastelli (2007), comes from *Agnipurāna*. Among passages hailing from other sources, for example from the Śaivasiddhānta text entitled *Somaśambhupaddhati* (AP 72–90, 92–103), there are also those (AP 21–70) deriving, sometimes verbatim, sometimes with regard to the contents, from Pāñcarātra *saṃhitās*, mostly from *Hayaśrīṣapañcarātra* and *Nāradīyasaṃhitā*.

The focus of the present paper will be to analyze, in turn, a particular portion of the ĪS which is perceived by the tradition as a specific commentary upon SātS. At least in regard to the initiatory prescriptions, the former draws richly from the latter; however, the process is quite selective. My attempt will be, therefore, to discuss the possible reasons behind such a selection. Many questions arise in this connection. Is it at all meaningful that the compiler of the ĪS avoided the coherent passage on *vaibhavīyanarasimhakaḷpa*, which, judging from its size (457 *ślokas*), was quite important for the SātS’s initiatory system? One might say that there is no need to look for further explanations since there are many other portions of SātS neglected by the compiler of the ĪS. Yet, despite the negligence of *vaibhavīyanarasimhakaḷpa* as a coherent section, there are single verses derived from it dispersed throughout many chapters of ĪS, which suggests that its compiler was familiar with it. Hence, the absence of the section as a consistent unit needs a specific explanation.

In order to give some arguments for the alleged purposefulness of the treatment (or rather: the lack of treatment) of SātS’s *vaibhavīyanarasimhakaḷpa* within the framework of ĪS, I will firstly discuss some passages suggesting that Pāñcarātrika authors were familiar with re-working and re-using the texts. Then I will proceed to the brief characteristic of the texts in question, i.e. both SātS and ĪS, followed by a short analysis of their concept of initiation (*dīkṣā*). After presenting their parallel

passages, I will conclude with some cautious observations regarding the reasons for the omission of the *vaibhaviyanarasimhakaḷpa* section in the case of ĪS.

1 How the *saṃhitās* of Pāñcarātra might have been Composed

The Pāñcarātrika *saṃhitās* were regarded to be revealed by God himself and composed in the form of a dialogue, which was actually the divine revelation (Rastelli 2003, p. 1). Accordingly, their authors or compilers remain unknown to us: “they hide themselves completely behind the divine figures and sages whom they introduce as instructors and questioners” (Gonda 1977, p. 119). Therefore, “the catena of divine and prehistoric transmitters is the counterpart of the exact indications of the preceptors and ancestors of a commentator so often found in exegetical works: the *guruparamparās* guaranteeing the reliability of the tradition” (Gonda 1977, p. 119). Yet, as Gonda continues: “this does not however mean that the compilers are not committed to that which is taught in their books. They expound, as well as they can, the religious doctrines of their community, that is of the Pāñcarātra school of thought as handed down in a definite region and in definite milieus of which these authors are learned guides” (Gonda 1977, p. 119).

A passage found in JayS sheds some light on the features of text compilers and, possibly, copyists. One finds there the definitions of both the knower of a treatise (*śāstrajñā*) and its preserver (*śāstradhāraka*)¹ suggesting that among the followers of the tradition there were people responsible for knowing the doctrine as well as people responsible for reconstructing and maintaining the texts/manuscripts. The JayS 22.51cd–56ab reads: “[Characteristic of the knower of a treatise:] Know that he [who] knows *purāṇas*, *dharmasāstras* and Vaiṣṇava *itihāsas*, [he who] would not only listen to the doctrine of Vedānta but also explains it, [he who] having discussed the reading of the lost words with their knowers, with effort and attentively keeps on refining the treatise (*āgama*), such [a person] is a knower of a treatise belonging to the Vaiṣṇava tradition. [Characteristic of the preserver of a treatise:] Know that he [who] having collected all treatises (*āgamas*) wherever they were with faith, then maintains them carefully meditating on Brahman, [he who] worships the seat of the treatise with the *arghya*-offerings, flowers etc., [he who] transmits [the texts] of the Vaiṣṇavas and keeps away those of unprepared minds following other doctrines, such [a person] is a preserver of a treatise.” By saying that through the reconstruction of the lost words the knower of a *śāstra* arranges the treatise or, in other words, makes it perfect, refines it (*saṃskaroṭi*), the text points most probably to the fact that those treatises, even though treated with the highest esteem, were, with time, subjected to reworking, modifications and manipulations.²

One of the aspects of changes that happened within the boundaries of Pāñcarātrika literature in the course of time seems to be the concept that the

¹ Also treated in Czerniak-Drożdżowicz (2003, p. 40; 2006/2007, pp. 228–229).

² Among the reasons for such modifications one can enumerate not only religious factors but also changes in the social, political and economic situation of a given community. See Czerniak-Drożdżowicz (2006/2007, p. 9).

particular younger texts are linked to the most respected ones. The best known passage on both the concept of mutual relations between the older and younger *saṃhitās* as well as the technique of composing the latter ones comes from the additional chapter of JayS called *Adhikapāṭha* (JaySA). The JaySA is relatively young, since it must have been composed after the time all the texts it mentions had been composed, including ĪS, PārS and the text which is traditionally linked to JayS itself, i.e. PādS.³ Here, for the first time within the scope of the Pāñcarātra literature the idea of a “basic” (*mūla*) text and its traditional commentary (*vyākhyā*) is openly expressed. In accordance with JaySA, the latter one is composed through borrowing to a certain extent the content of the former. Thus JaySA 1–8ab says that the whole corpus of Pāñcarātrika scriptures has been revealed by Nārāyaṇa himself. Out of these, the SātS, the PauṣS and the JayS are called the “three gems” (*ratnatraya*). They are regarded to be the essence of the teaching of the Sātvata [clan], to be secret, approved by learned men and to have emerged directly from the mouth of Bhagavān in their accomplished form. This means that they are neither defective nor too broad. The other scriptures, among them the so called commentaries (*vyākhyā*), are said to be composed through filling them up with the essence coming out of the mouth of Bhagavān by adding, removing or keeping it. Their value depends, however, on the coexistence with the basic text (*mūla*), i.e. one of the “three gems”. The texts are believed to function in pairs. JaySA 11cd–12ab⁴ reads: “The wise one should know that the three treatises present one doctrine which can be fruitfully used, since it has the form of, respectively, basic text and commentary”. The PārS is said to have descended in the form of *vyākhyā* in order to explain the meaning (*vivṛtyartha*) of PauṣS, ĪS has been caused to descend in order to explain the meaning of SātS and PādS is said to be the commentary (*vyākhyāna*) on JayS.

It has already been generally accepted that it was the particular idea of the author of JaySA to present the three *vyākhyās/vyākhyānas* as commentaries, even though in terms of structure they are not proper commentaries.⁵ Those *vyākhyās* are in fact independent, self-sufficient texts arranged in the same way as the rest of Pāñcarātrika *saṃhitās*, including the aspect of the unknown authorship. Nevertheless, most probably for the sake of a greater authority, they borrow more or less richly from the elder *saṃhitās*. Still, neither do the compilers of *vyākhyās* limit themselves to borrow from the particular *saṃhitā* ascribed to them by the author of

³ Architectural details of the Varadarāja Temple in Kāñcīpuram mentioned therein allow us to date it, contrary to the corpus of JayS, to the fourteenth century. See Rajan (1967, p. 73) and Rastelli (1999, pp. 52–53).

⁴ JaySA 11: *mūlavvyākhyānarūpatvād upajīvyam parasparam //11// tantratrayam idaṃ vidyād ekaśāstram tathā budhaḥ /*

⁵ See Rastelli (1999, pp. 54–55), where the same portions of the JaySA are treated, too. In the context of Indian philosophical terminology, the terms *vyākhyāna*, *vivṛti* consider usually the action of “commenting” by a commentator for the sake of establishing the proper meaning of a text commented upon by him.

the additional chapter of JaySA, nor do the compilers of the rest of the known *saṃhitās* resign from that, which shows the conventionality of the concept presented in JaySA.⁶ The technique of re-using the older texts is not limited to the three so called commentaries, but it is visible throughout almost the whole corpus of Pāñcarātra. One can also observe a change in respect to the subjects treated: in the course of time, there is an internal trend to depict the tradition as fitting the brahmanical environment of South India and, in consequence, to betray much fewer tantric features.

