The rewriting of a Tantric tradition: from the Siddhayogeśvarīmata to the Timirodghāṭana and beyond

Judit Törzsök

The rewriting of a Tantric tradition: from the *Siddhayogeśvarīmata* to the *Timirodghāṭana* and beyond*

Judit Törzsök

The earliest surviving scriptural sources that teach the Hindu tantric worship of goddesses and female spirits (*yoginī*s), the *Siddhayogeśvarīmata* and the *Brahmayāmala* (composed around the 7th century CE), belong to a corpus of texts called Bhairavatantras.[1] The main rituals they prescribe have the same structure as those of the *śaiva* Siddhānta and Tantras teaching the cult of Bhairava; but their pantheon, their mantras and some of their additional rituals are different, all of them involving mantra goddesses as opposed to male deities. These texts also teach the worship of numerous female spirits, *yoginī*s or *yogeśvarī*s, some of whom are goddess-like beings, others are rather human witch-like figures.

Subsequently, a new current, kaulism, developed from these *yoginī* cults, perhaps around the 8th or 9th century CE. It internalised the whole ritual system as well as the pantheon: the *yoginī*s became the goddesses of the senses in the body (*kula*) of the practitioner, and the rituals, such as *pūjā* or fire rituals, all came to be performed as internal worship in the body, based on yogic practices and meditation. Kaulism also lay much emphasis on possession (*āveśa*), although this phenomenon was already present in the early *yoginī* cults.

In what follows, I shall focus upon borrowings, changes and transformations that occur between an early text of the *yoginī* cult, the *Siddhayogeśvarīmata* ('The Teaching of Powerful Yoginīs') and an early *kaula* text, the *Timirodghāṭana* ('The Removal of the Darkness [of Ignorance]'), whose *codex unicus* was discovered and transcribed by Somdev Vasudeva. I hope to show that despite the fact that some of the textual changes seem minor, they often imply significant transformations of doctrine and practice. In addition to these two texts, I shall draw upon other parallels of related sources, with the help of which the relative dating

*This article is dedicated to the memory of N.R. Bhatt, whose editions of *śaiva* texts constitute a milestone in the study of Āgamas and Tantras. The scriptures discussed here belong to a more esoteric tradition than what he worked on; but the method to interpret them is the same: a philological inquiry into the ways in which they were read, understood and rewritten, without which no serious investigation about their history can be made. I would like to thank Somdev Vasudeva, who not only discovered and transcribed the *Timirodghāṭana*, but made his etext available immediately to others working in the field. I am also greatly indebted to Dominic Goodall, who has kindly shared several of his transcripts and draft editions, of which I used the *Niśvāsa*, the *Mohacūḍottara* and the *Sarvajñānottara* in this paper. I am also grateful to Shaman Hatley and Csaba Kiss for sharing their work on the *Brahmayāmala*, and to Olga Servaeva and Prof. Alexis Sanderson for their etext and draft edition of the *Jayadrathayāmala*.

[1] For the first, more detailed, account of how the *yoginī* cult was transformed in kaulism, see Sanderson 1988: 679ff., on which this short introductory summary is based.

of some *kaula* scriptures can perhaps be established, at least tentatively.

1. Bhairava's description and iconography

The first and most striking parallel can be found at the very beginning of the *Timirodghāṭana*. The description of Bhairava at the beginning of the first chapter is almost entirely taken over from chapter 20 of the *Siddhayogeśvarīmata*, in which it is not a description but a prescription, given for the visualisation (*dhyāna*) of Bhairava in his half male half female form (*ardhanārīśvara*).[2]

[2]I would like to thank Olga Serbaeva-Saraogi and Csaba Kiss for pointing out this parallel to me simultaneously. I am also indebted to Olga Serbaeva-Saraogi for discovering another parallel (starting with *lokālokagataṃ*, see part 2. of this paper) thanks to a computer generated list of parallels she kindly shared with me. The program which compiled the list was created by her father and herself.

kapālamālābharaṇaṃ
catur*vadanaśobhanam /*
bhujaiḥ ṣoḍaśabhir devaṃ
kālaṃ dvādaśalocanam //24//
jaṭāmakuṭabaddhorddhaṃ
śaśāṅkakṛtamūrdhani /
piṅgakeśaṃ mahāghoraṃ
jvalantam iva pāvakam //25//
nāgayajñopavītaṃ ca
mahāgonāsakuṇḍalam /
kaṭisthaṃ nāgarājānaṃ
devadevavirājitam //26//
gonāsair divyarūpais tu
kaṭakair nūpurais tathā /
śobhate devadeveśam
umādehārdhadhāriṇam //27//
khaṭvāṅgadhāriṇaṃ devaṃ
śūlapāṇibhayānakam /
mahāmuṇḍadharaṃ vīraṃ
tathā vajrāsidhāriṇam //28//
śaktihastaṃ ca paraśuṃ
śava*mālāvibhūṣitam /*
mahāśavakarāṃbhoja-
tatkṛtakarṇapūraṇam //29//
gajacarmottarīyaṃ syād
ghaṇṭāhastaṃ mahābalam /
vyāghracarmāmbaradharaṃ
duṣprekṣaṃ tridaśair api //30//
koṭarākṣaṃ mahāśastraṃ
mahāmudrāvibhūṣitam /
lelihānamahājihvaṃ
saṃsārocchittikārakam //31//
kapālaṃ vāmahastasthaṃ
tathā ḍamarukaṃ kare /
cakrapāṇiṃ sadhanuṣaṃ
śarodyatakaraṃ tathā //32//
padmahastaṃ savīṇaṃ ca
tathā karttarikākaram /
hasantaṃ kilikilāyantaṃ
mahābhīmāṭṭahāsinam //33//
Siddhayogeśvarīmata 20.24-33.

