



Universiteit  
Leiden  
The Netherlands

**The Niśvāsamukha, the Introductory book of the Niśvāsatattvasaṃhitā :  
critical edition, with an introduction and annotated translation  
appended by Śivadharmasaṅgraha 5-9**  
Kafle, N.

**Citation**

Kafle, N. (2015, October 15). *The Niśvāsamukha, the Introductory book of the Niśvāsatattvasaṃhitā : critical edition, with an introduction and annotated translation appended by Śivadharmasaṅgraha 5-9*. Retrieved from <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/35808>

Version: Corrected Publisher's Version

License: [Licence agreement concerning inclusion of doctoral thesis in the Institutional Repository of the University of Leiden](#)

Downloaded from: <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/35808>

**Note:** To cite this publication please use the final published version (if applicable).

Cover Page



Universiteit Leiden



The handle <http://hdl.handle.net/1887/35808> holds various files of this Leiden University dissertation

**Author:** Kafle, Nirajan

**Title:** The Nīśvāsamukha, the introductory book of the Nīśvāsatattvasaṃhitā : critical edition, with an introduction and annotated translation appended by Śivadharmasaṅgraha 5–9

**Issue Date:** 2015-10-15

## INTRODUCTION

A sole 9th-century Nepalese palm-leaf manuscript preserved in the National Archives, Kathmandu (NAK) transmits what appears to be the oldest surviving Śaiva tantra, called the *Niśvāsātattvasaṃhitā*. This manuscript consists of five separate books: *Niśvāsamukha*, *Mūlasūtra*, *Uttarasūtra*, *Nayasūtra* and *Guhyasūtra* in the order of appearance within the manuscript.<sup>1</sup> Various scholars have referred to this manuscript in the past, beginning with Śāstrī (1905:lxvii and 137–140), Bagchi (1929:757ff.), Goudriaan and Gupta (1981:33–36), Sanderson (2006:152), Goodall and Isaacson (2007:4) and, most recently, Goodall et al. (2015:108).

The complete work has remained unpublished. I here present for the first time the first critical edition and annotated translation of the *Niśvāsamukha*. I also present an edition of five chapters (chapters five to nine) of the *Śivadharmasaṅgraha* as an appendix. These are closely linked with the *Niśvāsamukha* as we will see below.<sup>2</sup> A critical edition and annotated translation of the three books (*Mūlasūtra*, *Uttarasūtra*, and *Nayasūtra*) of the *Niśvāsātattvasaṃhitā* prepared by Dominic Goodall in collaboration with Alexis Sanderson and Harunaga Isaacson has recently been published (Goodall et al. 2015), with my contribution as well.

The *Niśvāsātattvasaṃhitā* is consistently presented as one of the eighteen Rudratāntras in all lists of the Mantramārgic (Saidhāntika) Śaiva canon,<sup>3</sup> which consists altogether of twenty-eight scriptures, falling into two categories: ten Śivabheda (Śiva-divisions) and eighteen Rudrabheda (Rudra-divisions), along with scriptures that claim to be sub-recensions (*upabheda*) of these.<sup>4</sup> All these scriptures, including sub-recensions, are works of authority for the Śaiva Siddhānta (Sanderson 1988:668). The *Niśvāsātattvasaṃhitā* is an important text for tracing the early history of tantric Śaivism as it may be the oldest surviving text of the Mantramārga (path of mantras), as tantric Śaivism is called in *Niśvāsamukha* 4:132. The tantric tradition, or more specifically, “the scriptural revelations

---

<sup>1</sup>In addition to the five books of the *Niśvāsātattvasaṃhitā*, a text called *Niśvāsakārikā* has been located. This text, as a part of it, comprises the *Dikṣottara*, which is presumably a separate Śaiva work (see Goodall et al. 2015:23–26). The *Niśvāsakārikā* is not contained in the Nepalese manuscript but survives independently in three South Indian transcripts preserved in the French Institute of Pondicherry, for example, under T. 17, T. 127 and T. 150. It is to be noted that *Guhyasūtra* 18:15 refers to a work called *Kārikā*, presumably a reference to the *Niśvāsakārikā*. Besides, there exists a Śaiva *pratiṣṭhā* text— the *Niśvāsakhyamahātāntra*— traced in a Nepalese manuscript (NGMPP reel number A 41/13), which, however, bears no apparent connection to the *Niśvāsa* corpus. As far as we are aware, these are the texts that have survived to date under the title of *Niśvāsa*. From other Śaiva sources we learn that a number of others texts may have existed under this same title (Goodall et al. 2015:23–30). The existence of different works under the same title leads to the assumption that the *Niśvāsa* may have developed in the fashion of the *Kālottara*, undergoing more than one recension. (I owe this idea to Diwakar Acharya; for the various recensions of the *Kālottara*, see Goodall 2007: 125–127.)

<sup>2</sup>For more details, see the section “Borrowings from the *Niśvāsamukha* by the *Śivadharmasaṅgraha*”.

<sup>3</sup>The reader is referred to Goodall (2004:x ff.).

<sup>4</sup>An early list of these scriptures is already attested in the *Uttarasūtra* (1:23ff), the second book of the *Niśvāsātattvasaṃhitā*. For other lists, see the appendix to Goodall 1998.

of the Śaiva mainstream" (Sanderson 1988:660), is believed to have developed in South Asia from about the sixth century of the common era.<sup>5</sup> This religious system presents itself as a superior and more powerful form of religion and promises supernatural powers (*bhukti*) and liberation (*mukti*) to its followers through the power of spells (*vidyā*, *mantra*), which require initiation (Goodall et al. 2015:11).

The *Niśvāsamukha*, in its four chapters, is devoted to presenting the religious context in which the Mantramārga,<sup>6</sup> the highest stream of religion according to the *Niśvāsamukha*, emerged. The Mantramārga is then taught in the other four books of the *Niśvāsatattvasaṃhitā*. The *Niśvāsamukha* presents a five-fold taxonomical framework that encases the complete *Niśvāsatattvasaṃhitā* in a dialogue between Śiva and his consort Devī. This five-fold framework is called "the five streams" (*pañcasrotāḥ*): the Laukika (worldly), Vaidika (vedic), Ādhyātmika (relating to the soul), Ātimārga (transcendent), and Mantramārga. The Mantramārga is taught in the remaining four books of the *Niśvāsatattvasaṃhitā*, whereas the other streams are taught in the *Niśvāsamukha* itself. However, the text of the *Niśvāsamukha* is not evenly divided among the first four streams. The first, Laukika (effectively Śaiva Laukika), stream takes up the largest part of the text. The first three chapters are entirely devoted to this stream. This effectively means that the majority of the text is devoted to lay Śaiva religion. The second, Vaidika, stream gets comparatively good treatment. The Ādhyātmika, the teaching of Sāṅkhya and Yoga, gets comparatively less treatment. Specially the teaching of the Sāṅkhya system is dealt with quite shortly. Again, the Pāśupata section receives comparatively a great deal of treatment. The way of presentation of these streams may well suggest some information about the milieu from which the author of the text came. The author of the text is clearly from a Śaiva background and the aforementioned five streams seem to have represented, for him, the five major operating "Hindu" religious traditions around this time, i. e. the seventh century, when the *Niśvāsamukha* was composed.<sup>7</sup>

The fourth section, on the Ātimārga, is one of the few testimonies for the tradition of the Pāśupatas. This section is historically the most important as it preserves otherwise unknown Pāśupata material.<sup>8</sup>

Concerning the actual content of the *Niśvāsamukha* and other books of the *Niśvāsa*, it is evident that they contain two distinct types of teaching, although they all are transmitted in the same manuscript. Whilst the former focuses on the teachings of non-tantric traditions, the latter is devoted to tantric teachings, which require initiation. In addition, none of the other pre-tenth-century canonic Śaiva scriptures, such as the *Kiraṇa*, the non-eclectic

<sup>5</sup>Goodall and Isaacson (2011:122).

<sup>6</sup>Prof. Sanderson (2006:145) was the first Western scholar to introduce the term to Western readers as referring to tantric Śaivism. For a detailed discussion of tantric Śaivism, see Sanderson 2006:145ff.

<sup>7</sup>For the discussion of the date of the text, the reader is referred to p. 31ff.

<sup>8</sup>The text of part of the last section has already been published and discussed at length by Alexis Sanderson in his article (2006), *The Lākulas: "New Evidence of a System Intermediate between Pāñcārthika Pāśupatism and Āgamic Śaivism"*.

and eclectic versions of the *Kālottara*, and the *Svāyaṃbhuvāsūtrasaṅgraha*, begin their teaching with non-tantric content. Thus, the *Niśvāsamukha* as opening book of the *Niśvāsatattvasaṃhitā* is an unique phenomenon not only in the context of the *Niśvāsa*-corpus, but also within the ladder history of early Mantramārga Śaivism.

The *Niśvāsamukha* was probably composed to introduce Mantramārga in relation to other major “Hindu” traditions, including branches of Śaivism. We suppose that the tradition of Śaiva tantra had already been developed separately even with respect to other Śaiva traditions. Now, for the first time, the author of the *Niśvāsamukha* tries to link tantric Śaivism, perhaps coining the term Mantramārga itself, with other *mārgas* (paths) of main stream “Hindu” traditions. Thus, it may have been composed to bridge the gap between Mantramārga Śaivism and other religious communities. Thus, the *Niśvāsamukha* plays the key role of introducing the Mantramārga Śaivism to the Hindu communities at the early stage of its development.

Now coming back to the *Niśvāsamukha*’s identity inside the *Niśvāsatattvasaṃhitā*, the following passage of the *Guhyasūtra* (1:1–5b) sheds some light on the fact that the *Niśvāsamukha* is an independent text in itself :

upariṣṭāc caturthan tu sūtram ārabhyate punaḥ |  
 tatra sūtratrayaṃ proktaṃ boddhavyam anupūrvaśaḥ | |  
 mūlañ cottarasūtraṃ [((ca nayasūtraṃ tathaiva))] ca |  
 guhyasūtrañ caturthan tu procyamānaṃ nibodha me | |  
 tenaiva saha saṃyuktā saṃhitaikā prapaṭhyate |<sup>9</sup>  
 niśvāseti ca nāmena<sup>10</sup> sampūrṇā tu tato bhavet<sup>11</sup>  
 niśvāsaṃhitā hy eṣā mukhena saha saṃyutā |  
 pañcasrotās tu ye proktā mukhena parikīrtitāḥ | |  
 tena yuktā bhavet puṣṭā sarvasūtreṣu paṭhyate |

Given the cryptic nature of the above passage and the lack of further comparative materials, the translation which I quote here should be seen as tentative:

Now (*punaḥ*) below (*upariṣṭāt*) begins the fourth *sūtra*. Among those [*sūtras*], it should be understood that three have been taught in order: the *Mūla*, the *Uttarasūtra* and the *Nayasūtra*. Hear from me the *Guhyasūtra*, the fourth, being taught. Joined with that [*sūtra*], one *saṃhitā* is promulgated: it then becomes complete, [known] by the name *Niśvāsa*. This, joined with the *Mukha*, is the *Niśvāsaṃhitā*. The five streams that are spoken of are proclaimed by

<sup>9</sup>prapaṭhyate | NK; prapadhyate W

<sup>10</sup>niśvāseti ca nāmena | NW; niśvāseti nāmena K

<sup>11</sup>sampūrṇā tu tato bhavet | NWK<sup>pc</sup>; sampūrṇā ca tato bhavet K<sup>ac</sup>

the *Mukha*. Joined with that, it becomes full: [the full *saṃhitā*] is taught in all [these] *sūtras*. (Goodall et al. 2015:21)

The passage indicates that the *Mūlasūtra*, *Uttarasūtra* and *Nayasūtra* are the first three *sūtras*, and that they already existed by the time the *Guhyasūtra* was composed, as we are told that the fourth *sūtra* is the *Guhyasūtra*. This suggests that the *Guhyasūtra* is chronologically the fourth. The term *anupūrvāśaḥ*, “in due order” may be telling us the relative chronology of the first three *sūtras*. Thus, we assume *tatra sūtratrayaṃ proktaṃ boddhavyaṃ anupūrvāśaḥ* means that one should understand the chronology of these three texts in due order: first the *Mūlasūtra*, second the *Uttarasūtra*, and third the *Nayasūtra*. The fourth *sūtra*, the *Guhyasūtra*, joined with these other three texts comprise a compendium under the name of *Niśvāsa*. The text mentions that the *Niśvāsa* is complete (*saṃpūrṇā*) with these four *sūtras*. It should be noted that we are neither told that *Mukha* (i.e. the *Niśvāsamukha*) is a *sūtra* nor that it is the fifth text of the compendium. It merely mentions that the compendium becomes full (*puṣṭa*) combined with the *Mukha*. Therefore, perhaps, we should understand that the *Mukha* is somehow related to all the *sūtras* while at the same time remaining an independent treatise.

Moreover *Guhyasūtra* 18:15 suggests a separate identity for the *Niśvāsamukha*. It mentions that the *Kārikā* (i.e. the *Niśvāsakārikā*) is the fifth *sūtra*, but does not mention the *Niśvāsamukha* in the same category:

*catvāro kathitā sūtrā samukhādyā varānane* | <sup>12</sup>  
*pañcamam tu param sūtram kārikā nāma nāmataḥ* | <sup>13</sup>  
*sūcitā sūtramātreṇa kārikāḥ kimu prcchatha* | | 18:15 | | <sup>14</sup>

“Four *sūtras*, beginning with the *Mukha*, are taught, O lovely-faced lady. But, the next, fifth *sūtra*, is called *Kārikā* [i.e. *Niśvāsakārikā*] by name, which is only indicated in the *sūtra*; ask [me next] what you [may like].”

In addition, the post-colophon statement of the *Niśvāsatattvasaṃhitā* supports our assumption of a separate identity of the *Niśvāsamukha*. The post-colophon counts only the number of verses of the four *sūtras* and explicitly refers to the collection as a group of four. It thereby excludes the *Niśvāsamukha*: *asmin sūtracatuṣṭaye sahasracatuṣṭayaṃ ślokaṃ śatāni pañca ca iti*, “In this fourfold collection of aphorisms (*sūtra*) there are four thousand and five hundred verses.” This roughly matches the total number of verses of these four *sūtras*.

## Distinctive Colophons

There is a substantive difference between the colophons of the *Niśvāsamukha* and the other books of the *Niśvāsa* corpus. The chapter colophons of the *Niśvāsamukha* run as follows:

<sup>12</sup>catvāro | NW; catvāro(h) K

<sup>13</sup>pañcamam tu param | K; pañcamam tu para NW

<sup>14</sup>kārikāḥ kimu prcchatha | K; kārikā --- cchatha N; kārikā punaḥ prcchatha W

- *iti niśvāsamukhatattvasaṃhitāyāṃ laukike dharmme prathamah paṭalah.*
- *iti niśvāsamukhatattvasaṃhitāyāṃ laukike dvitīyah paṭalah.*
- *iti niśvāsamukhatattvasaṃhitāyāṃ laukike tṛtīyah paṭalah.*
- *iti niśvāsamukhatattvasaṃhitāyāṃ caturthah paṭalah.*

These colophons are formulated in three ways: the first chapter's colophon contains the phrase *laukike dharme* "worldly religion," the second and third reduce this to *laukike* "worldly," and the fourth chapter colophon has neither of the two, since it does not topicalise worldly religion. They all, however, unanimously begin with *iti niśvāsamukhatattvasaṃhitāyāṃ*, indicating that all four chapters belong to a work titled the *Niśvāsamukhatattvasaṃhitā*.

The colophons of the other four books of the *Niśvāsa*, however, are a little different. Particularly telling are the colophons of the first chapters of the *Mūlasūtra*, *Uttarasūtra*, *Nayasūtra* and *Guhyasūtra*:

- *iti niśvāsatattvasaṃhitāyāṃ mūlasūtre prathamah paṭalah.*
- *iti niśvāsatattvasaṃhitāyāṃ uttarasūtre prathamah paṭalah.*
- *iti niśvāsatattvasaṃhitāyāṃ nayasūtre pāśaprakaraṇaṃ prathamah paṭalah.*
- *iti niśvāsatattvasaṃhitāyāṃ<sup>15</sup> guhyasūtre prathamah paṭalah.*

These colophons,<sup>16</sup> as they are formulated, imply that these works are separate *sūtras*, yet belong to the *Niśvāsatattvasaṃhitā*.

The first apparent difference in the colophons of the *Niśvāsamukha* and the other books of the *Niśvāsa* is that the *Niśvāsamukha* is not associated with the *Niśvāsatattvasaṃhitā* in the same way as the other books. Secondly, the colophons of the *Niśvāsamukha* do not contain the term *sūtra* as the colophons of the other four books do. Since the teaching of these books is that of the Mantramārga, the term *sūtra* may be taken to refer to the teaching of the Mantramārga. This term *sūtra* is also used in the titles of some other texts of the Mantramārga, such as the *Rauravasūtrasaṅgraha* and the *Svāyaṃbhuvasūtrasaṅgraha*. This suggests that the terminology, *sūtra*, used in the colophons of the four books of the *Niśvāsa*

<sup>15</sup> *iti niśvāsatattvasaṃhitāyāṃ* | NW; *iti śrīniśvāsatattvasaṃhitāyāṃ* K

<sup>16</sup> The complete colophon at the end of the first chapter of the *Mūlasūtra* in fact reads: *iti niśvāsatattvasaṃhitāyāṃ mūlasūtre prathamah paṭalah ślo 23*. "Thus is the first chapter of the *Mūlasūtra* in the *Niśvāsatattvasaṃhitā*", followed by the number of verses. The second chapter colophon of the *Mūlasūtra*, however, runs: *iti mūlasūtre dvitīyah paṭalah* "Thus is the second chapter of the *Mūlasūtra*." This is also the way the colophons of the *Uttarasūtra*, *Nayasūtra*, and *Guhyasūtra* appear in our manuscript. In other words, the first colophon of each of these books appears in its complete form, including the name of the compendium, the *Niśvāsatattvasaṃhitā*, while in the succeeding colophons this name is not mentioned, the chapter names appearing directly in the locative: *-sūtre ... paṭalah*.

serves to identify it as a tantric text, as demanded by the context. The chapter colophons of the *Niśvāsamukha*, by contrast, call this work the *Niśvāsamukhatattvasaṃhitā*, thus introducing a separate identity for the non-tantric material, and establishing it as separate from the other books of the *Niśvāsa*. The *Niśvāsamukha*'s position in the Mantramārga will be discussed in the following pages.

## The Title of the Work

The colophon refers to the book as *Niśvāsamukhatattvasaṃhitā*. This presents us with a few problems with regard to its title. Let us begin by trying to understand the meaning of the name *Niśvāsatattvasaṃhitā*, which is given as the title in the other books of the *Niśvāsa*, which seems to be less problematic in terms of the meaning concerned.

The *Uttarasūtra* (5:50–51) provides us with the etymology (*nirvācana*) of the *Niśvāsa* as follows:

*anadhītyatha niśvāsaṃ niśvasanti punaḥ punaḥ |*  
*adhītvā caiva niśvāsan na punar nniśvasanti te | |*  
*niśvāsa eva vikhyātas sarvatantrasamuccayaḥ |*  
*yaṃ jñātvā mucyate jantuh saṃsārabhavabandhanāt | |*

“Now (*tha*) those who do not study the *Niśvāsa* will go on sighing and sighing. And those who do study the *Niśvāsa*, they will not sigh again. [For this reason] it is known as the *Niśvāsa*, the compendium of all Tantras, on knowing which a creature will be released from the bondage of being in *saṃsāra*.” Goodall et al. (2015:398)

On the basis of this passage we may render the title of the work as “compendium (*saṃhitā*) of the essence (*tattva*) of sighing (*niśvāsa*).” The same work (5:53), while referring to the twenty-eight scriptures of the canonic Śaiva scriptures, seems to employ the term *saṃhitā* to mean a tantric work:<sup>17</sup>

*aṣṭāviṃśati yā proktā saṃhitāḥ parameṣṭhinā |*  
*teṣāṃ vyākhyā tu kartavyā upariṣṭāt samantataḥ |*

Of the twenty-eight scriptures taught by the Supreme One commentary will have to be offered (*kartavyā*) later (*upariṣṭāt*) in full (*samantataḥ*). Goodall et al. (2015:398)

In the *Mūlasūtra* (8:10), we come across the term *tattvasaṃhitā*, where it refers to this particular work:

<sup>17</sup>In the consecutive verse (5:54) this single book is identified as the *Niśvāsottarasamhitā*. It is likely that the term here as well is used to refer to a tantric text rather than a compendium, since it is referring to a single work: *śate dve daśa ślokanāṃ niśvāsottarasamhitā | ekaviṃśatkulān devī adhitya hy uddhariṣyati |*.



*adhyāpayitvā etaṃ tu tattvasaṃhitā uttamam |  
buddhvā bhaktimayaṃ śiṣyaṃ ācāryatve niyojayet |*

“Having taught him this supreme *tattvasaṃhitā*, if he realises that his disciple is full of devotion, he may appoint him as an *ācārya*.” Goodall et al. (2015:328)

The same *sūtra* once again uses the same term in the same meaning in 8:20:

*samyag eṣa samākhyāto tattvasaṃhitā-m-uttamaḥ |  
sagotrā eva mucyante yasya lekhye ‘pi tiṣṭhati | |*

“This supreme *tattvasaṃhitā* has been fully taught. All the members of one’s *gotra* are liberated if one has it even [only] in [the form of] a manuscript.” Goodall et al. (2015:333)

The *Guhyasūtra* (1:1–3) ostensibly uses the same sense.<sup>18</sup> The use of the term *tattvasaṃhitā* to refer to Śaiva tantra is also attested by Hṛdayaśiva in a passage copied from the *Mṛgendratāntra*, where he refers the text as the *Mṛgendratattvasaṃhitā*.<sup>19</sup>

This evidence indicates that in a Śaivite context, both words, viz. *tattvasaṃhitā* and *saṃhitā*, may refer to a tantric work. The term *niśvāsa* means sighing. Thus, an alternative meaning of the *Niśvāsatattvasaṃhitā* could also be a “sighing tantra.” To be more precise, a tantra that originated from the sighing of Śiva. This is to say, the speech of Śiva.

Despite apparent similarities in titulation, it is difficult to define the precise meaning of the work under consideration here *Niśvāsamukhatattvasaṃhitā*. In particular the term (*mukha*) being in the middle of a compound presents difficulties. If we were to render the title as it is, it would either mean “compendium (*saṃhitā*) of the essence (*tattva*) of the sighing (*niśvāsa*) face (*mukha*)” or “the sighing face tantra.” But, we think that we are on safer ground to call it *Niśvāsamukha*, following Sanderson 2006, as it is the face/front book the *Niśvāsatattvasaṃhitā*. For this meaning we might, however, expect the title to be *Niśvāsatattvasaṃhitāmukha*.

## The *Niśvāsamukha*: A Mirror to Early Śaivism and Hinduism

The *Niśvāsamukha* relies upon a five-fold taxonomical framework that encompasses the disciplines of Laukika, Vedic, Ādhyātmika, Atimārga and Mantramārga, which has become influential for the framing of subsequent early Śaiva works.<sup>20</sup> These five disciplines refer to the already long-practised lay religion; the brahmanical culture reflected in the

<sup>18</sup>For the full quotation and translation, the reader is referred to p. 8.

<sup>19</sup>Cambridge University Library, Add. 2833, folio. 65<sup>v</sup>3–4: *mṛgendratat[t]vasaṃhitāyāṃ prāyaścittam likhyate; fol. 67<sup>v</sup>4–5: iti mṛgendratat[t]vasaṃhitāyāṃ prāyaścittapaṭalam iti.*

<sup>20</sup>The framework of the *Niśvāsamukha* has been adopted in other Śaiva works, such as the *Śivadharmasaṅgraha* (see the separate section below), the *Pauṣkarapārameśvara*, the *Svacchanda*, the *Mṛgendra*, the *Jayadrathayāmala*, the *Pūrvakāmika*, and the *Śataratnasaṅgraha* (see below).

*Dharmaśāstra*-literature; the teaching of Sākhya and Yoga; the teaching of the Pāśupata systems; and the teaching of the Mantramārga.

A small part of the Laukika section, which basically covers the first three chapters of the text, comes from the *Manusmṛti*. There are some passages for which we find parallels in early Purāṇas, such as the *Skandapurāṇa*. Although other passages of the Laukika section look like borrowed material, we are not able to show where these passages come from. The section of the Vaidika teachings (4:1–41) is based partly on the *Manusmṛti*. The exposition of Ādhyātmika religion is based on the teachings of Sāṅkhya and Yoga. Verses 4:42–48a paraphrase the Sāṅkhya system and verses 4:48b–69, although we cannot trace their actual source, describe a form of Śaiva Yoga. Similarly, the account of teaching of the *Lokātita* (4:88d–131d), the second division of the Atimārga teaching, follows the cosmology of the Pāśupatas, particularly that of the Kāpālikas. For the teaching of the Atyāśramins, of the *Niśvāsamukha*, the situation is different: it is a paraphrased version of the *Pāśupatasūtra*. Hence it does not seem far-fetched to assume that, likewise, passages were borrowed from other sources when describing the features of the Kāpālikas. The *Niśvāsamukha* deals with the above mentioned disciplines and brings them together in relation to Mantramārgic Śaiva religion. In this section we will show how the *Niśvāsamukha* integrates earlier existing systems of thought into an overarching Śaiva religion, and how this integration to some extent matches the notion that the umbrella term “Hinduism” now covers.

Besides a long passage on the procedures of *liṅga*-worship and other Śaiva teachings, there are a host of standard practices readily traceable to established Hindu traditions: pilgrimage (3:1ff.); offering water and sesame seeds to ancestors (2:39); offering a two-faced cow (2:49); offering land (2:56); making gardens (1:61); planting trees (2:25); making food offerings (2:37) etcetera, which are the practices long-exercised by the brahmanical tradition. The fact that the *Niśvāsamukha* is directly borrowing from the *Manusmṛti*, without any change in content, also indicates close relation to the brahmanical tradition. For instance, *Niśvāsamukha* 3:155 gives a list of the ancestors of the four castes (*varṇa*) as follows:

*pitaras somapā vipre kṣatriye tu havirbhujāḥ |*  
*ājyapā vaiśyayonau tu śūdrāṇān tu sukālinaḥ | |*

We know that the source of the *Niśvāsamukha* for this is *Manusmṛti* 3:197:

*somapā nāma viprāṇāṃ kṣatriyāṇāṃ havirbhujāḥ |*  
*vaiśyāṇāṃ ājyapā nāma śūdrāṇāṃ tu sukālinaḥ | |*

“The ancestors of Brahmins are called Somapas; of Kṣatriyas, Havirbhujas; of Vaiśyas, Ājyapas; and of Śūdras, Sukālins.” (Olivelle 2005:118)<sup>21</sup>

<sup>21</sup>Moreover, for instance, *Manusmṛti* 11:214 defines the *atikṛcchra* observance as *ekaikaṃ grāsam aśnīyāt tryahāṇi trīṇi pūrvavat | tryahāṇi copavased antyaṃ atikṛcchraṃ caran dvijaḥ*, and *Niśvāsamukha* 3:40 as follows: *ekaikaṃ bhakṣayed grāsam trīṇy ahāni jitendriyaḥ | trirātropavasec caiva atikṛcchraṃ viśodhane |*.

By borrowing texts<sup>22</sup> the *Niśvāsamukha* is not just reproducing the textual archetype found in the *Manusmṛti*, but thereby implicitly accepts the whole social system that was conceived by the brahmanical tradition. In other words, the *Niśvāsamukha*, being a Śaiva manual, accepts well-established brahmanical ideas and incorporates them in its own corpus. Thereby, it creates a basis for a new religious context, as the *Niśvāsamukha* is presenting the foundational tenets of tantric Śaivism. These are then more thoroughly extrapolated in the subsequent affiliated volumes of the *Niśvāsatattvasaṃhitā*.

We find many passages in the *Niśvāsamukha* that topicalise donative practices. In all instances the recipient is either a Brahmin or Śiva (for example 2:54 and 2:98) in his divine or symbolic aspect of *liṅga*. In order to trace the connections between Brahmanism and Śaivism more precisely, we can draw attention to a passage of the *Niśvāsamukha* (2:115–121) which deals with the hierarchy of recipients from the Śaiva perspective: Devī wants to know the most worthy recipient and puts forward this question to Śiva (2:115). Śiva, first, makes a general statement about the act of donation whose merit endures for eternity (2:116). The passage then hierarchically lists the degree of worthiness of the respective recipients (2:117–121), foolish Brahmins are mentioned to be the lowest recipients; those learned in the Vedas are above them; then above them those who have installed the Vedic fires (*āhitāgni*); still higher are those who maintain the sacrificial fire (*agnihotrī*); the penultimate one is one who knows *brahman* (*brahmavettā*); the highest is the knower of Śiva.

The passage, as expected, tells us that the most worthy recipient is the knower of Śiva (*śivajñānī*). The remaining recipients, from the lowest one to the penultimate, are persons of high social standing in the brahmanical tradition. This is an indicator that Śaivism builds its theoretical framework on the legacy of its brahminical predecessors. In his influential article “The Śaiva Age” Sanderson has developed the theory that Śaivism took over major aspects of brahmanical culture. He convincingly argues (2009:302) that the model of Śaivism is a combination of Śaivism and Brahmanism:

The religion of the Śaivas, then, was not Śaivism alone but rather Śaivism and Brahmanism, a fact born out not only by their literature but also by biographical data and the epigraphic record of the activities of Śaiva kings.

For a detailed account, see Sanderson 2009:201ff., where he puts forward the model of a Śaiva-Brahmanical order. The *Niśvāsamukha* entirely fits in this model.

The most innovative feature of the *Niśvāsamukha* is that all these teachings are associated with Śiva, as they come out of his five faces. This means that the *Niśvāsamukha* gives scriptural and traditional authority to all the other four systems. The text at the same time accepts the Mantramārga as the highest authority. We are told by Nandikeśvara that the Mantramārga is issued from the fifth, uppermost face, (Īśāna) as the “highest stream”:

*adhunā tad ato viprās saṃvādam umayā saha |*  
*īśvarasya tu devasya mantramārgaṃ vyavasthitam | | 4:134 | |*

<sup>22</sup>For a detailed list of borrowing see below p.49 ff.

*pañcamenaiva vaktreṇa īśānena dvijottamāḥ |*  
*mantrākhyam kathayiṣyāmi devyāyā gaditam purā | | 4:135 | |*  
*catuḥsrotā mayā pūrvam śrutā devyāḥ prasadataḥ |*  
*te sarve kathitās tubhyaṁ nissandigdha dvijottamāḥ | | 4:136 | |*  
*pañcaman tu param srotam śi --- |*

“Now, then (*tad ato*), O Brahmins, the discourse of the god Śiva (*īśvarasya*) with Umā [is as follows]; the *mantramārga* is settled with the fifth face, [that is to say] the *Īśāna* [face], O Brahmins! I shall tell [you of] the [path] of *mantra* which was formerly related to Devi. I heard [about] the four streams before by the grace of Devi: all those I have told you [of], O undoubtedly best of Brahmins. The fifth is the highest stream [...].”

The *Niśvāsamukha* is a typical example of eclectic inclusivism, as the following passage, for example, shows:

*prāsādam kārayitvā tu viṣṇuṁ ye sthāpayanti hi | | 2:27 | |*  
*viṣṇulokaṁ vrajanty ete modante viṣṇunā saha |*  
*brahmāṇaṁ skandaṁ rudrāṇīṁ gaṇeśaṁ mātaraṁ ravim | | 2:28 | |*  
*vahniṁ śatakratuṁ yakṣaṁ vāyuṁ dharmmañ jaleśvaram |*  
*yo yasya sthāpanaṁ kuryāt prāsāde tu suśobhane | | 2:29 | |*  
*pūjaye parayā bhaktyā so 'mrto hy asya lokatām | 2:30ab |*

Those who install Viṣṇu, having had a temple constructed [for him], will go to the world of Viṣṇu and rejoice with Him. If someone worships [whomsoever among] Brahmā, Skanda, Rudrāṇī, Gaṇeśa, the mothers (*mātaram*), sun, fire, Indra (*śatakratum*), Kubera (*yakṣam*), Vāyu, Dharma or Varuṇa (*jaleśvaram*) with highest devotion, having installed them in a beautiful temple, he becomes immortal and [achieves] the world of that [particular deity].

The term “inclusivism” has been coined by the German scholar Paul Hacker. In his recent study, *Unifying Hinduism*, Nicholson has taken up the term ‘inclusivism’ and its relevance to describing certain features of “Hinduism”. Instead of defining it as a religion characterised by tolerance he prefers, with Hacker, the term *inclusivism*.<sup>23</sup>

The word “inclusivism,” popularised in Hindu studies by Paul Hacker, is a better approximate of the process in India by which a multitude of various sects, philosophies, gods, and modes of worship are united under a single overarching concept, whether the late medieval idea of six *āstika darśanas* [orthodox philosophies] or the modern term Hinduism.