2 *Sātvatasamhitā* versus *Īśvarasamhitā*

Let us turn to the case of certain borrowings between ĪS and SātS. It was already mentioned that as for the latter one, the redaction available to us was most probably composed in Kashmir, in the ninth century AD. In the case of ĪS, there are still controversies regarding the time of its composition. However, all scholars agree that it must have been compiled in the South of India. Both Schrader (1995, p. 16) and Gonda (1977, pp. 54–55) propose to consider it the oldest *saṃhitā* among those of Southern Indian origin, but not earlier than the tenth century. According to Matsubara (1994, pp. 27–31),⁷ the text is much younger and should be dated at the fourteenth century, and its compiler must have been inspired by the older PārS. Nevertheless, as Matsubara continues, there must have been two variants of ĪS, the older and the younger one, out of which the latter one is now available, whereas the former one is known from quotations found in Yāmuna's (tenth century) *Āgamaprāmānya*.

If we compare the colophons of SātS and ĪS, both comprising 25 chapters, it turns out that in accordance with the changes which took place in the course of time, the former one focuses mostly on two subjects: the prominent role of different facets of the worship on *vyūha* and *vibhava* modes of God (2–6, 9–13) and, further, on the issues related to the initiation (*dīkṣā*) (16–23), whereas the latter one presents mostly the prescriptions connected with various aspects of temple practice. Its first section (2–9) regards the daily routine of temple priests, the second (10–15) regards the occasional festivals taking place throughout the year, the third (16–19, 21–22) regards the optional activities such as those performed in the context of the temple, including its building, furnishing, consecration as well as the vows (*vrata*) and initiation (*dīkṣā*). The additional fourth part (23–25) contains in turn the answers to six questions regarding the interests of professional priests (Smith 1975–1980, pp. 66–67).

In accordance with convention, the first chapter of ĪS contains the mythical story of the text's revelation (*śāstrāvatāra*). It is where the link with SātS is established and the

⁶ For example, as for the first case, there are parallel passages between all three “gems” and PārS (Rastelli 2006). As for the second case, there are parallel passages between *Śrīpraśnasaṃhitā* and SātS regardless of the fact that the former one is not believed to be a *vyākhyā* of any older *saṃhitā*, see Padmanabhan (2006).

⁷ The thirteen lines of the text quoted under that title in *Āgamaprāmānya* (to be found in Narasimhachary 1976, p. 163) do not appear in the published version (Matsubara 1994, p. 28).

Chart no. 1. Colophons of SātS and ĪS

SātS	ĪS
1. Questions and answers (<i>praśnaprativacana</i>)	1. The revelation of the text (<i>śāstrāvātāra</i>)
2. [no specific colophon]	2. The rules of internal worship (<i>mānasayāgavidhī</i>)
3. The extraction of the mantra of a [deity] in <i>vyūha</i> [aspect] in <i>śuśrupti</i> [state] (<i>śuśruptivyūhamantrodhāra</i>)	3. The rules of the worship of the deities of the temple (<i>vimānadevatārcanavidhī</i>)
4. [no specific colophon]	4. The rules of [the ceremony] ending with waving lights before an idol (<i>nīrājanāntavidhī</i>)
5. [no specific colophon]	5. The rules of kindling fire and preparing food (<i>bhojyāsanāgnikāryavidhī</i>)
6. The worship of [a deity] of a fourfold nature (<i>caturātmayārādhana</i>)	6. The rules beginning with the distribution to the ancestors and ending with the festival of <i>śayana</i> (<i>pitṛsaṃvibhāgādiśayanotsavāntavidhī</i>)
7. The rules of vows (<i>vratavidhī</i>)	7. The rules of worshipping Lakṣmī and Sudarśana (<i>lakṣmīsudarśanārcanavidhī</i>)
8. The rules of annual vows (<i>saṃvatsaravratavidhī</i>)	8. The rules of worshipping the deities of the retinue starting with Garuḍa (<i>garuḍādīparivārārcanavidhī</i>)
9. The internal worship of <i>vibhava</i> deities (<i>vibhavadevatāntaryāga</i>)	9. The rules starting with the characteristic of the deities of the doors and the accompanying [deities] (<i>dvārāvāraṇadevatālakṣaṇādividhī</i>)
10. The [external] worship of <i>vibhava</i> deities (<i>vibhavadevatārcana</i>)	10. The rules ending with the great festival of raising the flag (<i>mahotsavaadhvajārohaṇāntavidhī</i>)
11. The rules of the offering and a fire pit (<i>yāgakuṇḍavidhī</i>)	11. The rules of the great festival (<i>mahotsavavidhī</i>)
12. The visualization of <i>vibhava</i> deities (<i>vibhavadevatādhyāna</i>)	12. The rules of the festival of half of a lunar month (<i>pakṣotsavavidhī</i>)
13. The visualization of the deities with their weapons starting with ornaments (<i>bhūṣaṇādyastradevatādhyāna</i>)	13. The rules starting with the festival of half of a lunar month (<i>pakṣotsavādividhī</i>)
14. The rules of wearing a <i>pavitra</i> (<i>pavitrāropanavidhī</i>)	14. The rules starting with the <i>pavitra</i> festival (<i>pavitrotsavādividhī</i>)
15. The rules of the [festival] of bathing a <i>pavitra</i> (<i>pavitrāsānavidhī</i>)	15. The rules of the act of causing a bath (<i>snapanavidhī</i>)
16. The procedure [of mastering the mantra for the sake of] pacifying evil (<i>aghāśāntikalpa</i>)	16. The rules starting with the consecration of the temple (<i>prāsādādivipratīṣṭhāvidhī</i>)
17. The procedure of [mastering the mantra of] Narasiṃha in <i>vibhava</i> form (<i>vaibhavīyaṅsiṃhakaḷpa</i>)	17. The characteristic of the idol etc. (<i>pratimādīlakṣaṇa</i>)
18. The rules starting with the preliminary ceremonies of initiation (<i>adhivāsadīkṣāvidhī</i>)	18. The prescription for consecration [of an idol] (<i>pratīṣṭhāvidhāna</i>)
19. The rules of initiation (<i>dīkṣāvidhī</i>)	19. The rules of atonements (<i>prāyaścittavidhī</i>)
20. The rules of consecration [of a person] (<i>abhiṣekavidhī</i>)	20. The greatness of Yādavācala (<i>yādavācalamāhātmya</i>)

SātS	ĪS
21. The rules of the prescriptions [for proper behaviour] (<i>samayavidhi</i>)	21. The rules of initiation (<i>dīkṣāvidhi</i>)
22. The rules of the various signs relevant to the one possessing the authority (<i>adhikārimudrābhedavidhi</i>)	22. The prescriptions about the restrictions [for proper behaviour] (<i>niyamavidhāna</i>)
23. The rules of the preliminary ceremonies of initiation (<i>adhivāsadīkṣāvidhi</i>) [in fact rules on mantras]	23. The rules of the extraction of the mantra (<i>mantroddhāravidhi</i>)
24. The characteristic of an idol, the throne and the temple (<i>pratimāpīṭhaprāsādalakṣaṇa</i>)	24. The characteristic of signs and the mode of visualization of Bhagavān (<i>mudrālakṣaṇabhagavadhyānādīprakāra</i>)
25. The rules of consecration [of an idol] (<i>pratiṣṭhāvidhi</i>)	25. The characteristic of the fire pit and the offering ladle of <i>sruk</i> and <i>sruva</i> types and the prescriptions [regarding] the preparation of butter-offering (<i>kuṇḍasruksruvalakṣaṇahaviḥpākavidhāna</i>)

prominent role of being both the essence (*sāra*) of divine *śāstras* and the explanation of SātS (*sātvatārthaprakāśika*) is highlighted. However, since the compiler of ĪS was influenced by the PārS's story, the way of expressing the relation between both texts is not his genuine idea.⁸ The verses considering the relation with SātS are inspired by the relevant passage of the PārS speaking about the connection of the latter with PauṣS: PārS 1.90–92ab⁹ uses the formulation *arthopapādaka* in this context.