kapālamālinaṃ deva[ṃ]
pañca*vaktraṃ ca śobhitaṃ //6//*
bhujaṣoḍaśasaṃyuktaṃ
kālaṃ dvāda[śa]locanaṃ /
jaṭābaddhordhvamakuṭaṃ
śaśāṅkakṛtaśekharam //7//
piṅgakeśaṃ mahāghoraṃ
jvalantam iva pāvakam /
nāgayajñopavītī ca
mahāgonāsakuṇḍalam //8//
kaṭakanāgarājendra-
keyūraiḥ kaṭisūtrakaiḥ /

śobhate devadeveśaṃ
umādehārdhadhāriṇam //9//
khaṭvāṅgadhāriṇaṃ devaṃ
śūlapāṇibhayānakam
*mahāsa*dharaṃ vīraṃ*
tathā vajrāsidhāriṇam //10//
śaktiparaśuhastaś ca
akṣa*mālāvibhūṣitam /*
mahāśavakarāṃbhoja-
sukṛtakarṇipūritaṃ //11/
gajacarmottarīyaṃ ca
ghaṇṭāhastabhayānakaṃ /
vyāghracarmaparīdhāno
duṣprekṣaṃ tridaśair api //12//
koṭarākṣamahāśastraṃ
mahāmudrāvibhūṣitam /
lelihantamahājihvā
saṃsārocchittikārakaḥ //13//
kapālaṃ vāmahastasthaṃ
tathā ḍamarukaṃ kare /
cakrapāṇi-dhanuś-caiva
śarodyatakaraṃ tathā //14//
padmahastaṃ savīṇaṃ ca
tathā karttarikā kare /
hasantaṃ kilakilāyantaṃ
mahābhīmo 'ṭṭahāsinam //15//
Timirodghāṭana 1.6cd-15

‘The god holds a garland of (or a tiara decorated with) skulls and shines forth with **four —› five**[3] heads. The black deity has sixteen arms and twelve eyes, his dreadlocks are bound into a headdress above and his head bears the moon. His hair is reddish brown, he is very ferocious, blazing like fire. His brahmanic thread is made of a snake and huge serpents form his earrings. *The king of snakes is around his waist and he is decorated with divine serpents for bracelets and anklets. —› He has the king of snakes instead of bracelets, armlets and waistbands.*[4] Thus does the ruler of the gods shine forth, with half of his body being the goddess Umā. The god carries a skull-topped staff and brandishes a trident in his hand. He is frightening, carrying a hairless human head[5], a Vajra, a sword, a spear, and a battle-axe. He is decorated with a **garland of human bodies —› rosary**. Instead of beautiful lotuses, human hands deck his ears; his upper garment is an elephant hide. This *very strong —› terrifying* god carries a bell in his hand, wears a tiger-skin for a loin-cloth, and is hard to behold even for the gods. His eyes are hollow, he holds a huge dagger and is decorated with ornaments made of human bone. His enormous tongue flickers in and out to devour the world. His left hand carries a human skull, and he also holds an hour-glass shaped drum, a disc and a bow with an arrow in a raised hand. He bears a lotus, a Vīṇā and scissors. He smiles, chuckles and *makes a boisterous, terrifying laughter —› is terrifying with a boisterous laughter.*’

Before looking at the more important changes, some general remarks concerning the language of these texts may not be out of place. Both texts are written with numerous tantric irregularities of language (*aiśa*). Interestingly, while there are instances in which the *Timirodghāṭana* replaces the irregular original with a grammatically correct form,[6] in many other cases it changes the original to a grammatically less correct version.[7] Therefore, unlike in some other cases of a later recension or borrowing, here it is not possible to affirm that the earlier source went through a grammatical and stylistic purification to produce the later, grammatically more correct version.[8]

[3] Arrows indicate the change of meaning from the *Siddhayogeśvarīmata*’s to the *Timirodghāṭana*’s reading. Variant readings that do not affect the meaning substantially are in italics, while more important differences are in bold. Variants that are synonymous are not signalled in the translation.

[4] The *Timirodghāṭana* has a shorter and problematic reading, which is probably partly the result of corruption.

[5] Here, the manuscript of the *Timirodghāṭana* is not fully legible. It perhaps reads *mahāśaṅkha*, which would be a code word for human skull.

[6] E.g. it replaces *śaśāṅkakṛtamūrdhani* with *śaśāṅkakṛtaśekharaṃ*.

[7] E.g. *lelihānamahājihvaṃ*, which is *lelihānaṃ mahājihvaṃ* in the manuscripts of the *Siddhayogeśvarīmata*, is changed to *lelihantamahājihvā* in the manuscript of the *Timirodghāṭana*. There are more instances of *aiśa* forms than what appears in the above edited passages. I have corrected and emended both texts in several cases and conjectured words in places where parallels could clearly show how the corruption occurred. Since these changes do not affect the meaning, I have not reproduced the apparatus here. The edition of both passages with the apparatus will be published in Törzsök forthcoming A.

[8] Such is the case, for instance, of the earlier and later recensions of the *Svacchanda*, for which see e.g. Törzsök 1999: 198.