That term has also been used by Sanderson (2009:301) in reference to the attitude of Śaivism:

<sup>23</sup>Nicholson 2010:185.

It elaborated an inclusivist model of revelation that ranked other religious systems as stages of an ascent to liberation in Śaivism.

We should, however, note that inclusivism almost always entails some form of exclusivism, as the following teaching of the *Niśvāsamukha* reveals:

*laukikaṃ kathitaṃ hy etad vaidikaṃ cāturāśramam | | 1:55 | |*

--- |

--- *proktā lokātītā mahāvratāḥ |*

*mantrākhyāś ca tathā śaivā ato 'nye kupathe sthitāḥ | | 1:56 |*

“This is what I have taught as Laukika. The four-*āśrama* system is called Vaidika, [...]”<sup>24</sup> [...]”<sup>25</sup> The world-transcenders are the Mahāvratas and those who are called *mantra*[-path-follower]s are Śaivas. [Any] others than these are situated on a wrong path.’

Without mentioning them explicitly, the inclusivistic teaching of the *Niśvāsamukha* excludes two well-known religions of India: Buddhism and Jainism. These two distinguished religions are not mentioned in the “revelation of the five streams”. Thus, we understand that “a wrong path” (*kupathe*) in the verse may refer to Buddhism and Jainism as well as to the other so-called “heterodox” (*nāstika*) religions. This exclusion on the one hand shows that early Śaivism as presented in the *Niśvāsamukha* is developed around the teaching of brahmanical principles, and on the other hand provides a place for the *Niśvāsamukha* to present a model that remains characteristic to “Hinduism” through its history.<sup>26</sup>

In this way, the *Niśvāsamukha* is also a text pivotal to understanding the formation of Hinduism, as it serves as an early testimony to its development.

As the reader will be quite aware, many studies have been published in recent years which trace the origins of the umbrella-term of “Hinduism”.<sup>27</sup> These studies have ignited a heated debate about the scope and context of the concept of “Hinduism”. Studying the *Niśvāsamukha* may advance our knowledge and clarify important points of contention in this matter. Hinduism refers to a group of various religious identities, their beliefs, corresponding godheads, philosophies, rituals, modes of worship and other practices.<sup>28</sup>

<sup>24</sup>The lost part of the text must have listed the Sāṅkhya and Yoga which constitute the Ādhyātmikas in this corpus.

<sup>25</sup>We expect the term *atimārga* to occur here in 56a.

<sup>26</sup>It is to be noted that Stietencron (1995) puts forward a different view. He shows that Somaśambhu, the author of the 11th-century Śaiva ritual text called *Somaśambhupaddhati*, lists thirty-six Śaiva *tattvas* and puts them in a hierarchy with Śaiva ones near the top. In this list, those of Buddhists and Jains come before those of Śāktas, Smārtas and Naiyāyikas. For von Stietencron this list neither represents Hinduism nor it is inclusive in nature.

<sup>27</sup>See Lorenzen 1999 and Nicholson 2010.

<sup>28</sup>See Nicholson 2010:185ff. for more details.

Some scholars, point to the fact that significant streams within the tradition understand themselves as based in eternity, and being eternal religions (*sanātana dharma*), they are understood as beyond historical currents. The term “Hinduism” would simply be a modern term for this religion. Others, on the other hand, argue that colonial British scholars invented this term in the nineteenth century to refer to an Indian religious system which did not exist before.<sup>29</sup> I agree with the conclusion of Nicholson who says (2010:2):

The idea of Hindu unity is neither a timeless truth nor a fiction wholly invented by the British to regulate and control their colonial subjects.

The testimony of the *Niśvāsamukha* demonstrates that a notion similar to Hinduism was already developed by the time of the composition of the *Niśvāsamukha*. The answer of Śiva (3:61ff.) to the question put to him by Devī (3:60) reveals the idea of something like Hinduism taught in the *Niśvāsamukha*. Devī asks Śiva:

By resorting to which god will fasting bear great fruit? And how should [the god] be worshipped? Tell [me this] by your grace. (3:60)

Śiva could have answered Devī that it is Śiva whom you should worship, and this alone would bring rewards. He could also have said that one would go to hell for worshipping any other godhead. The answer of Śiva is unique, which catches our attention. Besides Śiva-worship, he recommends the worship of different godheads, however, and thus, accepts their authority, too. For example, he teaches an elaborate system of worshipping the following deities: Brahmā (3:61ff., 158ff.), Agni (3:67ff., 160ff.), Yakṣa (3:70ff., 164ff.), Gaṇeśa (3:75ff., 165ff.), the Serpents (3:80ff., 167ff.), Skanda (3:82ff., 167ff.), the Sun (3:87ff., 173ff.), Śiva (3:92ff., 175ff.), the Goddess (3:106ff., 177ff.), Yama (3:117ff., 178ff.), Dharma (3:121ff., 181ff.), Viṣṇu (3:127ff., 183ff.), Kāma (3:141ff., 186ff.), again Śiva (3:146ff., 188ff.) and the ancestors (3:151ff., 199ff.). The tradition of worshipping different godheads, that is to say, the culture of accepting polemical beliefs and traditions is thus already present in the *Niśvāsamukha*. The *Niśvāsamukha* accentuates the worship of Śiva and Viṣṇu, which has been common practice in modern Hindu society. As the *Niśvāsamukha* integrates polemical beliefs and traditions of Indian culture and puts a Śaiva stamp on them, excluding the other systems, except the five ones mentioned, it is a testimony to the history of the emerging of early identities of Śaivism and Hinduism. Furthermore, the evident effort of the *Niśvāsamukha* is to give a Śaiva flavour to the teachings of brahmanical heritage and to prepare the ground for the Mantramārga.

## The *Niśvāsamukha*'s Contribution to the Mantramārga

In order to assess the contribution of the *Niśvāsamukha* to the Mantramārga, we will more closely investigate the narrative framework of the text. Unfortunately, we are not able to

<sup>29</sup>See Lorenzen 1999 and Nicholson 2010:1.

represent the narrative framework in every aspect, since the text has been damaged and there is an acute lack of parallels for the narrative frame in the *Śivadharmasaṅgraha*. The narrative leads us to a new religion of Śiva passing through the religion that was propagated by the Vedas and pro-Vedic systems: Ricika is astonished— if we are right in our interpretation— upon seeing eighty-eight thousand sages of the Naimiṣāraṇya (Naimiṣa forest) moving to the Devadāruvana (the pine forest). He asks Mataṅga: Why were they moving to the Devadāruvana? Mataṅga replies to Ricika: they did so as they were astonished upon hearing that Brahmā and Viṣṇu were initiated at that spot (1:16–18). If we are right in our interpretation, then the very beginning of the narrative of the *Niśvāsamukha* is already quite significant with regard to the construction of the religious framework that the text adopts. Instead of taking us directly to mount Kailāsa, it leads us to the Naimiṣa forest, and then to the Devadāruvana. These places are symbolically significant, since they are remembered for the traditions that originated there.

The Naimiṣa forest is an important place from the time of the *Mahābhārata*. The story of the *Mahābhārata* begins “with the arrival of the *sūta* in the Naimiṣa forest” (Rocher 1986:81).<sup>30</sup> Perhaps on the example of the *Mahābhārata*, many Purāṇas chose the Naimiṣa forest for their stories to be recited among the sages.<sup>31</sup> In some contexts of the *Mahābhārata*<sup>32</sup> as well as in some Purāṇas the sages of the Naimiṣa forest are also engaged in performing long sacrifices,<sup>33</sup> providing us with a Vedic atmosphere. As the *Mahābhārata* and many Purāṇas are supposed to have been recited here for the first time, and since the sages of the Naimiṣa forest are often depicted as the performers of long sacrificial sessions, this place is imbued with special significance in brahmanical traditions.

The Devadāruvana, by contrast, has links with the Śaiva traditions. It is the place at which *liṅga*-worship originated according to Śaiva mythology. We encounter the myth of the Devadāruvana for the first time in the *Skandapurāṇa*. Bisschop (2006:80) summarises the myth as follows:

...as they [sages] were practising *tapas* in Devadāruvana, some person appeared, engulfed in *tejas*, in the form of a twice-born, a naked man, with a skull in his hand, his body covered with ashes and with an erect penis. At this sight they got angry and went after him, impelled by jealousy. The man, frightened and beaten by them, did not really get angry, but the blows and sticks that they raised were repelled and fell on their sons, wives and themselves in particular. The *liṅga* of that Lokapa fell down, after which he disappeared. With the falling of that *liṅga* in the middle of their hermitage, the virility of the four classes of beings was damaged. They have come to Deva for protection, that he may make them successful again.

<sup>30</sup>For the conventions of the Naimiṣa forest in the context of the *Mahābhārata*, see the detailed discussion of Hiltebeitel 2001, especially the third chapter.

<sup>31</sup>The reader is referred here to Rocher 1986: 70, 71, 81, 141, 161, 164, 168, 185, 226 and 232.

<sup>32</sup>Hiltebeitel 2001:131.

<sup>33</sup>For example *Brahmaṇḍapurāṇa* 1:1:165 and *Bhāgavatapurāṇa* 1:1:4. See also Bisschop 2006:217.

The author of the *Niśvāsamukha* was probably aware of this tradition about the Devadāruvana and decided to set its teaching in the area. To our knowledge the *Niśvāsamukha* is the first text to render Śaiva teachings against the backdrop of the Devadāruvana, as counter-model to the traditional setting in the Naimiṣa forest. If our interpretation is right, the move from Naimiṣa to Devadāruvana may be a significant aspect to further our understanding of the implied meaning of this narrative. We assume that the moving of sages to the Devadāruvana from the Naimiṣa may refer to the emergence of a new religion (of Śiva) which branches off from the mainstream religion. We think this is made more evident by the statement that Brahma, Viṣṇu and all the sages (1:19, 1:27–28) were initiated in the Śaiva system of initiation (1:18), which differs from the Vedic (1:8) one.

Nandikeśvara, authorised (1:14) as the speaker (1:18) of the *Niśvāsa*, is asked by the sages to teach this wisdom to them, which he had heard as a dialogue that took place between Devī and Śaṅkara (1:21–23). Nandikeśvara tells the sages about the question posed by Devī to Śiva (1:29). Devī states that she sees variously affected mortals and the dreadful spinning wheel of the world. Upon seeing this, she presumably becomes compassionate towards the mortals and asks for the means to eliminate suffering to Śiva, who is the highest god (1:46–50). What follows (1:51ff.) is Śiva's answer to Devī's question: the teaching of the five streams of knowledge. These streams consist of Laukika, Vaidika, Ādhyātmika, Atimārga, Mantramārga "in an ascending order of excellence."<sup>34</sup> As already mentioned above, the text states that the fifth is the highest stream (4:137), and the rest of the streams are presented in relation to the fifth one, the Mantramārga. In other words, they are meant for the sake of an introduction to the Mantramārga. We are told in the frame narrative itself that supreme knowledge is only possible through Śaiva initiation (*dīkṣā*), which destroys worldly existence (1:22). The initiation falls into two categories, relating to *vidyā* "supernatural enjoyment" and *nirvāṇa* "final liberation" (1:27–28), which is a characteristic subject of the fifth stream, the Mantramārga.<sup>35</sup> The frame narrative of the *Niśvāsamukha*, thus, finally, presents us the Mantramārgic teaching in relation to the teachings of the Laukika, Vedic, Ādhyātmika and the Atimārga.

In teaching these four disciplines, the *Niśvāsamukha* has made use of relevant sources of these systems. The innovative aspect of the text is that it modifies the original texts of its sources and integrates them in a new context. This leads us to a fundamental question: if the *Niśvāsamukha* is a compendium of borrowed materials, does the text have anything to say that we do not know yet from other sources? We may certainly answer in the affirmative. The text of the *Niśvāsamukha* preserves some archaic materials which are otherwise unknown to us. The first and the foremost example is the observances of the Kāpālavratins, a division of the Pāśupata sect of Śaivism. The *Niśvāsamukha* is the only existing source to preserve a systematic account of the practice of the Kāpālikas (Sanderson 2006:163). The other major contribution of the text is the innovation of the five streams.

<sup>34</sup>Sanderson 2006:156.

<sup>35</sup>The reader is referred to Goodall et al. (2015:73) for a discussion on the pair of *vidyā*- and *nirvāṇadīkṣā*.



The *Niśvāsamukha* might be the first source to introduce such a framework (see below). We will now discuss the issue of the revelation of the five streams.

### Introducing the Mantramārga through the Five Streams

As mentioned above, a remarkable feature of the *Niśvāsamukha* is that it presents the teachings of the Mantramārga as revealed by the upper, the fifth, Īśāna face of Śiva. This implies that this face is related with tantric Śaivism. It has been argued by Bakker 2002 that Śiva is not a five-headed figure in the *Mahābhārata*. Törzsök 2013 goes further to mention that this particular figure is absent in the early layer of the *Niśvāsa*-corpus and other relatively early Śaiva sources. Törzsök states (2013:152–153) that the four-faced god has his origin in the Atimārga and that the fifth face is added later by the Śaiva Siddhānta for the revelation of tantric Śaivism. This has subsequently been adopted also by the non-Śaīdhāntika traditions. The idea of Śiva's having five faces may have developed under the influence of the five Brahmamantras, because their names are held to correspond to the five faces of Śiva.<sup>36</sup> These are attested in prior literature, the *Taittirīya Āraṇyaka* (10:43–46) and the *Pāśupatasūtra*. These five mantras are known as Sadyojāta, Vāmadeva, Tatpuruṣa, Aghora and Īśāna. The same are the names of the five faces of Śiva. So, it is conceivable that the notion of the five faces of Śiva is based on the literature and traditions centred around the five Brahmamantras. The identification of five faces and the Brahmamantras, however, seems to be a relatively late development in Śaivism (Bakker 2002:400). The *Niśvāsamukha* just assumes that Śiva has five faces.<sup>37</sup>

According to the account of the *Niśvāsamukha*, the fifth, Īśāna face is associated with the Śaiva-siddhānta ( *Niśvāsamukha* 4:135). The account, however, does not make explicit whether the five Brahmamantras are identified with the five faces of Sadāśiva. On the other hand the *Guhyasūtra* (12:17–18) introduces the idea that five forms of knowledge derived from five Brahmamantras, but it is not clear whether they are the five faces of Sadāśiva. It is noteworthy that the five-faced Sadāśiva is absent in the *sūtras* of the *Niśvāsa* (Goodall et al. 2015:36).

Goodall et al. (2015:38) after an extensive discussion on the occurrence of the five *brahmamantras* and a five-headed Sadāśiva in the *Niśvāsa*-corpus, conclude:

it appears that the notion of a five-headed figure known as Sadāśiva and whose five heads are the *brahmamantras* is absent from the earliest *sūtras* of the *Niśvāsa* but is beginning to take shape in the latest layer of the text, namely that constituted by the *Niśvāsamukha* and *Guhyasūtra*.

<sup>36</sup>See Bakker 2002:400.

<sup>37</sup>*Niśvāsamukha* 3:196cd: *paścimenaiva vaktreṇa laukikaṃ gaditaṃ sadā*; *Niśvāsamukha* 4:41: *vedadharmmo mayā proktaḥ svarganaiśreyasaḥ paraḥ* | *uttareṇaiva vaktreṇa vyākhyātaś ca samāsataḥ*.; *Niśvāsamukha* 4:42: *ādhyātmikaṃ pravakṣyāmi dakṣiṇāsyena kīrtitaṃ* | *sāṃkhyāṃ caiva mahājñānaṃ yogaṃ cāpi mahāvrate*.; *Niśvāsamukha* 4:131abcd: *atimārggaṃ samākhyātaṃ dvīḥprakāraṃ varānane* | *pūrveṇaiva tu vaktreṇa sarahasyaṃ prakīrtitaṃ* |; *Niśvāsamukha* 4:135: *pañcamenaiva vaktreṇa īśānena dvijottamāḥ* | *mantrakhyāṃ kathayīṣyāmi devyāyā gaditaṃ purā* | |

This, altogether, could lead us, at least, to the conclusion that the *Niśvāsamukha* was composed sometime later than the *sūtras* of the *Niśvāsa*. The model of the five streams in the *Niśvāsamukha* is as follows:

*nandikeśvara uvāca |*  
*śṛṇvantu ṛṣayas sarve pañcadhā yat prakīrtitam |*  
*laukikaṃ vaidikaṃ caiva tathādhyātmikam eva ca |*  
*a[[timārgaṃ ca mantrākhyam]] --- |*

**Nandikeśvara said:** all you sages, listen to that which is said to be five-fold: [1] worldly (*laukikaṃ*), [2] Vedic (*vaidikaṃ*), [3] relating to the soul (*ādhyātmikam*), [4] transcendent (*atimārgaṃ*), and [5] Mantra (*mantrākhyam*) [...].

The *Laukika* is from the west face, *Sadyojāta*, (3:196cd); the *Vaidika* is from the north face, *Vāmadeva*, (4:41); the *Ādhyātmika* is from the south face, *Aghora*, (4:42); the *Atimārga* is from the east face, *Tatpuruṣa*, (4:131cd); and finally the *Mantramārga* is from the upper face, *Īśāna*, (4:135). The issue now is whether the group of the *Niśvāsamukha*'s five streams is an innovation of the *Niśvāsamukha* or not. There is a possibility that it was influenced by a passage from the *Manusmṛti*, for we encounter a related concept already attested in the *Manusmṛti* (2:117), which has been adopted later by the *Viṣṇusmṛti* (30:43).<sup>38</sup>

*laukikaṃ vaidikaṃ vāpi tathādhyātmikam eva ca |*  
*ādadīta yato jñānaṃ taṃ pūrvam abhivādayet | |*

“He should greet first the person from whom he received knowledge—whether it is the knowledge of worldly matters, of the Veda, or of the inner self.” (Olivelle 2005:101)

We have grounds to assume that the *Niśvāsamukha* 1:26cd *laukikaṃ vaidikaṃ caiva tathādhyātmikam eva ca* is formulated on the basis of the *Manusmṛti* (2:117ab), as the complete line is very similar: the line is copied verbatim with the singular exception of the *Niśvāsamukha*'s *caiva* in place of *vāpi* of the *Manusmṛti*—the meaning of these two expressions, however, is the same. Thus, we think, it is likely that the conceptual framework of the five streams of the *Niśvāsamukha* is based on the model of the three categories of knowledge of the *Manusmṛti*, with an extension of two more: the *Atimārga* and the *Mantramārga*. It is therefore quite possible that the *Niśvāsamukha* first developed that idea of five streams on the basis of the *Manusmṛti*.

We also find another different scheme of five streams in the *Guhyasūtra* (12:17–18). There the Śaiva Siddhānta was revealed by *Īśāna*, as in the *Niśvāsamukha*. But, the other four streams are different from those of the *Niśvāsamukha*. In the account of the *Guhyasūtra*, the remaining four streams are limited to the *Pāśupatas* and connected to the four faces

<sup>38</sup>Prof. Peter Bisschop provided this evidence to me.

of Śiva as follows: Vaimala was revealed by Tatpuruṣa; Pramāṇa by Aghora; Kāruka by Vāmadeva; and the doctrine of Lakulīśa by Sadyojāta.<sup>39</sup>

*pañcabhis tu tataḥ sarvaṃ yad bhūtaṃ yac ca bhāvayati |*  
*īśāne<sup>40</sup> śaivam utpannam vaimalaṃ puruṣāt<sup>41</sup> smṛtam | |*  
*pramāṇaṃ hṛdayā jātaṃ vāmadevāt tu kārukam |<sup>42</sup>*  
*sadyāc ca lakulīśāntaḥ<sup>43</sup> pañcabhedāḥ prakīrtitāḥ | |*

Since the *Guhyasūtra*'s account, too, is the revelation of five streams from the five faces of Śiva and the Mantramārga is connected with the upper face, Īśāna,<sup>44</sup> it cannot be denied that a prior template existed in Śaiva sources, which featured five streams. Thus it is also possible that both the *Guhyasūtra* and the *Niśvāsamukha* adopted and adapted the model of five streams and its association with five faces of Śiva from a third Śaiva source which is no longer extant. It is, however, likely that the *Niśvāsamukha*'s presentation of the five streams is an expanded version of the model of three streams of the *Manusmṛti*. As discussed above, the *Niśvāsamukha*'s passage on this section is quite close to the *Manusmṛti*'s concerned passage. If this was the case, this phenomenon further indicates that early Mantramārgic Śaivism has its roots in brahmanical traditions. But the involvement of the five faces in the five streams may have come from some Śaiva source. Although we cannot be certain, one of the likely sources could be the *Guhyasūtra*.

There are some other Śaiva sources that refer to such five streams. For example, the *Svacchandatantra*,<sup>45</sup> the *Pūrvakāmika*,<sup>46</sup> and the *Jayadrathayāmala* (Sanderson 2006:157, fn. 7). Compared to these three texts, the list of five domains of religious action found in a quite different context in the *Mṛgendrakriyāpāda*,<sup>47</sup> (and in the *Mṛgendrapaddhatiṭkā*), is substantially different in both wording and order. The hierarchy in the *Mṛgendra* (8:79) is as follows: [1] mundane (*loka*); [2] the Vedic (*āmnāya*); [3] the transcendent (*atimārgam*); [4] the

<sup>39</sup>For the discussion of the these four divisions of the Pāśupata sects, see Sanderson 1988:664–667.

<sup>40</sup>īśāne | N; īśānaṃ K; īśāne W

<sup>41</sup>puruṣāt | conj.; puruṣā NW; puruṣaṃ K

<sup>42</sup>hṛdayā jātaṃ vāmadevāt tu kārukam | conj.; hṛdayā jātaṃ vāmade --- ntu kārakam N; hṛdayā | ntu kārakam K; hṛdayā jātaṃ vāmade | ntu kārakam W

<sup>43</sup>sadyāc ca lakulīśāntaḥ | conj. Sanderson; sadyāc ca lakulīśāntaḥ NK<sup>pc</sup>; sadyoc ca lakulīśāntaḥ K<sup>ac</sup>; sadyāmba lakulīśāntaḥ W

<sup>44</sup>There is a widespread model of revelation of the five streams of tantric Śaiva knowledge that is found in a broad range of later scriptures. According to this model, the Siddhāntatantras come from the Īśāna face; the Bhairavatantras from Aghora; the Vāmatantras from Vāmadeva; the Bhūtantras from Sadyojāta; and the Gāruḍatantras from Tatpuruṣa (see Hatley 2010:3). This is not our concern here.

<sup>45</sup>*Svacchandatantra* 11:43c–45b: *laukikaṃ devī vijñānaṃ sadyojātād vinirgatam | vaidikaṃ vāmadevāt tu ādhyātmikaṃ aghorataḥ | puruṣāc cātimārgakhyam nirgataṃ tu varānane | mantrākhyam tu mahājñānam īśānāt tu vinirgatam.*

<sup>46</sup>*Pūrvakāmika* 3:17c–18b: *laukikaṃ vaidikaṃ caiva tathādhyātmikaṃ eva ca | atimārgaṃ ca mantrākhyam tantram etad anekadhā.*

<sup>47</sup>*Mṛgendrakriyāpāda* 8:78–79: *lokāmnāyatimārgābhisandhiśaivātmaṇyaṇoḥ | karmāṇi kṣetrikādīśaṇakāṅgan-takāṇi tu | | karmatatkrcchravairāgyajanyāni triṣu dhāmasu | yogavijñānanyāni parataḥ parato mune.*

internal (*abhisam̐dhi*); and [5] the Śaiva. As we have seen above, in the case of the *Niśvāsamukha*, *Svacchandatantra* and *Pūrvakāmika*, the Atimārga is higher than the Ādhyātmika, but in the *Mrgendra* their positions are reversed. Bhaṭṭa Nārāyaṇakaṇṭha *ad loc.*, however, notes that the Atimārga should be higher than the Ādhyātmika, as the *Niśvāsamukha*'s claim is that their sequence according to purpose (*arthakrama*) should outweigh the order in which they are read (*pāṭhakrama*). It is noteworthy that the *Mrgendrapaddhatiṭkā* (T. 1021, pages 217–218) quotes verses 8:78–79 from the *Mrgendra*, but, in commenting on them, it alters the hierarchy found therein (it puts Atimārga in a higher position than Ādhyātmika).

Although all these sources refer to the same five streams, except for the *Svacchandatantra*, they do not refer in this context to the five faces of Śiva. In any case, what is special is that the account of the *Niśvāsamukha* of the five streams is expansive in nature. The *Niśvāsamukha* is the only source that puts forward a full presentation on the four streams: [1] Laukika, [2] Vaidika, [3] Ādhyātmika, [4] Atimārga. This kind of long presentation is found nowhere else.

Now let us briefly look at the *Niśvāsamukha*'s descriptions of the five streams individually.

1. **The *laukika dharma*** as taught in the *Niśvāsamukha* is meant for uninitiated householders devoted to Śiva. It teaches this *dharma* to us as follows:

*kūpavāpīgrhodyāna --- |*  
*--- tha maṇḍapāḥ |*  
*dānatīrthopavāsāni vratāni niyamāni ca | | 1:53*  
*bhakṣyābhakṣyaparīhāraṇ japaḥoman tathārcanam |*  
*jalāgnibhṛgupāto hi tathānaśanam eva ca | | 1:54*  
*vidyamānanivṛttiś ca guruṣṛddhābhipūjanam |*  
*laukikaṃ kathitaṃ hy etad | 1:55c*

[Attending to] wells, ponds, houses, gardens [...] [and] courtyards (*maṇḍapāḥ*), donations, pilgrimages (*tīrtha*), fasting, religious observances and restraints; [eating] what may be eaten and avoiding what may not (*bhakṣyābhakṣyaparīhāraṇ*); mantra recitations and sacrifices (*japaḥoman*); [committing suicide by] falling into water or fire or from a cliff; fasting, renouncing possessions (*vidyamānanivṛttiḥ*) and honouring teachers and aged people; this is what I have taught as *laukika*.

This is a brief summary of what the text announces as *laukiko dharma*, but what is actually taught in the text is as follows (chapter 1 to 3):

The first chapter calls for the making of a water-fountain, lotus-pond, temple-garden, and the offering a house; bathing a *liṅga* in milk, clarified butter, curds, and water; the offering of flowers, fragrance, incense, clothes, ornaments, edibles, banners,

mirrors, and awnings; the offering of lamps and an umbrella, cows, goats, sheep, buffaloes, horses and elephants; the offering of servants and maids; the offering of cleansing and besmearing a *liṅga*; the offering of singing, dancing, and playing a lute and other musical instruments in the vicinity of a *liṅga*; keeping vigil on the eighth and fourteenth days of the dark half of the month; fasting and taking refuge in Śiva. This chapter also records a tradition of offering a certain *muktimanḍapa* to Śiva (1:114c–115b). A *muktimanḍapa* as an object of offering is little known elsewhere (see 1:114c–115b and our annotation thereon).

The second chapter calls for the making of a *liṅga* and installing it in a temple; constructing a temple and installing a figure of one of the following deities: Viṣṇu, Brahmā, Skanda, Rudrāṇī, Gaṇeśa, the mother goddesses, the Sun, Agni, Indra, Kubera, Vāyu, Dharma or Varuṇa in it; making a bridge; making a causeway on a muddy path; digging a water channel; making a hut, an abode or a pavilion; giving different kinds of donations. In this chapter too, the text provides us with material on traditions that are otherwise little known, or sometimes even not knowable through other sources. In 2:64 we come across a passage which is about offering a woman. We are not told to whom the woman is to be offered. The recipient, most probably, is either a Brahmin or Śiva, as the text constantly mentions these two recipients throughout.<sup>48</sup> If it was Śiva who was the recipient here, the text then must have hinted at the practice of offering a Devadāsī “servant of god.” If a Brahmin was the recipient, it would be an unusual practice. However, the text proceeds (2:65) with the offering of lovemaking, presented as a physical, not a symbolic, act with beautiful women (*ratisatran tu satataṃ varanāriṣu dāpayet*). Whoever be the recipient, and whether or not the text is recording an actual practice, this tradition is not known from other sources. The text teaches the worship of Kāmadeva (3:142c–146) on the thirteenth day of a fortnight. Although, the worship of Kāmadeva is not unknown,<sup>49</sup> the emphasis on the worshipping of him among other gods, such as Brahmā, Viṣṇu and Śiva, elevates the status of the deity Kāmadeva. This suggests that the place of Kāmadeva as a divinity to be worshipped was relatively high at this period.

The third chapter, for its part, calls for the following: bathing in prescribed rivers or lakes; committing suicide in a river or in a fire; going on pilgrimages to places sacred to Śiva; and to the ones sacred to Viṣṇu; practising observances; following procedures for fasting and worshipping (in both halves of a month for one year) Śiva and other deities (Brahmā, Agni, Kubera, Gaṇeśa, the Nāgas, Skanda, the Sun, Śiva, Mahādevī, Yama, Dharma, Keśava, Kāmadeva, again Śiva and the ancestors) on the days of the lunar fortnight that are sacred to them.<sup>50</sup>

<sup>48</sup>In one occasion the text (2:117ff.) mentions other recipients too, but it does so while it is presenting a hierarchy of recipients.

<sup>49</sup>See Benton 2006:94.

<sup>50</sup>Twelve names are to be used for each of these deities during twelve months, starting from Mārgaśīrṣa to

The text tells us about various offerings such as a golden carriage, weapon, or an emblem of a deity with that deity's name engraved on it (see 3:160ff). It also records a custom of offering a golden man (*puruṣa*) with the name of one's ancestor(s) on it on the new-moon and full-moon days (3:193–196). This information is not known from other sources.

Kārttika for each fortnight on their respective *tithis*. In the case of some deities, the number of names does not match twelve. We present here the names as attested in the text:

- Brahmā: [1] Brahmā, [2] Svayambhū, [3] Viriñci, [4] Padmayoni, [5] Prajāpati, [6] Caturmukha, [7] Padmahasta, [8] He who is the single syllable Om, [9] Caturvedadharaḥ, [10] Sraṣṭā, [11] Gīrvāṇa and [12] Parameṣṭhi
- Agni: [1] Vaiśvānara, [2] Jātavedas, [3] Hutabhuk, [4] Havyavāhana, [5] Devavaktra, [6] Sarvabhakṣa, [7] Ghṛṇin, [8] Jagadāhaka, [9] Vibhāvasu and [10] Saptajihva
- Kubera: [1] Dhanada, [2] Yakṣapati, [3] Vitteśa, [4] Nidhipālaka, [5] Rākṣasādhipati, [6] Piṅgalākṣa, [7] Vimānaga, [8] Rudrasakhā, [9] Kubera, [10] Paulastyakulanandana, [11] Lokapāleśvara and [12] Yakṣendra
- Gaṇeśa: [1] Vighneśvara, [2] Gaṇapati, [3] Ekadanta, [4] Gajānana, [5] Gajakarṇa, [6] Tryakṣa, [7] Nāgajñopavītin, [8] Caturbhujā, [9] Dhūmrākṣa, [10] Vajratuṇḍa, [11] Vināyaka and [12] Mahodara
- The Nāgas: [1] Ananta, [2] Vāsuki, [3] Takṣaka, [4] Trirekhin, [5] Padma, [6] Mahābja, [7] Śaṅkha and [8] Kulika
- Skanda: [1] Viśākha, [2] Trivaraṇa, [3] Umānanda, [4] Agnigarbhaja, [5] Gaṅgāgarbha, [6] Śaradgarbha, [7] Kṛttikāsuta, [8] Śaṇmukha, [9] Śaktihasta, [10] Mayūravāhana, [11] Pañcachaṭa and [12] Kumāra
- Sun: [1] Āditya, [2] Savitr, [3] Sūrya, [4] Khaga, [5] Pūṣan, [6] Gabhastimān, [7] Hiranyagarbha, [8] Trīśiras, [9] Tapana, [10] Bhāskara, [11] Ravi and [12] Jagannetra
- Śiva: [1] Śaṅkara, [2] Devadeva, [3] Tryambaka, [4] Sthāṇu, [5] Hara, [6] Śiva, [7] Bhava, [8] Nīlakaṇṭha, [9] Piṅgala, [10] Rudra, [11] Īśāna and [12] Ugra
- Mahādevī: [1] Umā, [2] The goddess Kātyāyinī, [3] Durgā, [4] Rudrā, [5] Subhadrikā, [6] Kālarātrī, [7] Mahāgaurī, [8] Revatī, [9] Bhūtanāyikā, [10] Āryā, and [11] Prakṛtirūpā and [12] The Leader of *gaṇas*
- Yama: [1] Yama, [2] Dharmarāja, [3] Mr̥tyu, [4] Antaka, [5] Vaivasvata, [6] Kāla, [7] Sarvalokakṣaya, [8] always Ugradaṇḍadhṛt, [9] He who travel sitting on a buffalo [10] Punisher and [11] Overlord of the hells
- Dharma: [1] Dharma, [2] Satya, [3] Dayā, [4] Kṣānti, [5] Śauca, [6] Ācāra, [7] Ahimsā, [8] Adambha and [9] Rakṣā, [10] Lokasākṣin, [11] Vṛṣabha and [12] Adṛṣṭa
- Viṣṇu: [1] Keśava, [2] Nārāyaṇa, [3] Mādhava, [4] Govinda, [5] Viṣṇu, [6] Madhusūdana, [7] Trivikrama, [8] Vāmana, [9] Śrīdhara, [10] Hṛṣīkeśa, [11] Padmanābha and [12] Dāmodara
- Kāmadeva: [1] Anaṅga, [2] Manmatha, [3] Kāma, [4] Īśvara, [5] Mohana, [6] Pañcabāṇa, [7] Dhanurhasta, [8] Unmāda, [9] Vaśaṃkara, [10] Ratipriya, [11] Pr̥tikara and [12] Hṛdayāpahārin
- Śiva: [1] Hara, [2] Śarva, [3] Bhava, [4] Tryakṣa, [5] Śambhu, [6] Vibhu, [7] Śiva, [8] Sthāṇu, [9] Paśupati, [10] Rudra, [11] Īśāna and [12] Śaṅkara
- Piṭrs: No such names are mentioned.