The sage Nārada says (ĪS 1.47–53)¹⁰: “Listen to what I am going to tell. Previously, Bhagavān Hari himself looked at those who desire the benefit for all people for the sake of favouring those who have abandoned the supreme *dharma* and wished to approach a mixed *dharma*, [and] even more (*bhūyas*) those who aspire at his abode [and] those who wish to reach faith and devotion. For the sake of showing favour towards [them] and for the sake of creating the ability for all *varṇas*

⁸ For details regarding the inspiration by PārS visible in the case of revelation stories of both texts see Rastelli (1999, pp. 80–84) and Matsubara (1994, p. 29).

⁹ PārS 1.90–92ab: *pārameśvaraśāstrānām sarveṣām munipuṅgava / sārabhūtam viśeṣeṇa pauṣkarārthopapādakam //90// mūlavedānusāreṇa chandasānuṣṭubhena ca / lakṣagranthena sarvārthakriyājñānopalabdhye //91// sa me 'bravīn mahāśāstram pārameśvarasaṃjñayā / “O great sage! For the sake of teaching me all knowledge which has efficacy to be seized, he [Saṃkarṣaṇa] revealed to me the great śāstra called Pārameśvara, which is the essence of all śāstras [communicated] by Pārameśvara, which explains especially the meaning of Pauṣkara[samhitā], [composed] in accordance with the Root Veda in anuṣṭubh metre comprising one hundred thousands words.”*

¹⁰ ĪS 1.47–53: *śrūyatām abhidhāsyāmi sarvalokahitaiṣiṇaḥ / puraivaṃ bhagavān eva samālocya haris svayam //47// parityajya param dharmam miśradharmam upeyuṣām / bhūyas tatpadākāṅkṣānām śrāddhābhakti upeyuṣām //48// anugrahārtham varṇānām yogyatāpādanāya ca / tathā janānām sarveṣām abhiṣṭaphalasiddhaye //49// mūlavedānusāreṇa chandasānuṣṭubhena ca / sātvataṃ pauṣkaram caiva jayākhyetyevam ādikam //50// divyaṃ sacchāstrajālam tad uktvā saṅkarṣaṇādibhiḥ / pravartayām āsa bhūvi sarvalokahitaiṣibhiḥ //51// evaṃ divyāni śāstrāṇi śāṅḍilyo 'pi mahāmuniḥ / saṅkarṣaṇād bhagavataḥ śrutvā adhyāpayan munin //52// malayācalaniṣṭhāś ca purā rāmasya cājñayā / prathamam sātvataṃ śāstram samyag adhyāpitā mayā //53//*

as well as for the sake of realizing the goals desired by all people, he communicated the net of the divine true *śāstras*, in *anuṣṭubh* metre and in accordance with the Root Veda (*mūlaveda*), starting with *Sātvata-*, *Pauṣkara-* and *Jayākhyā[samhitā]*. Then, he activated Saṃkarṣaṇa and others who desire the benefit for all people, [to teach His words] on earth. In the same way, also the great sage Śāṅḍilya having heard those divine *śāstras* from Bhagavān Saṃkarṣaṇa taught them to [other] sages. [Those who] were staying in the Malaya mountains previously have been taught correctly by me, with the consent of God Rāma, at first the *śāstra* [called] *Sātvata*.” And then (ĪS 1.64–71ab)¹¹: “O divine sages! Therefore, there is no better *śāstra* than the divine *Sātvata*. Those beginning with *Sātvata*, *Pauṣkara* and *Jayākhyā* are divine *śāstras* announced by Hari himself in accordance with the Root Veda for the sake of the benefit. These three *śāstras*, starting with *Sātvata*, are everywhere (*vyāpaka*), o best sages! Likewise, the three mantras starting with the eight-syllabled one (*aṣṭākṣara*),¹² o wise ones! Thus, according to the prescriptions of the three texts (*tantra*), Hari is worshipped in Yādavācala, Śrīraṅga and Hastīśaila respectively. Among these divine *śāstras*, however, *Sātvata* is the greatest among the greatest. The God himself directly announced it and Lord Saṃkarṣaṇa listened to him: How to characterize the greatness of this *Sātvata*, o divine sages! Thus, o the best of twice born! I will tell you about the *tantra* called *Īśvara*, which is the essence of the *śāstras* communicated directly by Īśvara, which explains specifically the meaning of *Sātvata[samhitā]* (*sātvatārthopapādaka*) and has been heard from Saṃkarṣaṇa himself. Listen, o sages, with attention.”

In addition, the mutual connection between ĪS and SātS is similarly expressed in the last chapter of the former, where the text says that it elucidates the meaning of SātS (*sātvatārthaprakāśika*) (ĪS 25.213).¹³

Although one could expect that due to the traditional link between SātS and ĪS, it was the compiler of ĪS who was primarily interested in the content of SātS; according to the information mentioned above (that is the fact that the *śāstrāvātāra* of the ĪS has been influenced by that of the PārS), also the short summary of SātS found in ĪS 21.567cd–577ab appears to be borrowed from PārS 19.529–538. In both

¹¹ ĪS 1.64–71ab: *ato divyāt paratarāṃ nāsti śāstrāṃ munīśvarāḥ / sātvataṃ pauṣkaraṃ caiva jayākhyāṃ ca tathaiva ca //64// evamādīni divyāni śāstrāṇi hariṇā svayam / mūlavedānusāreṇa proktāni hitakāmyayā //65// sātvatādyāṃ trikaṃ caitat vyāpakaṃ munisattamāḥ / yathā cāṣṭākṣarādīnāṃ mantrāṇāṃ tritayāṃ budhāḥ //66// etat tantratrayoktena vidhinā yādavācale / śrīraṅge hastīśaile ca kramāt sampūjyate hariḥ //67// eteṣu divyaśāstreṣu sātvatan tūttamottamam / vaktā sāḥśād īśvaro 'sya śrotā saṃkarṣaṇaḥ prabhuh //68// kiṃ varṇyate 'sya mātmyāṃ sātvatasya munīśvarāḥ / atas sāḥśādīśvaroktaśāstrāṇāṃ divjapuṅgavāḥ //69// sārabhūtaṃ viśeṣeṇa sātvatārthopapādakam / īśvarākhyāṃ idam tantram sāḥśātsaṃkarṣaṇāc chrutam //70// sampravakṣyāmi munayaḥ śṛṇudhvam avadhānataḥ /*

¹² The three mantras are the six-syllabled (*ṣaḍākṣara*), the eight-syllabled (*aṣṭākṣara*) and the twelve-syllabled (*dvādaśākṣara*) ones. Since ĪS teaches the eight-syllabled mantra, it is said to be the first one.