Apart from some differing expressions, *aiśa* forms, and a shortened passage (whose shortening may be due to textual corruption) there are two places in which the *Timirodghāṭana* seems to have rewritten its model deliberately and significantly. First, Bhairava has only four heads according to the *Siddhayogeśvarīmata*, while he has five in the *Timirodghāṭana*. As I have shown elsewhere,[9] other texts also adopted the five-headed form of Śiva and changed their sources accordingly. The change from four to five heads is not so remarkable in itself, given that it was identified in the iconography of Śiva long ago.[10] What is remarkable is that several texts and prescriptions were deliberately rewritten to accomodate the newer, five-headed form of Śiva, based on the iconography of Sadāśiva. The *Timirodghāṭana*'s author or redactor did this without making the necessary changes in other details: most notably, he left the number of eyes twelve, which was obviously not adequate in the new context.

The other detail that became altered is the garland Bhairava wears. The *Siddhayogeśvarīmata* gives him a garland of dead bodies (*śavamālā*), which the *Timirodghāṭana* transforms into a simple rosary (*akṣamālā*). That the *Siddhayogeśvarīmata* has the original reading is evident not only because it could be considered the *difficilior* reading in that a garland of bodies (*śavamālā*) occurs rarer than a rosary (*akṣamālā*), but also because there are several parallels to confirm this.[11] The *Siddhayogeśvarīmata* itself (6.23) provides the most important parallel, with a context very similar to the above passage, for it mentions again, immediately after the garland of corpses, the ear ornaments made of the hands of the dead instead of lotuses: *mahāpannagasaṃvītām śavamālāvibhūṣitāṃ // mahāśavakarāmbhojacārukarṇāvataṃsakām* 'she has a huge snake for a sacred thread and is decorated with a garland of corpses; she wears the hands of dead bodies instead of lotuses as charming ear ornaments'.

Finally, it must also be remarked that the compound *akṣamālāvibhūṣita*, lit. 'decorated with a rosary' is a *hapax*, for a deity is never decorated with a rosary – he or she holds one. Therefore, texts use such compounds as *akṣamālādhara* 'holding a rosary' (*Svacchanda* 2.75c) or *akṣamālākara* 'having a rosary in his hand' (*Sarvajñānottara* 5.65d), but never *akṣamālāvibhūṣita*.

In this case, one could argue that since *akṣamālā* is a more often seen expression than *śavamālā*, this is an accidental scribal corruption.[12] This is indeed possible; but given the difference between the words *śava* and *akṣa* both in pronunciation and in script, it is perhaps more likely that this is the result of a deliberate change.

Finally, it must be remarked that the context in which this ferocious Ardhanārīśvara is found is also different in the two texts. The *Siddhayogeśvarīmata* prescribes a visualisation (*dhyāna*), which explains why we have such a detailed account of all the attributes: the practitioner had to be able to create a precise mental image of the deity. Such visualisations were part of the standard quadripartite ritual in tantric texts of various currents. The four elements included

[9] Törzsök forthcoming B.

[10] See for instance Kreisel 1986: 64 note 202, Sharma 1976 and Hanneder 1998: 15. Bakker 2002 shows, among other things, that the four-headed representation certainly precedes the five-headed one.

[11] See *Tantrasadbhāva* 4.17d and *Jayadrathayāmala* 2.20.60d: *śavamālāvibhūṣitām*.

[12] One could of course argue that the *akṣara*s broke off at the edge of a leaf and that a later scribe tried to fill in the lacuna.

visualisation (*dhyāna*), worship (*pūjā*), recitation of mantras (*japa*) and fire ritual (*homa*).[13] The *kaula* currents questioned the efficacity of these rites and therefore no prescriptive passage on visualisation is to be found in the whole text of the *Timirodghāṭana*.[14] Indeed, the *Timirodghāṭana* repeatedly affirms that it offers practices that exclude deity visualisation (*dhyāna*) and meditation based on visualized elements (*dhāraṇā*) (*dh[y]eyadhāraṇavarjitaḥ* (8.1b), *dhyānadhāraṇavarjitaṃ* 11.8d). And that seems to be the reason why it does not borrow the above passage in its original function for visualisation, but uses it rather as a mere description of Bhairava, thus introducing the dialogue between the Lord and the Goddess.

2. Possession by the Power of Rudra (*rudraśaktisamāveśa*) and seeing the past and the future

Another shared feature of the two texts is the way in which both emphasize that the practitioner must be possessed by the Power of Rudra (*rudraśaktisamāveśa*). This emphasis is of course common in other *kaula* texts too: the *Ciñciṇīmatasārasamuccaya* mentions the expression twice (7.202a and 9.53c) and the *Ūrmikaulārṇava* once in connection with initiation (2.291c). However, the compound 'possession by the Power of Rudra' (*rudraśaktisamāveśa*) seems to occur more frequently in the *Siddhayogeśvarīmata* and the *Timirodghāṭana* than elsewhere: the *Siddhayogeśvarīmata* has it six times (1.17c, 2.4a, 2.5a. 2.10c, 2.11a and 20.78c), while the fragmentary *Timirodghāṭana* five times (end of chapter 2, 4.15a, 4.16c, 8.4c and 9.16a).[15] These occurrences, one could argue, do not prove much on their own, for they are not very numerous in any case. However, they occur in very similar contexts in the two Tantras. Compare, for instance, the following passages, both of which stress that mantras and rituals will not work without the power of Rudra, more precisely, without the practitioner being possessed by the power of Rudra:[16]

[13] For the set of *dhyānaḥ pūjā japo homaḥ*, see e.g. *Siddhayogeśvarīmata* 29.6ab and *Tantrasadbhāva* 7.123ab, 1.122cd and 14.128cd, *Kubjikāmata* 25.41cd and *Svacchanda* 7.166. A fifth element is often added, which varies in different passages. Moreover, the first element is sometimes also different, such as in *Mohacūḍottara* fol.35v, which reads *snānaḥ* for *dhyānaḥ*. See also Sanderson 2009: 62 for the series *nyāsa, pūjā, japa* and *homa*.