Table 1: Deities, their days, and their object of donation

day of fortnight	deity to be worshiped	gift to be offered
Pratipad	Brahmā	golden lotus
Dvitiyā	Agni	golden goat
Tṛtīyā	Yakṣa	golden mace
Caturthī	Gaṇeśa	golden elephant
Pañcamī	Nāgas	golden <i>padma</i>
Ṣaṣṭhī	Skanda	golden peacock
Saptamī	Āditya	golden horse
Aṣṭamī	Śaṅkara	[golden] bull
Navamī	Mahādevī	[golden] lion
Daśamī	Yama	[golden] buffalo
Ekādaśī	Dharma	[golden] bull
Dvādaśī	Viṣṇu	[golden] Garuḍa
Trayodaśī	Kāmadeva	golden bow
Caturdaśī	Parameśvara	[golden] bull
Amāvaśī/Pūrṇimā	Piṭrs	golden man

Nārāyaṇakaṇṭha,<sup>51</sup> and the *Mrgendrapaddhatiṭkā*<sup>52</sup> all seem to have the same understanding of *laukika dharma* related with social meritorious deeds. For Kṣemarāja, however, it means something different and encompasses: livelihood; penal code; the art of government; Āyurveda; Dhanurveda etc.<sup>53</sup> The *Niśvāsamukha*'s understating of the *laukika dharma* is different. It is not only social meritorious deeds as Nārāyaṇakaṇṭha and *Mrgendrapaddhatiṭkā* would explain it to be. Also, it does not involve Āyurveda, Dhanurveda and penal code as Kṣemarāja explains.

2. **Vaidika dharma** is positioned above *Laukika* in the hierarchy. It pertains to the four *āśramas* (1:55d): *vaidikaṃ caturāśramam*. The *Niśvāsamukha* (4:1–41) teaches that the four life-stages and their observances lead one to the abode of Brahman,<sup>54</sup> whereas the *Laukika dharma* only leads up to heaven.<sup>55</sup> Sanderson (2006:157) writes in this regard:

The distinction between this and the Vaidika religion (*vaidiko dharmah*) is

<sup>51</sup>See the commentary of Nārāyaṇakaṇṭha on *Mrgendratāntrakriyāpāda* 8:79: *tatra laukikāni tāvat karmāṇi vāpikūpaprapādini pūrtakhyāni*.

<sup>52</sup>T. 1021, pp. 217, line 15: *kūpataṭākādikaraṇaṃ paraṃ pūrtam ucyate*.

<sup>53</sup>Kṣemarāja's commentary on *Svacchandatantra* 11:44: *laukikaṃ vārtādaṇḍanītyāyurvedadhanurveda-nāṭyavedādipratipādyakṣīṇayānāyacakitsādivijñānam*.

<sup>54</sup>*Niśvāsamukha* 4:39: *evaṃ yo varttate nityaṃ sa yāti brahmalaukikaṃ | brahmaṇā saha modeta brahmaṇi sa tu liyate |*.

<sup>55</sup>*Niśvāsamukha* 1:52cd: *laukikaṃ sampravakṣyāmi yena svargaṃ vrajanti te*.

that the latter is the practice of the celibate life-stages. It comes above the Mundane in the hierarchy of paths because we are told that while the Mundane leads only to heaven (*svargah*), this may go beyond that transient reward to bestow [what it takes to be] liberation.

Nārāyaṇakaṇṭha,<sup>56</sup> and the *Mrgendrapaddhatiṭikā*<sup>57</sup> see the *vaidika* stream as being concerned with *soma* sacrifices and the like. This understanding is completely different from that of the *Niśvāsamukha*. Kṣemarāja, again, has still a different view, which focuses on *nitya*, *naimittika* and *kāmya* sacrifices.<sup>58</sup>

3. *Ādhyātmika dharma* is understood as the teaching of *Sāṅkhya* and *Yoga*:

*ādhyātmikaṃ pravakṣyāmi dakṣiṇāsyena kīrttitam |*  
*sāṅkhyaṃ caiva mahājñānaṃ yogaṃ cāpi mahāvrate | | 4:42 | |*

[Now] I will teach the [*dharma*] called *ādhyātmika* with [my] southern face: [namely] the great knowledge of *Sāṅkhya* and *Yoga*, O you who observe the *mahāvrate*.

To take only the teachings of *Sāṅkhya* and *Yoga* as *Ādhyātmika* is unusual. The Upaniṣads, which are mainly devoted to teaching *Ādhyātmika* religion, are curiously missing here. We do not understand why they are not mentioned by the *Niśvāsamukha*. Medhātithi and Kullūka, commenting on the verse of the *Manusmṛti* (2:117) which, we think, might be the basis for the fivefold scheme of the *Niśvāsamukha*, understand *ādhyātmika* in a conventional sense. To the former it is the knowledge of brahman: *ādhyātmikaṃ brahmajñānam*, and to the latter it is something related to the Upaniṣadic knowledge of the Self: *ādhyātmikavidyā ātmopaniṣadvidyā*. Nārāyaṇakaṇṭha (commentary on *Mrgendrakriyāpāda* 8:79) expounds this usual sense: *abhisandhirūpāṇi vairāgyātmakāni*. For the author of the *Mrgendrapaddhatiṭikā*,<sup>59</sup> and Kṣemarāja<sup>60</sup> too, the meaning has been narrowed down to the teachings of *Yoga* and *Sāṅkhya*.

4. *Ātimārga* refers to the Pāśupata system, which, in this text, is said to be twofold.<sup>61</sup> That is to say, it refers to *Ātyāśramins* and *Lokātītas* (*Niśvāsamukha* 4:88). The first

<sup>56</sup>The commentary on *Mrgendrakriyāpāda* 8:79: *āmnāyo vedah | taduktāni tu karmāṇy api karmakṛcchrajanyāni somasaṃsthādirūpāṇi iṣṭaśabdena prasiddhāni*.

<sup>57</sup>*Mrgendrapaddhatiṭikā* T. 1021, p. 217: *tat kṛcchraśabdena somasaṃsthādyātmakam iṣṭam ucyate*.

<sup>58</sup>The commentary on *Svacchandatantra* 11:44: *vaidikaṃ nityanaimittikakāmyayajñādisvarūpam*.

<sup>59</sup>T. 1021:217: *vairāgyaśabdenādhyātmikāny abhisandhirūpāṇi pātāñjalasāṅkhyāni (conj.; pātapañalāsaṃdhyāni MS) karmāṇy ucyante*.

<sup>60</sup>The commentary on *Svacchandatantra* 11:44: *ādhyātmikaṃ sāṅkhyaayogādipratipāditaprakṛtipuruṣavivekajñānasarvavyttinirodhajñānādikam*.

<sup>61</sup>*Niśvāsamukha* 4:131: *ātimārggaṃ samākhyaṭaṃ dvilīpra[[kāraṃ va(rā)]]nane | | 4:131*.



section teaches the *Pāśupatasūtras* in a versified form. The second section teaches the observances of the Kapālavratins and provides a systematic account of their cosmology. Sanderson 2006:158 writes:

... the *Niśvāsamukha* holds it ([i.e. Atimārga]) to be of two kinds (*dviprakāraḥ*). It outlines the first, which it calls “the Observance of those beyond the Estates” (*Atyāśramavratam*) in a rendering of the enigmatic prose *Pāśupatasūtra* into verses that are clear (where they are not lacunose through physical damage) and add a small amount of information found neither in the *Sūtras* nor in Kauṇḍinya’s commentary. The first level of the Atimārga, then, is that of the Pāñcārthikas. The rest of the section on the Atimārga introduces us to a new form of devotion to Rudra, which it calls Kapālavrata (‘the observance of the skull’), the Lokātītavratra (‘the observance of those beyond the world’) and the Mahāpāśupatavratra (‘the observance of the Greater Pāśupatas’). It also refers to those who adopt this observance as the Mahāvratas.

*Svacchandatantra* 11:45–45, too, takes the Atimārga as referring to the Pāśupata system, and this is further spelled out in *Svacchandatantra* 11:179–184 (see Sanderson 2006:158–160). The *Siddhāntasamuccaya* (T. 284, pp.153, lines 1–2) of Trilocana says the same thing: *atimārgaṃ punaḥ pāśupatādīḥ*. Sanderson (2006:158) points out that, when Kṣemarāja comments on *Svacchandatantra* 11:43–45 and 11:179–184, he does not distinguish the Atimārga and the Mantramārga in terms of non-Āgamic and Āgamic Śaivism (non-Āgamic and Āgamic Śaivism being Sanderson’s translations for *atimārga* and *mantramārga*):

“Thus when Kṣemarāja comments on the same list of five when it occurs at *Svacchanda* 11.43c–45b he does not see its distinction between the ‘Atimārga’ and the fifth as a distinction between non-Āgamic and Āgamic Śaivism. According to him – and he is, after all, one of the most influential of Āgamic authorities – the knowledge of the ‘Atimārga’ mentioned in the text is knowledge of the externals of Āgamic Śaivism itself, while the fifth level is knowledge of the core of the same system.”

He goes on to show convincingly (2006:162–163) why the redactor(s) of the *Mrgendrat Tantra* and the commentator Bhaṭṭa Nārāyaṇakaṇṭha did not understand the Atimārga correctly as non-Āgamic Śaivism. We observe a complete misunderstanding of the sense of *atimārga* in the *Tantrāloka* of Jayaratha, who, commenting on it at 13:346 asserts that it refers to such systems as Sāṅkhya and Yoga, which are placed higher than the *laukika* religion: *atimārgo laukikamārgātītaṃ sāmṛghyapātāñjalādi*. It is not clear what Abhinavagupta for his part may have

thought about the matter. After his enlightening discussion Sanderson (2006:163) concludes: “The term Atimārga, which I suggest we use for the non-Āgamic Śaivism of the Pāśupatas and related systems, is extracted, then, from a stage of the tradition which predates our famous commentators and perhaps even some of the Āgamas themselves. But I make no apology for putting it back to use: the dominion of these commentaries over later tradition need not extend to us.” Note that for the author of the *Mṛgendrapaddhati* (T. 1021, p. 217), too, Atimārgins are equated with Pāśupatas.

5. **Mantramārga** refers to Āgamic Śaivism. The *Niśvāsamukha* (1:56c) tells us: *mantrākhyāś ca tathā śaivāḥ* “and the followers of the *mantra*[-path] are Śaivas.” For the author of the *Mṛgendra* (see *Mṛgendrakriyāpāda* 8:78) and *Kāmika* (see *Kāmikapūrvabhāga* 3:20ff.) the term has the same meaning. It is not clear, however, whether it does for Nārāyaṇakaṇṭha (on *Mṛgendrakriyāpāda* 8:79), Kṣemarāja (on *Svacchandatanūdyota* 22:44) and the author of the *Mṛgendrapaddhati* (T. 1021:218).

## Origin and the Date of the Text

It is, at present, nigh on impossible to ascertain where and under what circumstances the *Niśvāsamukha* was composed. There are, however, some pieces of internal evidence, for example, the toponyms Naimiṣāraṇya “Naimiṣa forest” (1:2, 1:5) and Devadāruvana “pine forest” (1:11), the first two places mentioned in the *Niśvāsamukha*, are in all likelihood in the northern part of India. Naimiṣāraṇya may be on the bank of the river Gomatī in Uttar Pradesh (Bisschop 2006:217). Although we do not know the exact location of the Devadāruvana, Bisschop (2006:255) pointing to the evidence of the *Skandapurāṇa*, suggests that this place is situated somewhere in the region of the Himavat “snowy mountains.” He explains (2006a:195): “Most of the Purāṇic sources agree that it is a Himalayan mountain.”

As stated above, these places are not just important because they are located in a particular region, but also because they are imbued with potent religious connotations. The Naimiṣāraṇya is a place that was greatly praised and made famous in the *Mahābhārata* (Bisschop 2006:217) and Purāṇas are believed to have been first recited there. Therefore this site is strongly associated with brahmanical traditions. The Devadāruvana, however, has a Śaiva flavour. As argued above, this site is connected to the development of early Śaivism.<sup>62</sup> Besides these two famous forests, the *Niśvāsamukha* holds two other famous places in high regard: Mahālaya (3:27) and Kedāra (3:28). The text speaks of Mahālaya thus:

*mahāpralayaśthāyī ca sraṣṭānugrahakārakaḥ |*  
*darśanād eva gacchante padan divyaṃ mahālaye || 3:27 ||*

<sup>62</sup>For the mythical story of the site see (Bisschop 2006:79).

“He who stands in Mahāpralaya (*mahāpralayasthāyī*)<sup>63</sup> [is] the creator and agent of grace; from merely (*eva*) seeing him in [the sacred site of] Mahālaya, people will attain (*gacchante*) [in the next life] a celestial state of being.”

Mahālaya is the summit of Himavat where Mahādeva, according to Purāṇic traditions, planted his foot-print. This is again one of the holiest places of Śaivas in ancient times (Bisschop 2006:66). Although the exact location of Mahālaya remains obscure, it is located somewhere in the Himalayas.

Kedāra is treated as a special place and is imbued with extraordinary features (*Niśvāsamukha* 3:28a–29a). It is stated that by dying in any site of the *pañcāṣṭaka*, a group of forty pilgrimage places, one goes up, penetrating the shell of the egg of Brahmā to a world of the same name as that site, and will not be reborn in this world again. On the other hand, by merely drinking water from the sacred site of Kedāra one can obtain the fruit of attaining the five divine sets of eight sacred places. Kedāra also appears in *Guhyasūtra* 7:115, and the elaborate legend of its origin and significance is recounted in chapter 16 of the *Guhyasūtra*.<sup>64</sup>

Also the mention of Kardamāla among auspicious places for bathing (3:12–13) deserves some comment.

*śoṇapuṣkaralohitye mānase sindhusāgare |*  
*brahmāvartte karddamāle snātvā ca lavaṇodadhau | | 3:12 | |*  
*sarvopāpaviśuddhātma pitrdevāṃś ca pūjayet*

“Having bathed in the Śoṇa [river], Puṣkara [lake?] or Lohitya [river] (*śoṇapuṣkaralohitye*), in [lake] Mānasa, in the place where the Indus meets the ocean (*sindhusāgare*) or in Brahmāvartta, or Kardamāla or in the salty ocean, one [becomes] free from all sins [and] one should [then] worship one’s ancestors and the gods.”

All these places are well-known pilgrimage sites, except Kardamāla. Prof. Bisschop, in his paper presented in the second International Workshop on Early Tantra, July 2009, on “Purāṇic” Topography in the *Niśvāsa*,” suggested that this place may have some connection with the Pāśupatas. He also argued that this passage, if not borrowed from an earlier source(s), could indicate the origin of the text, as this little known place is here placed among well-known sites. The evidence of toponyms suggests that the origin of the *Niśvāsamukha* could be somewhere between the Himavat and modern Gujarat, if the particular toponyms were not simply drawn from other sources. This point will be clear if one considers the *pañcāṣṭaka* toponyms.

<sup>63</sup>Perhaps this is to be understood in two ways: “He who remains [even] in a period of total resorption [of the universe]” and “He who stands in [the sacred site called] Mahā(pra)laya”.

<sup>64</sup>For the full treatment of Kedāra and the creation of these texts see p. 40 onwards.

There is a list of forty pilgrimage sites known as the *pañcāṣṭaka* “the group of five ogdoads” (see TAK2, s.v. *guhyaṣṭaka*) in *Niśvāsamukha* 3:19–22. Most probably, the *Niśvāsamukha* has simply adopted the list of *pañcāṣṭaka* from an earlier source,<sup>65</sup> in which case its own origin need have nothing to do with the list. We cannot, thus, take the list as evidence to locate the origin of the text. In addition, we come across a list of rivers in *Niśvāsamukha* 3:2–8. This list also cannot be taken as evidence to locate the origin of the text, as the *Niśvāsamukha* once again may have borrowed it from some earlier source, since lists of rivers appear in a vast range of texts.

The Prākṛtic words in the text might serve as a further, although limited, indicator of its origin. The text uses Prākṛtic vowel-sounds, such as *sāyojya* for *sāyujya*, in many cases (1:41d, 1:79c, 1:79a, 1:83a, 1:86c, 1:89d, 1:91a, 1:94c, 1:96b, 1:99b, 2:18c, 3:29a, 3:86d, 3:145c, 3:150c, 3:191b and 4:87d). Similarly, it records a further Prākṛtic vowel, *vāgeśyām* for *vāgīśvāryām* in 4:95a and 4:126c. There are some more instances of Prākṛtic influence in the *Niśvāsamukha*. For example, the omission of the final *t* in optatives; and special word formations, for example *catālīśa*.<sup>66</sup> Such Prākṛtic forms once again lead to the conclusion that the language used is more likely northern than southern.<sup>67</sup> If the text had a southern origin we would expect other sorts of deviations from standard Sanskrit, for instance: masculine nouns might be treated as neuter in gender; Prākṛtisms like *catālīśa* would be rare. Prākṛtic phonetic shifts are much less likely to be found in the non-standard Sanskrit written in Dravidian-language-speaking areas, in which Prākṛits were not spoken. All in all we can conclude that a North Indian origin of the text appears most plausible.

The dating of the *Niśvāsamukha* remains an open question. The sole manuscript of the *Niśvāsa* we have is from 9th-century Nepal. Although the manuscript is not dated, the script (“Licchavi”) used to write it appears in all likelihood to date from the 9th century (Goodall et al. 2015:103ff.).<sup>68</sup> This provides us with the *terminus ante quem*. We come across two blank spaces in this manuscript where some letters are missing: fol. 50<sup>v</sup>, line:4 and fol. 52<sup>r</sup>, line:4. If these gaps reflect damage to the exemplar, this would mean that the scribe of the extant manuscript was working from a manuscript that was already worn and therefore perhaps old.

Goodall et al. (2015:471–472) mentions the possibility that the manuscript did not copy at least one folio from its source. This means, the manuscript that we have is a copied one, which also leads us to suppose that there existed at least one manuscript before the present one. This pushes back its *terminus ante quem*, but we are not sure by how much.

The dating of the other books of the *Niśvāsatattvasaṃhitā* might serve as a valuable indicator for the time-frame of the *Niśvāsamukha* as well. Goodall et al. (2015:35) assumes that the whole corpus of the *Niśvāsa* was probably composed between the middle of the

<sup>65</sup>We are not able to offer the exact source of it. It is possible, however, that the source of the *Niśvāsamukha* was the *Śivadharmasāstra*, as its teaching is similar in nature, and the date of the latter work is, we think, earlier.

<sup>66</sup>See the footnote on verse 4:107 for the form *catālīśa*.

<sup>67</sup>See also Goodall et al. 2015:72–73.

<sup>68</sup>For more details, see the discussion of the manuscript of the *Niśvāsa*, p. 92 ff.

fifth and end of the seventh century. For Goodall, the text

...begins, we think, with the *Mūlasūtra* (c. 450-550 AD) and is completed with the *Niśvāsamukha* and *Guhyasūtra* probably by the end of the seventh century. The pointers may be broadly grouped under the (partially overlapping) heads of palaeography; iconography; terminology; theology; social religion; and intertextuality (allusion within the *Niśvāsa* to other literature and allusions in other literature to the *Niśvāsa*).

Bakker (2014:9), however, without yet having seen Goodall et al.'s completed edition, has expressed doubts about this dating of the *Mūlasūtra*, and instead places it a century later. Instead, he voices the possibility that the *Mūlasūtra* and the *Skandapurāṇa* may have evolved around the same period. Goodall et al. (2015:22) present a relative chronology of the *Niśvāsa*-corpus, which depicts how the works evolved in relation to each other.

We are therefore confident that the *Mūlasūtra* was followed by the *Uttarasūtra*, which was followed by the *Nayasūtra*, which was in turn followed by the *Guhyasūtra*, exactly the order in which those works are transmitted in the manuscript.

This too, does not help us further delimit the possible time-frame of the *Niśvāsamukha*. Had it been possible to establish the direction of borrowing between the *Guhyasūtra* and the *Niśvāsamukha*, we could have dated the *Niśvāsamukha* more precisely. The geographical evidence of the pilgrimage site Kedāra (see also p. 40 onwards), shared by both texts in close proximity, could have helped us to narrow down the possible date of the *Niśvāsamukha*. Unfortunately, we cannot establish the way of borrowing of these passages. Thus, we can not use this evidence to limit down the date of the *Niśvāsamukha*.

There are some parallels shared by the *Niśvāsamukha* and Purāṇic sources. For example, *Niśvāsamukha* 1:2ab: *aṣṭāśītisahasrāṇi ṛṣṭhām ūrdhvaretasām*. is paralleled by the *Brahmāṇḍapurāṇa* (1:7:180ab and 1:21:170cd) and the *Viṣṇupurāṇa* (1:6:36ab). Similarly, *Niśvāsamukha* 1:126c–127b (*bukasya karavīrasya arkkasyonmattakasya ca | | caturṇāṃ puṣpajātīnāṃ sarvaṃ āghrāti śaṅkaraḥ*.) is almost an exact parallel of *Skandapurāṇa* 28:31abcd (*caturṇāṃ puṣpajātīnāṃ gandham āghrāti śaṅkaraḥ | | arkasya karavīrasya bilvāsya ca bukasya ca*). *Niśvāsamukha* 1:71ab (*śataṃ sanmārjane puṇyaṃ sahasram upalepane*) is also closely paralleled by *Skandapurāṇa* 27:24ab (*saṃmārjanaṃ pañcaśataṃ sahasram upalepanam*). Although the first *pāda* is slightly different, we have found *sahasram upalepane/ sahasram upalepanam* nowhere else except in these two texts and the *Śivadharmasaṅgraha*, which has borrowed from the *Niśvāsamukha*.

Once again, the parallels shared by the *Niśvāsamukha* and Purāṇic sources could shed some light in this issue if we, again, could determine the direction of borrowing. There is, however, no indication of direct borrowing, as these verses could be either floating ones of some Śaiva sources or both sources (*Niśvāsamukha* and the Purāṇas) might be making use

of a third common source. The *Niśvāsamukha*'s connection with these old Purāṇic sources, anyway, testifies to the antiquity of the *Niśvāsamukha*.

There is, however, one important case of overlapping material in which direction can be determined. We have noted (p. 61 ff.) that chapters 5–9 of the *Śivadharmasaṅgraha* and the text of the *Niśvāsamukha*<sup>69</sup> are closely related. Having examined this relation in greater detail, we have concluded that the *Śivadharmasaṅgraha* is later than the *Niśvāsamukha* (see below). Dr. Anil Kumar Acharya in a recent study (2009\*:91) places the date of the *Śivadharmasaṅgraha* between the 9th and 10th centuries. We know that the *Niśvāsamukha* was composed earlier than the 9th century because of its extant manuscript of the 9th century.

Another important text to take into account is the *Pāśupatasūtra*. *Niśvāsamukha* 4:70c–88 paraphrases the *Pāśupatasūtra*. The latter text, therefore, certainly precedes the former. If any influence of Kauṇḍinya's commentary on the *Niśvāsamukha* could be established, a more precise dating would be possible. As we shall see (p. 46) there is considerable additional information in the *Pāśupata*-section of the *Niśvāsamukha* compared to the *Pāśupatasūtra*, but we cannot trace close influence of Kauṇḍinya in these blocks of the text. The Vedic section (4:2–41) of the *Niśvāsamukha*, as well as some part of the *Laukika* section, borrows from the *Manusmṛti*. This again means little regarding the dating of the *Niśvāsamukha*, as the *Manusmṛti* is such an early text that it cannot be compared with the *Niśvāsamukha* as to fix its time of composition.

There is one further piece of evidence that is relevant to us here. It is likely that the *Svacchandatantra* was redacted after the *Niśvāsa* corpus, for the former borrows a large amount of text from the latter (see Sanderson 2006:160ff.). For example, Sanderson (2006:160), commenting on the sketch of Atimārga in the *Svacchandatantra*, writes,

... I propose that this explanation of the term Atimārga is not that of the *Svacchanda* itself, and that on the contrary his source exactly confirms the use of the *Niśvāsamukha*. This conclusion rests on *Svacchanda* 11.179c–184.

More recently (2009:50), Sanderson argued for the following:

it is clear in my view that the *Svacchandatantra* was redacted after the formation of the *Niśvāsa* corpus, the *Tantrasadbhāva* after the *Svacchanda*, the *Kubjikāmata* after the *Tantrasadbhāva*, the hexad of the *Jayadrathayāmala* after the *Kubjijāmata*, and the remaining three hexads after the first.

On the basis of Sanderson's arguments, it is evident that the *Niśvāsamukha* is earlier than the *Svacchandatantra*. On the strength of this conclusion, we can venture to say that the *Niśvāsamukha* was composed before the *Svacchandatantra*. Since the date of the *Svacchandatantra* is an open question, the exact dating of the *Niśvāsamukha* remains a complicated issue, as pointed out by Goodall et al. (2015:22):

<sup>69</sup>The introductory part of the first chapter and the section on Ādhyātmika and Atimārga (i.e. after verse 4:41) are not attested in the *Śivadharmasaṅgraha*.

More problematic is the relative date of the *Niśvāsamukha* in the corpus. Being professedly an introduction, it presupposes the existence of at least one *sūtra* for it to introduce, but because it does not discuss the subject matter of the *sūtras*, it is difficult to judge whether or not it was written when all of them were already in existence and constituted together a *Niśvāsatattvasaṃhitā*.

In the final end, we agree on the proposition of Goodall et al. (2015:35) that the *Niśvāsamukha* was redacted before the eighth century, probably sometime during the 7th-century. The precise date of the text, however, still needs further investigation.

## Parallels and Borrowings

As already indicated above, the *Niśvāsamukha* seems to be largely dependent on outside sources to create its body of text. The *Niśvāsamukha* mentions the five religious systems— [1] Laukika, [2] Vaidika, [3] Ādhyātmika, [4] Atimārga, and [5] Mantramārga— and specifically deals with the first four in its teaching, while only alluding to the fifth. Since the *Niśvāsamukha* concerns itself to introduce the first four types of religious groups, it is natural that it makes use of the relevant sources of these systems. Although we do not find parallels to what the *Niśvāsamukha* teaches in all cases, it is likely that in many cases the particular text is not original to the *Niśvāsamukha*.

A large part of the Laukika section of the *Niśvāsamukha* may have been composed on the basis of external sources, as we come across similar materials in other texts, both Śaiva and non-Śaiva. Thus, the *Aṣṭamūrti* hymn (1:30–41), the list of the *pañcāṣṭaka* (3:19–22), the list of rivers (3:2–8) and the famous *Liṅgodbhava* (1:172–185) story are not probably the *Niśvāsamukha*'s innovations. The descriptions of *Cāndrāyaṇa* (3:43), *Yaticāndrāyaṇa* (3:45), and *Śisucāndrāyaṇa* observances (3:46), and the names of the ancestors of the four castes (3:155) are borrowed from the *Manusmṛti*.

Likewise, *Niśvāsamukha* 1:167c–168b is exactly paralleled by *Śivadharmasāstra* 1:14c–15b; *Niśvāsamukha* 2:2 is closely paralleled by *Śivadharmasāstra* 3:77c–78b; *Niśvāsamukha* 2:91cd is redolent of *Śivadharmasāstra* 12:72; the notion of a gradation of recipients (*pātra*) in the *Niśvāsamukha* 2:117–19 also seems to have some connection with the account in *Śivadharmasāstra* 7:69–71. (see p. 54 for more details). *Niśvāsamukha* 1:2ab is paralleled by *Brahmaṇḍapurāṇa* 1:7:180ab and 1:21:170cd, and *Viṣṇupurāṇa* 1:6:36ab; *Niśvāsamukha* 1:126c–127b is paralleled by *Skandapurāṇa* 28:31abcd; *Niśvāsamukha* 1:71ab is closely paralleled by *Skandapurāṇa* 27:24ab. (see above p. 32). The Vedic section (4:2–41) of the *Niśvāsamukha*, as well, has partly borrowed from the *Manusmṛti*. As we have discussed above (p. 13) the Ādhyātmika section, dealing with the systems of Sāṅkhya and Yoga, seems to be modelled on the basis of their earlier respective sources. The Atimārga sections, the teachings of the Pāñcārthas and Kāpālikas, as well are fashioned using the sources of those traditions.

There are a few texts that have citable parallels with the *Niśvāsamukha* and that, being unquestionably younger than the *Niśvāsamukha*, we are not going to discuss individually: The division of the five streams of knowledge found in *Niśvāsamukha* 1:26c–27b is paralleled in *Pūrvakāmika* 1:17c–1:18b; the *Aṣṭamūrti*-hymn in *Niśvāsamukha* 32–39 is paralleled in *Prayogamañjarī* 1:19–26, *Tantrasamuccaya* 1:16–23, and *Īśānagurudevapaddhati* 26:56–63; and *Niśvāsamukha* 2:82c–86b in *Somaśambhupaddhati* 1:6:5–8, *Kriyākramadyotikā* (§ 67, p.134), and *Ātmārthapūjāpaddhati* (attributed to *Suprabhedāgama*), while the first two lines are found in the *Jñānaratnāvalī* fol. 126b (also attributed to the *Suprabhedāgama*) (R 14898, p. 144).

### Parallels with other Books of the *Niśvāsatattvasaṃhitā*

Among the parallels that we will examine more closely, let us begin with the *Niśvāsamukha* and the other books of the *Niśvāsatattvasaṃhitā*, starting with the first three *sūtras*: the *Mūlasūtra*, *Uttarasūtra* and *Nayasūtra*. The cosmology taught in the *Niśvāsamukha* (4:88c ff.) and the cosmology of the *Mūlasūtra* (5:3ff.) are quite similar. We are not, however, able to show if one of the two was serving as a source to the other or both were relying on a third common source.

The *Niśvāsamukha* seems to have no connection with the *Uttarasūtra*. It, however, has a strong connection with the *Nayasūtra*. The sections on yoga in the *Niśvāsamukha* (4:50ff) and the *Nayasūtra* (4:105ff) are very similar. A phrase in 4:60ab (*prthvī kaṭhinarūpeṇa śṛṇu dehe yathā sthitā*) of the *Niśvāsamukha* matches exactly what we find in the *Nayasūtra* (2:23). Another example of this kind of parallel is the list of eight yogic postures in the *Niśvāsamukha* and *Nayasūtra*. These are: Svastika, Padmaka, Bhadra, Arddhacandra, Prasāritam, Sāpāśraya, Añjalika and Yogapaṭṭa. The verse that records this list in *Niśvāsamukha* 4:50 is as follows:

*svastikaṃ padmakam bhadram tv arddhacandram prasāritam |*  
*sāpāśrayam añjalikaṃ yogapaṭṭam yathāsukham | |*

And the verse that records the list in the *Nayasūtra* (4:14c–15b) is:<sup>70</sup>

*svastikaṃ padmakam bhadram arddhacandram prasāritam | |*  
*sāpāśrayam añjalikaṃ yogapaṭṭam yathāsukham |*

The only difference is that where the *Nayasūtra* reads *arddhacandram*, the *Niśvāsamukha* reads *tv arddhacandram*. In this context, *Niśvāsamukha* 4:65c–66d and *Nayasūtra* 3:21c–22d<sup>71</sup>

<sup>70</sup>Later on, the *Nayasūtra* presents the eight yogic postures in a slightly different phrasing: *āsanam padmakam baddhvā svastikaṃ bhadracandrakam | sāpāśrayam yogapaṭṭam āsīnaṇca yathāsukham | |* 4:105 | |.