¹³ ĪS 25.213: *sarvottamā samhitā eṣā sātvatārthaprakāśikā / nākhyeyā duṣṭabuddhīnāṃ abhaktānāṃ janārdane //213//* “O Janārdana! This *samhitā*, which is the best one among all and elucidates the meaning of *Sātvata[samhitā]*, should not be told to the bad-minded people who are not devoted to Viṣṇu.”

cases the passage appears in the context of presenting the features of the *mantrasiddhānta* (one of the four doctrines into which the Pāñcarātra is traditionally divided), to which SātS belongs. It includes the outline of several subjects dealt with (in the same order) in SātS, among them the section on different forms of *prādurbhāva* deities; the section on the worship both in the heart-lotus and the lotus-throne, along with the worship of *śaktis* such as Lakṣmī, Puṣṭi etc. as well as the worship of divine attributes such as conch and discus; the section on the initiation of Narasiṃha; the section on three initiations called *vibhava*, *vyūha* and *sūkṣma*; the section on the four ranks of *samayī*, *putraka* and others; the section on consecration; the section on the rules of religious and social behaviour (*samaya*); and the section on the order of the installation of idols, characteristics of *mantras*, *maṇḍalas*, *mudrās*, a fire pit and others. Additionally, the same passage is partly re-used in another chapter of ĪS, i.e. ĪS 20, which praises the greatness of Yādavācala (*yādavācalamāhātmya*), the holy Vaiṣṇava site linked to the tradition of SātS and ĪS. In that case, the verses presenting SātS as belonging to *mantrasiddhānta* are abandoned (ĪS 20.196–207ab). As a result, there might be two streams of borrowings: the re-use of the passage of PārS by the compiler of ĪS 21 (PārS 19.529–538 = ĪS 21.567cd–577ab) and the shortened version of the same passage re-used again within ĪS 20 with the same variants present in ĪS 21 (PārS 19.532cd–537 = ĪS 21.571–575cd = ĪS 20.198cd–203).

Chart no. 2. PārS 19.529–538 = ĪS 21.567cd–577ab

PārS 19	ĪS 21	ĪS 20
mantrasiddhāntasaṃjñāṃ tājājāgradvyūhādīmūrtinā / samutkīrṇaṃ dvitīyasya sātvatasya mahātmanaḥ //529// tena pradyumnasamjñāsya tena turyātmano vibhoḥ / tena vāgīśvarākhyasya tasmād vīdyākhyavīgrahe //530// saṃkrāntaṃ ca tataḥ paścād rudrendrādityendravahniṣu / tathaiva nāradādyeṣu devarṣiṇām gaṇeṣv api //531// saṃkrāntaṃ mantrasiddhāntaṃ bhedabhinnam anekadhā	mantrasiddhāntasaṃjñāṃ tājājāgradvyūhādīmūrtinā //567// samutkīrṇaṃ dvitīyasya sātvatasya mahātmanaḥ / tena pradyumnasamjñāsya tena turyātmano vibhoḥ //568// tena vāgīśvarākhyasya tasmād dvīpākhyavīgrahe / saṃkrāntaṃ ca tataḥ paścād rudrendrādityendravahniṣu // 569// tathaiva nāradādyeṣu devarṣiṇām gaṇeṣv api / saṃkrāntaṃ mantrasiddhāntaṃ bhedabhinnam anekadhā //570//	

PārS 19	ĪS 21	ĪS 20
yatra śāntataraṃ vyūhaṃ śāntoditam anantaram //532// suṣuptisaṃjñāṃ svapnākhyam jāgradvyūhaṃ yathoditam / mūrtyantaraṃ keśavādyam prādurbhāvaṃ tathāntaram // 533// hr̥tpadmapadmapīṭhādu lakṣmīpuṣṭyādisaktibhiḥ / lāñchanaiḥ śaṅkhacakrādyaiḥ garuḍapramukhair api //534// bhūtasiddhādibhiḥ śāstraparyantair yajanaṃ hitam / viśvatrātṛṅsiṃhasya dikṣāpūrvaṃ tathā param //535// vihaga vyūhasūkṣmākhyam adhikāraṃ yathākramam / samayīputrikādīnāṃ caturṇām abhiṣecanam //536// tathaiva <u>samayācāram mūrtinām</u> sthāpanakramam / mantramaṇḍalamudrāṇām kṛṇḍādīnām ca lakṣaṇam //537// karmaṇām evam ādinām vidhānaṃ yatra puṣkalam / mantrasiddhāntasaṃjñāṃ tadbahubhedasamanvitam //538//	yatra śāntataraṃ vyūhaṃ śāntoditam anantaram / suṣuptisaṃjñāṃ svapnākhyam jāgradvyūhaṃ yathoditam //571// mūrtyantaraṃ keśavādyam prādurbhāvaṃ tathāntaram / hr̥tpadmapadmapīṭhādu lakṣmīpuṣṭyādisaktibhiḥ //572// lāñchanaiḥ śaṅkhacakrādyaiḥ garuḍapramukhair api / bhūtasiddhādibhiḥ śāstraparyantair yajanaṃ hitam // 573// viśvatrātṛṅsiṃhasya dikṣāpūrvaṃ tathā param / vibhava vyūhasūkṣmākhyam adhikāraṃ yathākramam //574// samayīputrikādīnāṃ caturṇām abhiṣecanam / tathaiva <u>samayācāram mūrtinām</u> sthāpanakramam //575// mantramaṇḍalamudrāṇām kṛṇḍādīnām ca lakṣaṇam / karmaṇām evam ādinām vidhānaṃ yatra puṣkalam //576// mantrasiddhāntasaṃjñāṃ tadbahubhedasamanvitam /	yatra śāntataraṃ vyūhaṃ śāntoditam anantaram //198// suṣuptisaṃjñāṃ svapnākhyam jāgradvyūhaṃ yathoditam / mūrtyantaraṃ keśavādyam prādurbhāvaṃ tathāntaram // 199// hr̥tpadmapadmapīṭhādu lakṣmīpuṣṭyādisaktibhiḥ / lāñchanaiḥ śaṅkhacakrādyaiḥ garuḍapramukhair api //200// bhūtasiddhādibhiḥ śāstraparyantair yajanaṃ hitam / viśvatrātṛṅsiṃhasya dikṣāpūrvaṃ tathā param //201// vibhavav vyūhasūkṣmākhyam adhikāraṃ yathākramam / samayīputrikādīnāṃ caturṇām abhiṣecanam //202// tathaiva <u>samayācāram mūrtinām</u> sthāpanakramam / mantramaṇḍalamudrāṇām kṛṇḍādīnām ca lakṣaṇam //203//

PārS 19.532cd–537 = ĪS 21.571–576ab = ĪS 20.198cd–203 (modifications highlighted)

3 Borrowings in the Case of Chapters on Initiation (*dīkṣā*)

Despite the conventionality of the idea proposed by the author of JaySA, there are in fact many parallel passages between ĪS and SātS. An interesting example of textual borrowings between them is the case of initiatory chapters. The compiler of ĪS reused the relevant portions of the latter to a great extent, however, as was already mentioned, this happened quite selectively. Whereas he rewrote many substantive passages from the consecutive chapters of SātS, others have been excluded by him. What is more, to provide his own chapters with an expected, logical structure, some new, original portions have been added by him. Therefore, at least in regard to the initiatory prescriptions, the account of ĪS makes the impression of being a kind of an essence (*sāra*) of SātS, though at the same time it reflects the changes which took place within the tradition due to the historical circumstances.

In short, the SātS teaches the system of three initiatory paths. Each one of them is supposed to bear a particular result. In general, the highest *dīkṣā* (*paradīkṣā*) provides liberation (*kaivalya*), the middle one (*vyūhadīkṣā*) provides worldly pleasures (*bhoga*) together with liberation and finally, the lowest among them, namely *vibhavadīkṣā*, provides first and foremost worldly pleasures (*bhoga*) (SātS 19.3–7). The three initiations of SātS differ in the type of initiatory mantra in the

sense that a candidate, depending on his predisposition, might be initiated with the mantra belonging to the *vibhava*, *vyūha* or *para* aspect of Viṣṇu. Nevertheless, there is only one initiatory pattern presented within the text, focusing on the initiation with the usage of *vibhava-mantras*.¹⁴ Therefore, we can presume that the procedures are similar in the case of all three *dīkṣās*. In this connection each of them comprises the hierarchical entitlements of *samayin*, *putraka*, *sādhaka* and *ācārya*. However, before the initiation one should undertake the specific purification, or, if there is a need, cut off his previous religious affiliations by the means of an initiation with the help of the mantra of Narasiṃha. Then, as is explained in SātS 16, in order to check the readiness of the candidate to be initiated, the teacher observes him when he worships the mantra of Narasiṃha. As we could see from chart no 1, seven chapters of SātS deal with various initiatory prescriptions. These are: SātS 16 on the procedure [of mastering the mantra for the sake of] pacifying evil (*aghaśāntikalpa*), SātS 17 on the procedure of [mastering the mantra of] Narasiṃha in the *vibhava* form (*vaibhavīyanarasiṃhakalpa*), SātS 18 on the rules of the preliminary ceremonies of initiation (*adhivāsadīkṣāvidhi*), SātS 19 on the rules of initiation (*dīkṣāvidhi*), SātS 20 on the rules of consecration (*abhiṣekavidhi*), SātS 21 on the rules of the prescriptions of proper religious behaviour (*samayavidhi*), SātS 22 on the rules of various signs relevant to the one possessing the authority (*adhikārimudrābhedavidhi*), and SātS 23 on the rules of the preliminary ceremonies of initiation (*adhivāsadīkṣāvidhi*) (but in fact on different kinds of *mantras* applicable during an initiation).

