

The Bhasmāṅkura in Śaiva texts

Csaba Kiss¹

This short article focuses on a fascinating but not very well-known category of person in mediaeval India: the Bhasmāṅkura. After examining how the Bhasmāṅkura appears in published and unpublished texts of the Jātiviveka genre, I will deal with earlier, Śaiva sources that are mainly in the form of unpublished manuscripts to explore the origin and history of the term. I will then try to raise some questions, rather than giving answers, concerning the figure of the Bhasmāṅkura: What are the origins of the Bhasmāṅkura? Why is he denied certain rights? And most importantly: Can he tell us anything about the social setting of Śaivism in the Śaiva Age?² Indeed, to what extent can Śaiva texts in general help us in mapping the actual social environment of mediaeval India? SANDERSON (2009: 298) raises this question, and while addressing the extension of Śaivism beyond the higher classes he also draws to attention the daunting problem of making any definite statements concerning the socio-religious changes brought about by Śaivism (*italics mine*):

Our sources reveal, then, that the Śaivas extended their recruitment beyond the high-caste circles from which most of our evidence of the religion derives. But, of course, they do not readily reveal the extent to which it was adopted outside these élites. The epigraphical

¹ I would like to express my heartfelt thanks to Prof. Alexis Sanderson for his valuable feedback, to Judit Törzsök, Shaman Hatley, and Gergely Hidas for their constant help, to Prof. Rosalind O’Hanlon for sharing with me her manuscripts of the Jātiviveka genre, and to Prof. Vincent Eltschinger, Nina Mirnig, and Marion Rastelli for inviting me to contribute to this volume. I gratefully acknowledge the financial support received from the Austrian Science Fund (FWF) in the context of the SFP Project “Visions of Community” (VISCOM).

² I borrow the term “Śaiva Age” from Prof. Sanderson’s grandiose article published in 2009: “The Śaiva Age: The Rise and Dominance of Śaivism during the Early Medieval Period.” The period referred to is the fifth to eleventh centuries CE (SANDERSON 2009: 41).

evidence is almost entirely restricted in this regard to records of the pious activities of rulers and brahmins, and the Śaiva sources, being largely prescriptive in their concerns, tell us much about what should or could be done by or for various categories of person but give us no sense of how widely these prescribed activities were adopted or supported. *One of the tasks of future research, then, should be to gather data that will improve our ability to address this question.*

That prescriptive texts are insufficient if we strive to understand to what extent the prescribed activities were actually performed at a given time is a chronic problem, and I am unable to offer any remedy for it. Rather, in accordance with Sanderson's piece of advice, here I will only attempt to gather and display small pieces of data, in the hope that this may be useful for further investigations.

The first time I became aware of the category "Bhasmāṅkura" was while reading a manuscript of the *Jātiviveka*. This text, attributed to Gopīnātha, was probably composed in the fifteenth century and discusses the complex network of mixed castes (*saṃkarajāti*).³ It has never been published or translated properly⁴ but is relatively well-known. For instance, the work has been used by Kane for his *History of Dharmaśāstra*, in which he paraphrases the *Jātiviveka*'s definition of a Bhasmāṅkura as an offspring "from a Śaiva fallen ascetic and a Śūdra prostitute" and confirms that the Bhasmāṅkura is also "called Gurava by the *Jātiviveka*."⁵ More precisely, the *Jātiviveka* (2.126–129) defines the Bhasmāṅkura as the offspring of a fallen (*patita*), i.e., out-caste, Śaiva or Pāśupata ascetic and a Śūdra prostitute.⁶

³ For more information on the *Jātiviveka* and related texts, see O'HANLON & HIDAS & KISS 2015.

⁴ Riccardo Nobile's edition and translation of the *Jātiviveka* ("*Jātivivecana*," NOBILE 1910) is rather fragmentary and unreliable. Note also that a great number of passages cited in the *Bālabhaṭṭi* ((1), pp. 294–305) are closely parallel with the *Jātiviveka*.

⁵ In vol. 2, part 1, p. 102.