<sup>71</sup>The *Niśvāsamukha*'s version is : *divyadr̥ṣṭiḥ prajāyeta yadā tanmayatāṇi gataḥ | | sarvavidyāḥ pravartante sarvaṃ pratyakṣato bhavet | siddhaiś ca saha saṃbhāṣaṃ yadā tanmayatāṇi gataḥ*. The version of the *Nayasūtra* runs as follows: *siddhaś caiva svatantraś ca divyadr̥ṣṭiḥ prajāyate | | saṃmāsād dhyānayogena divyasiddhiḥ prajāyate | trailokyē yaḥ pravartteta pratyakṣan tasya jāyate | |*



may also serve as evidence for the relation between the two texts. As stated before, we can not ascertain which text borrowed from which source at this point. Since this is a well-known list of yogic postures, both texts may go back to a common source.

The descriptions of *prāṇāyāma* in the *Nīśvāsamukha* and in the *Nayasūtra*<sup>72</sup> are also closely related. We see that both texts teach three types of *prāṇāyāma*: *kumbhaka*, *recaka* and *pūṛaka*. The definition of *kumbhaka*, *recaka* and *pūṛaka* is basically the same in both texts, the *Nīśvāsamukha*'s being more elaborate and the *Nayasūtra*'s more concise. Further, there are two other categories relating to *prāṇāyāma* taught in the *Nayasūtra*: external and internal.<sup>73</sup> The *Nayasūtra* (4:113d) states that the internal *prāṇāyāma* is of four kinds, the fourth being *supraśānta*, which is not found in the *Nīśvāsamukha*.

We do find a close connection between these two texts in the section on *dhāraṇā*, “fixation.” *Nīśvāsamukha* 4:57c–61 teaches four types of fixation, in the following order: air, fire, earth, and water. The *Nayasūtra*, for its part, teaches five types of *dhāraṇā*, in the following order: air, fire, earth, water and ether.<sup>74</sup> Both texts show their account of fixation relating to the same first four elements, but the *Nayasūtra* adds the ether. This makes them unique compared to other Śaiva sources which have different sequences.<sup>75</sup>

Another relevant topic shared by both texts in their yoga section and commonly taught in the Śaiva yoga system is *karaṇa*. *Karaṇa* is a term for what is done once a yogin has assumed a yogic posture, before doing *prāṇāyāma* “breath control.”<sup>76</sup> What is taught in the *Nīśvāsamukha* (4:51) and in the *Nayasūtra* (4:106ab) is effectively the same procedure. Only the wording of the verses differs a little. Neither employs the term *karaṇa*.<sup>77</sup>

Given the close relationship between these two texts, we wish to determine which one borrowed from the other. We should not, however, forget that this kind of yoga chapter is common to many Śaiva texts and that therefore, both the *Nīśvāsamukha* and the *Nayasūtra* may have based themselves on some other source.

A large proportion of text is also shared by both the *Nīśvāsamukha* and the *Guhya-sūtra*, including an account of the *pañcāṣṭaka*, “five ogdoads.”<sup>78</sup> The accounts found in the

<sup>72</sup>The version of the *Nīśvāsamukha* is: *prāṇāyāmaṃ pravakṣyāmi triṣprakāraṃ samabhyaset* || 4:54 || *virecyāpūrya saṃruddhaṃ kumbhakaṃ parikīrtitam* | *pūrayec ca svakaṃ dehaṃ yāvad āpūritaṃ bhavet* | | 4:55 || *pūrakas tu samākhyāto prāṇāyāmo dvitīyakah* | *niṣkrāmayati yo vāyuṃ sva[dehā]* --- || 4:56 || *sa recakas samākhyātaḥ prāṇāyāmas tṛtīyakah* | 4:57ab. The *Nayasūtra*'s version is as follows: *recanāt pūṇād rodhāt prāṇāyāmas trayah smṛtaḥ* | 4:111ab.

<sup>73</sup>*Nayasūtra* 4:111cd: *sāmānyād bahir etāni punaś cābhyantarāṇi ca* |

<sup>74</sup>*Nayasūtra* 4:115–116: *vāyavīn dhāraye 'ṅguṣṭhe āgneyīn nābhimadhyataḥ* | *māhendrīn kaṇṭhadeśe tu vāruṇīn ghaṇṭhikeṣu ca* | | 4:115 || *ākāśadhāraṇā mūrdhni sarvasiddhikarī smṛtā* | *ekadvitīyācatuṣpañca udghātaiś ca prasiddhyati* | | 4:116 ||.

<sup>75</sup>We find a different sequence of fixation taught in *Rauravasūtrasaṅgraha* 7:6–10, *Svāyaṃbhuvāsūtrasaṅgraha* 20:4–28, *Mataṅgayogapāda* 35c–65, *Kiraṇa* 58:18c–26b etc. in the order listed: fire, water, sovereign (*īśa*) and nectar (*amṛta*). For more details, see TAK3 s.v. *dhāraṇā*.

<sup>76</sup>See TAK2 s.v. *karaṇa* for further details.

<sup>77</sup>The *Nīśvāsamukha* runs as follows: *baddhvā yogāsanāṃ samyak rjukāyaḥ samāhitaḥ* | *jihvān tu tāluke nyasya dantair dantān na saṃsprśet* | ; and the *Nayasūtra*: *tālujihvo dantāsparśī samako nāsadṛṣṭigaḥ* |.

<sup>78</sup>This is the translation of Goodall 2004:15, fn. 617. For a detailed treatment on the *pañcāṣṭaka* see Goodall

*Niśvāsamukha* and the *Guhyasūtra* are similar. Particularly striking is that *Niśvāsamukha* 3:22ab is hypermetrical, as is the corresponding half-verse *Guhyasūtra* 7:116ab. Both texts present their lists of these places similarly with regard even to the order of the items, with only small variations. The *Niśvāsamukha* reads *vastrāpada* and *thaleśvara*, where the *Guhyasūtra* reads *bhastrāpada* and *sthaleśvara*. These are perhaps significant variations, as the *Guhyasūtra*'s readings are closer to the original. Although the readings of the *Guhyasūtra* are better than those of the *Niśvāsamukha*, we cannot be sure that the *Niśvāsamukha* borrowed this chunk of text from the *Guhyasūtra*. As it is a common topic in Śaiva sources, the difference in readings may have happened because they draw on the list of the *pañcāṣṭaka* from different sources. Alternatively, the reading of the *Niśvāsamukha* may have decayed during transmission. Here we present the comparative list of the two texts:

*Niśvāsamukha* 3:19–25

*amareśaṃ prabhāsaṃ ca*  
*naimiṣaṃ puṣkaraṃ tathā |*  
*āṣāḍhaṃ diṇḍimuṇḍiṇ ca*  
*bhārabhūtiṇ ca lākulim ||*

*hariścandraṃ paraṃ guhyaṃ*  
*guhyaṃ madhyamakeśvaram |*

*śrīparvataṃ samākhyātāṇ*  
*jalpeśvaram ataḥ param ||*

*amrātikeśvaraṇ caiva*  
*mahākālaṃ tathaiṣa ca |*

*kedāraṃ uttamaṃ guhyaṃ*  
*mahābhairavam eva ca ||*

*Guhyasūtra* 7:112–120

*amareśaṃ prahāsaṃ ca*  
*naimiṣaṃ puṣkaraṃ tathā |*  
*āṣāḍhin diṇḍimuṇḍiṇ ca*  
*bhārabhūtiṃ salākulim ||*  
***pratyātmike mṛtā ye tu***  
***te vrajanty eva tatpadam |***  
*pratyātmike | conj.; pratyātmikā NKW*

*hariścandraṃ paraṃ guhyaṃ*  
*guhyaṃ madhyamakeśvaram ||*  
*guhyaṃ guhyaṃ | K; guhyaṃ guhya°*  
*NW*

*śrīparvataṃ samākhyātāṇ*  
*jalpeśvaram ataḥ param | jalpeś-*  
*varam ataḥ | N; jāleśvaram ataḥ K; jal-*  
*paśvaram ataḥ W*

*ambrātikeśvaraṃ caiva*  
*mahākālaṃ tathaiṣa ca || am-*  
*brātikeśvaraṃ | em.; ambrā --- N;*  
*amdhraḥ | K; ambrātike | W,*  
*mahākālaṃ | em.; mahākāla NW;*  
*mahākālas K*

*kedāraṃ uttamaṃ guhyaṃ*  
*mahābhairavam eva ca | guhyaṃ |*  
*NW; śuddhaṃ K **guhyāṣṭake mṛtā***  
***ye tu***  
***te vrajantiha tatpadam ||***

(2004:315), Bisschop (2006:27–37) and TAK2 s.v. *guhyāṣṭaka*.

gayāñ caiva kurukṣetraṃ  
nakhalāñ kanakhalan tathā |

vimalañ cāṭṭahāsañ ca  
māhendraṃ bhīmam aṣṭamam ||

vastrāpadaṃ rudrakoṭim  
avimuktam mahābalaṃ |

gokaṇṇaṃ bhadraṇṇaṃ ca  
svaraṇākṣaṃ sthāṇur aṣṭamam ||

chagalaṇḍaṃ dviraṇḍaṃ ca  
mākoṭaṃ maṇḍaleśvaram |  
kālañjaraṃ samākhyātaṃ  
devadāruvanan tathā ||

śaṅkukaṇṇaṃ tathaiṇeva  
thaleśvaram ataḥ param |  
**snānadarśanapūjābhīr**  
**mucyate sarvākilbiṣaiḥ** ||

gayāñ caiva kurukṣetraṃ  
nakhalāṃ kanakhalan tathā | gayāñ  
caiva ] NW; gayā caiva K

vimalañ cāṭṭahāsañ ca  
māhendraṃ bhīmam aṣṭamam ||  
**atiguhye mṛtā ye tu**  
**atiguhyaṃ vrajanti te** |  
te ] NW; ca K

bhadrāpadaṃ rudrakoṭim  
avimuktaṃ mahābalaṃ ||  
rudrakoṭim avimuktaṃ ] em.; rudrakoṭim  
avimukta NW; rudrakoṭi avimuktaṃ K

gokaṇṇaṃ bhadraṇṇaṃ ca  
svaraṇākṣaṃ sthāṇur aṣṭamam |  
gokaṇṇaṃ bhadraṇṇaṃ ] em.; gokaṇṇa  
--- kaṇṇaṃ NW; gokaṇṇa rudraṇṇaṃ  
K, svaraṇākṣaṃ sthāṇur aṣṭamam ] em.;  
svaraṇā --- raṣṭamam NK; svaraṇa 𑀧 raṣṭa-  
mam W

**eteṣv api mṛtās samyag**  
**bhittvā lokam aśeṣataḥ** |  
**dīpyamānās tu gacchanti**  
**atra sthāneṣu ye mṛtāḥ** |

chagalaṇḍaṃ dviraṇḍaṃ ca  
mākoṭaṃ maṇḍaleśvaram ||  
kālañjaraṃ samākhyātan  
devadāruvanan tathā |

śaṅkukaṇṇaṃ tathaiṇeva  
sthaleśvaram ataḥ param ||

The list of the *pañcāṣṭaka* in the *Niśvāsamukha* appears in the *Laukika* section where the text purports lay religious duties. Thus, the *Niśvāsamukha* may have taken the list of the *pañcāṣṭaka* from the *Śivadharmā*-type *Laukika* Śaiva source. Looking at these places listed in the *pañcāṣṭaka* here, they are clearly the famous Śaiva pilgrimage sites. The list of the *Niśvāsamukha* does not have the names for each group of eight, as we find them in other sources. The list, however, gives the name “most secret” *paraṃ guhyaṃ* for Hariścandra

and Madhyamakeśvara is named as secret (*guhyaṃ*) (*Niśvāsamukha* 3:20f). Further, Kedāra is called “extreme[ly] secret” (*atiguhya*). This may indicate that the author was already familiar with the notion that these five groups bear the names of five levels. There is an additional line at the end of the section in the *Niśvāsamukha* (3:25cd) which reminds us of the pre-tantric notion of the *pañcāṣṭaka*. This line does not presuppose these places to be Śaiva worlds (*bhuvana*) named after the same names: *snānadarśanapūjabhir mucyate sarvak-ilbiṣaiḥ* “By bathing, seeing or performing worship [there] one becomes free from all sins.” When the text moves further (3:26), however, it seems to suppose some divine abode called *pañcāṣṭaka* above the egg of Brahma (*brahmāṇḍa*). The text mentions that those who die in the worldly *pañcāṣṭaka* (i.e. pilgrimage places), they will go to the divine *pañcāṣṭaka* and do not come back again. This passage conceives a connection of the pilgrimage sites called *pañcāṣṭaka* to the cosmic *pañcāṣṭaka*. This account of the *Niśvāsamukha*, however, is not presented as a fully developed cosmic hierarchical set of the *pañcāṣṭakas* as in the *Guhyasūtra*.

In the *Guhyasūtra*, however, the list of the *pañcāṣṭaka* is presented more explicitly in a cosmic context. Each ogdoad in the *Guhyasūtra* (7:123–124) has been given a name: *pratyātmika*, *guhya*, *atiguhya*, *pavitra*, and *sthānu*. We are told that if one dies in any site of the *pañcāṣṭaka* on earth one goes up, for example in *Guhyasūtra* 7:113ab, to the corresponding Śaiva *bhuvana* of the same name. The extra line in each group of eight mentions this concept. For instance, for the first group, it says: *pratyātmike mṛtā ye tu te vrajanty eva tatpadam* “Whoever die in [the group of the world called Pratyātmikā] certainly go to the corresponding world.” Thus, the five ogdoads, as presented in the context of the *Guhyasūtra*, reflects a tantric view of the cosmos. These places are no longer just pilgrimage sites on earth, but clearly represent a layer of the *bhuvanas* as well. The *Guhyasūtra* itself, however, is not responsible for incorporating these ogdoads into Śaiva cosmology. To our knowledge, the Lākulas (*Niśvāsamukha* 4:117) are the ones who incorporated these places into their cosmology first, and subsequently, the Mantramārgins continued to include these place into their cosmology.<sup>79</sup>

In this connection, it is to be noted that the *Sivadharmasāstra* (12:117ff.) also records these lists with some variation in name. This list of the *Śivadharmasāstra* also refers to the pilgrimage centres. The list does not provide a name for each group: “it may thus represent an archaic stage” (Bisschop 2006:27–28). To come back to the *Niśvāsamukha*, although

<sup>79</sup>The Śaiva cosmos begins with the world of Kālāgnirudra and goes up to *parama* (“highest”) Śiva, which is the ultimate reality in the system (*Mūlasūtra* 5:1–2). Dominic Goodall defines the Śaiva cosmology, in an email to me dated 5th November 2014 as follows:

The Śaiva cosmology is the “order of the universe” according to the Śaivas. In other words, it refers to the levels of hells, *pāṭālas* “netherworlds” and other *bhuvanas* “worlds” that are described, for instance in chapter 5 of the *Parākhya*, or chapter 8 of the *Kiraṇa*, or chapters 4–7 of the *Guhyasūtra*, or chapter 10 of the *Svacchanda*. Some people might prefer to refer to a Śaiva cosmography, a description of the cosmos. What makes it Śaiva is that no other group makes the claim that the universe has quite this shape. The Purāṇic cosmography, for example, is much more limited, since it restricts itself to the *brahmāṇḍa* “egg of Brahmā.”

the *pañcāṣṭakas* are clearly the pilgrimage centres in the context of the *Niśvāsamukha*, these places seem to appear with a cosmic context as well. In contrast, the *Guhyasūtra* explicitly sets forth the *pañcāṣṭakas* within a map of Śaiva cosmology.

Another shared concept between the *Niśvāsamukha* and the *Guhyasūtra* concerns the topic of Kedāra, a famous pilgrimage place sacred to Śaivas. *Niśvāsamukha* 3:28a–29a mentions it thus:

*kedārodakapānāc ca gatiṃ pañcāṣṭamīm dhruvam |*  
*vidyayā saṃyutā ye tu pibante ca jalam śubham ||*  
*śivasāyojyātām yānti |*

Also, by drinking the water of Kedāra one certainly obtains the fruit (*gatiṃ*) [of attaining] the five sets of ogdoads (i.e. all forty *bhuvanas*) (*pañcāṣṭamīm*). As for those who possess (*saṃyutāḥ*) the Vidyāmantra (*vidyayā*) and who drink [this] pure water [of Kedāra], they will obtain (*yānti*) union with Śiva.

The *tīrtha* Kedāra occurs twice in the *Niśvāsamukha*: once in the list of forty sacred places (3:21) and once here (3:28). As we see, in the second occurrence, the drinking of the water of Kedāra is emphasised: “those who possess (*saṃyutāḥ*) the Vidyāmantra (*vidyayā*) and who drink [this] pure water [of Kedāra] will obtain (*yānti*) union with Śiva.” The Vidyāmantra refers to the ten-syllable *vidyāmantra* (also referred to as Daśākṣaradeva) taught in chapter 16 of the *Guhyasūtra*.<sup>80</sup> This implies that the *Laukika* teaching of the *Niśvāsamukha* shows knowledge of the Mantramārgic teachings.

The related account of Kedāra in the *Guhyasūtra* is presented as follows:

*rṣaya ū*<sup>81</sup> |  
*devadāruvane ramye*<sup>82</sup> *rṣayaḥ saṃśītavratāḥ |*  
*nandīśam upasaṃgamya praṇipatya muhur muhuḥ || 16:1 ||*  
*ūcus te rṣayaḥ sarve stutvā nandīm*<sup>83</sup> *śīvātmajam |*  
*sarvadharmātiriktaś tu kedāras tu katham bhavet || 16:2 ||*  
*utpattiṃ ca vidhānaṃ ca pītasyaiva tu yat phalam |*  
*kedārasya samāśena tattvato vaktum arhasi*<sup>84</sup> || 16:3 ||  
*nandir uvāca |*  
*himavacchikharāsīnaṃ deva[[devaṃ jagadgurum]] |*  
*brahmādyādisurāḥ sarve saṃsārabhayapīḍitāḥ || 16:4 ||*  
*śaraṇaṃ śaṃkaraṃ jagmuḥ*<sup>85</sup> *stutvā ca vividhaiḥ stavaiḥ |*

<sup>80</sup>(For a summary of the legend, see also TAK 3, s.v. *daśākṣara*).

<sup>81</sup>*rṣaya ū* | *conj.*; *r---* NW; *□* K

<sup>82</sup>*devadāruvane ramye* | *conj.*; *---mmye* N; *□* msK; *ṛ □* W

<sup>83</sup>*nandīm* | K; *nandi°* NW

<sup>84</sup>*vaktum arhasi* | K; *vāktumarhasi* NW

<sup>85</sup>*śaṃkaraṃ jagmuḥ* | KW; *śaṃkaraṃ jagmuḥ* N

*padbhyāṃ nipatitāḥ sarve kṛtvā cāñjalisaṃputaṃ*<sup>86</sup> || 16:5 ||  
*vijñāpayāṃ haraṃ caivaṃ*<sup>87</sup> *sarve tatra divaukasāḥ*<sup>88</sup> |  
*yā te rudra śivā mūrtilḥ sā kathaṃ prāpyate vibho*<sup>89</sup> || 16:6 ||  
*aśivaś ca suraiḥ sarvair brahmapuṣṭipurogamaiḥ* |  
*tataś ca sa haro devaḥ*<sup>90</sup> ((sa)) --- [[kā]]rakāḥ<sup>91</sup> || 16:7 ||  
*vi[[dyayā (saṃ)]]putaṃ retaṃ surāṇāṃ agratas tyajan*<sup>92</sup> |  
*bho surendrā pibasvedaṃ*<sup>93</sup> *reta vidyāsamanvitam* || 16:8 ||  
*mama retasya pānena śivatvaṃ prāpyate dhruvam* |  
*etac chrutvā tu vacanaṃ*<sup>94</sup> *sarve tatra divaukasāḥ*<sup>95</sup> || 16:9 ||  
*prādudruvan*<sup>96</sup> *tataḥ sarve apītvā tu tadāmṛtam* |  
*devīm*<sup>97</sup> *māṃ ca bravīd devo pāsyatāṃ jalam uttamam* || 16:10 ||  
*na ca devī pibet tat tu* ---<sup>98</sup> |  
 --- ((vet)) |  
*aham eva hi pāsyāmi devī vacanam abravīt* || 16:11 ||  
*nandi nandi mahāprajña*<sup>99</sup> *rakṣasva -m- amṛtaṃ*<sup>100</sup> *jalam* |  
*na deyaṃ devatānāṃ tu naitat pānaṃ kadācana*<sup>101</sup> || 16:12 ||  
*mānuṣā[[nugra(haṃ kāryaṃ paśupakṣi)]]mṛgādiṣu*<sup>102</sup> |  
*vidyāhīnā gaṇeśāś*<sup>103</sup> *ca sāyojyaṃ vidyayā yutaḥ*<sup>104</sup> || 16:13 ||

“In the beautiful Devadāru forest, the sages [who were] under stringent vows approached Nandiśa and prostrated [before him] again and again. All the sages, having first praised Nandi, a son of Śiva, asked: <<How is it that Kedāra is excelling over all *dharma*s? What is the origin [of its water], what is the

<sup>86</sup> cāñjalisaṃputaṃ | WK<sup>pc</sup>; cāñjalisaṃputāṃ N; cāñjalisaṃputāṃ K<sup>ac</sup>

<sup>87</sup> vijñāpayāṃ haraṃ caivaṃ | W; vijñāpayāṃ haraṃ cevam N; vijñāpayāṃ haraṃ tvevaṃ K

<sup>88</sup> divaukasāḥ | W; divaukasā N; divaukasāḥ K

<sup>89</sup> mūrtilḥ sā kathaṃ prāpyate vibho | *em.*; mūrtili sā kathaṃ prāpyate vibhoḥ N; mūrtili sā kathaṃ prāpyate vibho KW

<sup>90</sup> devaḥ | K; deva NW

<sup>91</sup> kārakāḥ | K; --- N; dārakāḥ W

<sup>92</sup> °gratas tyajan | *conj.*; °gratas tyajat N; °gratas tyajet KW

<sup>93</sup> surendrā pibasvedaṃ reta | NW; surendrāḥ pibasvedaṃ retaṃ K

<sup>94</sup> vacanaṃ sarve | NW; sarve K

<sup>95</sup> divaukasāḥ | NW; divaukasāḥ K

<sup>96</sup> prādudruvan | *conj.*; prādudruvan NKW

<sup>97</sup> devīm | K; devī NW

<sup>98</sup> pibet tat tu | W; pibe --- N; pibet ta □ K

<sup>99</sup> mahāprajña | K; mahāprajña NW

<sup>100</sup> amṛtaṃ | NW; amṛtaṃ K

<sup>101</sup> kadācana | KW; kadācanaḥ N

<sup>102</sup> mānuṣānugrahaṃ kāryaṃ paśupakṣimṛgādiṣu | K; mānuṣā ḍga ḍṃ --- mṛgādiṣu N; mānuṣānugrahaṃ kṛtvā tathā pakṣimṛgādiṣu W

<sup>103</sup> gaṇeśāś ca | N; gaṇegaṇeśāś ca K; gaṇeśāś ca W

<sup>104</sup> yutaḥ | K<sup>pc</sup>; yatā NW; yutām K<sup>ac</sup>

[proper] procedure for drinking it and what is the fruit of drinking it? Pray tell [us all] about Kedāra in brief.» Nandi replied: «All the foremost gods, beginning with Brahmā, oppressed by fear of the world, sought refuge with Śaṅkara, god of gods, [and] teacher of the world, who was sitting at the top of the snow[-capped] mountain. The [gods] praised [Śaṅkara] with various panegyrics, [and then,] folding their hands, they all fell at his feet. Then, introducing [themselves] to Hara, the gods [asked]: «How can, O Rudra, [oneness with] your peaceful form be attained by all [us] anxious gods, headed by Brahmā and Viṣṇu?» Then the god Hara [answered] [...] discharging [his] semen covered up in the Vidyā-[mantra] in front of the gods: «O excellent gods! Drink this semen [thus] connected with the Vidyā-[mantra]. By drinking my semen, [you] certainly [will] attain Śiva-hood.» As soon as they heard this instruction, all the gods flew away from there without drinking that nectar. God said to Devī and me: «†Drink [this] excellent water; Devī may not drink it [...].» †Devī said the [following] words: «I myself drink this [semen].» [Then the god said:] «O Nandi of great intelligence! Protect [this] water, [this] nectar. [You] should never give this water to gods. [You] should favour human beings, domesticated animals, birds, and forest animals [with it]. [All who drink this water] without possessing the Vidyāmantra (*vidyayā*), [will become] lords of the Gaṇas. As for those who possess the Vidyāmantra (*vidyayā*), they will attain oneness [with me].»”

*Guhyasūtra* 16:15 furthermore tells us:

*vidyāyā lakṣaṇaṃ vakṣye yathāha paramaśvaraḥ |  
nyāsapānavidhānaṃ ca vidyāmāhātmyam eva ca ||*

I will relate [to you] a description of the Vidyā-[mantra] as the highest god related it [to me], the *nyāsa* procedure [relating to the mantra], the procedure for drinking the [Kedāra water] and also the greatness of the Vidyā-[mantra].

This evidence shows that the *Niśvāsamukha* and the *Guhyasūtra* are closely connected. This fact, however, does not exactly tell us if one text borrowed from the other or not. We could think on the basis of the above-mentioned example that, since the Vidyāmantra is a tantric mantra, what is taught in *Niśvāsamukha* 3:28–29b may have been influenced by chapter 16 of the *Guhyasūtra*.<sup>105</sup> Therefore, the *Niśvāsamukha* would have borrowed from the *Guhyasūtra* the idea of achieving union with Śiva by means of the Vidyāmantra and by drinking the Kedāra water.

<sup>105</sup>The other case where the reading of the *Niśvāsamukha* seems to be influenced by the tantric teachings could be the passage of *Niśvāsamukha* 1:27c–28b (*dikṣitā nandinā sarve nirvāṇe yojitāḥ pare | | vidyābhikāṅkṣiṇāś cānye vidyāyāṃ te tu yojitāḥ |*). These two lines appear just after Nandin names the five streams (1:26a–27a) and state two types of initiation, *vidyādikṣā* and *nirvāṇadikṣā*, which actually fall under the fifth stream, the Mantramārga.

This is not, however, the only possibility. The topic of Kedāra in the *Niśvāsamukha* or in the *Guhyasūtra* may not have been influenced by the one or the other. The reality might be that the author who redacted the *Niśvāsamukha* and the final chapters,<sup>106</sup> including chapter sixteen, of the *Guhyasūtra* may have been responsible for the reference to the water of Kedāra and the Vidyāmantra in both texts. Alternatively, the author who composed the passage on Kedāra in the *Niśvāsamukha* had the same understanding of the place as the author of chapter sixteen of the *Guhyasūtra* had. In any case, both texts represent the Mantramārgic understanding of the place, as both texts try to associate the Vidyāmantra in connection with drinking the water of Kedāra. This also indicates that the passage of the *Niśvāsamukha* was not taken from a Laukika source.

As we have already observed (p. 8) *Guhyasūtra* 1:4 refers to the *Mukha* (i.e. the *Niśvāsamukha*).<sup>107</sup> Another similar, but doubtful, cross-reference occurs thus at the end of the *Guhyasūtra* (18:12–15):

*daśākṣaraparivāraṃ*<sup>108</sup> *sarveṣāṃ kathitaṃ tava*<sup>109</sup> |  
*catuḥsūtrasamāyuktaṃ mūlavidyāsamuddhṛtaṃ* | |  
*uddhāraṃ sarvamantrāṇāṃ samukhādyāṃ prakīrtitaṃ* |  
*etat te kathitaṃ sarvaṃ mayākhyātaṃ suvīṣṭa[[ram]]*<sup>110</sup> | |  
 [[□]] *rānane* |  
*sāraṃ tat sarvamantrāṇāṃ kiṃ bhūyaḥ prcchase priye*<sup>111</sup> | |  
*catvāro*<sup>112</sup> *kathitā sūtrā samukhādyā varānane* |  
*pañcamāṃ tu paraṃ*<sup>113</sup> *sūtraṃ kārīkā nāma nāmataḥ* |  
*sūcitā sūtramātreṇa kārīkāḥ kimu prcchatha*<sup>114</sup> | |

The recognition of the *Niśvāsamukha* by the *Guhyasūtra* raises some issues. If the verse was not added later, then the *Niśvāsamukha* must be earlier than the *Guhyasūtra*. But, there is a possibility that both these passages were added secondarily in a late stage of the composition of the *Guhyasūtra*, appearing as they do at the very beginning and end of the *Guhyasūtra*. These pieces of texts cannot therefore be taken as certain evidence of the relative dates of these two texts.

<sup>106</sup>The *Guhyasūtra* may have been written in different layers and thus many people may have been involved to complete the text of what we have now in eighteen chapters. See Goodall et al. (2015: 20, 44 and 71–73) for more details.

<sup>107</sup>For the translation and full quote of the text see p. 8.

<sup>108</sup>*daśākṣaraparivāraṃ* | NW; *daśākṣaraṃ parivāraṃ* K

<sup>109</sup>*tava* | K; *tavaḥ* NW

<sup>110</sup>*mayākhyātaṃ suvīṣṭaṃ* | K; *mayākhyāta suvīṣṭa* --- N; *mayākhyāta suvīṣṭaṃ* W

<sup>111</sup>*priye* | N<sup>pc</sup>KW; *pricchase* N<sup>ac</sup>

<sup>112</sup>*catvāro* | NW; *catvāro(h)* K

<sup>113</sup>*pañcamāṃ tu paraṃ* | K; *pañcamantu para* NW

<sup>114</sup>*kārīkāḥ kimu prcchatha* | K; *kārīkā* --- *cchatha* N; *kārīkā punaḥ prcchatha* W



### The *Niśvāsamukha*'s Borrowings from the *Pāśupatasūtra*

The *Pāśupatasūtra* is one of the earliest and most extensively used sources by the composer of the *Niśvāsamukha*. The *Pāśupatasūtra* is the earliest existing scripture of the Pāśupatas, the oldest known sect of Śaivism, which is referred to by the *Niśvāsamukha* as the *Atimārga* "the outer path."<sup>115</sup> It is known as such because it presents itself as being beyond the path of the four stages of life (Sanderson 1988:664) propounded by the brahmanical system.<sup>116</sup> The practice of the Pāśupatas is extraordinary in the sense that it goes beyond the orthodox rules of the brahmanical tradition and accepted social conventions. The injunctions, for example, *bhasmani śayita* "One should sleep in ashes," ...' *unmattavad eko vicareta loka* "One should stroll around in the world like a mad person," *śmaśānavāsi* ... "One should live in a cremation ground,"<sup>117</sup> clearly indicate the antinomian aspect of the Pāśupatas. The *Niśvāsamukha*'s adoption of the *Pāśupatasūtra* tells us about the history of this sect and its role for the formation of early Śaivism. What it specially reveals is that the Pāśupatas were still prominent in society by the time of the composition of the *Niśvāsamukha*, and that some of the roots of Mantramārga Śaivism lie in the teaching of the *Atimārga*.<sup>118</sup>

The fourth section of the *Niśvāsamukha*, dealing with the *Atimārga*, starts from 4:70c and goes up to 4:130d. This section presents two types of Pāśupata system (4:123), *Atyāśrama* (4:70c–88d) and *Lokātita* (4:89–130). The first, *Atyāśrama*, is presented by a versified paraphrase of the *Pāśupatasūtra*. We may begin by exploring the manner in which our text takes the *Pāśupatasūtra* into account. In the following, I present mutually corresponding passages of these two texts and discuss some of the changes to the text. This may tell us something about the way the composer compiled this text. More detailed discussion and references to the texts can be found in our notes to the translation.<sup>119</sup>

Obviously, we cannot expect the same wording in the *Niśvāsamukha*, since the author of the text had to versify the *Pāśupatasūtras* and resituate them in the context of the *Niśvāsamukha*. Alternatively, it is conceivable that the author had access to a version of the *Pāśupatasūtras* that was already in verse-form and the task was simply to align them with the trajectory of the *Niśvāsamukha*. In both cases we expect some changes. Here we deal with some of the most important findings noticed in the Pāśupata section of the *Niśvāsamukha*. For other cases, the reader is referred to the translation and accompanying notes of the relevant section (*Niśvāsamukha* 4:70c–88d).

In some cases, the borrowed text is augmented and made clear. For example, *Pāśupatasūtra* 1:18 *akaluṣamateḥ* "of one [he who is] of unclouded mind" is rendered as *Niśvāsamukha*

<sup>115</sup>Sanderson 1988:664.

<sup>116</sup>The Pāśupata observance, as Sanderson mentions (1988:664), is meant for a brahmin who has already gone through the *upanayana* rite, in which the boy is invested with the sacred thread, qualifying him to learn the Veda.

<sup>117</sup>*Pāśupatasūtra* 1:3, 4:4 and 5:20.

<sup>118</sup>The reader is referred to Sanderson 2006:199ff.

<sup>119</sup>Here I have followed the *sūtra* number of the *Pāśupatasūtra* based on Kaunḍinya's *bhāṣya* (i.e. in accordance with Śāstri's edition), not of the *sūtrapāṭha* of Bisschop (2007).