The *dīkṣā*-related portions of ĪS are, in turn, enclosed within two chapters: the 21st chapter, entitled “The prescriptions about initiation” (*dīkṣāvidhi*), and the 22nd chapter, entitled “The prescriptions about the restrictions [for proper religious behaviour]” (*niyamavidhāna*). The former comprises many parallels with SātS 16 and SātS 18–20: three fourths of SātS 16 and almost the complete SātS 18, 19 and 20. The latter almost entirely (without introductory statements) corresponds to SātS 21. The borrowed passages are taken systematically from the subsequent chapters of SātS (with the exception of SātS 17) and put in the order following the structure of SātS’s exposition. Nevertheless, there is no reference to the source of borrowing. Most often, the re-used portions are joined together by means of short passages authored, possibly, by the compiler of ĪS. As for significant interferences in the structure of transmission of SātS (apart from occasional small modifications of, usually, single words or corruptions) one can enumerate the omission of SātS 17 containing the elaborate description of the procedure of worshipping the mantra of Narasiṃha in his *vibhava* form (*vaibhavīyanarasiṃhakalpa*) and the addition of the *pañcasamskāra* rite.

¹⁴ See SātS 19.169–177, where according to the account of *vibhavādīkṣā* it says that in the case of *vyūhadīkṣā* *bījas* of four *vyūhas* should be applied in each rite, whereas in the case of *brahmadīkṣā* (*paradīkṣā*) it should be the first *mantra* (*ādyaṃmantra*) divided into six parts.

Chart no. 3. Parallel passages between ĪS 21 and SātS 16.18–20

ĪS 21	SātS 16.18–20
21.1–3ab	
21.3cd–28	16.4–29ab (<i>verbatim</i> , with occasional small modifications)
21.29ab	
21.29cd–30ab	18.2 (<i>verbatim</i>)
21.30cd–74	18.4–48ab (<i>verbatim</i> , with occasional small modifications)
21.75	
21.76–91	18.48cd–64ab (<i>verbatim</i> , with occasional small modifications)
21.92ab	
21.92cd–98	18.78–84ab (<i>verbatim</i> , with occasional small modifications)
21.99–105ab	18.86–92 (<i>verbatim</i> , with occasional small modifications)
21.105cd	
21.106–246ab	18.93cd–233 (<i>verbatim</i> , with occasional small modifications)
21.246cd	
21.247–283a	19.3–39a (<i>verbatim</i> , with occasional small modifications)
21.283cd–318 [1. <i>tāpa</i> , 2. <i>ūrdhvapūṇḍra</i>] 21.319–325 [<i>nāma</i>]	19.39cd–46ab (<i>verbatim</i> , with occasional small modifications)
21.326–460ab	19.46cd–180 (<i>verbatim</i> , with occasional small modifications)
21.460cd–464ab	
21.464cd–503ab	20.2–40 (<i>verbatim</i> , with occasional small modifications)
21.503cd–587	

As we can see, the passages taken over from SātS do not cover the whole content of ĪS 21. There are also visible additions reflecting the innovations which took place during the development of the Pāñcarātra tradition. In these terms, the significant portion appears just at the beginning of the instructions regarding the course of the proper initiation (corresponding to SātS 19). It discusses *tāpa* (branding) and

Chart no. 4. Parallel passages between ĪS 22 and SātS 21

ĪS 22	SātS 21
22.1–2	
22.3–22.38a	21.3–38a (<i>verbatim</i> , with occasional small modifications)
22.38b	
22.38cd–62a	21.38cd–62a (<i>verbatim</i> , with occasional small modifications)
22.62b	
22.62cd–67ab	21.62cd–66 (<i>verbatim</i> , with occasional small modifications)
22.67cd	

ūrdhvaṇḍra (painting the mark) rites (ĪS 21.283cd–318), supplemented with the *nāman* (naming) element. The passage regarding the latter one is again rewritten from SātS (ĪS 21.319–325= SātS 19.39cd–46ab) but placed in a new context. Those three rites, after adding two additional ones, i.e. *mantra* (conferring *mantra*) and *yāga* (interpreted usually as offering an idol or teaching), together form an initiatory practice of five sacraments (*pañcasamskāra*). It is not attested in such a form in the oldest *saṃhitās* of Pāñcarātra.¹⁵ The ceremony, optionally called *samāśrayaṇa*, is still performed nowadays in the South of India. As Raman claims,¹⁶ the *pañcasamskāra* rite, or at least some aspects of it, has been a marker of Vaiṣṇava identity in the Tamil country at least since the ninth century AD. With time passing it took over a role of a basic initiatory rite endowing Śrīvaiṣṇavas with the competence to participate in the religious life of the community.

In comparison to SātS, the new element is also the portion at the end of ĪS 21 expressing again the different historical background. It discusses the features of the worship for oneself (*svārtha*) and for others (*parārtha*) (ĪS 21.504–512ab), continues with the greatness of Śāṅḍilya and other sages important for the ĪS tradition (ĪS 21.512cd–558) and ends with the division into four Pāñcarātriya doctrines, so-called *siddhāntas* (ĪS 21.559–587).

4 Why has the *vaibhavīyanarasimhakaḷpa* Section been Omitted?

As we could see in charts no. 2 and no. 3, while preparing his own description of the *dīkṣā* practice, the compiler of ĪS omitted the 17th chapter of SātS. This happened

¹⁵ As Young summarizes, branding (*tāpa*) with a conch and discus was not specific for Pāñcarātra but associated with Vaiṣṇavas in general. The earlier *saṃhitās* neither mention *pañcasamskāra* nor branding, although there is one exception. SātS 22.9 describes a *samayin* as having the body branded with *cakra* (*cakrataptatana*), but as explained by Rastelli, “this could be a later modification of the text” (*aber dies könnte eine spätere Modifikation des Textes sein*, TĀK 3, s.v. *tāpa*). See Young (2006, p. 207).

¹⁶ On different aspects of this ceremony see Raman (2005, 2006).

regardless of the fact that he re-used the other chapters of SātS on different aspects of initiation very extensively.

SātS 17 contains the account of a fully-fledged practice devoted to the mantra of Narasiṃha in his *vaibhava* form (according to colophon: *vaibhavīyanarasimḥa-kalpa*). It might be divided into two broad but closely related sections: the former considers the practice of an *ācārya* preparing to confer the *narasiṃhādīkṣā* (SātS 17.3–148), and the latter considers the practice of an adept already initiated by the means of the mantra of Narasiṃha, including the account of magical powers (*siddhi*) he acquires (SātS 17.148–150cd, 153ab–456).