[14] The *Timirodghāṭana* explicitly opposes the teaching of the *Siddhayogeśvarīmata* and similar texts when it states (fol. 45v) that there should be no invocation of *yoginī*s (*na yoginīmelakaṃ caiva*) and that the sacred places are to be found in the body, it is not necessary to wander elsewhere (*dehasthaṃ pīṭhakṣetre tu nānyakṣetraṃ paryaṭate*).

[15] Only the *Mālinīvijayottara* comes close to this with four occurrences, but two out of those are the repetition of the same line: 2.13a, 2.17a, 8.42a (8.42ab is almost identical with 2.13ab) and 20.29c.

[16] I highlight the parallels in bold in this case.

mantratantrāṇi *deveśa*
tvayā proktāny anekadhā /
*kleśenā***pi na sidhyante**
narā yogādisādhane //...
aśeṣām eva **mantrāṇām**
ato vīryaṃ *pragopitam /...*
rudraśaktisamāveśo
yatrāyaṃ lakṣyate priye /
sa gurur matsamaḥ prokto
mantravīryaprakāśakaḥ //
Siddhayogeśvarīmata 1.5, 13ab, 2.11

sarvāṇi **mantratantrāṇi**
devatākalpajalpanam /
mahato **'pi na sidhyante**
rudraśaktivivarjitam //
hṛdayaṃ sarvavidyānāṃ
mantravīrya[ṃ] *para[ṃ] smṛtam /*
rudraśaktisamāveśa[ṃ]
yo na vetti na sidhyati
Timirodghāṭana 8.3-4
(smṛtam *em. S. Vasudeva* : smṛtaḥ MS)

Here, both texts state that various mantras and Tantras do not function because of a lack of power. The power of mantras is called the 'virility of mantras' (*mantra-vīrya*). Only he who is possessed by the Power of Rudra can have access to this mantric energy and succeed. Although there is no trace of direct borrowing here, several elements of the wording correspond, and they do so rather closely. The similarity of the main idea and wording here, coupled with the frequent occurrences of the compound *rudraśaktisamāveśa*, point to a particular doctrinal and redactional closeness of these two sources on this subject.

The same chapter of the *Timirodghāṭana* has a closer parallel with the *Siddhayogeśvarīmata*, this time concerning supernatural effects the practitioner can obtain with the help of various female powers. The passage is interesting not only because the similarity of wording shows us again the textual closeness of the two sources, but also because it reveals once again the way in which the *Timirodghāṭana* adapts its source to a new context.

The reconstruction of each version needs to rely on the testimony of both texts, for they were transmitted in a rather corrupt form:

lokālokagataṃ vāpi
yad dhṛtaṃ yena yad dṛtam /
tad bhavivyapaśeṣaṃ tu
sarvaṃ vā yat purātanam /
hastastham iva tat sarvaṃ
paśyanty ātmānacakṣuṣā //
Siddhayogeśvarīmata 25.93

lokālokagataṃ sarvvaṃ
yad vṛtta yena yat kṛtaṃ //
yad bhaviṣyam anāgataṃ
bhayam vā yat parābhekaṃ /
tat samādhisthitaḥ paśye
parāśaktiprabhāvataḥ //
Timirodghāṭana 8.17cd-18

The reconstructed texts run as follows, including a few conjectures:[17]

[17] Bold signals the part of the text that was rewritten in the *Timirodghāṭana*.

lokālokagataṃ vāpi	*lokālokagataṃ sarvaṃ*
yad vṛttaṃ yena yat kṛtam /	*yad vṛttaṃ yena yat kṛtaṃ //*
yad bhaviṣyam aśeṣaṃ tu	*yad bhaviṣyam anāgataṃ*
sarvaṃ vā yat purātanam /	*bhavyam vā yat purātanaṃ /*
hastastham iva tat sarvaṃ	**tat samādhisthitaḥ paśye'**
paśyanty ātmānacakṣuṣā //	**parāśaktiprabhāvataḥ //**
Siddhayogeśvarīmata 25.93	*Timirodghāṭana 8.17cd-18*

> '*They* —› *he* shall see anything that happened in this world or beyond it and anything that has been done by anyone, the whole future and the (whole)[18] past **as if on the palm of his hand, with his own [inner] eyes —› being established in yogic trance, through the power of the supreme Śakti**.'

The *Siddhayogeśvarīmata* has this passage after describing a special maṇḍala, a worship involving skulls, blood etc, and the invocation of *yoginī*s who must be offered the practitioner's blood. Seeing everything is one of several supernatural abilities the practitioner is promised. Accordingly, the text stresses the easy use of this ability: the *sādhaka* will see everything as if on the palm of his hand.

The *Timirodghāṭana* places the passage after a description of supernatural powers one can obtain thanks to yogic practice (*abhyāsa*), including such effects as becoming infinitely short, tall etc. It transforms the passage to suit better this context, and mentions that one needs to be in yogic trance (*samādhi*) and employ the inner power of the supreme Śakti to see the past and the future.