4:75ab (*akāluṣyeṇa bhāvena jantum paśyeta sarvataḥ*) “One should see all living beings with an unclouded disposition.” We suppose that this is not just conditioned by the metre, it is rather connected with the meaning concerned. The text of the *sūtra* is typically concise, and also when the text was versified, it seemed natural to make the meaning explicit.

There are cases where the text of the the *Niśvāsamukha* deviates significantly from the *Pāśupatasūtra*, although the intended meaning might be identical. Here are some examples:

*Pāśupatasūtra*

- *carataḥ* 1:19
- *kāma-rūpitvam* 1:24
- *avamataḥ* |  
*sarvabhūteṣu* 3:3–4
- *paribhūyamāno hi vidvān*  
*kytsnatapā bhavati* 3:19
- *sarvaviśiṣṭo 'yaṃ panthāḥ* |  
*satpathaḥ* 4:16–17

*Niśvāsamukha*

- evaṃ yo varttate nityaṃ* 4:86a
- yathepsitam* 4:87b
- viparītāni karmmāṇi*  
*kurvaṃl lokajugupsitaḥ* | 4:78cd
- paribhūtaḥ kṛcchratayā*  
*sarvalokeṣu ninditaḥ* |  
*mahātapās ca bhavate* 4:81c–82a
- sanmārggavratācārīṇe* 4:84d

We encounter, however, also some crucial deviations in *Pāśupata* injunctions in the borrowed passages. In the following example we find a reference to the *liṅga*, the icon of Śiva, which is otherwise absent in the *Pāśupatasūtra* and Kauṇḍinya's commentary on it. This change in the paraphrased text may have appeared as the result of relatively loose paraphrasing. Perhaps, the redactor saw no difference between *āyatana* (“abode”) and *liṅgasyāyatana* (“the abode of the *liṅga*”). Alternatively, *āyatana* is made explicit by rephrasing it as *liṅgasyāyatana*.<sup>120</sup> Therefore he may not have been aware of having introduced potentially significant modification:

*Pāśupatasūtra* 1:7

*āyatanavāsi*

*Niśvāsamukha* 4:72a

*liṅgasyāyatane vāsaḥ*

Another change in the *Niśvāsamukha* concerns mantra recitation. Our text speaks of reciting the *bahurūpī gāyatrī* mantra without mentioning any option. The *Pāśupatasūtra* and Kauṇḍinya's commentary on it, however, attest an option, prescribing either recitation of the *raudrī gāyatrī* or the *bahurūpī gāyatrī*. We are not completely sure whether or not the *Niśvāsamukha* is responsible for abolishing the option of reciting the *raudrī gāyatrī*, as there is a possibility that the *Niśvāsamukha* simply borrowed the passages from a third source:

<sup>120</sup>Kauṇḍinya basically states that since people worship there, it is called an *āyatana* (*yajanāc cāyatanam*). In his specific understanding of what an *āyatana* is, in this commentary on *Pāśupatasūtra* 1:7, he appears to avoid mentioning the *liṅga*.

Pāśupatasūtra 1:17

Niśvāsamukha 4:74d

raudrīm gāyatrīm bahurūpīm vā japet

bahurūpan tato japet

In the following passage, the *Niśvāsamukha* strikingly replaces *hasita*, “laughter,” by *stava*, “eulogy,” which we find nowhere mentioned in the *Pāśupatasūtra*. If the replacement was on purpose, it suggests that by the time of the *Niśvāsamukha*, the offering (*upahāra*) of laughter to Śiva was no more in use and a new, less radical, custom of eulogy may have been introduced. Furthermore, the order of the elements in the verse of the *Niśvāsamukha* is different from the order that is found in the *Pāśupatasūtra*, and the word *upahāra* is missing in the *Niśvāsamukha*. This may simply have happened due to the constraints of the metre:

Pāśupatasūtra 1:8

Niśvāsamukha 4:72b–72d

hasitagītanṛtya-  
huḍḍuṅkāranamaskāra-  
japyopahāreṇopatiṣṭhet

huḍḍuṅkārastavaḥ tathā |  
gītanṛtyanamaskārair  
brahmabhir japasaṃyutaḥ |

Nowhere in the *Pāśupatasūtra* do we come across a reference to the concept of *pūjā*, “worship”, but the version of the *Niśvāsamukha* mentions it at several places. This is a substantial change from the perspective of the *Pāśupatas*, who are considered to be practising a form of religion that goes beyond the established traditions. We could assume, once again, that the author of the *Niśvāsamukha* saw no difference between *yajana* and *pūjā* as they can be used synonymously. Thus, we cannot exclude the possibility that this change too was the result of relatively loose paraphrasing:

Pāśupatasūtra 2:9–11

Niśvāsamukha 4:76ab

tasmād ubhayathā yaṣṭavyaḥ;  
devavat pitṛvac ca;  
ubhayaṃ tu rudre devāḥ pitaraś ca

pitṛpūjāṃ devapūjāṃ  
ubhe devāya kalpayet |

This is not, however, the only instance that we come across *pūjā* in the *Pāśupata* section of the *Niśvāsamukha*. The passage 4:71b–71d (... *guhyasthānam parivrajat | darśanārthan tu īśasya pūjān tatraiva kalpayet |*), which has no parallel in the *Pāśupatasūtra*, again refers to *pūjā*. *Niśvāsamukha* 4:81d (*pūjālābhavivarjitah*) once more includes *pūjā* among the injunctions of the *Pāśupatas*. The offering of the withered flowers which is described by the *Niśvāsamukha* and also forms a part of *pūjā* ritual implies a *Pāśupata* concept even though it is not attested in the *Pāśupatasūtra* itself, as will be shown in p. 47. There is a possibility that the version of the *Pāśupatasūtra* available to the *Niśvāsamukha* was different from that which is available to us through Kauṇḍinya’s commentary.

Further, we find non-standard grammar in the verses of the *Niśvāsamukha*, while the corresponding passage of the *Pāśupatasūtra* is in standard grammar. In the first instance,

when two *Pāśupatasūtras* featuring the neuter *s*-stem *vāsas* are paraphrased in the *Niśvāsamukha*, the word is treated as a masculine *a*-stem, *vāsa*. In the second, the standard optative singular *avekṣet* of the *Pāśupatasūtra* has been replaced with its common equivalent, but irregularly in *Ātmanepada*, *paśyeta*:

*Pāśupatasūtra*

- *ekavāsāḥ | avāsā vā* 1:10–11
- *mūtrapurīṣaṃ nāvekṣet* 1:12

*Niśvāsamukha*

- *ekavāso hy avāso vā* 4:73a
- *mūtrāmedhyan na paśyeta* 4:74a

There are some extra elements in the *Niśvāsamukha*, parallels for which we do not find in the extant *Pāśupata* sources (cf. also Sanderson 2006:158). These pieces of information we will examine further below.

We may now expand on this a little because further *Pāśupata* materials have since been discovered. There are four independent *Pāśupata* ritual texts ascribed to a certain Gārgya, the *Samskāraavidhi* (D. Acharya 2007), *Antyeṣṭividhi* (D. Acharya 2010), *Pātravidhi* (2011), and the *Prāyaścittavidhi*, all of which have come to light thanks to Prof. Diwakar Acharya, who has published three of them (with the fourth soon to appear). It is significant that none of the extra elements in question are to be found in these *Pāśupata* manuals either, nor in the *Pampāmāhātya* (Filliozat 2001:91–152), which also contains some of the *Pāśupatasūtras* in a paraphrased form.

Now, the question is: what purpose do these extra passages serve in the *Niśvāsamukha*? First of all, we should bear in mind that we are dealing with text that has been turned from prose into verse. In the process of drafting verses, some verse-fillers, no doubt, were also added. For example, a phrase like *jīṭendriya*, “with the senses subjugated” in *Niśvāsamukha* 4:70d (*bhasmaśāyī jīṭendriyaḥ*) and 4:83a (*jīṭendriyaś ca dāntaś ca*). Either one of these is certainly a verse-filler. The other might be taken as the parallel for *Pāśupatasūtra* 5:11.<sup>121</sup>

There are, however, some other pieces of text which actually look like *Pāśupata* injunctions. For example, *Niśvāsamukha* 4:73cd *suśīrṇapatitaiḥ puṣpair ddevadevaṃ samarccayet* “He should worship the god of gods with withered, fallen flowers.” This passage is reminiscent of the important *Pāśupata* concept of *ahiṃsā*, “harmlessness.” Since the *Pāśupatas* are conscious of the subtle implications of *hiṃsā*, “harmfulness,” they may have seen *hiṃsā* in the picking of flowers.<sup>122</sup> From Kauṇḍinya’s commentary on the *Pāśupatasūtra* we know that *Pāśupatas* try to observe *ahiṃsā* in their main ritual practices. Kauṇḍinya explains that the concept of *ahiṃsā* is embedded in the practice of a *Pāśupata* ascetic. In order to avoid harm to creatures he is supposed to eat the food prepared by others (*parakṛta*), live in a temple prepared by others, wear *nirmālya*, “the used garlands of god” and bathe in

<sup>121</sup> A similar example may be the phrase *prāṇāyāma* “breath control” that occurs in 4:85a. As this expression has already been used in 4:74ab and is paralleled by *Pāśupatasūtra* 1:16, the second occurrence in 4:85a must be verse-filler.

<sup>122</sup> The reader is here referred to Sanderson 2014:10, fn. 38.

*bhasma*, “ashes”, instead of water so as to avoid direct harm to living creatures by one-self (Hara 2002:71–73). This effectively means he deliberately avoids, at least according to Kauṇḍinya, every possible harm to any creature. We therefore assume that *suśīrṇapatitaiḥ puṣpāir ddevadevaṃ samarccayet* is not just a verse-filler, but an actual Pāśupata injunction, even though it is not found in the *Pāśupatasūtra*.

The passage of *Niśvāsamukha* 4:83d *naikānnādaḥ kadācana*, “He [should] never eat food [that is obtained] from a single [house]” also does not seem to be meant for padding out the metre, and indeed the *Prāyaścittavidhi*, one of the newly found Pāśupata texts, prescribes (verse 81) atonement for eating food collected from a single household in certain conditions.

Likewise, the following complete verse of *Niśvāsamukha* 4:77 is without parallel:

*śītātāpāparikleśair jalam aśrū --- sibhiḥ |*  
*jāpadhyānaparo nityaṃ sarvadvandvasahiṣṇutā || 4:77 ||*

“Through the hardships of cold and heat; water [...] He should always be dedicated to mantra recitation and meditation, and should [have] the capacity for patient endurance of all kinds of pairs [of opposites]”

Although we do not find any parallel for this verse in the *Pāśupatasūtra*, the elements of the verse of the *Niśvāsamukha* do not seem unmindfully chosen ones. We know that enduring the hardships of cold and heat (cf. for example *Yājñavalkyasmṛti* 3:52) is a practice of asceticism in Indian tradition. Furthermore, we find the compound *°dvandvasahiṣṇutā/dvandvasahiṣṇutva* which reflects specific ascetic practice also attested in Pāśupata sources, such as *Pāñcārthabhāṣya*, p. 121. Thus, the verse we discussed above does not look as though it has been completely made up by the author of the *Niśvāsamukha*, but rather reflects authentic Pāśupata tradition.<sup>123</sup>

Most striking is that the Pāśupata section of the *Niśvāsamukha* does not have the five Brahmamantras— Sadyojāta, Vāmadeva, Aghora, Tatpuruṣa and Īśāna in due order. These mantras are prominent features in the *Pāśupatasūtra* for one is placed at the end

<sup>123</sup>Here is a list of remaining extra elements that are found in the Pāśupata-section of the *Niśvāsamukha*. We think that these too may be valid injunctions incorporated in Pāśupata tradition at a later stage, most probably after the time of composition of the *Pāśupatasūtra*.

- 4:78a *japaṣiṣṭhaikāntaratih* “Being intent upon mantra recitation and enjoying solitude.”
- 4:80a *vikrośen* “He should tremble.”
- 4:80cd *viruddhaceṣṭitaṃ vākyaṃ viruddhañ cāñjanaṃ sadā* “[He should engage in] inappropriate behaviour, inappropriate speech, [and] always [apply] inappropriate ointments.”
- 4:81ab *viruddhamāṇḍanaṃ gātre sarvadā samupakramet* “He should always apply inappropriate ornaments on his body.”
- 4:83ab ... *dāntaś ca kṣamī kāmavivarjitah* “[He should] be restrained, be forgiving, [and] free from desire.”
- 4:86b *dambhalobhavivarjitah* “Devoid of pride and greed.”

of each of the five chapters. It is worth inspecting the cause of their absence in the *Niśvāsamukha*. Were these mantras not a part of the *Pāśupatasūtra* which the author of the *Niśvāsamukha* drew upon? If this is the case, was Kauṇḍinya responsible for the division in five chapters of the *Pāśupatasūtra*, adding one of these mantras to each chapter? Or were these mantras intrinsic to the *Pāśupatasūtra* and the person who paraphrased it deliberately left them out because they were not about practice? We are only able to raise these issues but not to provide an answer. In addition, the rewards of following the injunctions, which are mentioned in the *Pāśupatasūtra* just before the Brahmanamantras, are missing in the *Niśvāsamukha*. We cannot at this stage understand why this is the case.

### The *Niśvāsamukha*'s Borrowings from the *Manusmṛti*

As we have mentioned in passing above, another work upon which the author of the *Niśvāsamukha* plainly drew was the *Manusmṛti*.<sup>124</sup> This work has substantially influenced the composition of the *Niśvāsamukha*. This is evident from the inclusion of making donations (2:37ff.), practising observances (3:37ff.), worshipping ancestors (2:39–41), using the five products of the cow and *kuśa*-grass (for example 3:37) and the like. We find such materials in the *laukika* section of the *Niśvāsamukha*, showing adaptation of the textual and cultural influence of the brahmanical tradition. The *Manusmṛti*, which is one of the most influential works of the brahmanical tradition, is one of the texts that the *Niśvāsamukha* used to create some parts of the *Laukika* and *Vaidika* sections. We start by considering the possibility that the *Niśvāsamukha* borrowed directly from the *Manusmṛti*. A careful reader will observe stylistic differences between the original text of the *Manusmṛti* and the form in which it has been incorporated into the *Niśvāsamukha*. Such assimilated text certainly loses its original texture upon being transplanted into a novel linguistic or structural context. In the section of the *Niśvāsamukha* that deals with observances we encounter the following verse defining the *Atikṛcchra* (3:40) observance:

*ekaikaṃ bhakṣayed grāsaṃ trīṇy ahāni jitendriyaḥ |*  
*trirātropavasec caiva atikṛcchraṃ viśodhane ||*

“Having subdued one’s sense faculties, one should, for three days, eat [only] a mouthful and one should fast for three nights. [This kind of religious observance is called] *atikṛccha* O pure lady!”

If we compare this to the definition in the *Manusmṛti* (11:214) we find changes influenced by both context and style:

*ekaikaṃ grāsaṃ aśnīyāt tryahāni trīṇi pūrvavat |*  
*tryahaṃ copavased antyaṃ atikṛcchraṃ caran dvijaḥ ||*

<sup>124</sup>For the *Manusmṛti* and its place in the brahmanical tradition, see Olivelle’s introduction to the *Manusmṛti* (2005).

“A twice-born practicing the *Atikṛcchra* (very arduous) penance should eat as before (11:212) one mouthful a day during the three-day periods and fast during the final three days.” (Olivelle 2005:226)

Apart from minimal changes of vocabulary, such as replacing *aśnīyāt* by *bhakṣayed*, and word-order, the *Niśvāsamukha* replaces *pūrvavat* by *jīhendriyaḥ* and *caran dvijaḥ* by *viśodhane*. In the *Manusmṛti* these two words — *pūrvavat* and *caran dvijaḥ*— fit the particular context. The word *pūrvavat* refers to nine-day periods taught in verse 11:212 of the *Manusmṛti*, where a twice-born man, practising the *Prājāpatya* penance, is supposed to eat in the morning for three days; in the evening for three days; the following three days he should eat unsolicited food. As the preceding section of the *Niśvāsamukha* deals with the *Sāntapana* penance, and the procedure of practising this observance is different to that of the *Prājāpatya*, the text replaces this word, according to the demands of the context, by *jīhendriyaḥ*, which seems to be a verse-filler. Similarly *caran dvijaḥ* makes perfect sense in the *Manusmṛti*, as this penance is listed among others which are meant to be practised by twice-born people. Such a restriction is not fitting to the context of the *Niśvāsamukha*.

Moreover, the *Niśvāsamukha*’s grammar is less standard and as such fits in the style of the language of the wider text. As will be shown in the section on language later on, the overall language of the *Niśvāsamukha* is a mixture of Pāṇinian and non-Pāṇinian forms, which is a genuine feature of the text (see p. 81ff.). The *Niśvāsamukha* replaces *tryaḥaṇ copavased* with a less standard compound *trirātropavaset*, where the ending of the expected accusative *trirātram* has been irregularly elided with the following word.

In the same section of the *Niśvāsamukha*, we find a verse which deals with the *Sāntapana* observance. If we compare this version of the *Niśvāsamukha* with that of the *Manusmṛti*, apart from other minimal changes, the *Niśvāsamukha* adds the fruit of observing the *Sāntapana* presumably because it mentions the reward of the undertaken tasks described in the rest of the section. The version of the *Manusmṛti* (11:213) reads as follows:

gomūtram gomayaṁ kṣīram dadhi sarpiḥ kuśodakam |  
ekarātropavāśaś ca kṛcchraṁ sāntapanam smṛtam ||

“Subsisting on cow’s urine, cow dung, milk, curd, ghee, and water boiled with Kuśa grass, and fasting during one day— tradition calls this *Sāntapana* penance.” (Olivelle 2005:226)

The *Niśvāsamukha*’s text (3:37a–38b), however, appears as follows:

māse māse tu yaḥ kuryād ekarātram upoṣitaḥ |  
pañcagavyaṁ śucir bhūtvā pītvā sāntapanam bhavet ||  
samvatsareṇa śuddhātmā brahmaloke mahīyate |

“If someone observes (*kuryāt*) fasting for one night every month (*māse māse*) after consuming only the five products of the cow having first purified himself— [this] would be *Sāntapana*. [By observing this vow of *Sāntapana*] for a year, one [becomes] pure and will be honoured in the world of Brahṁā.”

Similarly, the *Manusmṛti* (11:217), defining the *cāndrāyaṇa* observance, says:

*ekaikaṃ hrāsayet piṇḍaṃ kṛṣṇe śukle ca vardhayet |  
upaspṛśaṃs triśavaṇaṃ etat cāndrāyaṇaṃ smṛtam ||*

“He should decrease his food by one rice-ball a day during the dark fortnight and increase it likewise during the bright fortnight, bathing three times a day—tradition calls this *cāndrāyaṇa* (the lunar penance).” (Olivelle 2005:226–227)

This appears in *Niśvāsamukha* 3:43–44 thus:

*ekaikaṃ varddhayed grāsaṃ śukle kṛṣṇe ca hrāsayet |  
triṣkālasnāyī māsaṃ tu candravṛddhyā vrataṃ caret ||  
cāndrāyaṇaṃ idaṃ śreṣṭhaṃ sarvapāpāpanodanam |  
pāpī mucyeta pāpena apāpaḥ svargago bhavet ||*

“One should increase [his food] by a mouthful [a day in the days of] the bright fortnight and should decrease it [in the days] of the dark fortnight [by a mouthful a day] and should bathe three times a day; [one should] observe this observance for a month in accordance with the change of the moon (*candravṛddhyā*). This is the excellent lunar-observance (*cāndrāyaṇa*), which removes all sins. A sinner will be freed from sin [by performing it], and one who has not committed sin will go to heaven.”

For the *Niśvāsamukha* there are clearly two types of people who practise this observance, the *pāpī*, “sinful one” and the *apāpaḥ*, “sinless one,” which the text mentions throughout its section on *upavāsa*, “fasting.” Accordingly it entails two types of rewards, one for the sinful person and the other for the sinless person. Such a distinction of agent of observance and the reward is absent in the *Manusmṛti*. The two adjectives, *śreṣṭhaṃ* and *sarpapāpāpanodanam*, are not present in the original text of the *Manusmṛti*. Once again, the fruit of observing this *cāndrāyaṇaṃ* is an additional element in the *Niśvāsamukha*.

Other examples of this kind are:

*Manusmṛti*

*caturaḥ prātar aśnīyāt  
piṇḍān vipraḥ samāhitaḥ |  
caturo 'stamite sūrye  
śīśucāndrāyaṇaṃ smṛtam || 11:220*

*Niśvāsamukha*

*caturo bhakṣayet piṇḍān  
pūrvāhne tu vicakṣaṇaḥ ||  
sūryasyāstamane vāpi  
caturo bhakṣayet punaḥ |  
śīśucāndrāyaṇaṃ hy etad  
upapātakanāśanam ||  
māsenaikena śuddhātmā  
apāpī svargatiṃ vrajet | 3:46c–  
3:48b*



*aṣṭāv aṣṭau samaśnīyāt  
piṇḍān madhyamdine sthite |  
niyatātmaṁ haviṣyasya  
yaticāndrāyaṇaṁ caran || 11:219*

*aṣṭāv aṣṭau samaśnīyāt  
piṇḍān madhyandine sthite |  
haviṣyeṇa samāyuktān  
mucyate sarvapātakaiḥ ||  
apāpī svarggam āyāti  
yaticāndrāyaṇena tu | 3:45a–3:46b*

In the first example the *Niśvāsamukha* states that the *śisucāndrāyaṇa* observance removes secondary sins, making people pure within a month and that they, being pure, will go to heaven. This has no equivalent in the *Manusmṛti*. In the second example, too, the *Niśvāsamukha* asserts that by practising the *yaticāndrāyaṇa* observance one becomes free from all sins and, being sinless, goes to heaven. This again in contrast with the *Manusmṛti*.

Let us examine another parallel, this time from the treatment of the rules for householders in the *Niśvāsamukha*'s Vaidika section. The word-order has been changed and *upaskaraḥ* is replaced by the synonymous word *pramārjanī*. Besides, *badhyate yās tu vāhayan* is replaced by *kathitās tava śobhane* to fit the context of the *Niśvāsamukha*.

*Manusmṛti*

*pañca sūnā grhasthasya  
cullī peṣaṇy upaskaraḥ |  
kaṇḍanī codakumbhaś ca  
badhyate yās tu vāhayan || 3:68*

*Niśvāsamukha*

*peṣaṇī kaṇḍanī cullī  
udakumbhaḥ pramārjanī |  
pañca sūnā bhavanty ete  
kathitās tava śobhane || 4:19*

There are some examples where the *Niśvāsamukha* makes its language *aiśa* (see p. 81ff.) by slightly changing the formulation of the *Manusmṛti*. The *Niśvāsamukha* recurrently uses grammatically incorrect forms from the standpoint of standard Pāṇinian grammar. Śaiva commentarial tradition, however, regards these grammatically erroneous instances as authoritative on the ground that they stem from Śiva himself. This can be seen in the following example, where *Manusmṛti* 3:197 gives the list of the ancestors of the four *varṇas* in this form:

*somapā nāma viprāṇāṁ kṣatriyāṇāṁ havirbhujāḥ |  
vaiśyāṇāṁ ājyapā nāma śūdrāṇāṁ tu sukālinaḥ ||*

“The ancestors of Brahmins are called Somapas; of Kṣatriyas, Havirbhujas; of Vaiśyas, Ājyapas; and of Śūdras, Sukālins.” (Olivelle 2005:118)

The same verse appears in the version of the *Niśvāsamukha* (3:155) as follows:

*pitaras somapā vipre kṣatriye tu havirbhujāḥ |  
ājyapā vaiśyayonau tu śūdrāṇān tu sukālinaḥ ||*

“In the case of a Brahmin, the ancestors will be [called] Somapās; in the case of a Kṣatriya, Havirbhujas; in the case of a Vaiśya, Ājyapas; and for Śūdras, [they are called] Sukālins.”

The author of the *Niśvāsamukha* does not alter any nuance in the text of the *Manusmṛti* here, but changes the style. The genitives, namely, *viprāṇām*, *kṣatriyāṇām* and *vaiśyāṇām* of the *Manusmṛti* have been replaced by locatives *vipre*, *kṣatriye* and *vaiśyayonau* in the *Niśvāsamukha*. But the trace of original reading of the *Manusmṛti*, *śūdrāṇām*, genitive, has been retained. This creates a mixture of locative and genitive in the borrowed text of the *Niśvāsamukha*. This again testify to the fact that the *Niśvāsamukha* loosely paraphrased the borrowed passages. This use of two cases in parallel construction could be considered as one of the features of *aīśa* language. There is, however, no change in the content of the borrowed text. This is further made clear by the attestation of *śūdrāṇām* in 155d of the *Niśvāsamukha*.

Here follow a few more similar examples:

#### *Manusmṛti*

*ṣaṭtriṃśadābdikaṃ caryaṃ*  
*gurau traivedikaṃ vratam |*  
*tadardhikaṃ pādikaṃ vā*  
*grahaṇāntikam eva vā || 3:1*

*adhyāpanaṃ brahmayajñāḥ*  
*pitryajñas tu tarpaṇam |*  
*homo daivo balir bhauto*  
*nryajño 'tithipūjanam ||*  
*pañcaitān yo mahāyajñān*  
*na hāpayati śaktitaḥ |*  
*sa grhe 'pi vasan nityaṃ*  
*sūnādoṣair na lipyate || 3:70–71*

#### *Niśvāsamukha*

*ṣaṭtriṃśadābdikā caryā*  
*guros traivedikaṃ vratam |*  
*tadardhikaṃ pādikaṃ vā*  
*grahaṇāntikam eva vā || 4:5c–6b*

*adhyāpanaṃ brahmayajñāṃ*  
*pitryajñan tu tarppaṇam |*  
*homo daivo balir bhauto*  
*nryajño 'tithipūjanam ||*  
*pañcaitāms tu mahāyajñāṃ*  
*na hāpayati śaktitaḥ |*  
*svagrhe 'pi vasan nityaṃ*  
*sūnādoṣair na lipyate || 4:17–18*

In the first example, we observe that the *Niśvāsamukha* places *ṣaṭtriṃśadābdikā caryā* in apposition to *traivedikaṃ vratam*, whereas the *Manusmṛti* displays it in the neuter case: *ṣaṭtriṃśadābdikam* qualifying *caryam*. In the second example, the *Niśvāsamukha* reads irregular *°yajñāṃ*, whereas the *Manusmṛti* records the regular masculine, *°yajñāḥ*.

The *Niśvāsamukha*'s borrowing from the *Manusmṛti* is significant for the history of early Śaivism, as it demonstrates the fact that some of the major features of the orthodox brahmanical teaching were adopted by the Śaivas to create their corpus of teachings. Moreover, direct borrowing of *Niśvāsamukha* from the *Manusmṛti* points to the fact that brahmanical heritage was a major part for the development of early Śaivism. Once again this evidence supports the theory of Sanderson (2009) that the religion of Śaivas consist of both: the teaching of Śaivism and Brahmanism.

### The *Niśvāsamukha* and the *Śivadharmasāstra*

The *Śivadharmasāstra* is the first among a group of non-tantric Śaiva works that is commonly called the *Śivadharmā* corpus.<sup>125</sup> A number of Nepalese palm-leaf manuscripts transmit eight works of this corpus in a single codex. The first text in these manuscripts is usually the *Śivadharmasāstra*, which is the oldest work of the group. The second is the *Śivadharmottara*,<sup>126</sup> the third the *Śivadharmasaṅgraha*, the fourth the *Śivopaniṣad*, the fifth the *Umāmaheśvarasaṁvāda*, the sixth the *Uttarottaramahāsaṁvāda* (or *Umottara*), the seventh the *Vṛṣasārasaṅgraha*, and the eighth the *Dharmaṣūtrikā*. In one early Nepalese palm-leaf manuscript, we find fragments of a ninth work called the *Lalitavistara*, which may also form part of the *Śivadharmā* corpus (not to be confused with the Buddhist work of that name). Until recently, the *Śivopaniṣad* was the only published work from this corpus, but there is now a printed version (based on a single manuscript and full of mistakes) published by Yogi Narahari Nath, of all the texts mentioned with the exception of the *Lalitavistara*.<sup>127</sup>

In two articles published in the 1980s in the journal *Purana*, R.C. Hazra proposed approximate dates for the first two works of the corpus, namely the *Śivadharmasāstra* and the *Śivadharmottara*. He suggests that the *Śivadharmasāstra* was composed between 200 and 500 AD, while the *Śivadharmottara* came much later, between 700 and 800 AD, on the grounds that it makes use of expressions such as *āgama* and *śivatantra*, which Hazra assumes to refer to tantric Śaiva scriptures.<sup>128</sup>

This assumption, however, is far from certain. It is perhaps worth mentioning that the

<sup>125</sup>For a summary of its chapters, see Hazra 1952–53, and A. Acharya 2009\*:28ff.

<sup>126</sup>According to Goodall 1998:375, the first two texts have been transmitted from North to South India.

<sup>127</sup>See Goodall 1998: 375–376, for a brief outline of this corpus; for a summary of each chapter of the texts of the *Śivadharmā* corpus including the *Lalitavistara*, see A. Acharya 2009\*:22–82.

<sup>128</sup>Concerning the *Śivadharmottara*, Magnone (2005:590–591) holds that the text is from South India and proposes the date of the 13th-century or even later, in view of the verse *nandināgarakair varṇair lekhayec chivapustakam* “one should have Śaiva books written in Nandinagari letters.” This is a clear reference, according to him, to the so-called Nandinagari script, which originated in the 13th-century. Here he is in error, since we have the 9th-century Nepalese manuscript of the text written in the “Licchavi” script. Thus, *nandināgarakair varṇair* cannot refer to the so called Nandinagari script he alludes to, nor does the text necessarily belong to South India, and certainly not to the 13th-century (Bisschop 2007:27–28, fn. 69). Prof. Goodall, in his post to Indology list, dated 23 January, 2010, illuminates this further:

There is a passage in the *Śivadharmottara* that appears to recommend the copying of Śaiva literature using Nandināgarī letters. This has hitherto been assumed (in an article by R.C. Hazra and, more recently, by Paolo Magnone) to be a reference to the South Indian script now known as Nandināgarī, which reached its developed form in the Vijayanagara period.

*mātrānusvārasaṁyogahrasvādīrghādīlakṣitaḥ | nandināgarakair varṇair lekhayec chivapustakam | | 2.40 | |*

But a Nepalese palm-leaf manuscript transmitting the *Śivadharmottara* has come to light that appears to have been written at the end of the 8th or in the 9th. The passage in question is to be found in the bottom line of the bottom folio of exposure 40 of NGMPP A 12/3. (The 3rd

*Śivadharmottara* prescribes the installation of an image of *Lakulīśa*, a deity of no importance in the *Mantramārga* and rather indicative of a Pāsupata background. Bisschop (2014) has recently presented the view that some of the information in chapter six of the *Śivadharmasāstra* is not easy to align with a date earlier than the 6th century. In the second chapter of her unpublished thesis, Florinda De Simini (2013) presents a detailed treatment of the *Śivadharmasāstra* corpus and the date of the first two works. For more discussion on the date of these texts, we refer the reader to her work, specifically pp. 28–66.

The *Niśvāsamukha* has sizeable parallels with the *Śivadharmasāstra* all across the text. These parallels are not surprising, as we have seen above that the former is teaching lay Śaiva religious duties to common householders in its *laukika* section. Conversely, the latter is entirely devoted to teach the same throughout the text.

An example of such a parallel is *Niśvāsamukha* 1:167c–168b, which teaches the reward of remembering Śiva (*virūpākṣa*). This is exactly paralleled by *Śivadharmasāstra* 1:14c–15b:

#### *Niśvāsamukha*

*ekakālaṃ dvikālaṃ vā  
triṣkālaṃ vāpi nityaśaḥ ||  
ye smaranti virūpākṣaṃ  
vijñeyās te gaṇeśvarāḥ |*

#### *Śivadharmasāstra*

*ekakālaṃ dvikālaṃ vā  
triṣkālaṃ vāpi nityaśaḥ ||  
ye smaranti virūpākṣaṃ  
vijñeyās te gaṇeśvarāḥ |*

Both texts, the *Niśvāsamukha* and the *Śivadharmasāstra*, share the notion of making temporary *lingas* of different substances.<sup>129</sup> There are parallels in these sections between the two texts. One notable example is that of the making of a dust *linga* in *Niśvāsamukha* 2:2.

---

pāda of the verse there reads *nandināgarakair varṇṇair*, but we may perhaps be justified in taking this to be a copying error.)

Nandināgarī, therefore, is not just the name of a Southern script of the Vijayanagara period; it is attested much earlier as a label for a different style of lettering. Furthermore, I think that we can assume that the script in question was a Northern one from the way the lettering is described in the previous verse.

caturasraiḥ samaśīrṣair nātisthūlair na vā kṛśaiḥ | sampūrṇāvayavaiḥ snigdhair nā-  
tivicchinnaśaṃhataiḥ || 2.39 ||

Most of these qualifications could probably be interpreted to describe almost any sort of characters, but it seems to me that the instruction that they should be neither too thick nor too thin (*nātisthūlair na vā kṛśaiḥ*) narrows the range of possibilities. For this, it seems to me, is very unlikely to have been a formulation chosen if the author had been thinking of a scribal tradition in which letters are incised into palm-leaves, such as we find in the Southern, Dravidian-speaking areas and along much of the Eastern littoral.