The contemporary interpreters of the procedure devoted to Narasiṃha as described in SātS (Smith 1975–1980; Gupta 1983; Hikita 1990, 1991, 1993; Hudson 2002, 2006; Carman 2006) follow to some extent the strategy of the compiler of ĪS in the sense of focusing mostly upon the information given in SātS 16 and SātS 18–20 so that the *narasiṃhadīkṣā* seems like a kind of preliminary rite. If we consider its function exclusively from the perspective of SātS 16, Hudson's proposal to interpret *narasiṃhadīkṣā* as a unique converting ceremony/purification seems the most convincing. Based on the Śaiva accounts of converting ceremonies,¹⁷ one can say that in the context of Hindu tantric traditions only after the converting rite comprising purifying ceremonies is accomplished, the proper initiation can be undertaken. Structurally it recalls the schema outlined in SātS 16, where after completing expiations in the form of *prāyaścitta* along with *brahmakūrca*, one is, if there is such a need, supposed to undertake *narasiṃhadīkṣā* to remove previously gathered serious sins or even religious affiliations. Being new-born, the adept is finally allowed to be regularly initiated into the tradition of SātS.¹⁸

However, in contradistinction to the content of SātS 16 as well as prevailing interpretations, the SātS 17 presents *narasiṃhādīkṣā* as entitling the advanced adept to worship the mantra of Narasiṃha for the sake of realization of worldly aims (*bhoga*). In this connection, since the logical discrepancy between the 16th and 17th chapters of SātS is obvious, it makes us consider the content of the previous one as a kind of purposeful manipulation aiming at reformulation of the original meaning of the *kalpa*-type¹⁹ ceremony devoted to Narasiṃha for the sake of establishing the unique cleansing ritual introducing even strangers, like *nāstikas*, into the tradition of Pāñcarātra.

Strikingly, it was the SātS 17 as a coherent, meaningful unit which has been neglected by the redactor of ĪS. That he must have been familiar with its content is suggested by the fact that many verses of SātS 17, most of them verbatim, can be found within the limits of ĪS's corpus. The size of these borrowings, adjusted to different contexts without any reference to the original source, ranges from half a *śloka* to nearly ten. All of them, however, come from the first section of SātS 17 presenting the activities of an *ācārya* preparing to perform *narasiṃhadīkṣā* so that,

¹⁷ There are at least two such examples: one is mentioned in the 27th verse of *cāryapāda* section of *Mrgendrāgama* (eighth century AD) and the other in *Somaśambhupaddhati* dated from the eleventh century AD. For the latter one, called *liṅgoddhāra*, see Gengnagel (2010).

¹⁸ On the structure of converting ceremonies see Gengnagel (2010, p. 294).

¹⁹ In the context of Tantric Śaiva literature, the term *kalpa* refers to a text devoted to the worship of a single deity for the sake of realizing one's objectives by magical means, see Goudriaan (1981, p. 115) and Sanderson (2001, pp. 11–13).

Chart no. 5. Verses from SātS 17 throughout ĪS (modifications highlighted)

17.43cd–44ab dakṣiṇottarahastābhyāṃ hr̥dbījena vicintya ca// sūryasomau tataḥ kuryād dravyadāhasamudbhavau /	3.30cd–31ab dakṣiṇottarahastābhyāṃ hr̥dbījena vicintya ca / sūryasomau tataḥ kuryād dravyadāhasamudbhavau //
17.74–76ab niṣṭaptakanakābhaṃ ca sampūrṇāṅgaṃ mahānutam / ghoraśārdūlavadanam caṇḍamārtāṇḍalocanam// saudāminīcayaprakhyair lomabhiḥ paripūritam / aruṅām bhojapatrābhaṃ vajrādihikakaroruham// calatphaṇīśvarasaṭam candrakotīśatadyutim	20.250cd–252 niṣṭaptakanakābhaṃ ca sampūrṇāṅgaṃ mahātanum // ghoraśārdūlavadanam caṇḍamārtāṇḍalocanam/ saudāminīcayaprakhyair lomabhiḥ paripūritam// aruṅām bhojapatrābhavajrādihikakareruham / calatphaṇīśvarasaṭam candrakotīśatadyutim//
17.77 pralayāmbudanirghoṣam udagirantaṃ svavācakam / yugāntahutabhuḡjvālāmaṇḍalāntarvyavasthitam //	20.253 pralayāmbudhinirghoṣam udgirantaṃ svavācakam/ yugāntahutabhuḡjvālāmaṇḍalāntarvyavasthitam //
17.78cd–79ab divyagandhānūliptāṅgaṃ divyāambaradharam tathā// divyasragveṣṭanopetaṃ divyālaṅkāramaṇḍitam/	4.92 = 20.257 <i>divyagandhānūliptāṅgaṃ divyāambaradharam</i> <i>tathā /</i> divyasragveṣṭanopetaṃ divyālaṅkāramaṇḍitam//
17.80 ratnakāñcanasanmuktāyuktayā vanamālayā/ sabraḥmasūtrayā caiva śobhitaṃ parameśvaram//	4.94 = 20.256 ratnakāñcanasanmuktāyuktayā vanamālayā/ sabraḥmasūtrayā caiva śobhitaṃ parameśvaram//
17.84cd–88ab evam eva hi hr̥nmantraṃ dhyāyet kumudapāṇḍaram // padmarāgācalākāramāraktaṃ ca śīraḥ smaret/ aṅjanāśmapratīkāśaṃ śikhāmantraṃ tathākṛtim// paritaḥ sūryasantaptaṃ yathā kanakaparvatam/ tathā kavacamantraṃ ca dhyānakāle vicintya ca// vṛṭo jvālāsahasrais tu ayaskāntasamadyutiḥ/ sarvāstraśaktisampūrṇaś cāstramantraḥ prakīrtitaḥ// nirdhūmāṅgārasīkharasadr̥śo netramantrarāṭ/	4.103–106 evam eva hi hr̥nmantraṃ dhyāyet kumudapāṇḍaram/ padmarāgācalākāramāraktaṃ ca śīraḥ smaret// aṅjanādr̥ipratīkāśaṃ śikhāmantraṃ tathākṛtim / paritas sūryasantaptaṃ yathā kanakaparvatam// tathā kavacamantraṃ ca dhyānakāle vicintya ca/ vṛṭam jvālāsahasrais tu ayaskāntasamadyuti// sarvāstraśaktisampūrṇam astramantraṃ prakīrtitam/ nirdhūmāṅgārasadr̥śam bhāvayen netramantrarāṭ//

17.98–100ab dhyātvā tretāgnirūpaṃ tu dakṣiṇād aṅgulītrayam/ spaṣṭam ūrdhvaśikhaṃ saiva jyeṣṭhākrāntā kanīyasī // atho 'khilasvarūpaś ca dhvāntātīto 'gnirūpadhrk/ devo guṇatrayāṭītas tathā mārgatrayāṭīgaḥ// dharmaīḥ sthūlatarair mukto yo 'yaṃ vyakto dhiyārcitah/	24.16cd–18 dhyātvā tretāgnirūpaṃ tu dakṣiṇād aṅgulītrayam // spaṣṭam ūrdhvamukhaṃ saiva jyeṣṭhākrāntā kanīyasī / athākhiḷādhvarūpā cāpy adhvātīto 'gnirūpadhrk // devo guṇatrayāṭītas tathā mārgatrayāṭīgaḥ/ dharmaīḥ sthūlatarair mukto yo 'yaṃ vyakto dhiyārcitah//
17.100cd–102 samputaṃ hr̥dayoddeśe baddhvā hastadvayena tu// nirantarābhyāṃ śākhābhyāṃ mudraiṣā hārdikī smṛtā/ aṅguṣṭhādīkanīṣṭhāntaṃ śākhāyugmaṃ pṛthak pṛthak // sāntaraṃ sampudād asmāt kaniṣṭhādaḥ tathā bhavet/ śīrasāśikhātanutrāstranetrāmudrā yathākramam//	24.21–23ab samputaṃ hr̥dayoddeśe baddhvā hastadvayena tu/ nirantarābhyāṃ śākhābhyāṃ mudraiṣā hārdīkīsmṛtā // aṅguṣṭhādīkanīṣṭhāntaṃ śākhāyugmaṃ pṛthak pṛthak / sāntaraṃ sampudād asmāt kaniṣṭhādaḥ tathā bhavet// śīrasāśikhātanutrāstranetrāmudrā yathākramam
17.104 svamantrayuktā cānyeṣāṃ arcitānāṃ yathākramam/ punaḥ punaḥ prayoktavyā hārdeyaṃ śīrasā saha//	24.63 svamantrayuktā cānyeṣāṃ arcitānāṃ yathākramam/ punaḥ punaḥ prayoktavyā hārdīkīśīrasā saha//
17.107 yathāśakti jāpaṃ kuryāc chatam aṣṭādīkaṃ tu vai/ ekaikaṃ hr̥dayādīnāṃ sarveṣāṃ vihitam tv atha//	5.40 yathāśakti jāpaṃ kuryāc chatam aṣṭādīkaṃ tu vā/ ekaikaṃ hr̥dayādīnāṃ sarveṣāṃ vihitam tv atha//
17.110cd kriyāṅgatvān na doṣo 'sti anyathā tajjapaṃ vinā//	5.41ab kriyāṅgatvān na doṣo 'sti anyathā tajjapaṃ vinā /
17.111cd–112 ab vyāsto guṇagaṇaḥ ṣaṣṭhas tejo nāma guṇo hi yaḥ// parasya brahmaṇas so 'yaṃ sāmānyam sarvatejasāṃ/	5.86cd–87ab vyāsto guṇagaṇāt ṣaṣṭhas tejo nāma guṇo hi yaḥ// parasya brahmaṇas so 'yaṃ sāmānyam sarvatejasāṃ /