3. Possession as a sign of success

Since possession by the Power of Rudra is the cause of success, signs that could commonly be considered signs of possession also function to indicate that the practitioner shall certainly succeed. This is a shared doctrine in many Tantras, whether *kaula* or not. However, the following parallel shows a remarkable closeness in wording too, so much so that the *Siddhayogeśvarīmata* in fact helps us to reconstruct the illegible or lost syllables in the *Timirodghāṭana*.[19]

[18] The *Siddhayogeśvarīmata* has a symmetrical contruction: all the future and all the past. The *Timirodghāṭana* has a variant that may be partly the result of corruption. It mentions, rather superfluously, the future three times (*bhaviṣyam, anāgatam, bhavyam*), while the past only once (and even that single mention is completely corrupt in the manuscript).

[19] It is again the parallel that is highlighted in bold.

*tatkṣaṇ***occāraṇād** *vāpi*	*tasy***occārita***mātreṇa*
pratyayaś cātra jāyate //	**pratyayaś copajāyate**
kampate dehapiṇḍas tu	**ka[mp]ate [d]ehapiṇḍan** *tu*
drutaṃ cotpatate tathā /	*tasya stobha prajāyate*
Siddhayogeśvarīmata 3.48cd-49ab	*Timirodghāṭana 4.5*

Both passages affirm that through the recitation of the appropriate mantra with breath control (*uccāra*), the proofs of possession or success (*pratyaya*) will be produced: the body shall tremble and levitate immediately (according to the *Siddhayogeśvarīmata*) or tremble and become paralysed (according to the *Timirodghāṭana*). A further, somewhat longer, parallel can be added from the *Tantrasadbhāva*, another Trika scripture, which shows a slight variation again: both immediate levitation and paralysis is promised, in addition to the knowledge of mantras and *mudrā*s within seconds.

> **uccāre tu kṛte** *tasya* **pratyayaś copajāyate /**
> *udghātaiḥ pañcabhiś caiva svayaṃ jānāti tatkṣaṇāt //*
> *mantramudrāgaṇaṃ caiva nātra kuryād vicāraṇāt /*
> **śarīre stobham āyāti drutaṃ cotpatate** *kṣaṇāt //*
> *Tantrasadbhāva 4.53-54*

A few other signs of possession also occur in both texts, in suspiciously similar wording and in the same metrical conditions; see for instance the fact that one becomes capable of entering another person's body, an expression occurring in even *pāda*s: *paradeheṣu saṃkramet* (*Siddhayogeśvarīmata* 25.90d) and *paradehe tu saṃkrame[t]* (*Timirodghāṭana* 6.5d) against *saṃkramet paradeheṣu*, always occurring in odd *pāda*s in the *Niśvāsa*, the *Svacchanda* and the *Tantrasadbhāva*. Nevertheless, some of the signs of possession in the *Timirodghāṭana* agree with those of the *Tantrasadbhāva* rather than of the *Siddhayogeśvarīmata*. Both text signal for example that the eyes of a person possessed will roll upwards: *ūrdhvadṛṣṭi[ḥ] prajāyate* (*Tantrasadbhāva* 3.164b), which is altered and corrupted in the *Timirodghāṭana* (6.6d) to *ūrdhvasṛṣṭi varānane*.

Some expressions not related to this topic are also shared by the *Timirodghāṭana* and the *Tantrasadbhāva* rather than the *Siddhayogeśvarīmata*. One such expression is used in the context of worshipping or serving the guru: one can serve him 'through one's self or by one's wealth.' While the *Timirodghāṭana* uses an *aiśa* extended form of the first word *ātmanena dhanena vā* (6.9b), the *Tantrasadbhāva* transmits a morphologically right form, albeit with a slightly awkward verse-filling *tu*: *ātmanā tu dhanena vā* (7.155d).[20]

The additional parallels from the *Tantrasadbhāva* are less striking, but confirm the close relation of the *Timirodghāṭana* not only with the *Siddhayogeśvarīmata*, but perhaps more generally with the Trika.

[20]This could point to the fact that the *Tantrasadbhāva*'s version represents a later, corrected form of this expression. However, this does not imply that the *Tantrasadbhāva* itself is later, for the correction may have happened in the transmission of that text. Moreover, more evidence would be needed to establish such a relative dating.

4. The ideal guru and the Power of Rudra

Being possessed by the power of Rudra is also one of the requirements a real guru must fulfill. In this context, another parallel can be adduced, in which, in addition to an identical *pāda*, the purport of the sentence also corresponds. Furthermore, both the *Siddhayogeśvarīmata* and the *Timirodghāṭana* mention in the immediate context the *guru* and the *gurutara*, the latter meaning the mantra that the guru transmits.[21]

tadgrahaṃ yo 'pi jānāti
tathā cātmaparigraham /
guruṃ gurutaraṃ caiva
tasya siddhir *na dūrataḥ //*
śaktihīnaṃ guruṃ prāpya
kalpoktaphalakāṅkṣiṇaḥ /
abhiyuktā na sidhyanti
prayatnenāpi sādhakāḥ //
Siddhayogeśvarīmata 1.15-6

śaktihīnaṃ guruṃ prāpya
śiṣyasiddhi[ḥ] *kutaḥ priye*
mūle naṣṭe drumā devi
kutaḥ puṣpaphalādiṣu
rudraśaktisamāveś –
guruḥ gurutaram *param*
viditātmā priyed yuktaṃ
sa guruḥ mokṣadam padam
(°hīnaṃ *em. Vasudeva* : °hīne MS)
Timirodghāṭana 11.18cd-20ab

Although the text of the *Timirodghāṭana* does not construe easily,[22] both passages clearly affirm that a practitioner shall not attain success if he has a guru without power (*śakti*); and both speak about the *gurutara* in the sense of mantra, which should be transmitted by such a guru. The simultaneous mention of the *guru* and the *gurutara* (in the sense of mantra) is again a particular feature of these two texts: the *Siddhayogeśvarīmata* mentions them twice using the same *pāda* (*guruṃ gurutaraṃ caiva* 1.15c and 2.1c), while the *Timirodghāṭana* three times.[23] Although this does not amount to much by itself, it is the relative rarity of these terms occurring together and the similarity of the contexts that make these parallels notable.