On the basis of above discussion, we are sure that the date of the *Śivadharmottara* cannot be the 13th-century or later as proposed by Magnone.

<sup>129</sup>The reader is referred here to *Niśvāsamukha* 2:2ff. and *Śivadharmasāstra* 3:63ff.

It is made, according to the text, by chance, by children or ignorant people while playing. The same sort of the *liṅga* is also found described in *Śivadharmasāstra* 3:77c–78b in very similar words:

*Niśvāsamukha*

*krīḍamānās tu ye bālā  
liṅgaṁ kurvanti pāṁśunā |  
labhanty ekāntato rājyaṁ  
nissapatnam akanṭakam | |*

*Śivadharmasāstra*

*pāṁśunā krīḍamāno 'pi  
liṅgaṁ kuryāt tu yo naraḥ | |  
pratyante labhate rājyaṁ  
asapatnam akanṭakam |*

According to *Niśvāsamukha* 2:91cd, someone who offers tooth-cleaning sticks, will obtain a beautiful wife. The same link between offering tooth-cleaning sticks and obtaining a beautiful wife is observed in *Śivadharmasāstra* 12:72:

*Niśvāsamukha*

*dantadhāvanadātā ca  
bhāryaṁ labhati śobhanām*

*Śivadharmasāstra*

*dantadhāvanam uddiṣṭaṁ  
nivedya śivayogine |  
divyastribhogasaṁyuktaṁ  
divi rāmyaṁ puraṁ labhet | |*

Another example is the account of a gradation of recipients (*pātra*) in *Niśvāsamukha* 2:117–119, which also seems to be closely connected to the account in *Śivadharmasāstra* 7:69–71:

*Niśvāsamukha*

*mūrkhaviprasahasrebhyo  
vedādhyāyī paraḥ smṛtaḥ |  
vedādhyāyīśahasrebhyo  
hy āhitāgnis tato 'dhikaḥ | |  
āhitāgnisahasreṣu  
agnihotrī varaḥ smṛtaḥ |  
agnihotrīśahasreṣu  
brahmavettā tato 'dhikaḥ | |*

*Śivadharmasāstra*

*brahmacārisahasrebhyo  
vedādhyāyī viśiṣyate |  
vedādhyāyīśahasrebhyo  
hy agnihotrī viśiṣyate | |  
agnihotrīśahasrebhyo  
yajñayājī viśiṣyate |  
yajñayājīśahasrebhyaḥ  
satrayājī viśiṣyate | |  
satrayājīśahasrebhyaḥ  
sarvavidyāntapāraḥ |  
sarvavidyāvidkoṭibhyaḥ  
śivabhakto viśiṣyate | |*

In addition to this, the version of the *Līṅodbhava* myth of *Niśvāsamukha* 1:72ff. is close to that of *Śivadharmasāstra* 3:2ff.;<sup>130</sup> the list of rivers (3:2ff.) and the list of the *pañcāṣṭaka* (see 3:19ff.) in the *Niśvāsamukha* are also close to *Śivadharmasāstra* 6:201ff. and 12:108ff.

If the *Śivadharmasāstra* was at the basis of these parallels of the *Niśvāsamukha*, then the consequence would be that the *Niśvāsamukha* must have been composed after the composition of the *Śivadharmasāstra*, which can be tentatively dated around the 6th to 7th centuries (Bisschop 2014), although there is no irrefutable evidence regarding its date. Even if these parallels show a connection between the *Niśvāsamukha* and the *Śivadharmasāstra*, we cannot, again, be sure that the *Niśvāsamukha* has borrowed these pieces from the *Śivadharmasāstra*. It is quite conceivable that there was a third, common, lay Śaiva source which might have been the source for both texts or that these represent floating verses. This means that these parallels do not necessarily prove that the *Śivadharmasāstra* was the direct source for the *Niśvāsamukha*, and that the *Niśvāsamukha* was therefore composed later than the *Śivadharmasāstra*.

The *Niśvāsamukha*'s parallel with the above-mentioned sources does shed some light on the development and the history of early Mantramārgic Śaivism. The Mantramārgic branch of Śaivism did not develop completely on its own, but rather there seems to have been considerable contribution of other religious traditions, evidently brahmanism, Sāṅkhya, Yoga, Atimārga and lay Śaiva religion.

## Some Remarkable Irregularities in the Text

The text of the *Niśvāsamukha* displays its dependence on other sources also stylistically, since it varies greatly throughout. Some of the unevenness of the text may have been caused by the poor arrangement of loaned passages. Some of the inconsistencies may have come into the text in the process of transmission. The irregular language of the text may also have played a role in this. Some of the uncertainties about the text and its interpretation may also be due to our limited knowledge of the community that produced it. Here we discuss some examples of these kinds.

The first example is *Niśvāsamukha* 1:51–52 which presents the five streams of knowledge and their goals according to the Mantramārgic perspective:

*īśvara uvāca* |  
*pañca srotā mayā khyātā lokānāṃ hitakāmyayā* |  
*tān pravakṣyāmi sarvāṃs tu śṛṇuṣva vahitā priye* | | 1:51 | |  
*svarggāpavarggahetoś ca tan nibodha yathārthataḥ* |  
*laukikaṃ sampravakṣyāmi yena svargaṃ vrajanti te* | | 1:52 | |

**Īśvara replied:** I have [elsewhere] taught five streams [of knowledge] on account of my desire for the welfare of the world. I will explain (*pravakṣyāmi*) all

<sup>130</sup>See Kafle (2013) for more details.

of them, O beloved one! Please listen attentively. And for the sake of heaven and liberation (*svargāpavargahetoḥ*), understand this (*tan*) exactly. I shall teach [first] the worldly [stream] (*laukikam*), by which people attain heaven (*svargam*).

The term *svargāpavargga* seems to be the characteristic terminology of the *Niśvāsamukha*, when compared with the *Niśvāsatattvasaṃhitā*. The first three books, *Mūlasūtra*, *Uttarasūtra*, and *Nayasūtra* do not use this term. It, however, appears together with *niraya* once in *Guhyasūtra* 6:14 to describe the region of actions (*karmabhūmi*). This may suggest that this term was not a distinctly Mantramārgic term. The use of the terminology *svargāpavargga* might reflect the voice of the *Niśvāsamukha* itself as a separate work.

We are told that these streams are for the sake of heaven and liberation (*svargāpavargahetoḥ*). It is, however, not absolutely clear in this passage whether “heaven and liberation” applies to all five streams, only some of them, or only one of them. Given that the *Niśvāsamukha* is an introduction to the Mantramārga, we can understand that the author of the text does not understand the final goal of other systems to be the highest form of liberation, because, in its perspective, that is offered by the Mantramārga alone. However, there is nothing in the text to suggest that other streams do not offer *svarga* and *apavarga*.

The above passage (*Niśvāsamukha* 1:51–52) seems to be a problematic statement, particularly, in connection with the Laukika and Mantramārga. First of all, the fifth stream, which is not the subject matter of the *Niśvāsamukha*, does not deal with *svarga* and *apavarga*. It rather deals with *bhukti* and *mukti* (Goodall et al. 2015:15, 32, 59 and 73). Moreover, this passage clearly mentions that the Laukika stream has heaven as its goal. But we come across a passage (1:86), in the same Laukika section, which speaks about union with Śiva (*sāyojyam*) resulting from bathing a *liṅga* with ghee for two years.<sup>131</sup> Likewise, the passage 1:118c–119b of the same section states that if one worships Śiva by offering a *muktimanḍapa* with devotion, no rebirth ensues.<sup>132</sup> What is evident here is that, although we are not able to trace the sources for all these passages, the above discussed passages tell us their goal in their own perspective, claiming to be salvific. These passages, however, explicitly go against the statement of 1:52cd above that the Laukika stream leads only up to heaven. This contradiction here may have resulted from the attempt of the author of the *Niśvāsamukha* to present these teachings of Laukika Śaivism within a Mantramārgic framework.

<sup>131</sup>It may not be entirely clear here whether or not union with Śiva is a state of liberation, but another passage of *Niśvāsamukha* 2:17–18 confirms that it is. This passage tells us that by obtaining union with [Śiva] one is never reborn, showing that there is no difference between union with Śiva and final liberation: *saccakena tu liṅgāni pārthivāni tu kārayet | sahasrapūjanāt so hi labhate īpsitam phalam || lakṣeṇaikena gaṇatām koṭim abhyarcya gacchati | svaśarīreṇa sāyojyam punaś ca na nivarttate ||*

“If someone makes [and worships] earthen *liṅgas* made from a mould (*saccakena*) a thousand times, he will certainly (*hi*) obtain the desired fruits. By worshipping [it] ten thousand times, he will obtain the state of Gaṇa, and by worshipping [it] one hundred thousand times, he will obtain (*gacchati*) union with [Śiva] in his own body (*svaśarīreṇa*) and will never come back [to worldly existence] again.”

<sup>132</sup>*Niśvāsamukha* 1:118c–119b: *muktimanḍapadānena bhaktiā tu yo 'rcayec chivam | | na tasya punar āvṛttir ggaṇaś caivottamo bhavet |*.

In doing so, the author confines the goal offered by the Laukika stream to be heaven to show the supremacy of Mantramārga teachings. This attempt, however, entailed a doctrinal tension within the text.

Another controversial passage is the list of hells in 4:100-105b. This passage is most probably borrowed from an unknown Kāpālika source. Thus, these hells here represent the scheme of the Kāpālika Pāśupatas. This list consists of thirty-five hells. We are, however, told in the text itself (4:105cd) that the total number of the hells is thirty-two. This number in all possibility represents the Mantramārgic concept of hells, for there the standard number is thirty two (Sanderson 2003-4:422 and Goodall 2004:282–283, fn. 487). We assume that the last line (4:105) in the following passage might have been added here without any awareness of how it might impact the preceding passage. The attempt is undertaken to give the passage a slant of the Mantramārga, but yet it backfires by resulting in a significant contradiction:

*avīcī kṛminicayo vaitaraṇī kūṭśālmālī |*  
*giriryamala ucchvāso nirucchvāso hy athāparaḥ | | 4:100 | |*  
*pūtimāṃsadravaś caiva trapus taptajatus tathā |*  
*paṃkālayo 'sthibhaṅgaś ca krakacachedam eva ca | | 4:101 | |*  
*medo'sṛkpūyahradaś ca tikṣṇāyastuṇḍam eva ca |*  
*aṅgāraraśībhuvanaḥ śakuniś cāmbaṛīṣakaḥ | | 4:102 | |*  
*---nyā hy asitālavanas tathā |*  
*sūcīmukhaḥ kṣuradhāraḥ kālasūtro 'tha parvataḥ | | 4:103 | |*  
*padmaś caiva samākhyāto mahāpadmas tathaiṣa ca |*  
*apāko sāra uṣṇaś ca sañjīvanasujīvanau | | 4:104 | |*  
*śītatamondhatamasau mahārauravarauravau |*  
***dvātriṃśad ete narakā mayā devī prakīrtitāḥ | | 4:105 | |***

[1] Avīcī, [2] Kṛminicaya, [3] Vaitaraṇī, [4] Kūṭśālmālī, [5] Giriryamala, [6] Uchhvāsa, and then [7] Nirucchvāsa [8], Pūtimāṃsadrava, [9] Trapu, [10] Taptajatu then [11] Paṃkālaya, [12] Asthibhaṅga, [13] Krakacacheda and [14] Medo'sṛkpūyahrada, [15] Tikṣṇāyastuṇḍa, then [16] Aṅgāraraśībhuvana, [17] Śakuni, [18] Ambaṛīṣaka, [19] Asitāladruma, [20] Asitālavana, then [21] Sūcīmukha, [22] Kṣuradhāra, [23] Kālasūtra, then [24] Parvata, then [25] Padma is taught, then [26] Mahāpadma, then [27] Apāka, [28] Sāra, [29] Uṣṇa, [30] Sañjīvana, [31] Sujīvana, [32] Śītatamas, [33] Andhatamas, [34] Mahāraurava and [35] Raurava; **I have taught, O goddess, these thirty-two hells.**

It is to be noted that a list of thirty-two hells found in the inscription of Angkor Vat bas-relief is particularly close to the list of the hells of the *Niśvāsamukha* both in names and their order (Sanderson 2003-4:422). We know from the Khmer inscriptions that the *Niśvāsa* was known and used among royalty in rituals (Sanderson 2001:7–8. fn. 5). The list of the hells



found in Angkor Vat may also hint at knowledge of some portion of the *Niśvāsa* corpus beyond the Indian subcontinent.

Another possible case of borrowing is the *Aṣṭamūrti* hymn in *Niśvāsamukha* 1:30–41, which seems not to fit the context in which it occurs. This has all the appearance of an independent hymn, one which even has a *phalaśruti*. This particular passage of the *Niśvāsamukha* is conspicuously out of place. If it were removed, the preceding and the following text of the *Niśvāsamukha* elegantly interlocks:

*mahādevyā yathā prṣtas sarvaduḥkhaharo haraḥ |*  
*tathā vakṣyāmi viprendraḥ praṇipatya śivaṃ śuciḥ | | 1:29 | |*

[...]

*devy uvāca |*  
*anādinidhano devo hy ajam akṣaram avyayaḥ |*  
*sarvagat sarvarūpo 'si sarvajñaś caikakāraṇaḥ | | 1:42 | |*

“I will teach, O best among Brahmins, just as Śiva, the destroyer of all suffering, when asked by the great goddess. After prostrating before Śiva and making myself pure.

[...]

Devī said: You are the god [having] no beginning and end (*anādinidhano*), devoid of birth and destruction, imperishable, all pervading and having all forms. You are omniscient [and] the sole cause [of the whole universe].”

Not all the problems in the text seem to have come in due to borrowing at the time of composition of the text, but some of the oddities may have rather occurred in subsequent transmission of the text. For example, a passage teaches the worship of Kubera on the third day of the fortnight (3:165c–166), but the reward for worshipping Kubera is not mentioned, as in the case of the other divinities prescribed for worship. We are presumably missing one line here. It is more likely that the line was skipped while copying the text than that the original author forgot to mention it.<sup>133</sup>

The text runs as follows:

<sup>133</sup>Here is another example of the same kind with regard to the worship of Devī (3:177c–178):

*navamyāṃ sinḥa nāmena devyāś cābhyarcitena ca | ghṛtatāmrasya dānāc ca bhakṣaiḥ payaghaṭānvitaiḥ | | yamāya mahiṣaṇ dadyān nāmāṅkan tu ghṛtaplutam |*

“On the ninth day [of a fortnight], [one should give a sculpture of] a lion [after first] worshipping Devī by [calling out] her name[s], [and] also by giving a copper [container] of ghee and [some] eatables, together with pots filled with milk, [to a Brahmin]. For [the worship of] Yama (*yamāya*), on the tenth day [of the fortnight], one should feed Brahmins and give [them a sculpture of] a buffalo covered in ghee, marked with the names [of Yama], and placed in a copper vessel, together with a pot filled with milk and together with [some] eatables.”

In this instance, too, regarding the worship of Devī, the reward is missing. The text immediately goes on to mention the procedure for worshipping Yama.

*tr̥tīyāyāṇi tu sampūjya yakṣaṃ hemamayīṇ gadām | |  
 nāmāny ālikhya dātavyā bhājane ghṛtapūrite |  
 caturthīyān dantīnan dadyāt sauvarṇṇan nāma-cāṅkitam | |*

Having [first] worshipped Kubera (*yakṣam*) on the third day [of the fortnight], one should give a golden mace [to a Brahmin], writing the names of [Kubera on it and putting it] in a vessel filled with clarified butter. On the fourth day [of the fortnight], one should give a golden elephant marked with the names.

After dealing with all these individual cases, we can conclude that by definition the *Niśvāsamukha* is a problematic composition, because it makes use of earlier sources and puts them in a new perspective, that of Mantramārgic Śaivism. Secondly, there are some problems related to the transmission of the text. Since we have a single manuscript of the text, it is hard to judge to what extent irregularities of the text are an inherent feature, and to what extent they are caused by transmission.

## **Borrowings from the *Niśvāsamukha* by the *Śivadharmasaṅgraha***

In the above sections, we have been situating the *Niśvāsamukha* in relation to sources from which it may have borrowed. Now, we will deal with what happened to the *Niśvāsamukha* after its composition. Thanks to the initial observations of Mr. Sambandhaśivācārya and Dr. Anil Kumar Acharya, we have come across clear evidence that the *Niśvāsamukha* also has been borrowed by another text, the *Śivadharmasaṅgraha*. The title of the *Śivadharmasaṅgraha* itself already tells us about the nature of the text. *Śivadharmasaṅgraha* literally means “the collection of the teachings of Śiva.” The title suggests that the text collected teachings of Śiva from earlier Śaiva sources. Actually the text itself speaks about this. The author of the text (1:3) mentions that he composed (*kriyate*) the text named *Dharmasaṅgraha* (i.e. the *Śivadharmasaṅgraha*), drawing the essence of texts from Śaṃbhu, Sanatkumāra, Vāyu and Dvaipāyana:

*śaṃbhoḥ sanatkumārasya vāyor dvaipāyanasya ca |  
 granthasāraṃ samuddhṛtya kriyate dharmasaṅgrahaḥ | |*

Among the twelve chapters of the *Śivadharmasaṅgraha*, the first three chapters, which have now been edited by Dr. Anil Kumar Acharya, contain moralising or sermonising *subhāṣitas*, wise sayings. Chapter 4 contains a description of the hells, the *narakas*, which shows some correspondence with the *Skandapurāṇa*. In this chapter, some verses are identical with verses (chapters 37–47) on hells in the *Skandapurāṇa* (Bakker, Bisschop and Yokochi 2014:82–95). Chapters 5–9, closely parallel parts of the *Niśvāsamukha*. Chapters 10–12 deal with Purāṇic cosmography; chapter 10 is identical with the fifth chapter of the *Guhyasūtra*; chapter 11 coincides with parts of the sixth and seventh chapters of the *Guhyasūtra*; and chapter 12 corresponds with verses 209–355 of the 39th chapter of the *Vāyupurāṇa*.

Now, it is evident that Śambhu in the above quoted verse refers to the *Niśvāsa-tattvasaṃhitā* as it has drawn upon the *Niśvāsamukha* and the *Guhyasūtra*, and our text is delivered by Śiva.<sup>134</sup> Further, Sanatkumāra could perhaps mean the *Skandapurāṇa* as this Purāṇa is spoken by Sanatkumāra and the *Śivadharmasaṅgraha* shows some parallels with materials on hells in its fourth chapter. Vāyu, similarly, refers to the *Vāyupurāṇa*. Dvaipāyana could be a reference to the *Mahābhārata*. This remains to be investigated. It is important to mention here that, as we will show in the section below, the *Śivadharmasaṅgraha* is not just copying from the *Niśvāsamukha*. It rather standardises irregular forms and syntax of the underlying source text in the process of borrowing. The following comparative table of the relevant chapters of the *Niśvāsamukha* and the *Śivadharmasaṅgraha* presents an exact overview of the borrowing by the *Śivadharmasaṅgraha*.

Table 2: Comparative table of *Niśvāsamukha* and *Śivadharmasaṅgraha*

NM	SD
1:1–1:57	—
—	5:1–5:14
1:58–1:63	5:15–5:20
1:64	—
1:65–1:87	5:21–5:43
1:88–1:92	—
—	5:44ab
1:93a–1:98b	5:44c–5:49
—	5:50ab
1:98c–1:100b	5:50c–5:52b
—	5:52c–5:54
1:100c–1:107b	5:55–5:61
1:107c–1:114b	—
1:114c–1:124b	5:62–5:71
1:124c–1:125b	5:72
—	5:73–5:75
1:125c–1:127b	5:76–5:77
1:127c–1:154	5:83a–5:110b
1:155ab	—
1:155c–1:156b	5:110cd
1:156c–1:158b	5:111a–5:112
1:158c–1:150b	—
—	5:113–5:119

<sup>134</sup> *Śivadharmasaṅgraha* appears to be the first text of the *Śivadharm* corpus to incorporate tantric material.

1:150c–1:159b	—
1:159c–1:160	5:120a–5:121b
1:161ab	—
—	5:121cd
1:161c–1:162b	5:122
—	5:123
1:162c–1:165b	5:124–5:126
—	5:127
1:165c–1:169b	5:128–5:131
—	5:132
1:169c–1:171	5:133–5:135
1:172	5:136
1:173–1:176	5:137–5:140
1:177ab	—
—	5:141a–5:143b
1:177cd	5:143c–5:144b
1:178	5:144c–5:145b
—	5:145c–5:149
1:179–1:185	5:150–5:156
2:1a–2:18b	6:1a–6:17f
—	6:18–6:38
2:18c–2:35	6:39a–6:56b
2:36	—
2:37a–2:38b	6:56c–6:57
—	6:58
2:38c–2:39b	6:59
—	6:60–64
2:39c–2:41b	6:65–6:66
—	6:70c–6:76b
2:41c–2:42b	6:76c–6:77b
—	6:77c–6:78b
2:42c–2:43b	6:78c–6:78f
2:43c–2:46	6:67a–6:70b
—	6:79–6:88
2:47–2:48	6:89–6:90
—	6:91–6:94
—	6:97
—	6:105
—	6:107–6:117

2:49	6:118
2:50	6:106
—	6:119–6:122
2:51	6:123
2:53a–2:56b	—
—	6:138–6:153b
2:56cd	—
2:57–2:70	6:124–6:137
2:71a–2:80b	6:153c–6:162
2:80c–2:82b	6:95–6:96
2:82c–2:86b	6:98–6:101
2:86c–2:88b	6:103–6:104
2:88c–2:115	6:163–6:189
2:116	6:190
2:117	6:191
2:118	6:192ab
2:119a–2:120b	6:192c–6:193d
2:120c–2:121b	6:194
2:121c–122	—
—	6:195
3:1a–3:13b	7:1a–7:13b
3:13c–3:14b	7:13cd
3:14c–3:15d	7:14a–7:15b
—	7:15c–7:16b
3:16	7:16c–7:17b
3:17–3:18	—
3:19–3:22	7:17c–7:21b
3:23	7:22
3:24ab	7:21cd
3:24c–3:25b	—
3:25c–3:30b	7:23–7:27
—	7:24–7:40
3:30c–3:34b	7:41–7:44
3:35c–3:36b	—
3:36c–3:37	7:45a–7:46b
3:38–3:42	—
—	7:46c–7:52
3:43a–3:56f	7:53a–7:67b
—	7:67c–7:69b

3:57–3:69	7:69c–7:72b
—	7:72c–7:124
3:60–3:83	8:1a–8:25b
3:84ab	8:25c–8:26b?
3:84cd	8:26cd
3:85ab	8:26ab
3:85cd	8:27ab
3:86ab	8:27cd
—	8:28ab
3:86c–3:151	8:28c–8:93
3:152–3:153	—
—	8:94–8:108
3:154	8:110
3:155	8:109
3:156a–3:158b	—
—	8:111–8:114
3:158c–3:163	8:115a–8:120b
3:164	8:120c–8:121b
3:165a–3:177b	8:121c–8:133
3:177c–3:179b	8:134–8:135
3:179c–3:194b	8:136–8:150
3:194cd	8:151
3:195a–3:196b	8:152a–8:152f
3:196cd	—
4:1–4:7b	9:1–9:7b
4:8–4:12	9:7c–9:12b
4:13–4:14	—
4:15–4:16	9:12c–9:14b
4:17–4:19	—
—	9:14c–9:23b
4:20a–4:31b	9:23c–9:34d
4:31cd	—
4:32a–4:36b	9:35a–9:39b
4:36c–4:37b	9:39c–9:40
4:37c–4:41	9:41–9:44
4:42–4:137	—

---

This table shows that the author of the *Śivadharmasaṅgraha* takes over the first three chapters of the *Niśvāsamukha*. These chapters teach the lay Śaiva religion of householders. Apart from this, the *Śivadharmasaṅgraha* also borrows text from the Vedic section of the

*Niśvāsamukha*, which is the first part of the fourth chapter. It is also clear from this table that the *Śivadharmasaṅgraha* does not borrow every part of the text. The question why the *Śivadharmasaṅgraha* borrowed some passages from the *Niśvāsamukha* and not others is particularly interesting. This answer must lie in the fundamental teaching of the two texts. Basically the *Niśvāsamukha* aims at presenting the five streams of religion as being beneath the Mantramārga. No such idea is present in the *Śivadharmasaṅgraha*, as it is a text of lay Śaivism and simply collects materials from different Śaiva sources to build its textual corpus thereon. The context of the two texts is therefore fundamentally different. Thus, the *Śivadharmasaṅgraha* omits a number of significant passages, such as:

1. The frame story of the *Niśvāsatattvasaṃhitā* 1:1-1:57.
2. Passages that are not fitting to the setting of the *Śivadharmasaṅgraha*. For example, as the *Śivadharmasaṅgraha* is not framed as a dialogue between Śiva and Devī, and also the speaker of the *Śivadharmasaṅgraha* is not Nandikeśvara, the following verses are omitted. *Niśvāsamukha* 1:64:

*evaṃ śrutam mayā pūrvvan devyāṃ kathayato harāt |  
tat sarvaṃ kathitan tubhyaṃ yat phalaṃ liṅgapūraṇe | |*

“This is what I heard from Hara, as he was telling it to the goddess, and I have told it all to you, namely what the fruit of covering the *liṅga* (*liṅga-pūraṇe*) is.”

3. Those passages that directly reflect the conceptual framework of five streams, with the exception of the Vedic section.<sup>135</sup>

We cannot always understand the principle of selection of the *Śivadharmasaṅgraha* completely. For example, the passage of *Niśvāsamukha* 2:52-53, which deals with offering a black woollen garment and a buffalo, has been reduced to two lines in the *Śivadharmasaṅgraha*. It could be the result of a mistake in the process of textual transmission; or else, the redactor may have felt it was unnecessary to adopt it. Otherwise, there is no compelling reason for having left it out. It fits seamlessly within the context and is readily comprehensible. On the whole, however, omissions in the *Śivadharmasaṅgraha* do not always look like accidental ones. The principle of selection in some cases looks to be deliberate, but it fails to reflect the hand of a careful redactor.

## Additions

As the *Śivadharmasaṅgraha* is an independent text, it is normal that it should have extra material compared to the *Niśvāsamukha*. In the following example, we see that the *Śivadharmasaṅgraha* adds a substantial passage, in twenty-one verses, inserted between two

<sup>135</sup>The passage of *Śivadharmasaṅgraha* 9:44cdef reads: *vedadharmo mayā proktaḥ svarganaśreyasaḥ padam | uttareṇaiva vaktreṇa vyākhyātaś ca samāsataḥ ||*. This, we think, is the result of careless borrowing as the *Śivadharmasaṅgraha* does not claim to spring up from one of Śiva's faces.

lines of the *Niśvāsamukha*. It introduces a new topic— the procedure for worshipping the *liṅga* made of sand— and a new speaker (Dadhīci). Most probably the *Śivadharmasaṅgraha* borrowed these passages from another source where Dadhīci was the speaker of the text, and put them in between the passage borrowed from the *Niśvāsamukha*, but we are unable to identify the underlying source. There are more such examples, but we will only quote one:

*Niśvāsamukha* 2:18

*lakṣeṇaikenā gaṇatām koṭim abhyarcya gacchati |*  
*svaśarīreṇa sāyojyaṃ punaś ca na nivarttate | |*

“By worshipping [it] ten thousand times, he will obtain the state of Gaṇa, and by worshipping [it] one hundred thousand times, he will obtain (*gacchati*) union with [Śiva] in his own body (*svaśarīreṇa*) and will never come back [to worldly existence] again.”

ŚiDhS 6:18–39b

*lakṣeṇaikenā gaṇatām koṭyām abhyarcya gacchati | |*  
*dadhīcir uvāca |*<sup>136</sup>  
*kiṃ phalaṃ bālukāliṅgasyārccanād api kiṃ bhavet |*  
*katham vā pūjayet karma vratañ caiva katham bhavet | |*  
*maheśvara uvāca |*  
*śṛṇu me kathayīṣyāmi bālukāliṅgam arcanam |*

.....

*etat purā mayā khyātam na deyaṃ yasya kasyacit |*  
*svaśarīreṇa sāyojyaṃ punaś ca na nivarttate |*

By worshipping [it] ten thousand times, he will obtain the state of Gaṇa, and by worshipping [it] one hundred thousand times, he will obtain (*gacchati*) ...

**Dadhīci spoke:**

What fruit does one obtain from worshipping a *liṅga* made of sand? How is one supposed to worship it? What is the procedure [of worship]? And how should one practise the observance?

**Maheśvara replied:**

<sup>136</sup>Dadhīci does not appear in the *Niśvāsamukha*. Instead, either Devī asks questions to Śiva or the sages ask Nandikeśvara. In the *Śivadharmasaṅgraha* too, Dadhīci appears in this place only.



Listen to me. I will tell [you] the [procedure of] worshipping the *liṅga* made of sand.

.....

This [knowledge that] I taught earlier (*purā*) should not be given to everybody.  
... the union with [Śiva] in his own body and will never come back [to worldly existence] again.

### Grammatical Changes

One of the characteristics of the *Niśvāsamukha*, as discussed on p. 81 ff., is that it shares features of *aiśa* language with the rest of the *Niśvāsatattvasaṃhitā*. We will show that the *Śivadharmasaṅgraha* has removed these archaic irregular features and replaced them with what are considered authentic Sanskrit forms. As the rest of the text of the *Śivadharmasaṅgraha* is more or less written in Pāṇinian Sanskrit, we believe these changes took place in the *Śivadharmasaṅgraha* to make the text smoother. In this respect, we can only explain the change from *aiśa* to proper Sanskrit and not from proper Sanskrit to *aiśa*. Thus, this direction of grammatical changes also tells us the direction of borrowing.

We present here five types of grammatical correction in the parts of the text borrowed from the *Niśvāsamukha* by the *Śivadharmasaṅgraha*: those involving verb-forms, nominal forms, regularisation of *sandhi*, compounds and gender. We come across this kind of change throughout the text, and the examples quoted below are characteristic:

#### Regularisation of Verb-forms

- Correction of irregular optative: *dadet* (NM1:60b) to *dadyāt* (ŚiDhS 5:17ab)
- Correction of irregular optative: *pūjye* (NM 2:30a) to the regular *pūjayet* (ŚiDhS 6:50c)
- Correction of irregular *lyap*: *pūjya* (NM 3:160c) to *saṃpūjya* (ŚiDhS 8:117a)

#### Regularisation of Nominal Forms

- Correction of irregular nominative: *kṛṣṇāṣṭamicaturddaśī* (NM1:69d) to *kṛṣṇāṣṭamyāṇī caturdaśyāṇī* (ŚiDhS 5:25c)
- Correction of irregular numerical form: *triṃśabhir lakṣaiḥ* (NM2:7c) to *triṃśallakṣaiḥ* (ŚiDhS6:7c)
- Correction of irregular nominative singular: *parameṣṭhinaḥ*<sup>137</sup> (NM 3:65ab) to *parameṣṭhī* (ŚiDhS 3:65b)

<sup>137</sup>This form is the same in accusative plural and genitive singular too. From other instances (NM 1:58b, 1:115d, 2:34d etc.) we could determine that this is more likely to be a nominative singular.

### Regularisation of *Sandhi*

- Correction of double *sandhi*: *yoddharet* (NM 1:87b) to *uddharet* (ŚiDhS 5:43b)
- Correction of irregular extended ending: *kuruteti*<sup>138</sup> (NM 3:58d) to *kurute tu* (ŚiDhS 7:70cd).
- Correction of irregular *sandhi* of the pronoun: *so dhruvam* (NM 4:16d) to *sa dhruvam* (ŚiDhS 9:14ab)

### Regularisation of Compounds

- Correction of inflected form: *śaṣkulyāmodakāni* (1:164b) to *śaṣkulīmodakāni* (ŚiDhS 5:125cd)
- Justifying an otiose *sa* : *guḍakṣīrasapāyasaiḥ* (NM 3:80d) to *guḍakṣīraiḥ sapāyasaiḥ* (ŚiDhS 8:21d)

### Regularisation of Gender

- Correction of irregular masculine to standard neuter: *-puṣpaḥ* (NM 1:147d) to *-puṣpam* (ŚiDhS 5:103b)
- Correction of irregular neuters to regular masculines: *kumbhīpākan tu nirayan* (NM 2:44c) to *kumbhīpākas tu nirayo* (ŚiDhS 6:68a)

### Syntactical Changes

The *Śivadharmasaṅgraha* does not simply correct obvious grammatical mistakes of the borrowed text, but also changes the syntax substantially. The modifications are intended to clarify the original text. There are many instances of such syntactical change, and many of them will be discussed in the notes to the translation of the text. Here we just refer to one outstanding example.