The text is reproduced from the editions given in References

for example, they do not deal with the procedures of the initiation itself or the issue of acquiring the magical powers (*siddhi*). What is more, they are scattered throughout the whole *ĪS* and re-used, again mostly verbatim, sometimes even twice, in its different chapters discussing various topics. Most of the minor modifications that appear in *ĪS* are not very significant or they are simply corruptions, but in some cases, as for example in the parallel passage of *SātS* 17.27cd (*atha hastadvaye nyased dīptimad dvādaśākṣaram*) and *ĪS* 5.21cd (*hastadvaye 'pi vinyasyed dīptam aṣṭākṣaram param*), the compiler had to adjust the type of *mantra* in use: whereas in

SātS's context it is the twelve-syllabled *mantra* of Narasiṃha, in the context of ĪS it has been changed into the eight-syllabled *mantra* of Bhagavān.

This particular case of re-using the 17th chapter of SātS by the compiler of ĪS shows, on the one hand, to what almost unimaginable extent the notion of intertextuality was common for Pāñcarātrika authors, and, on the other, makes it tempting to consider the omission of SātS 17 as a meaningful section intentional for some reasons.

Are there any reasons for such lack of treatment of the procedure related to the Narasiṃha-*mantra* within ĪS?

In chart no. 3 we could see that in the case of SātS 16 the compiler of the ĪS restricts himself to quoting, word for word, only up to SātS 16.29ab. Significantly, that particular verse recommends conferring three regular initiations called *vibhava*, *vyūha* and *sūkṣma* (SātS 16.29ab: *vibhavyavyūhasūkṣmākhyāṃ dīkṣāṃ kuryād anantaram*; ĪS 21.28cd: *vibhavavyūhasūkṣmākhyāṃ dīkṣāṃ kuryāt tadantaram*) immediately after performing *narasiṃhādīkṣā* which removes past sins (SātS 16.26ab = ĪS 21.25cd: *kalmaṣasya vighātārthaṃ nārasimhīm mahāmate*). Then, the exposition of ĪS smoothly continues with the portion taken from SātS 18 dealing with preliminary ceremonies of regular *dīkṣā*. In such circumstances it seems that the idea of the redactor of ĪS 21 was most likely to present the initiation with the help of Narasiṃha-*mantra* simply in terms of purification to be taken before the proper initiation, quite similarly as it is implied by SātS 16.

Yet, within the passages borrowed from SātS 16 (SātS 16.4–29ab = ĪS 21.3cd–28), a reference is made there to *nāstikas* etc., who by the means of the cleansing power of *narasiṃhādīkṣā* may join the regular initiation of the *vibhava*, *vyūha* or *para* type. Afterwards, there are passages taken over from SātS 18 considering preliminaries to the *dīkṣā* proper (*adhivāsa*) and the beginning of SātS 19 regarding the *dīkṣā* itself but supplemented in its initial part with an account of the *pañcasamṣkāra* rite unknown to SātS (ĪS 21.283cd–325). According to Raman (Raman 2005, pp. 91–114), it was the *pañcasamṣkāra* rite which in certain Śrīvaiṣṇava contexts “enabled a person to cross over from Śaivism to Vaiṣṇavism”. In such circumstances, it might not be coincidental that at the beginning of the description of the regular initiation, borrowed in fact mostly from SātS instead of *narasiṃhādīkṣā*, the compiler of ĪS provided an account of the *pañcasamṣkāra* rite. If we accept the interpretation of Raman, then both *narasiṃhadīkṣā* and *pañcasamṣkāra* rites occur to have the similar function, i.e. the function of introducing strangers into the tradition.

However, it might also have happened that due to the general tendency, the compiler of ĪS being aware of the actual content of SātS 17,²⁰ aimed at invalidating of

²⁰ It seems that at least the compiler of AhS was familiar with the actual function of *narasiṃhakaḷpa*, i.e. the function of providing a *sādhaka* with magical powers arising out of mastering the *mantra* of Narasiṃha. He does not quote from SātS but refers to it. The meaningful passage appears in the context of a teaching regarding magical amulets (*yantra*) meant for kings and the like to secure the kingship. AhS 27.31–33ab: *sātvatādiṣu tanreṣu vihitenaiṣa cādhvanā / sudarśanasya mantrasya nārasimhasya vā mune //27.31// kālpaḥprayuktā vidhayaḥ sarve caitāsyā samnidhau / bhavanti sakalāḥ caitatprabhāveṇa prajoyitāḥ //27.32// tasmād yathoktamārgeṇa pratiṣṭhāpyaitad arcayet /* “O sage! The prescriptions related to the worship (*kalpa*) of the *mantra* of Sudarśana or Narasiṃha [should be performed] with the method [given] in *Sātvata* and other *tantras*. In its [yantra’s?] presence all of them become complete [if] performed with its power. Therefore, he should worship it having placed it according to the aforesaid way”. On the *vaibhaviyanarasimhakaḷpa* in SātS see DeBicka-Borek (2013).

the role of a *sādhaka* described therein. Such purposeful removal of the passages on *sādhaka*'s practice would not be surprising if we take into account, on the one hand, the observations of Brunner regarding the general devaluation of *sādhakas* within Indian society (Brunner 1975), and on the other, the visible incoherence of the function of *vaibhavīyanarasimhakaḷpa* as presented in SātS 16 and SātS 17 respectively, which might have appeared problematic also to the compiler of ĪS when he decided to re-use SātS's passages on initiation. By neglecting the content of SātS 17, which discusses the particular methods of worshipping the *mantra* of Narasiṃha applied by a *sādhaka* striving for particular *siddhis*, the compiler of ĪS 21 aptly omitted the logical ambiguity between the two chapters and therefore emphasized even more clearly the view presented by SātS 16. By doing so, he successfully led to the actual exclusion of the awkward results of *narasiṃhīdikṣā* in the form of creating a *sādhaka* aiming at the realization of *bhoga* with the help of magical powers. Yet, we cannot exclude the possibility that the omission of *vaibhavīyanarasimhakaḷpa* happened simply because such a procedure was well-known and, therefore, presenting it was redundant.

Open Access This article is distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License which permits any use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author(s) and the source are credited.