More striking than this example is that the first verse cited above occurs in almost the same form in the *Timirodghāṭana* and the *Kubjikāmata*.[24]

---

[21] This is explained in *Siddhayogeśvarīmata* 2.2.

[22] There are several problems, among which the most disturbing one is perhaps *priyed*. As a very conjectural solution, I would propose something along these lines: *rudraśaktisamāveśād guruḥ gurutaraṃ param viditātmāpnuyād yuktaḥ [yaḥ] sa guruḥ mokṣadaḥ smṛtaḥ* 'the guru [who] knows his self, is devoted and obtains (*āpnuyāt*) the supreme mantra thanks to being possessed by the Power of Rudra, is known to be one who can bestow liberation'. However, *priyed* may be accepted as meaning 'propitiate' and *yuktaṃ* may also refer to the mantra which is 'employed.'

[23] *gurugurutarasvinam* at the end of ch. 2 (I cannot interpret this expression, which may be corrupt), *durlabhaṃ sa guruḥ devi durlabhaṃ gurutaraṃ mahat* 9.21cd (Somdev Vasudeva suggests that one should correct *sa guruḥ* to *sadguruḥ*, but this is not necessary, for there must have been a relative clause before, which has been transmitted in a fragmentary state), and *guruḥ gurutaram param* 11.19cd.

[24] Bold highlights the words that became changed.

śaktihīnaṃ guruṃ prāpya	*śaktihīnaṃ guruṃ prāpya*
śiṣya **siddhi[ḥ]** *kutaḥ priye*	*śiṣye* **muktiḥ** *kutaḥ priye*
mūle **naṣṭe drumā devi**	*mūla***cchinne yathā vṛkṣe**
kutaḥ puṣpaphalādiṣu	*kutaḥ puṣpaphalādikam*
Timirodghāṭana 11.18cd-20ab	*Kubjikāmata 3.48*

> 'If a disciple has a master without power, how could he attain **success [/ supernatural powers]?** (*Timirodghāṭana*) —› **liberation?** (*Kubjikāmata*) **If the root of a tree dies, o Goddess** (*Timirodghāṭana*) —› **Just as, if the root of a tree is cut off** (*Kubjikāmata*), how could it produce flowers, fruit and the like?'

The version of the *Kubjikāmata* seems secondary for several reasons. It attempts to improve on the grammar by replacing the *aiśa -ādiṣu* with *-ādikam*.[25] It tries to make the parallelism more explicit by introducing the relative pronoun *yathā*. The *Timirodghāṭana*'s two *pāda*s mentioning the tree are certainly somewhat corrupt, but the *Kubjikāmata* interferes more than necessary, probably to make the image more appropriate by replacing 'is destroyed' (*naṣṭa*) with 'is cut off' (*chinna*). And most importantly, it replaces the promise of success in general or of supernatural powers (*siddhi*) with the promise of liberation (*mukti*) – a clear indication of rewriting, making the text oriented to a more general public rather than to the somewhat eccentric wandering practitioners who aspire to obtain supernatural effects.

Although the direction of borrowing and the details of the textual transformation seem to be clear, the situation is somewhat less straightforward than it appears. For the *Kubjikāmata* has an important variant that cannot be ignored: two of its manuscripts, F and G, read *siddhi* for *muktiḥ*.[26] This variant cannot be easily discarded as representing only a deviating minority of the manuscripts. As Sanderson 2002: 9 remarks: 'in this highly contaminated manuscript transmission truth and error have permeated everywhere in approximately equal measure. [...] Where all, some or one of the manuscripts of the *Kubjikāmata* agree with the source text, that reading should be adopted as original, except where there may be independent error.' Here, if the *Timirodghāṭana* was indeed the source text, F and G agree with its reading.

Moreover, among the variants Sanderson examines in this article, there is one case in which the same two manuscripts, F and G, agree with the source text, in that case the *Tantrasadbhāva*. The source as well as F and G read *dhyānāc cakrasamo* against *dhyānāc ca kramaśo*, the latter being a rather unambiguous case of corruption (and simplification).

The case of *siddhi* replaced by *mukti* or vice versa is, however, different, for it shows a

[25] Several cases of the locative plural *-ādiṣu* is found in the *Brahmayāmala* in the sense of *-ādikam* or for yet another case. It seems that the compound ending *-ādi* attracts somehow the locative plural case ending in *aiśa*. See e.g. (the spelling has been standardized) 25.283cd: *pādādiṣu samārabhya śikhāntāṃ yāvat sādhakaḥ*; 45.210cd-211ab *kharamānuṣakūrmoṣṭraśvaśṛgālahayādiṣu // tanubhiś ca varāhaś ca ity eṣāṃ phalguśais tathā* (for *phalguṣais tathā*); 45.596cd-597ab *vyālasya vānarasyaiva śarabhasya varānane // uṣṭrakasya tu citrasya vijakādiṣu caiva hi*. (The unrecorded word *vijaka* may be corrupt or stands perhaps for *ajaka*, goat.)