NiMukh 4:15c–16b

*asvayaṅkṛtavāṇijye bhūtādroheṇa jīvate | |*  
*japti juhote vā nityaṁ sa svarggaphalabhāḥ bhavet |*

“Without engaging in trade done by himself he lives without harming living beings. He should regularly do mantra-recitation (*japti*) and (*vā*) perform oblations; [by doing so] he will partake of the fruit of heaven.”

ŚiDhS 9:13

---

<sup>138</sup>Cf. Goodall et al. 2015:122.

*vāñijyādi tyajet karma bhūtadrohaṇ ca sarvadā |  
japāgnihomasanyuktaḥ sa svarggaphalabhāg bhavet | |*

“He should avoid work such as trade, and [should] always [avoid] harming living beings. Engaged in mantra-recitation and oblations on fire, he will partake of the fruit of heaven.”

Here the *Śivadharmasaṅgraha* corrects *asvayaṅkṛtavāñijye* to *vāñijyādi tyajet karma*, where the former is used in the sense of the instrumental case. Then it replaces *bhūtadroheṇa jīvate* to *bhūtadrohaṇ ca sarvadā*. Here the sense of the present verb is employed in the place of the optative. Finally *japti juhoti vā nityam* (where *japti* is meant for *japati* and these verb forms should have an optative sense) is corrected to *japāgnihomasanyuktaḥ*.

### Alteration of Content

Comparing the *Śivadharmasaṅgraha* and the source passages of the *Niśvāsamukha*, in some cases, we detect some alteration of meaning in the borrowed passages. These kinds of change may roughly be grouped in two categories: 1. deliberate alteration concerning rewards and 2. deliberate alteration of the essential meaning.

### Concerning Rewards

Especially in the matter of rewards the *Śivadharmasaṅgraha* has considerably altered the borrowed passages. If we compare the corresponding passages in both texts, the actions are the same but the results prescribed are different. Although the changes may seem trivial, a significant difference in meaning results. In some cases, it is possible that such changes occurred due to palaeographical issues, such as *śivālayam* (NM 1:82d)  $\approx$  *surālayam* (ŚiDhS 5:83d).

- Change of Brahma-hood to Skanda-hood: *brahmatvaṃ* (NM 2:7b) to *skandam*<sup>139</sup> (ŚiDhS 6:7b)
- Change from attaining the world of the Moon to that of Indra: *somapuram* (NM 2:59c) to *śakrapuram* (ŚiDhS 6:126c)
- Change of the fruit of rejoicing in heaven to attaining the world of Kāmadeva: *divi* (NM 2:65d) to *kāmadevapuram* (ŚiDhS 6:132c)

### Core Meaning

As we have already discussed, a large part of the *Niśvāsamukha* deals with Laukika material, and the *Śivadharmasaṅgraha* has particularly borrowed from this part of the *Niśvāsamukha*. The other parts are not relevant within the context of the *Śivadharmasaṅgraha*. The

<sup>139</sup>We have taken Skanda in the sense of Skanda-hood here.

only exception is the Vaidika section. The following example shows how the *Śivadharmasaṅgraha* changes the core meaning of the text while borrowing:

NM 2:110

*atidānavidhiḥ khyāto lokānāṃ hitakāmyayā |*  
*dine dine ca yo dadyād dānan tañ ca nibodha me*

“I have taught the ritual of extreme offering (*atidānavidhiḥ*) for the benefit of the world. If someone makes an offering every day, listen to the fruit of that offering too.”

ŚiDhS 6:184c-185b

*iti dānavidhiś cokto lokānāṃ hitakāmyayā |*  
*dine dine ca yad dānaṃ tac cāpi hi nibodha me*

“I have thus taught the ritual of offering (*iti dānavidhiḥ*) for the benefit of the world. [If someone makes] an offering every day, listen to the fruit of that offering too.”

Here the *Niśvāsamukha* teaches about the extreme offering (*atidāna*<sup>o</sup>). This is of course a problematic term as its meaning differs from context to context (see fn. 236). The *Śivadharmasaṅgraha* does not mention it and instead writes *iti dāna*<sup>o</sup> “thus offering,” resulting in the change of the core meaning of the borrowed text. There are some other instances of borrowed text where a significant change in the core meaning has taken place in the *Śivadharmasaṅgraha*, but we limit ourselves to this example.

In sum, our observations have shown that in many cases the *Śivadharmasaṅgraha* has rephrased the text, replacing uncommon words, structures and syntax. In many cases, it has made the text more comprehensible than the original text of the *Niśvāsamukha*. As a large amount of the text of the *Niśvāsamukha* is lost due to damage of manuscript, and the *Śivadharmasaṅgraha* draws upon the *Niśvāsamukha*, it has helped greatly in reconstructing lost parts of the *Niśvāsamukha*. Furthermore, the *Śivadharmasaṅgraha*’s borrowings from the *Niśvāsamukha* show that the *Niśvāsamukha* had become an authoritative scripture for the Śaivas by the time the *Śivadharmasaṅgraha* was composed, between the 9th and 10th centuries.<sup>140</sup>

We have made references to the text of the *Śivadharmasaṅgraha* also in the apparatus for the edition of the *Niśvāsamukha*. We have mainly used the text of the *Śivadharmasaṅgraha* for reconstituting the lost text of the *Niśvāsamukha* due to damage of the manuscript. As the printed text of the *Śivadharmasaṅgraha* is not reliable,<sup>141</sup> we have consulted two manuscripts as well and established a preliminary edition of the relevant chapters of the *Śivadharmasaṅgraha*, which we have included in this thesis as an appendix to my edition

<sup>140</sup>See A. Acharya 2009\*:91.

<sup>141</sup>The *Śivadharmasaṅgraha* has been printed in *Śivadharmasūpatimatam Śivadharmamahāśāstram Paśupatināthadarśanam* ed. Yogin Narahari 1998 (samvat 2055).

of the *Niśvāsamukha*.<sup>142</sup> It is from this edition that we have drawn the quotations of the *Śivadharmasaṅgraha*.

## Structural Overview and Summary of Content

The *Niśvāsamukha* is divided into four chapters (*paṭalas*). Among them, the first begins with the frame story of the whole *Niśvāsatattvasaṃhitā*. Then the five streams of knowledge are briefly taught, after which the lay religious duties are expounded, ending with the method of worshipping the *liṅga* and its fruit. The second chapter treats making different kinds of *liṅgas*, installing them and worshipping them daily, the fruit of their worship and various donations. The third chapter is about sacred places of pilgrimage, the benefit of worshipping various gods and performing different religious observances. The fourth chapter deals with the so-called Vedic, Ādhyātmika and Atimārga streams.

### Chapter One

#### [Frame story: the five streams]

Ṛcika inquires of Mataṅga about a wonder that he had seen in the forest of Naimiṣa. (1–4)

Mataṅga answers Ṛcika in brief that Brahmā and Viṣṇu were initiated, and, upon hearing this, sages gathered in the forest of Devadāru. (5–13)

Nandin gets authority to teach the tantra to the sages. (14–17)

Ṛcika's question to Mataṅga as to how Nandin could be the teacher of the sages and how he could grant initiation to them. (18)

Mataṅga tells how the sages praised Nandikeśvara. (19–25)

Nandin initiates the sages and promises to tell them the five streams of knowledge as they were revealed to Devī by Hara. (26–29)

Nandin bows down to Śiva and praises him in what is called an *Aṣṭamūrti* hymn. (30–41)

Devī recites a hymn to Śiva. (41–45)

Devī tells Śiva that she feels sad for afflicted people, so she asks how such people can be freed from their afflictions. (45–50)

Īśvara gives a brief account of the five streams of knowledge. (51–56)

<sup>142</sup>The editorial policies involved will be discussed in the appropriate section (p. 94ff.)

Devī asks Īśvara to describe the five streams of knowledge in detail. (57)

### [The Laukika stream]

Īśvara teaches the fruits of making a fountain of drinking water, creating a lotus pond, offering a house to a Brahmin, making a garden at a temple, offering the gift of a flower or a garland, and covering a *liṅga* with flowers. (58–63)

Nandin states what he had heard when Hara was teaching Devī regarding the fruit of covering a *liṅga* with flowers. (64)

The sages inquire about how the god is to be pleased and about the fruits of worshipping him with different means and substances. (65–70)

### [Worship of the *liṅga*]

Nandin tells of the fruits of cleansing a *liṅga*, worshipping it daily with different substances, such as leaves, flowers, fruits, curd, milk, ghee, and *pavitra* (i.e. *kuśa* grass), the sounding of HUDDUN. (71–76)

The fruits of bathing a *liṅga* with water, curds, ghee, milk, honey and with the five products of a cow. (76–97)

The fruits of besmearing a *liṅga* with sandal paste mixed with camphor, burning *guggulu* in front of a *liṅga*, offering clothes, banners or awnings to the *liṅga*. (98–107b)

The fruits of offering a golden bell, made of different substances, a yak-tail fly-whisk, a girdle and waist-cord, a crown, an ear-ring and a multicoloured fabric, a turban, gems, ornaments, adornments and a *muktimanḍapa* to the *liṅga*. (107c–119b)

The fruits of performing the rite of besmearing with different substances, offering bracelets, armbands, gems, scentless flower, and covering a *liṅga* with flowers. (119c–123b)

The beginning of the teaching of worshipping the *liṅga* with fragrant flowers. (123c–124b)

The fruits of offering one fragrant flower, the names of flowers that Śaṅkara smells (i.e. delights in) and the fruits of worshipping Śiva with them. (124c–128b)

The fruits of worshipping a *liṅga* with different flowers and the rewards connected. (128c–156b)

The fruits of offering leaves, flowers, fruit, water, grass and milk to Śaṅkara daily. (1156c–158b)

Ranking of flowers. (158c–159)

The fruits of offering different foods and songs. (160–165b)

The fruits of offering lute music, the sound “HUḌḌUṆ,” dance, mouth music, and loud laughter to Śiva. (165c–169b)

The fruits of worshipping Śiva for those who have not received Śaiva initiation and for those who have. (169cdef)

Nandi tells the sages the significance of the *liṅga*, and states that this is what he heard from Hara, as he related it to the goddess. (170–171)

### [The *Liṅgodbhava* myth]

Nandi relates the famous *Liṅgodbhava* myth to the sages. (172—184)

The chapter concludes with the warning that prosperity is not possible for mortals who do not worship Śiva in the form of the *liṅga*. (185)

## Chapter Two

### [Temporary *liṅgas*]

The question of the sages to Nandi about the fruits of making the *liṅga* and installing it. (1)

The fruits of making the *liṅga* and worshipping it. (2–7)

The fruits of making the *liṅga* with different substances and worshipping it. (6–20b)

### [Donations]

The fruits of making a Śiva temple built with marked bricks, and the fruits of making and worshipping the *liṅga* made of different metals. (20c–24b)

The fruits of planting trees and cultivating a garden. (24c–27b)

The fruits of constructing a temple and installing godheads. (27c–30b)

The fruits of making a bridge, causeway, water-channel, a hut, an abode or a pavilion, and of making donations. (30c–36)

The fruits of offering food and water. (37–39b)

- The fruits of offering sesame and water to gods and ancestors. (39c—41b)
- The fruits of offering the hide of a black buck. (41c–43b)
- The fruits of performing *śrāddha* rites to ancestors. (43c–45b)
- The fruits of offering a lamp and cows to gods and ancestors. (45c–48)
- The fruits of offering a calving cow and a bull to a Brahmin. (49–50)
- The fruits of offering a goat, a garment and a buffalo to a Brahmin. (51–55)
- The fruits of offering land, gems, clothes and silver. (56–57)
- The fruits of donating sesame seeds, gold, pearls, or gems of various kinds and quality. (58–59)
- The fruits of offering treacle, milk, curds, ghee, sandalwood, agallochum, camphor, cloves etc. (60–61)
- The fruits of offering a virgin girl, grains and protection to living beings. (62–63)
- The fruits of offering a woman and providing a feast of lovemaking with women. (64–65)
- The fruits of offering a cane-seat, a couch, fuel, shelter, straw, a blanket and food. (66–68)
- The fruits of regularly offering songs, musical instruments and vehicles to the gods, and of offering a horse to Brahmins. (69–71)
- The fruits of offering an umbrella, a pair of shoes, a chariot drawn by an elephant, a horse and a bullock cart. (72–80b)
- The fruits of offering a mouthful of grass (*grāsaṃ*) to cows. (80c–86b)
- The fruits of letting a black bull or any bull free. (86c–88b)
- The fruits of offering various kinds of fruits. (88b–91b)
- The fruits of offering teeth-cleaning sticks, fragrant betel, flowers and other fragrant substances. (91c–92)
- The fruits of offering cushions made of *kuśa*-grass, different weapons, and vessels. (92–97)
- The fruits of offering slaves to the gods or to Brahmins; sea salt, piper longum, ginger, pepper, and dry ginger; and remedies for the sick. (98–100)



The fruits of offering sweet, sour, pungent, bitter, astringent and salty objects; oil, sugar or treacle, and thickened curd or buttermilk. (101–102)

The fruits of offering pearls or nacreous shells, cowrie shells, a mirror, nourishment, expressions of compassion or alms. (103–105)

#### **[Hierarchy of recipients]**

The greatness of the donor and the characteristics of the true donor. (106–109)

The end of the description of the highest form of offering. (110)

The fruits of offering objects that are useful for daily life, cosmetics and food. (111–114)

Devī's queries to Īśvara about the best recipient, and Īśvara's answer about the best types of recipients of gifts. (115–116)

Ranking of the recipients. (117–122)

### **Chapter Three**

#### **[Sacred sites]**

Devī queries Īśvara about the merits of pilgrimage. (1)

#### **[Rivers]**

A list of river names. (2–8)

The fruits of bathing in different bodies of water, the mantra that is to be recited while bathing and its fruits. (9–13b)

The fruits of bathing while remembering Agni as the womb; Viṣṇu as the seminal fluid, Brahmā as the father, and water as a form of Rudra. (13c–14)

The fruits of abandoning one's body (i.e. suicide) in rivers. (15a–16b)

The fruits of always remembering a certain pilgrimage site and of entering a fire. (16c–18)

#### **[The *pañcāṣṭakas* and other sacred sites]**

A list of five groups of eight pilgrimage places, and the fruits of bathing, seeing or performing worship and dying at any of them. (19a–26)

The fruits of seeing the god in Mahālaya and drinking the water of Kedāra with and without reciting the *vidyāmantra*. (27a–29b)

The fruits of visiting other secret (*guhyāḥ*) places and of dying there. (29c–30)

The places where Hari always resides, and the fruits of dying there. (31–32)

The fruits of being a devotee of various divinities. (33a–34b)

### **[Observance of fasts]**

The fruits of undertaking a fast until death. (34c–36)

The description of the *Sāntapana Parāka*, *Atikṛcchra*, *Taptakṛcchra*, *Cāndrāyaṇa*, *Yati-cāndrāyaṇa* and *Śīśucāndrāyaṇa* observances, and the fruits of practising them. (37a–50b)

The fruits of fasting every other day, fortnight and one month for a year. (50c–53)

The fruits of an observance on consuming food. (54–55)

The fruit of not consuming honey and meat. (56)

The significance of celibacy. (57)

The significance of giving up all wealth. (58)

A list of bad food that is not to be offered to Brāhmins. (59)

Devī's question about the fruits of resorting to and worshipping different divinities. (60)

### **[Worship of different divinities]**

Śiva's reply on worship and the respective rewards of worshipping Brahmā, Agni, Kubera, Gaṇeśa, Nāgas, Skanda, and Āditya all in twelve forms (except Nāgas), on the first, second, third, forth, fifth, sixth and seventh days respectively of each month, starting from Mārgaśīrṣa to Kārttika. (61–91)

The fruits of fasting and worshipping Śaṅkara, Devadeva, Tryambaka, Sthāṇu, Hara, Śiva, Bhava, Nīlakaṇṭha, Piṅgala, Rudra, Īśāna and Ugra, on the eighth day of each month starting from Mārgaśīrṣa to Kārttika. (92–106b)

The fruits of fasting and worshipping twelve different forms of Mahādevī on the ninth day. (106c–113b)

The fruits of fasting and worshipping the mother goddess for nine consecutive ninth lunar days. (113c–116b)

The fruits of worshipping twelve forms of Yama on the tenth day of each month beginning with Mārgaśīras. (116c–121b)

The fruits of worshipping twelve forms of Dharma on the eleventh day. (121c–126b)

The fruits of fasting and worshipping Keśava, Nārāyaṇa, Mādhava, Govinda, Viṣṇu, Madhusūdana, Trivikrama, Vāmana, Śrīdhara, Hṛṣīkeśa, Padmanābha and Dāmodara on the twelfth day for a year. (126c–138b)

The fruits of worshipping Viṣṇu for a year and for a lifetime. (138c–141b)

The fruits of worshipping the twelve forms of Anaṅga on the thirteenth lunar day. (141c–145)

The fruits of worshipping Parameśvara in his twelve forms on the fourteenth lunar day. (146–150)

The fruits of satisfying the ancestors on the new and full moon days of Mārgaśīra. (151–154)

The names of the ancestors of the four castes. (155)

The fruits of fasting and worshipping Agni on a full moon day. (156–157)

The fruits and procedure of worshipping Prajāpati on a new moon day. (158–160b)

The fruits and procedure of worshipping Agni on the second day. (160c–163)

The procedure of worshipping Kubera on the third day. (164)

The fruits and procedure of worshipping Vighneśvara on the fourth day. (165–166)

The fruits and procedure of worshipping Nāgas on the fifth day. (167–169)

The fruits and procedures of worshipping Skanda on the sixth day. (170–172)

The fruits and procedure of worshipping the Sun god [on the seventh day]. (173–174)

The fruits and procedure of worshipping Śiva on the eighth day. (175–177b)

The fruits and the procedure of worshipping Devī on the ninth day. (177c–178b)

The fruits and the procedure of worshipping Yama on the tenth day. (178c–180)

The fruits and the procedure of worshipping Dharma on the eleventh day. (181–182)

The fruits and the procedure of worshipping Viṣṇu on the twelfth day. (182–185)

The fruits and the procedure of worshipping Kāmadeva on the thirteen day. (186–188b)

The fruits and the procedure of worshipping Parameśvara on the fourteenth day. (188c–191b)

The injunction for honouring the ancestors on the new and full-moon days. (191c–195b)

End of the section on worshipping gods and ancestors in Nandin's words, stating that this is what Śaṅkara taught Devī with his western face. (195c–196)

## Chapter Four

### [The Vaidika stream]

Devī's question about Vedic *dharma* to Īśvara. (1)

### [Injunctions for Vedic students]

The god's description of the observance of a *brahmacārin*. (2–6)

### [Injunctions for householders]

The duties of the householder and the distinguishing characteristics of a Brāhmin. (7–12)

The fruits of reciting the [Vedic] *saṃhitās*. (13–14)

The proper form of livelihood for a householder. (15)

The significance of reciting mantras, making oblations, and the consequences of not performing the five mandatory sacrifices. (16)

The list of the five sacrifices and the five slaughterhouses of a householder. (17–19)

The defining characteristic of an expert in the Vedic *dharma*. (20)

The fruits of meditating while intoning *praṇava*. (21)

The conclusion of the observances of a householder. (22–24)

### [Injunctions for forest-dwellers]

The observances of the forest-dwelling stage of life. (25)

Further injunctions for a forest-dweller. (26–31)

**[Injunctions for ascetics]**

The procedures for renunciation and the injunctions for an ascetic. (32a–40)

The end of the Vedic section, taught by Śiva's Southern face. (41)

**[The Ādhyātmika stream]**

The beginning of the *ādhyātmika* section, taught by Śiva's Northern face. (42)

**[Sāṅkhya]**

The cause of everything coming into being according to Sāṅkhya. (43)

The emanation of the three qualities, the twenty-five *tattvas* of the Sāṅkhya and the distinctive feature of *puruṣa*. (44–46)

The conditions determining whether one is content or remains bound according to the Sāṅkhya system. (47)

The end of the section on Sāṅkhya and beginning of the section on Yoga. (48ab)

**[Yoga]**

The definition of a *yogin*, the right direction to face when assuming a yogic posture, the eight yogic postures, and assuming the mode of *karaṇa*. (48c–51)

The definition of *pratyāhāra*, the purpose of practising meditation, the three breath-controlling exercises and their definitions. (52a–57b)

The section on *dhāraṇā*: air, fire, earth and water, followed by the sections on *tarka* and *samādhi*. (57c–67)

The result of practising contemplation. (68–69)

**[The Atimārga stream]****[Atyāśrama]**

The teaching of the first type of Pāśupata practice, called Atyāśramavrata.<sup>143</sup> (70–88c)

**[Lokātīta]** The teaching of the second type of Pāśupata practice, called Lokātīta.<sup>144</sup> (88d–130)

<sup>143</sup>For more details see our translation and the accompanying footnotes.

<sup>144</sup>The reader is here referred to the translation of our text and footnotes thereon.

Conclusion by Śiva that he has taught the Atimārga in two forms with his Eastern face. (131)

Devī's query regarding the Mantramārga. (132)

Nandin's promise to pass on to sages the supreme knowledge of the Mantramārga that he heard while Śiva spoke to Devī with his fifth face, the Īśāna face. (133–137)

## Language

The Sanskrit employed to write the *Niśvāsamukha* is anomalous with regards to syntax and morphology, for it does not follow the rules of standard Pāṇinian Sanskrit grammar. It certainly contains forms that are in agreement with Pāṇini's rules but other forms do not. Such language applied in tantric texts is understood by the later tradition to be "*aiśa* (*īśvaraprokta*), i.e. *the speech of the Lord*." The underlying sense is that although such language is ungrammatical by the standards of human grammarians such as Pāṇini, it is specially authoritative. Kṣemarāja, the 11th century Kashmirian author, for the first time, in his commentary *Svacchandatanrodya*, terms such linguistic oddities as *aiśa* (see Goodall 1998:lxv—lxx and Törzsök 1999:xxvi ff.). Several lists of such deviations from classical Sanskrit grammar have already been drawn up by Goodall et al. (2015:113ff.) and Törzsök (1999:xxvi ff.).

We find such non-standard usages of language in the Epics and Purāṇas as well. Oberlies (2003:XXXI) observes that "The Epic language presents itself as a mixture of correct and incorrect forms, always met with side by side, within one and the same stanza." In the case of Purāṇas, such irregularities have also been taken into account and discussed so far with regard to the *Skandapurāṇa*. The editors, (Adriaensen, Bakker & Isaacson 1998:26–51; Bakker, Bisschop & Yokochi 2014:21–23; Yokochi 2013:67–72) have listed numerous non-Pāṇinian forms spread across the text. Similar linguistic features have been studied and discussed by Salomon (1986) with regard to the *Viṣṇupurāṇa*. Such irregularities in Epics and Purāṇas are called *ārṣa* (*rṣiprokta*), i.e. *the speech of a sage*, by the commentators of the Epics (Oberlies 2003:XXVIII). Franklin Edgerton (1953) has done an extensive research on deviated Sanskrit that appeared in Indian Buddhist Sanskrit texts. The principal outcome of his research is that such Sanskrit drifted forms of Sanskrit are not incorrect forms but a different register of the language.

The question now is what makes the *Niśvāsamukha*'s language *aiśa*. There are some peculiar features of the *Niśvāsamukha* that show some of the typical characteristics of *aiśa* language, which are equally shared by the other books of the *Niśvāsātattvasaṃhitā* (Goodall et al. 2015:113ff.). In the list of deviations from standard Sanskrit below we have indicated such shared characteristics with reference to the deviations noted in Goodall et al.'s edition (2015:113ff.)

A number of *aiśa* forms in the *Niśvāsamukha*, as can be observed in a large number of texts of the Mantramārga, can be explained from the perspective of metre. This is a feature that is already fairly well-established with respect to other texts, as shown by Oberlies 2003 when he deals with the Epics. Such a condition can also be observed in several tantric texts, like the remaining books of the *Niśvāsa*, the *Svacchandatantra*, the *Brahmayāmala*, different recensions of the *Kalottara*, *Matanṅga* etc.

Concerning the linguistic variants of the *Niśvāsamukha*, we have considered the possibility that some of the readings are due to scribal variation, and not an intrinsic part of the composition of the text.<sup>145</sup> The foremost among these variations is *āṃ* used for *ān* in accusative plural. For example when *Niśvāsamukha* 2:88 speaks about offering female and male slaves, it uses the phrase, *dāsīdāsāṃ ca yo dadet*, where *āṃ* ending is intended for *ān*. Likewise, masculine accusative plurals with a final *anusvāra* instead of *n* in 2:39c (*devān pitṛṇ samuddiśya*), 2:56cd (*yāvat sūryakṛtāṃ lokāṃ*) is likely a similar kind of scribal style.<sup>146</sup> We have, however, decided to keep such scribal variations in the text, following the editorial policies established by Goodall et al. 2015. We do not want to interfere much with the text as our edition is based on a single manuscript. Thus we try to present the text in much the way it has been transmitted in the manuscript, unless we have good reasons to correct it.

Here we present an exhaustive list, except those we consider to be scribal variations, of unusual linguistic forms of the *Niśvāsamukha*, some of which are also shared by the Epics and the Purāṇas. It remains open to question whether some of the following forms are scribal or a feature of the language of the *Niśvāsamukha*, but most of them seem to represent genuine features of the language of the text. For the discussion of individual cases see our translation and accompanying notes.

## Morphology of Nominal Forms

### Syncopation of a *visarga*

1:70d (*upasannāḥ sma te vāyam*) and 4:41b (*°naiśreyasa* for *°naiḥśreyasa*)

### Syncopation of a vowel

1:58a (*utpānam* for *udapānam*) and 4:16 (*japti* for *japati*)<sup>147</sup>

### Elongation of a vowel

<sup>145</sup>Some such scribal variations are discussed with reference to the *Skandapurāṇa* by Adriaensen, Bakker & Isaacson 1998:49–50. The editors of the *Skandapurāṇa* considered such readings to be no more than scribal variations and not an intrinsic part of the composition of the text.

<sup>146</sup>For more examples see 2:63a, 2:98b, 3:166a, 3:171a, 3:187a and 3:187b, 4:8b (twice), 4:18a, 4:62a, 4:62b and 4:111b. Cf. also Goodall et al. 2015:132.

<sup>147</sup>Cf. Goodall et al. 2015:118 and 123.

1:118a, 1:162a, 3:104d and 3:105d (*gāṇāpatyam* for *gāṇapatyam*), 4:8d (*hāvanam* for *ha-vanam*) and 1:11d and 1:13b (*brahmāviṣṇumaheśvarāḥ*)<sup>148</sup>

### Prākṛtic vowel

1:79c, 1:79a, 1:83a, 1:86c, 1:91a, 1:94c, 1:99b, 2:18c, 3:86d, 3:145c, 3:150c and 3:191b (*sāyojya* for *sāyujya*), and 4:95a and 4:126c (*vāgeśyām* for *vāgiśvaryām*)<sup>149</sup>

### Prākṛtic vowel with double abstract

1:41d, 1:89d, 1:96b, 3:29a and 4:87d (*śivasāyojyatām*)<sup>150</sup>

### an stem treated as āna stem

4:92c and 4:97c, 4:125d (*adhvānam*) and 4: 128d *adhvānaḥ* (it is presumably also meant to be plural)<sup>151</sup>

### Shortening of vowel

4:21d (*yadicchet* for *yadīcchet*) and 3:81a (*śarkara* for *śarkarā*)

### Singular for plural

1:64c (*tat sarvaṇ kathitan tubhyam*) and 1:170c (*mayāpi kathitam tubhyam*)<sup>152</sup> and 2:45b (*śrāddhakārayitā narāḥ*)

### Plural for singular

1:58b (*pāpātma duṣṭacetasaḥ*), 1:115d (*citrapaṭṭapradāyinaḥ*), 2:34b (*nālimārgaprayāyinaḥ*), 2:34d (*maṇḍapasya ca kāriṇaḥ*), 2:45b (*śrāddhakārayitā narāḥ*), 2:45d (*nityan dīpapradāyinaḥ*), 3:89d (*nirujo dīrghajīvināḥ*), 4:78b (*vyaktāvyaktaikaalinginaḥ*) and 3:7cd (*tāmra caiva trisandhyā ca mandākinyaḥ parāḥ smṛtāḥ* | )

### Plural for dual

1:17ab (*yathā te sarvaśāstrāṇām dīkṣājñānasya vedakau*) and 4:33b (*dīkṣu śrotrāṇi vinyaset*)

### Instrumental for locative

4:123b *mūrdhnābhibhavapañcakam*<sup>153</sup>

### Locative for instrumental

2:102 (*gavaḍhyo goprapūjane*), and 3:76b and 3:166d (*yāvajjīve gaṇottamaḥ*)

<sup>148</sup>Cf. Goodall et al. 2015:119.

<sup>149</sup>Cf. Goodall et al. 2015:127.

<sup>150</sup>Cf. Goodall et al. 2015:128.

<sup>151</sup>Cf. Goodall et al. 2015:115.

<sup>152</sup>In both cases, *tubhyam* refers to the sages *rṣayaḥ*. Thus, we expect *yusmabhyam* instead of *tubhyam*.

<sup>153</sup>Cf. Goodall et al. 2015:124.



**Nominative for locative**

3:75d (*caturtthy ubhayapakṣayoḥ*) and 3:158c (*pratipad bhojayed viprān*)<sup>154</sup>

**Nominative for accusative**

1:124d (*aśītikalpakoṭayaḥ*) and 3:11a (*ayaṃ mantram anusmṛtya*)<sup>155</sup>

**Locative for dative**

1:24d (*tryakṣāya ṛṣisambhave*), 1:31d (*śive namaḥ*), 1:157a (*pratyahaṃ śāṅkare dadyān*), three times in 2:38ab (*yastu grīṣme prapān dadyāt tṛṣṇārtte pathike jane*), 2:50b (*yaḥ prayacched dvijottame*), 2:53b (*mahiṣiṃ yo daded dvije*), 2:54d (*athavāpi dvijottame*), 2:75ab (*gajarathan tu yo dadyād brāhmaṇāya guṇānvite*), 2:100ab (*dattvā nirujatāṃ yāti āture oṣadhāni ca*), 2:119d (*ekan dadyāt tu jñānine*), 3:59c (*tad brāhmaṇe na dātavyam*), 3:118c (*ugradandadhṛte nityam*), 3:119ab (*śāsitre ca namas tubhyaṃ narakādhipate namaḥ*), 3:162c (*dadyād viprāya śobhane*), 3:175ab (*aṣṭamyāṃ vṛṣabhan dadyād bhavanāmāṅkitāṃ dvije*) and 3:181b (*vṛṣan dadyād dvijottame*)<sup>156</sup>

**Vocalic *ri* for *r***

1:1, 1:7 and 1:18 (*ricika*)<sup>157</sup>

**Feminine *ī* stem as *ā*-stem** 1:107c (*hemamayān*) and 1:109a (*mṛṇmayāṃ*)<sup>158</sup>

**Feminine *ī* stem singular treated as *yā*-stem**

1:14c (*devyāyās tu tathā pūrvam*) and 4:135d (*devyāyā gaditaṃ purā*)<sup>159</sup>

**Masculine for neuter**

1:147d (*javāpuṣpas tathaiva ca*), 4:8c (*svādhyāyaṃ pratyahaḥ kuryāt*), 1:10c: (*taṃ śrutvā āgatāḥ sarve*), 2:14 (*labhen mahāntam aiśvaryaṃ*), 4:45d (*bhūtaṣṭānāmātrāsambhavaḥ*) and 1:139a (*tān puṣpān*), 2:90a (*anyāmṛtaphalā ye ca*), 1:140c (*saugandhikādyā jalajā*), 1:155a (*nīlaraktās tu ye puṣpāḥ*) and 2:120cd (*yasya dāne na duḥkhāni naraka-pretasambhavāḥ*)<sup>160</sup>

**Neuter for masculine**

1:21c–22b (*devyāśāṅkarasaṃvādaṃ śrutam pūrvan tvayānagha || saṃsārocchittikaraṇaṃ sarvajñānāmṛtottamam*) and 3:67c–68c: *vaiśvānaraṃ jātavedaṃ*

<sup>154</sup>Cf. Goodall et al. 2015:125.

<sup>155</sup>Cf. Goodall et al. 2015:125. Note that aside from being nominative, *ayaṃ* is also masculine for neuter.

<sup>156</sup>Cf. Goodall et al. 2015:124.

<sup>157</sup>Cf. Goodall et al. 2015:133.

<sup>158</sup>Cf. Goodall et al. 2015:117.

<sup>159</sup>Cf. Goodall et al. 2015:118.

<sup>160</sup>Cf. Goodall et al. 2015:116.