References

Original Sources

- Āgamaprāmānya* = *Āgamaprāmānya of Yāmunācārya*. Ed. by M. Narasimhacharya, (Gaekwad's Oriental Series, 160), Baroda 1976.
- AhS = *Ahīrbudhnyasaṃhitā. Ahīrbudhnyasaṃhitā of the Pāñcarātrāgama*. Ed. by M.D. Ramanujacharya under the Supervision of F. Otto Schrader. Revised by V. Krishnamacharya, 2 vols., (The Adyar Library Series, 4), Adyar 1986.
- ĪS = *Īśvarasaṃhitā. Īśvarasaṃhitā Anantācāryais saṃśodhitā*, (Śāstramuktāvalī, 45), Kāñcī 1923.
- JayS = *Jayākhyasaṃhitā. Jayākhyasaṃhitā. Crit. Ed. with an Introduction in Sanskrit, Indices, etc.* by Embar Krishnamacharya, (Gaekwad's Oriental Series, 54), Baroda 1934.
- Mṛgendrāgama (Kriyāpāda et Caryāpāda), avec le commentaire de Bhaṭṭa-Nārāyaṇakanṭha*. Ed. by N. R. Bhatt, (Publications de l'Institut Français d'Indologie, 23), Pondicherry 1962.
- PādS = *Pādmasaṃhitā. Padma Samhita*. (Part I). Crit. ed. by Seetha Padmanabhan and R. N. Sampath. (Part II). Crit. Ed. by Seetha Padmanabhan and V. Varadachari, (Pancaratra Parisodhana Parisad Series, 3–4), Madras 1974, 1982.
- SātS = *Sātvasaṃhitā. Sātva-saṃhitā. With Commentary by Alasiṅga Bhaṭṭa*. Ed. by Vrajavallabha Dvivedī, (Library Rare Text Publication Series, 6), Varanasi 2001.
- ŚrīpraśnS = *Śrīpraśnasaṃhitā. Śrīpraśnasaṃhitā*. Ed. by S. Padmanabhan, (Rashtriya Sanskrit Vidyapeetha Series, 12), Tirupati 2006.

Secondary Sources

- Brunner, H. (1975). Le *sādhaka*, personnage oublié du śivaïsme du Sud. *Journal Asiatique*, 263, 411–443.
- Carman, J. B. (2006). Illuminating the relation between Pāñcarātra and the early Śrīvaiṣṇava community. In G. Oberhammer & M. Rastelli (Eds.), *Studies in Hinduism IV. On the mutual influences and relationship of Viśiṣṭādvaita Vedānta and Pāñcarātra* (pp. 55–73). Wien: Verlag der Osterreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.

- Czerniak-Drożdżowicz, M. (2003). *Pāñcarātra scripture in the process of change. A study of Paramasamhitā*. Vienna: The De Nobili Research Library.
- Czerniak-Drożdżowicz, M. (2006–2007). How to structure God's revelation—Some remarks about constructing tantric texts. *Folia Orientalia*, 42/43, 1–12.
- Dębicka-Borek, E. (2013). Ritual Worship of the Narasimhamantra as Depicted in the Sātvatasamhitā. *Cracow Indological Studies*, XV, 167–207.
- Dvivedī 2001 = *Sātvatasamhitā*.
- Gengnagel, J. (2010). Conversion or initiation. On the removal of the sectarian marks (*liṅgoddhāra*) in Śaiva Siddhānta. In A. Zotter & C. Zotter (Eds.), *Hindu and Buddhist initiations in India and Nepal* (pp. 299–318). Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag.
- Gonda, J. (1977). Medieval religious literature in Sanskrit. In *A history of Indian literature* (Vol. 2/1). Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz.
- Goudriaan, T. (1981). Hindu tantric literature in Sanskrit. In T. Goudriaan & S. Gupta (Eds.), *Hindu tantric and Śākta literature* (pp. 1–172). Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz.
- Gupta, S. (1983). The changing pattern of Pāñcarātra initiation. A case study in the reinterpretation of ritual. In R. Kloppenborg (Ed.), *Selected studies on ritual in the Indian religions. Essays to D.J. Hoens* (pp. 69–91). Leiden: Brill.
- Hikita, H. (1990). Sāttvata Samhitā: An annotated translation. Chapter 17 (1). *Soto-shū kenkyū kiyō*, 21, 190–137.
- Hikita, H. (1991). Sāttvata Samhitā: An annotated translation, Chapter 1 and 2. In *Bukkyō bunkagaku ronshū Maeda Egaku hakase shōju kinen* (pp. 578–546). Tokyo.
- Hikita, H. (1993). Sāttvata Samhitā: An annotated translation, Chapter 18. *Bulletin of the Faculty of Letters Aichi Gakuin University*, 22, 1–26.
- Hudson, D. D. (2002). Early evidence of the Pāñcarātra āgama. In K. A. Harper & R. L. Brown (Eds.), *The roots of tantra* (pp. 133–167). Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Hudson, D. D. (2006). The vyūhas in stone. In G. Oberhammer & M. Rastelli (Eds.), *Studies in Hinduism IV. On the mutual influences and relationship of Viśiṣṭādvaita Vedānta and Pāñcarātra* (pp. 125–178). Wien: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- Matsubara, M. (1994). *Pāñcarātra Samhitās & early Vaiṣṇava theology. With a translation and critical notes from chapters on theology in Ahirbudhnya Samhitā*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.
- Narasimhachary 1976 = *Āgamapramānya*.
- Padmanabhan 2006 = ŚrīprśnS.
- Rajan, K. V. S. (1967). Kaustubha Prāsāda—New light on Jayākhyā tantra. *Journal of the Oriental Institute of Baroda*, 17, 71–85.
- Raman, S. (2005). Samāśrayaṇa in Śrīvaiṣṇavism. In J. Gengnagel, U. Hüsken & S. Raman (Eds.), *Words and deeds. Hindu and Buddhists rituals in South Asia*. Ethno-Indology. Heidelberg Studies in South Asian Rituals (Vol. 1, pp. 91–114). Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz.
- Raman, S. (2006). Initiation and conversion in Medieval South India: pañcasamkāra as historical practice in the Śrīvaiṣṇava Post-Rāmānuja hagiographical literature. In G. Oberhammer & M. Rastelli (Eds.), *Studies in Hinduism IV. On the mutual influences and relationship of Viśiṣṭādvaita Vedānta and Pāñcarātra* (pp. 263–286). Wien: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- Rastelli, M. (1999). Zum Verständnis des Pāñcarātra von der Herkunft seiner Samhitās. *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde Südasiens*, 43, 51–93.
- Rastelli, M. (2003). http://ikga.oew.ac.at/Mat/rastelli_ekayanaveda.pdf. Accessed 12 June 2014.
- Rastelli, M. (2006). *Die Tradition des Pāñcarātra im Spiegel der Pārameśvarasamhitā*. Wien: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- Rastelli, M. (2007). The 'Pāñcarātra Passages' in *Agnipurāna* 21–70. In D. Goodall & A. Padoux (Eds.), *Mélanges tantriques à la mémoire d'Hélène Brunner. Tantric studies in memory of Hélène Brunner* (pp. 87–229). Pondicherry: Institut Français de Pondichéry.
- Sanderson, A. (2001). History through textual criticism in the study of Śaivism, the Pāñcarātra and the Buddhist Yoginītantras. In F. Grimal (Ed.), *Les sources et le temps. Sources and time. A colloquium, Pondicherry, 11–13 January 1997*. Pondicherry: École Française d'Extrême-Orient (pp. 1–47).
- Schrader, F. O. (1995). *Introduction to the Pāñcarātra and the Ahirbudhnya Samhitā*. Madras: The Adyar Library and Research Centre.
- Smith, H. D. (1975–1980). *A descriptive bibliography of the printed texts of the Pāñcarātrāgama* (2 vols.). Gaekwad's Oriental Series, 158 and 168. Baroda: Oriental Institute.

- TĀK = Goodall, D. & Rastelli, M. (Eds.) (2013). *Tāntrikābhīdhānakośa, III*. Wien: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- Young, K. K. (2006). Brāhmaṇas, Pāñcarātrins, and the formation of Śrīvaiṣṇavism. In G. Oberhammer & M. Rastelli (Eds.), *Studies in Hinduism IV. On the mutual influences and relationship of Viśiṣṭādvaita Vedānta and Pāñcarātra* (pp. 179–261). Wien: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.