[26] B has *mukti* without the Visarga. There are also some additional variants in other manuscripts: *chinnamūle* for *mūlacchinne* and *kathaṃ* for *kutaḥ*.

deliberate change in one direction or the other. Given the fact that, as Sanderson (2002: 9) notes, 'HJK (the editors' third recension) and CD (their second) have very little in the way of interpolation compared to AB and EFG', it cannot be excluded that F and G have interfered on purpose here to bring in a potentially more general *siddhi*. The change from *siddhi* to *mukti* is nevertheless much more likely, for it can be motivated by the desire to upgrade the text and to attribute a more noble aim to its teaching. It also corresponds to a shift of emphasis often remarked elsewhere in the history of śaivism.[27]

The history of the passage becomes yet more difficult to reconstruct when considering an unattributed citation or paraphrase in the *Tantrāloka* that seems to be a recast fusion of the two versions discussed above.

> *śaktihīnaṃ guruṃ prāpya mokṣajñāne kathaṃ śrayet /*
> *naṣṭamūle drume devi kutaḥ puṣpaphalādikam //*
> *Tantrāloka 13.336*
>
> 'If one has a guru without power, how can one rely on him for knowledge of liberation? How could one have flowers, fruit and the like on a tree whose root has been destroyed?'

The passage is claimed to reproduce Śiva's words (*tathā coktaṃ śivena tat* 13.334d) without naming the scriptural source. The wording of the third *pāda* shows that the *Timirodghāṭana* is the most likely source, but the second *pāda* suggests that the *Kubjikāmata*'s secondary reading is paraphrased here. There are at least two possibilities: if we assume that the *Kubjikāmata* that Abhinavagupta had access to read *muktiḥ*, then Abhinavagupta may have deliberately chosen a conflated reading and decided not to name his sources; or he may have cited the *Timirodghāṭana*, changing the third *pāda* of his own initiative. The latter solution is perhaps more likely, for he does not simply take up the *Kubjikāmata*'s *muktiḥ*, but rewrites the whole second *pāda*. Whichever is the case, Abhinavagupta definitely relied on the *Timirodghāṭana*'s wording more heavily, which shows, in addition to other pieces of evidence,[28] that the text was known to him, roughly in the form in which we have it.[29]

Conclusion

An important conclusion to be drawn independently of what exactly Abhinavagupta cites is that judging from the parallel verses the *Timirodghāṭana*'s version seems to predate the *Kubjikāmata*'s. This is true whether one accepts the reading of *siddhi* in the *Kubjikāmata* as the

[27] On the shift from *siddhi* to *mukti*, see for example Brunner (1975).

[28] Somdev Vasudeva points out in his transcript / draft edition that Abhinavagupta cites a passage in his *Parātriṃśikāvivaraṇa* (p. 210) which is also quoted by Kṣemarāja in his *Śivasūtravimarśinī ad* 1.4. Kṣemarāja names the *Timirodghāṭana* as his source. Although this citation cannot be found in the text, it may have been on one of the missing folios, as Somdev Vasudeva remarks.

[29] It is of course also conceivable that he quoted this verse from a third source we no longer have access to, but the verse is less proverbial than it seems and does not occur frequently.

original one, or one retains *mukti* of the majority of the manuscripts, arguing that this reading is proper to this text. Now it would be too big a leap to conclude with certainty that the *Timirodghāṭana* as a whole predates the *Kubjikāmata*. Nevertheless, the *Timirodghāṭana*'s doctrinal and stylistic closeness to the *Siddhayogeśvarīmata*, the earliest Trika Tantra, suggests that it may be one of the earlier *kaula* scriptures, one that was rewriting an early Bhairavatantric scripture to create its own doctrine. This is all the more significant since the *Timirodghāṭana* does not belong to the Trika and does not assimilate the Trika's pantheon.[30]

In the light of the above parallels, it can be tentatively concluded that the *Timirodghāṭana* could well be one of the earliest *kaula* scriptures. It certainly relies rather heavily on the Trika's stock phrases, especially on those of the *Siddhayogeśvarīmata*, and purposefully rewrites its source in several places: it comes to lay emphasis on yogic practices that exclude visualisation in particular. Judging from a parallel verse, it is quite possible that it predates the *Kubjikāmata*. It is to be hoped that closer analysis of the *kaula* corpus will shed more light on the relative dating of these texts and confirm the tentative conclusion proposed here.

Works cited

Abbreviations

GRETIL = Göttingen Register of Electronic Texts in Indian Languages. E-texts available online at http://fiindolo.sub.uni-goettingen.de/gretil.html

IFI / IFP = Institut Français de Pondichéry

KSTS = Kashmir Series of Texts and Studies

MIRI = Muktabodha Indological Research Institute. E-texts available online at http://muktalib5.org/digital_library.html

NAK = National Archives, Kathmandu

NGMPP = Nepal-German Manuscript Preservation Project

Sanskrit texts

Ūrmikaulārṇava edited by Mark Dyczkowski on the basis of NAK MS no: 5-5207 (sic. 5-5202); NGMPP reel no: B 115/9. MIRI.

Kubjikāmatatantra ed. Goudriaan, T. and Schoterman, J. Leiden: 1988. E-text by Somdev Vasudeva, GRETIL.