*hutabhugghavyavāhanam | | devavaktraṃ sarvabhakṣaṃ ghr̥ṇī ca jagadāhakam | vibhāva-*  
*suṃ saptajihvaṃ* (except *hutabhuk* and *ghr̥ṇī*)<sup>161</sup>

### ***ap* treated as an *a*-stem masculine**

3:100c (*āpam* for *apah*)<sup>162</sup>

### **Non-thematic ending**

4:23b (*°homasu*)<sup>163</sup>

## **Compounds**

### **Member(s) in inflected from**

1:21c (*devyāśaṅkarasaṃvādam*), 1:130d (*br̥hatyāgastipuspakaiḥ*), 1:164b (*śaṣku-lyāmodakāni*), 2:21d (*sphaṭirmmarakatāni*), 3:33c (*devyāmātarayakṣeṣu*) and 3:34b (*japahomādyapūjanaiḥ*)<sup>164</sup>

### **Otiose letter in the middle of a compound**

3:165b (*sauvarṇṇan nāma-cāṅkitam*), 3:80d (*gudakṣīrasapāyasaiḥ*) and 3:82c (*gandha-puṣpasadhūpena*)

### **Shortening of a vowel**

4:13c (*tryabdād gāyātrisiddhis tu*) and 4:14a (*rgyajuḥsāmātharvāṇām*)

### **Omission of a vowel**

4:29d (*parākcāndrāyaṇais sadā*)

### **Lengthening of a vowel**

1:178c (*anānurūpaṃ yasmād dhi*) and 3:11b (*kuryān nadyāvagāhanam*)

### **Reversal of the members**

1:33b (*mūrtyākāśa* for *ākāśamūrte*) and 3:140d (*maṇiratnavicitrakaiḥ* for *vicitramaṇi-ratnakaiḥ*)

### **Dvandva followed by conjunction**

2:11c (*arccayen naranāri vā*), 4:1 (*svargāpavargahetoś ca*)<sup>165</sup>

<sup>161</sup>Cf. Goodall et al. 2015:116.

<sup>162</sup>Cf. Goodall et al. 2015:115

<sup>163</sup>Cf. Goodall et al. 2015:116.

<sup>164</sup>Cf. Goodall et al. 2015:128.

<sup>165</sup>Cf. Goodall et al. 2015:129.

### Elision of a word

1:67c (*dīpacchatraphalaṃ brūhi* for *dīpacchatradānaphalaṃ brūhi*), 1:68b (*dāsīdāsasya yat phalaṃ* for *dāsīdāsapradāna/dānasya yat phalaṃ*)<sup>166</sup>

### Morphology of the Verb

#### *ktivā* for *lyap*

2:62a (*alaṅkṛtvā tu yo dadyāt*)<sup>167</sup>

#### *ktivā* for optative

3:168ab (*pañcamyāṃ hemajaṃ padmaṃ dattvā viprāya bhojite* | )

#### Singular for dual

1:176ab (*punaś caiva samāgamyā stotreṇa tuṣṭuve haram* | )<sup>168</sup>

#### Plural for dual

2:46b (*tāmisramandhatāmisrau narakā na bhavanti hi*)

#### The root *vid* (VII) “to find” in the sense of *vid* (II) “to know”

3:14a *vindyāt* for *vidyāt* and 4:47d *vindati* for *vetti*

#### Omission of final *t*

2:30a (*pūjaye parayā bhaktyā*), 2:119a (*tasya dattaṃ bhave nantaṃ*) and 4:80b (*maṇṭe kuṇṭeti vā punaḥ*).<sup>169</sup>

#### Past perfect for optative

3:95c (*aśvamedhaphalaṃ lebhe*) and 3:11d (*dehatyāge divaṃ yayau*)

#### Optative for past tense

1:172b (*pūrvavarttaṃ hi yad bhavet*) and 1:173d (*kim etac cādbhutaṃ bhavet*)

#### Irregular optative singular

1:60b, 1:100d 2:42b, 2:52b, 2:98b and 2:104d (*dadet* for *dadyāt*), and 1:137b, 2:65b, 3:159d, 3:179d and 3:187b (*dāpayet*)

<sup>166</sup> Apart from these, there are other irregular compounds in the text, which do not fall into some specific category. These we list here: 1:54a (*bhakṣyābhakṣyaparīhāram*), 3:121a (*yāvajjīvārcanam*), 3:192d (*yāvajjīvakṛtenaiva*), 4:2c (*homajāpi*), 4:45a (*budhyahaṅkāras saṃbhūtaḥ*) and 4:122b (*harirudradaśeśakam*).

<sup>167</sup> Cf. Goodall et al. 2015:122.

<sup>168</sup> Cf. Goodall et al. 2015:134.

<sup>169</sup> Cf. Goodall et al. 2015:13. *kuṇṭeti* stands for *kuṇṭet iti*. By omitting the final *t* in *kuṇṭet* it remains *kuṇṭe* and *iti*. Finally, *kuṇṭeti* is the result of *aīśa sandhi* thereon.

**Causative for simplex**

2:8b (*mṛdā liṅgan tu kārayet*), 2:17b (*saccakena tu liṅgāni pāṛthivāni tu kārayet*), and 2:107c (*jīvaṃ rakṣayate yo hi*)<sup>170</sup>

**Simplex for causative** 1:91c *snaped* for *snāpayed*

**Gerund for infinitive**

1:176d (*varan dattvā ubhāv api*)

**Active for passive**

3:76d (*yo rcayeta gaṇādhipam*)<sup>171</sup>

**Sandhi****Hiatus within a pāda**

1:176d (*varan dattvā ubhāv api*), 1:188c (*sendrair ddevaiś ca asurair*), 1:185d (*ye martyā na namanti idṛśam ajaṃ kṣemas tu teṣāṃ kutah*), 2:8d (*labhate īpsitam phalam*),<sup>172</sup> 2:20b (*kṛīdante aṇimādibhiḥ*), 2:52b (*kṛṣṇāṇi vā āvikāṇḍadet*), 2:62b (*kanyāṇi caiva ayācitām*), 2:63d (*ye cānye abhayapradāḥ*), 2:74d (*yo dadāti upānahau*), 2:87c (*nīlasyaiva alābhe tu*), 2:100b (*āture oṣadhāni ca*), 3:123a (*ahiṃsā ca adambhaś ca*), 3:127d 3:128d, 3:129d, 3:130d, 3:132d and 3:134d (*tu upoṣitaḥ*), 4:2d (*bhaikṣāśi ca amaithunī*) and 4:38b (*anāraṃbhī ahiṃsakah*).<sup>173</sup>

**so for sa when followed by a voiced consonant**

2:31a and 2:33 (*so hi*), 3:195b (*so bhavet*) and 4:89 (*so bhramet*)<sup>174</sup>

**as-stem turned into a-stem**

1:44d (*piśācāpsararakṣasāḥ*) and 1:183b (*apsaroragakinnarair*).

**as-stem turned into an-stem**

4:81c (*paribhūtaḥ kṛcchratapā*) and 4:82a (*mahātapā ca bhavate*)

**No vṛddhi when a is followed by e**

1:19d (*śṛṇuṣvekamanā dhunā*)

<sup>170</sup>Cf. Goodall et al. 2015:122.

<sup>171</sup>Cf. Goodall et al. 2015:121.

<sup>172</sup>The same irregularity occurs in 2:13b and 2:17d.

<sup>173</sup>Cf. Goodall et al. 2015:133.

<sup>174</sup>Cf. Goodall et al. 2015:131.

### Double sandhi

1:87b (*yoddharet kulasaptakam*), 2:90a (*anyāmṛtaphalā ye ca*), 3:58b (*kuruteti*), 4:80b (*kuṇṭeti*), 4:115c (*svarlokan tu tatordhvan tu*), 4:116a (*satyaṃ caiva tatordhvaṃ tu*), 4:118c (*tattvasargaṃ atordhvan tu*), 4:121c (*gahanañ ca tatordhvan tu*) and 4:121d (*vigraheśaṃ tatordhvataḥ*)<sup>175</sup>

### Hiatus Breakers

**m:** 1:11a: (*te dr̥ṣṭvā tvayi-m-āyāntā*), 1:38b twice (*hy aja-m-* and *akṣara-m-avyayaḥ*), 2:46a (*tāmisra-m-andhatāmisrau*), 2:31cd (*nadīṃ vaitaraṇīṃ caiva-m-uṣṇatoyāṃ mahāravām*) and 4:89d (*sa jaṭi muṇḍa-m-eva vā*)<sup>176</sup>

**r:** 1:185c (*varārthino -r-ahar*)

### Syntax

#### Anacoluthon

1:72–1:76 (starts with an optative and ends with a conditional; it is also an incomplete sentence), 1:77 1:78–1:79, 2:38c–39b, 2:43c–44b, 2:56 2:65 (start with a singular structure and end with a plural) and 3:178c–3:180b (start with a singular structure and end with a plural and also constitutes an incomplete sentence)<sup>177</sup>

#### Cumbersome syntax

1:87, 1:95, 1:135, 1:148–149, 1:152c–154b, 1:172–173, 1:178, 2:1, and 2:3ab, 2:33c–34b, 2:37d, 2:45c–46b, 2:56–57, 2:66, 2:65, 2:69, 2:85a–86b, 3:1, 3:69ab, 3:101c, 3:145cd, 3:148ab, 164 and 4:123ab.<sup>178</sup>

#### Two correlative pronouns for a single relative

2:32c–33b (*setubandhan tu yaḥ kuryāt karddame pathi dāruṇe | dharmmarājapure so hi durggame sukhayāyy asau | |*)

#### Omission of relative and correlative pronouns

1:88 (*kṣīreṇa snāpayel liṅgaṃ kṛṣṇāṣṭamicaturdaśī | yāvajjīvakṛtāt pāpān mucyate nātra saṃśayaḥ | |*)

<sup>175</sup>Cf. Goodall et al. 2015:130–131.

<sup>176</sup>Cf. Goodall et al. 2015:133.

<sup>177</sup>Cf. Goodall et al. 2015:135–136.

<sup>178</sup>For particular awkwardness in syntax of these cases, see the translation and footnotes accompanying these verses.

### Omission of a relative pronoun

2:52, 2:65, 2:68, 3:100, 3:197

### Absence of case-ending for days of the fortnight

1:69d, 1:80b, 1:88b, 1:93b (*kṛṣṇāṣṭamicaturddasī*) and 3:114 (*labhate sarvakāmāṃs tu navamīnavamoṣitaḥ | maricapraśānaṃ kṛtvā navamīnava yo 'rccayet |* |)

### Otiose repetition

1:110c–1011 (*śvetaṃ raktaṃ tathā pītaṃ kṛṣṇaṃ vā cāmaran dadet | | hemadaṇḍan tu raupyaṃ vā raityaṃ trāpuṣaṃ eva vā | idrṣaṇ cāmaraṃ datvā rudraloke mahīyate |*), 1:130c–131 (*mantrasiddhim avāpnoti brhatyāgastipuspakaiḥ | | yo rccayet parameśānaṃ siddhakena samāhitaḥ | sarvakāmān avāpnoti yo rcayed gandhapuspakaiḥ | |*), 1:142c–143b (*jayārthe damanakaṃ syād yo rccayet parameśvaram | | nirjitāḥ śatrasvas tena yo rccayeta vṛṣadhvajam |*), 2:90 (*anyāmṛtaphalā ye ca dattvā tu subhago bhavet | bahuputraś ca rūpādhyas subhagaś caiva jāyate | |*), 3:73c–74 (*lokapāleśvaraś caiva yakṣendraḥ parikīrtitaḥ | abdaṃ pūjayate yas tu yakṣaṃ bhaktisamanvitaḥ | | dhanadhānyasamṛddhaś ca yāvajjīvena yakṣarāt |*) and 4:36c–36b (*tridaṇḍakuṇḍī cakrī ca naikānnādas sa bhaikṣabhuk | | na tv asvam upabhuñjīta bhaikṣavṛttisamāśritaḥ |*)

### Ordinal instead of Cardinal Number

3:114b (*navamīnavamoṣitaḥ*)

### Other Irregular Numbers

There are some cases of irregular formations with regard to numbers as well which we list below: 1:86c: *dvirabdena* for *dvyabdena*, 1:167a and 1:167d *triṣkāla* for *trikāla*, 2:7b *viṃśabhiḥ* for *viṃśatibhiḥ* and 2:7c *triṃśabhiḥ* for *triṃśatibhiḥ*

### Words Missing in Lexicons

There are also some lexical items that we are also not able to identify in any other work in this meaning:

- NM 1:51b *apsara* (denoting a flower)
- NM 1:151c *ditvākṣī* (denoting a flower)
- NM 2:102c *marjjitā* (denoting a flower)

### Elsewhere Unattested *Aiśa* Forms

The language of the *Niśvāsamukha* attests to some more aspects of *aiśa* language. Here we list four cases taken from the above list of *aiśa* forms that are not listed in the list of *aiśa* forms of Goodall et al. (2015):

- **Gerund (*dattvā*) for infinitive *dātuṃ*:** We come across this instance in the passage of the *Liṅgodbhava*, when Śiva stands in front of Brahmā and Viṣṇu to grant a boon to them: 1:176d (*varan dattvā ubhāv api*). The context tells us that the gerund *dattvā* is meant for infinitive *dātuṃ*.
- **Optative for past perfect:** In verse 1:172b (*pūrvavarttaṃ hi yad bhavet*) and 1:173d (*pūrvavarttaṃ hi yad bhavet*) the optative is used, even when the context demands past tense.
- **Past perfect for optative:** In 3:11d (*dehatyāge divaṃ yayau*) and 3:95c (*aśvamedhaphalaṃ lebhe*) we expect optative and what we have is past perfect.<sup>179</sup>
- **Absence of case-ending for days of the fortnight:** We encounter absence of case-ending for days of the fortnight in the following cases: 1:69d, 1:80b, 1:88b, 1:93b (*kṣṇāṣṭamicaturddaśī*) and 3:114 (*labhate sarvākāmāṃs tu navamīnavamoṣitaḥ | maricapraśānaṃ kṛtvā navamīnava yo rccayet |* | )

### Metre

The text is written in śloka (*anuṣṭubh* metre) with the exception of the concluding verse of the first chapter, which is written in the *śārdūlavikrīḍita* metre. The style of the śloka is defined by an abundant use of *vipulās*. Goodall (1998:lxxi) observes in his discussion of metrical features of early Śaiva tantras, such as, the *Kiraṇa* and the *Svāyaṃbhuvāsūtra-saṅgraha*, that they are metrically basic. They almost never use *vipulās*. The *Pārameśvara*, *Mataṅga* and *Parākhya*, however, show more variations and use them occasionally. The *Niśvāsamukha* stands out, just like the other books of the *Niśvāsa*, when we compare its style of the śloka with other tantras. We even observe some use of *sa-vipulās*, which is of course rare, and whose authenticity may be questionable, but which is also shared by the other books of the *Niśvāsa* and the *Mahābhārata* (Goodall et al. 2015:237–238). There are a few instances of hypermetry, hypometry and of lines that are in other ways unmetrical. Here follows a list of lines that deviate from the standard *pathyā* pattern:

- **na-vipulā:** 1:4c, 1:22a, 1:85a, 1:120c; 1:144c, 1:158c, 2:18a, 2:33c, 2:39a, 2:44a, 2:44c, 2:50a, 2:65a, 2:91a, 2:92c, 2:95c, 2:114a, 3:10a, 3:77a, 3:88a, 3:105c, 3:159a, 3:171a,

<sup>179</sup>It is to be noted that our text uses simple present and optative interchangeably.

3:177a, 3:194c, 4:32c, 4:36c, 4:37a, 4:82a, 4:86c, 4:100a (with irregular preamble),<sup>180</sup> 4:102c, 4:105c, 4:109a, 4:109c, 4:112a, 4:118a and 4:132c.

- **ma-vipulā**: 2:49a, 3:17a, 3:26a, 3:43c (with irregular preamble), 3:89c, 3:116c, 3:128a (with irregular preamble), 3:132a (with irregular preamble), 3:138a, 3:147c (with irregular preamble), 3:161c, 3:177c (with irregular preamble), 4:32a, 4:35c, 4:40c, 4:45a (with irregular preamble), 4:71a, 4:90c, 4:94c and 4:99a.
- **bha-vipulā**: 1:140c, 1:153c (with irregular preamble), 3:5c (with irregular preamble), 3:34c, 3:72a (with irregular preamble), 3:90c, 3:143c, 3:151a, 4:17a, 4:27a, 4:46c, 4:69a, 4:78a (with irregular preamble), 4:81c (with irregular preamble) and 4:105c.
- **sa-vipulā**: 1:142c, 3:31c, 3:115c, 4:103c and 4:122a.
- **ra-vipulā**: 3:23a, 3:31a, 3:63a, 3:64c, 3:67c, 3:68a, 3:102c, 3:103c, 3:133a, 4:6a, 4:67a, 4:75c, 4:82c, 4:85a and 4:102a.
- **unmetrical**: 1:3d, 2:49a, 2:98c, 4:100b, 4:126a (the second and the third syllables are short), 3:93a and 3:94c (the seventh syllable is short).
- **hypermetry**: 1:37a, 2:101a, 3:6a and 3:67a.
- **hypometry**: 1:84c and 3:64a.

---

<sup>180</sup>We have not considered “irregular preamble” when the break (*yati*) is not in a proper syllable.



## Manuscripts

### Sources for the *Niśvāsamukha*

#### The Manuscript N.

The principal source for the present edition is a palm-leaf manuscript transmitting the *Niśvāsātattvasaṃhitā*, N, preserved in the National Archives, Kathmandu (NAK). The Nepal-German Manuscript Preservation Project (NGMPP) reel number is A 41/14, the NAK accession number is 1-277, the size of the manuscript is 50.0 x 4.0 cm. The manuscript consists of 114 folios written in the Nepalese “Licchavi” script. Both the recto and verso sides contain six (occasionally five) lines. The manuscript contains two binding holes, one to the left and one to the right of the centre. The manuscript is considerably damaged in the margins. The leaves were originally numbered in letters-symbols in the right-hand margin of the versos. These leaves have been renumbered at a later stage above the first binding hole in a different hand. There is a third hand that inserted correction marks to the second foliation below the same binding hole.

Although the manuscript is not dated, on the basis of palaeographic evidence we can assign it, with a reasonable margin of error, to the 9th century. Various scholars have taken note of the above manuscript, and put forward tentative dates: Śāstrī (1905), Bagchi (1929), Goudriaan and Gupta (1981), Sanderson (2006) and Goodall and Isaacson (2007), and most recently Goodall et al. (2015). It has been dated from the middle of the 8th to the very beginning of the 10th century. Goodall et al. (2015:108) after a long discussion based on comparison with other early Nepalese manuscripts, proposes the date of the manuscript to 850–900 AD, which is also the date proposed by Sanderson (2006:152). We, however, feel that the lower date of the manuscript is a little early. On the grounds of palaeography, the date of the *Niśvāsa* manuscript probably falls after the date of the manuscript of the Nepalese *Suśrutasamhitā* which is dated to 878 AD. (Harimoto 2014).

Apart from the NAK manuscript, there are three apographs of the *Niśvāsātattvasaṃhitā*:

**Apograph W.** It is preserved in the Wellcome Institute, London: Wellcome Institute Sanskrit MS number I.33, Devanagari script, 114 folios. Both the recto and verso sides containing five to six lines. The foliation is in the right-hand margin of the verso, and is in a few cases wrong. The scribe gives raised dashes for the damaged or illegible letters. This apograph is dated *vikramasamvat* 1969, which corresponds to 1912 AD. The colophon states that the manuscript was copied in Nepal by one Bauddhasevita Vajrācārya. The post-colophon runs as follows: *ida(!) pustaka(!) tāra(!)patraguptākṣarapustake dṛṣṭvā nepālavāsi-bauddhasevitavajrācāryena(!) likhitam || śubham || | śrīsamvat 1969 sālām iti āṣāḍhaśukla-aṣṭamīyām*. In comparison, this MS retains more letters than the following apograph K from the damaged portion of the original MS. This is due to the fact that it was prepared at a time when the original MS was less damaged. The copyist tried to be faithful to the original. Unlike K, it avoids conjectures.

**Apograph K.** This apograph is preserved in the NAK and dated *Vikrama samvat* 1982

(1925 AD). The colophon states that it was prepared at the request of Rājaguru Hemarāja Śarma during the reign of King Tribhuvana when Candra Śamśera was his prime minister.<sup>181</sup>

The NGMPP reel number is A 159/18, and the NAK accession number 5-2406. The text is written in Devanāgarī script on 114 folios 49 x 13 cm in size. Both the recto and verso sides contain six to ten lines. The recto side of folio 104 is blank. The regular foliation is in the middle of the right-hand margin of the verso with numbers occasionally being crossed out and corrected. There are three deviating foliations: in the extreme lower right-hand margin, in the extreme upper right-hand margin and in the extreme upper left-hand margin of the verso. The scribe leaves gaps for unrecovered letters, and gives dots when only a small portion of letters is visible. In damaged places, the scribe attempts to restore letters. Frequently he, too, provides conjectures replacing irregular or non-Pāṇinian Sanskrit forms with regular ones. He puts parentheses around uncertain readings. In few cases, parentheses are left empty, or enclosed with dots.

**Apograph T.** This apograph is preserved in the Tucci collection in Italy. It is written in Devanāgarī script. The MS number is 3:7:1 and the folio size is 48.5x 9.5 cm. There are 94 folios, fols. 1, 4, 5 and 98–104 of which are missing. Both the recto and verso sides usually contain five to six lines. The foliation is located in the lower right-hand margin of the verso (see Sferra 2008:60, fn. 132). The scribe adds dots to indicate either damaged portions or unreadable letters. Since the MS does not have a final colophon its date cannot be determined. Nonetheless, we can say that N had become more damaged by the time this scribe sat down to copy, since he has recorded fewer letters in the margins. Thus, we can tentatively say that this MS is somewhat later than K and W. The scribe obviously had difficulty reading N, and given the large number of scribal errors, we have not drawn upon this MS.

### Sources for the *Śivadharmaśaṅgraha*

We have included an edition of chapters 5–9 of the *Śivadharmaśaṅgraha* in the Appendix as these chapters closely parallel the *Niśvāsamukha*. We have used two Nepalese manuscripts and one printed book for the preliminary critical edition of these five chapters:

**Manuscript A.** This manuscript is from the Asiatic Society of Bengal, Kolkata. It is a palm-leaf manuscript written in Newari script and is damaged in the margins. The MS number is G 4077/3. There are 324 folios, and both the recto and verso sides contain five lines. They are 53 x 4.5 cm in size and have two binding holes. The original foliation is

<sup>181</sup>The post-colophon reads as follows: *likhitam idaṃ purāṇanajarattāḍapatralivitaḥ samuddhṛtya vikramābde 1982 pramite śrāvāṇaśuklaikādaśyāṃ samāpya sāmāśivāya samarpitaṃ* [[ka]]*virājani nepālabhūmaṇḍalādhiśvare śrīpaṇcakasaṃpanne tribhuvanavīravikramavarmaṇi samabhiśāsati* [[ca]] *taddhīśacive śrītrīṭayasaṃpanne mahārāja-candrasaṃśerajaṅgavahādūrarāṇavarmaṇi mahāmahodaye tadīyaguruvaragururājaśrīmaddhemarājapaṇḍita-mahodayānujñāyā tadīyasarasvatīsādane niveśitaṃ ca bhūyāḥ lekhaḥkapāṭhakayor mudeḥ śubhamḥ maṇigalamḥ hariharau śaraṇīkaravāmiḥ iti śubham.*

in the left-hand margin of the verso, marked in letter-symbols. There is a second foliation below the first binding hole in figures. The MS contains nine separate texts: *Śivadharmasāstra*, *Śivadharmottara*, *Śivadharmasaṅgraha*, *Umāmaheśvarasaṁvāda*, *Śivopaniṣad*, *Uttarot-tarasaṁvāda*, *Vṛṣasārasaṅgraha*, *Dharmaputrikā* and an otherwise unknown *Lalitavistara*.<sup>182</sup> As indicated by its palaeographic features, it can be placed at the end of the 10th or beginning of the 11th century. The reading of this manuscript in numerous cases is close to that of the *Niśvāsamukha*. Some archaic Prākṛtic forms, such as *sāyojya* for *sāyujya* are also preserved. Although this manuscript is very old, and might therefore be expected to be very accurate, it contains numerous slips of the pen.

**Manuscript C.** This is another multi-text manuscript currently housed in the University Library, Cambridge, England. It is dated Nepal *saṁvat* 256 (1136 AD). The manuscript shelf number is MS ADD. 1645, and the script is Newari.<sup>183</sup> There are 247 folios, and both the recto and verso sides of it usually contain six lines. Fols. 87-131 cover the *Śivadharmasaṅgraha*. The foliation is given on the verso; in the left-hand side spelled out in letters and in the right-hand side in figures. It contains all other texts of Manuscript A except the *Lalitavistara*. This is the most reliable source for the present edition of the *Śivadharmasaṅgraha* as it contains less scribal errors.

**Printed edition.** This printed edition, *E<sub>N</sub>*, titled *Paśupatimatam śivadharmasāstram paśupatināthadarśanam*, sometimes accompanied by a Nepali translation and in some cases by added comments, was produced by Narahari Natha in the year 2055 VS (1998 AD) under the editorship of Viṣṇu Prasād Aryāl Ātreya and Śrīśa Thāpā. The title of the book is the editors' own. The tome contains the same eight texts as the Cambridge manuscript C. It is poorly edited on the basis of a single manuscript. The *Śivadharmasaṅgraha* covers pages 323–433. See Anil Acharya 2009\*:114–115 for more details.

## Editorial Policies

A policy for critical edition of the *Niśvāsa* corpus has been established in Goodall et al. 2015 and we overall follow this policy in the present edition. There is, however, one major difference. As mentioned above, the *Niśvāsamukha* has been copied by the *Śivadharmasaṅgraha* and we have decided to include its reading into our edition of the *Niśvāsamukha*. This adds a new element to the constitution of the text.

The critically edited text appears as the main text of each page. The apparatus is fully positive and is divided into two registers. On the page where both registers are present, the uppermost register records testimonia and parallels and the bottom register records the variants found in the manuscripts. Each entry starts with a chapter number and then

<sup>182</sup>Dr. Anil Kumar Acharya first identified the latter text.

<sup>183</sup>The complete manuscript is available online now at: <http://cudl.lib.cam.ac.uk/view/MS-ADD-01049-00001/3>.

a verse number in boldface (e.g. **1:97**). Then comes a word, phrase or fragment from the main text followed by a lemma sign ( [ ] ). After this appears the siglum (or sigla) of the source (or sources), then the variants, separated from each other by semicolons. The variants are listed after a semicolon, each followed by the sigla of the sources that read the given variant. A siglum that is followed by superscript *ac* indicates the reading of a source before correction (ante correctionem) and a siglum followed by superscript *pc* indicates the reading of a source after correction (post correctionem). When a reading is unmetrical, that is recorded after the sigla of the source.

We have used four sources to produce a critical edition of the *Niśvāsamukha*: N, K, W and the edited chapters (5–9) of the *Śivadharmasaṅgraha*.

When a portion of text is lost in the manuscript, N, we have marked it as ---. If there is loss of text in other sources and only K records some text then it is marked between two double square brackets [...]. The reading enclosed in single round brackets (...) is the reading of K where the scribe is not certain about the reading as indicated by round brackets in the manuscript.

If there is a loss of text in other sources and only W records some text then it is marked between two double round brackets ((...)). If there is loss of text in other sources and both K and W record some text then it is marked between two double square and round brackets: [((...))]. If the reading is lost in all the manuscripts consulted, and the corresponding reading is extant in the *Śivadharmasaṅgraha*, the relevant passage has been adopted from the edited text of the *Śivadharmasaṅgraha*. The readings adopted from the *Śivadharmasaṅgraha* are by definition insecure, since we have established that the *Śivadharmasaṅgraha* modifies the text considerably when borrowing passages from the *Niśvāsamukha* (see our discussion on p. 71). Still, we have preferred to include the readings of the *Śivadharmasaṅgraha* into the gaps of the *Niśvāsamukha* to continue the flow of the text. We have, however, put the reading of the *Śivadharmasaṅgraha* between double angled brackets (⟨...⟩) to alert the reader to those portions of the texts that have been incorporated from the *Śivadharmasaṅgraha*.

When the text is omitted in one particular source we have placed *om.* just before the siglum of that source; for example: *om.* N. The text enclosed by a single square bracket '[ ]' is supplied by us; each folio and line change in the manuscript is marked and placed within the same bracket; for example [ 3] stands for third line in the manuscript and [3<sup>v</sup>] indicates that this is the beginning of the third folio. When we are not certain about our reading we have supplied a question mark (?) after the reading. When the text is uninterpretable to us, we have put it between crux marks: †... †. When apographs leave long dashes we have marked them: - . If there appear two long dashes in apographs it is marked thus: - - . Gaps left by the scribe in the original manuscript have been marked with a --- and those left by the scribes of the apographs with □. Where the gap is large and there is a possibility of counting the number of letters lost, we have marked ◇ for each letter. For example, if five letters are lost in a gap, then it is presented in this way: ◇ ◇ ◇ ◇ ◇. Letters that are enclosed between plus-sings (+ ...+) represent those letters that were added later by the

same or a different hand. Letter(s) that appear between two 'x .. x' signs had been written in manuscripts and cancelled later. The sign ⊗ stands for ornamental signs in manuscripts written before or after colophons. A list of all these symbols is provided at the start of the edition.

When there are scribal errors and other obvious mistakes, we have corrected the text with the mark *em.* (emendation); bolder corrections are marked *conj.* (conjecture). Of course, the difference is somewhat subjective. These conjectures are made when there is a complete lacuna in the text or only a little part of the *akṣaras* is visible. In case these conjectures have been supplied by others this is mentioned in the apparatus. When an *avagraha* is missing in our sources, we have silently supplied it.

The verse numeration is more or less arbitrary. In most of the text a verse is divided up into four-*pādas*. Occasionally a verse is divided into six-*pādas* if there is lacuna in the text, if demanded by the context, such as change of the speaker or sometimes for the sake of meaning.

The middle register contains testimonia, i.e. passages from other sources, older or younger, that are parallel or close enough to our text. The entry starts with the verse number. The testimonia is preceded by 'cf.' if the passage is somewhat similar to the *textus criticus* of the *Niśvāsamukha*, or can throw some light on it.

In our preliminary edition of the relevant chapters of the *Śivadharmasaṅgraha* in Appendix I, we have followed the same editorial conventions as in the case of the *Niśvāsamukha* except for the use of square and round brackets.

## Symbols and Abbreviations in the Apparatus

- « » Enclosed text refer to the readings of the *Śivadharmasaṅgraha*.  
+ + Enclosed text by plus signs refers to those letters that were added later by the same or a different hand.  
x x Letter(s) that have been written in manuscripts and cancelled later.  
◇ A number of letters lost in the manuscript.  
□ Gap left by the scribes of the apographs.  
--- Gap left by the scribe in the original manuscript.  
- Long dashes in the apographs.  
† † The text between these signs is uninterpretable to us.  
? Used when we are not certain about the reading.  
□ Supplied by us.  
[[ ]] Enclosed reading refers to the text that survives only in K.  
(()) Enclosed reading refers to the text that survives only in W.  
[[ ( ) ]] Enclosed reading refers to the text that survives in both K and W and is lost in N.  
( ) The text enclosed represents the reading of K where the scribe is not certain about the reading. This bracket is used in the manuscript itself.  
⊗ The sign stands for ornamental signs in manuscripts written before or after colophons.

conj.	conjecture	em.	emendation
ac	before correction	pc	after correction
f.	folio	cf.	carried forward
r	recto	v	verso
om.	omit(s)		

## Sigla of the Manuscripts and the Edition Used

- N National Archives, Kathmandu, NGMPP reel number is A 41 / 14, the NAK accession number is 1-277 and the size of the manuscript is 50.0 x 4.0 cm. The manuscript consists of 114 folios written in the Nepalese “Licchavi” script. Although the manuscript is not dated, on the basis of paleographic evidence we can assign it, with a reasonable margin of error to 850 – 900 AD. Both the recto and verso sides contain six (occasionally five) lines.
- W Wellcome Institute, London: Wellcome Institute Sanskrit MS number I. 33, Devanagari script, 114 folios. This apograph is dated *vikramasamvat* 1969, which corresponds to AD 1912. Both the recto and verso sides contain five to six lines.
- K National Archives, Kathmandu, NGMPP reel number is A 159/18, and the NAK accession number 5-2406. The text is written in Devanagari script on 114 folios 49 x 13 cm in size. Both the recto and verso sides contain six to ten lines. The recto side of folio 104 is blank. This apograph is dated Vikrama *samvat* 1982 (1925 AD).
- T Tucci collection in Italy. It is written in Devanāgarī script. The MS number is 3:7:1 and the folio size is 48.5x 9.5 cm. There are 94 folios, fols. 1, 4, 5 and 98–104 of which are missing. Both the recto and verso sides usually contain five to six lines. We have not used this apograph as it contains many scribal errors.