[30]This is again impossible to affirm with certainty, since the text has many lacunae. In some fragmentary passages, it speaks about three goddesses (9.10ff), but their names do not seem to be those of the Trika goddesses.

Ciñcinīmatasārasamuccaya MS K: NAK MS no. 1-767; MS Kh: NAK MS no.: 1-245; MS G: NAK MS no.: 1-145; MS Gh: NAK MS no.: 1-199. Electronic edition in progress by Mark Dyczkowski. MIRI.

Jayadrathayāmala NAK 5-4650 (ṣaṭka 1 and 2) ; 5-722 (ṣaṭka 3) ; 1-1468 (ṣaṭka 4 A 151-16) E-text by Olga Serbaeva. I am grateful to Olga Serbaeva for making her transcription available to me, which includes Prof. Alexis Sanderson's draft edition of the *Yoginīsaṃcāraprakaraṇa*, prepared in 2004.

Tantrasadbhāva NAK 5-1985 and NAK 5-445, unpublished edition of chapter 4 by Somdev Vasudeva, unpublished edition of chapters 9, 16 and 25 by Judit Törzsök. Complete e-text established under the supervision of Mark Dyczkowski. MIRI.

Tantrāloka of Abhinavagupta, with a commentary -*viveka* by Jayaratha. 8 vols ed. with an introduction R.C. Dwivedi and N. Rastogi. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass. 1987. (Reprint of KSTS 1918-1938) E-text MIRI.

Timirodghāṭana NAK pam 690 vi vedānta darśana 33 NGMPP A35/3. Transcription and partial draft edition by Somdev Vasudeva.

Niśvāsa(tattvasaṃhitā) NAK 1-277; London, Wellcome Institute for the History of Medicine, MS Indic delta 41. E-text by Dominic Goodall, Peter Bisschop, Diwakar Acharya, and Nirajan Kafle. *Mūlasūtra, Nayasūtra* and *Uttarasūtra* edited by D. Goodall and A. Sanderson.

Parātriṃśikā with a commentary -*vivaraṇa* by Abhinavagupta. Ed. Mukunda Rāma Shāstrī. Reprint of KSTS No. XVIII. de 1918. New Delhi: Aroma Publishing House. 1991. E-text MIRI.

Brahmayāmala NAK Ms. No. 3-370. E-text by Shaman Hatley, revised by Csaba Kiss. Draft edition of the first 49 chapters by Csaba Kiss.

Mālinīvijayottaratantra. Ed. Acharya Krishnanand Sagar. Varanasi: Krishnānand Sāgar. 1985. (1st ed. Madhusūdan Kaul, Bombay 1922 KSTS 37) E-text by Somdev Vasudeva on GRETIL, and MIRI.

Mohacūḍottara NAK MS J 1977, NGMPP A 182/2. Partial annotated transription by Dominic Goodall.

Śivasūtravimarśinī: being the sūtras of Vasugupta, with the commentary called Vimarśinī by Kṣemarāja. Srinagar: Kashmir. KSTS 1. 1911.

Sarvajñānottara Draft edition by Dominic Goodall based on IFP MS T.334 (a paper transcript copied from Madras GOML MS D 5550), IFP MS T.760, and NAK MS 1-1692 (NGMPP A 43/12).

Siddhayogeśvarīmata edition based on NAK Ms.No.5-2403; Asiatic Society of Bengal, Calcutta. 5465 (G). V. Törzsök 1999 and Törzsök forthcoming A.

Svacchanda(tantra), with the commentary -*uddyota* by Kṣemarāja. 2 vols ed. Dvivedi, V.V. Delhi: Parimal Publications. 1985. E-text based on the original KSTS edition, MIRI.

Secondary Literature

Bakker, H. (2002). "Sources for reconstructing ancient forms of Śiva worship" In: *Les sources et le temps* Ed. F. Grimal. Pondicherry: IFI. pp. 397-419.

Brunner, H. (1975). "Le *sādhaka*, personnage oublié du śivaïsme du Sud" Journal Asiatique CCLXIII (1975), pp. 411–43.

Hanneder, J. (1998). *Abhinavagupta's Philosophy of Revelation* Groningen: Egbert Forsten.

Kreisel, G. (1986). *Die Śiva-Bildwerke der Mathurā-Kunst* Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag.

Sanderson, A. (1988). "Śaivism and the Tantric Traditions" In: *The World's Religions* Ed. S. Sutherland, L. Houlden, P. Clarke and F. Hardy. London: Routledge. pp. 660-704.

Sanderson, A. (2002). "Remarks on the text of the Kubjikāmatatantra" *Indo-Iranian Journal* 45 (2002) : 1-24.

Sanderson, A. (2009). "The Śaiva Age — The Rise and Dominance of Śaivism during the Early Medieval Period" In: *Genesis and Development of Tantrism* Ed. S. Einoo. Tokyo: Institute of Oriental Culture, University of Tokyo. pp. 8-349.

Sharma, B. N. (1976). *Iconography of Sadāśiva* New Delhi: Abhinav Publications.

Törzsök, J. forthcoming A *The Teaching of Powerful Yoginīs: A critical edition and translation of the Siddhayogeśvarīmata.*

Törzsök, J. forthcoming B "Multiple heads of Yoginīs and Bhairavas in Early Śaiva Tantras" *Indo-Iranian Journal* 2012.

Törzsök, J. (1999). *The Doctrine of Magic Female Spirits — A critical edition of selected chapters of the Siddhayogeśvarīmata(tantra) with annotated translation and analysis.* Unpublished DPhil thesis, University of Oxford.