⁶ The following conventions for Sanskrit texts are used in this article: em. (X) = emendation (by X), corr. = correction, acorr = ante correctionem (before correction), pcorr = post correctionem (after correction), ms(s) = manuscript(s), fol. 2r = folio 2 recto side, fol. 2v = folio 2 verso side, cod. = codicum, '≈' means 'approximately,' text in ()s should be eliminated from the Sanskrit text, '(?)' after a letter or syllable in italics means that its reading is uncertain, text in []s is supplied by the editor, text cancelled (e.g. ~~kuṭāpaha~~) was cancelled by the Sanskrit scribe, '°' indicates that the lemma or variant is part of a longer compound or word, '●' separates variants found

śaivāḥ pāśupatāś caiva tapodharmaparāyaṇāḥ |
ārūḍhapatitāś te syuḥ śūdrapaṇyāṅganārātāḥ ||126||
tebhyas tābhyas ca saṃjāto bhasmāṅkura iti smrtaḥ |
sa jaṭābhasmadhārī ca śivaliṅgaṃ prapūjayet ||127||
tām̐būlam akṣatā dravyaṃ gāvaḥ kṣetrāṇi śākinī |
śivāya prāṇibhir dattam anyat kim api bhaktitaḥ |
caṇḍāmśaṃ tad iti khyātaṃ tena tasyeha vartanam ||128||
śaivāḥ pāśupatāś proktāḥ mahāvratadharās tathā |
turyāḥ kālāmukhāḥ proktāḥ bheda ete tapasvinām ||129||
ya eva śivadharmāḥ śivabhaktānām tāpasānām ta eva bhasmāṅkurāṇām |
iti bhasmāṅkura gurava ||

Witnesses:

A = BORI no. 233 of the Viśrama (ii) collection, *Paraśurāmapratāpa* fol. 50v

B = 1638B, Eggeling Catalogue, British Library, *Jātiviveka*, fol. 13v

126a *śaivāḥ*] A ; *śevāḥ* B **126b** *tapo°*] A ; *naro°* B • *°parāyaṇāḥ*] em. ;
°parāyaṇaḥ AB **126c** *ārūḍha°*] A ; *āroḍhya°* B **126d** *°panyā°*] A ;
°pāṇyā° B **127b** *bhasmāṅkura*] em. ; *bhasmāṅkuru* AB **2.127d** *śival-*
iṅgaṃ] AB^{pcorr} ; *śi cavalīṅgaṃ* B^{acorr} **128b** *śākinī*] A ; *śālinī* B **128c**
prāṇibhir] A ; *pāṇibhir* B **128d** *api*] A ; *ami* B **128e** ; *caṇḍāmśaṃ*] B ;
caṇḍīśaṃ A (also *Bṛhājātiviveka*, see n. 9, and *Śūdrācāraśiromaṇi*, see n.
 11) • *tad*] A ; *taṃ(?)d* B **128d** *tena*] A ; *tene* B **129a** *pāśupatāś*] A ;
pāśumatāḥ B **129b** *°dharās*] B ; *°carās* A **129c** *turyāḥ*] B ; *kuryāt* A
129d *tapasvinām*] em. ; *manīṣiṇaḥ* A ; *tapaścinā* B **Prose after 129:**
ya eva ... bhasmāṅkurāṇām] omitted in A • *ya eva*] em. ; *sa evaṃ(?)* B •
°dharmāḥ] em. ; *°dharmā* B • *tāpasānām*] em. ; *tāpasām* B • *iti*
bhasmāṅkura] B ; *nasmāṅkuru* A • *gurava*] em. ; *gurucu* A ; *gurova* B

The Śaivas and Pāśupatas are devoted to asceticism. They fall from their elevated status (i.e., they become outcastes) if they enjoy Śūdra prostitutes. [The offspring] born from them (i.e., from Śaiva/Pāśupata

in the same *pāda*, ‘- - -’ indicate syllables marked as missing/illegible by the scribe, IFP = Institut Français de Pondichéry/French Institute of Pondicherry, EFEO = Ecole française d’Extrême-Orient, BORI = Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute.

males and Śūdra prostitutes) is called a Bhaṣmāṅkura. He wears twisted locks of hair and [besmeared his body with] ashes and worships the *śivaliṅga*. People offer betel, unhusked barley-corns, goods, cows, landed properties, lands planted with vegetables, and many other things to Śiva out of devotion. These [offerings] are called Caṇḍa's share (*caṇḍāṃśa*).⁷ He (i.e., the Bhaṣmāṅkura) makes a living from that in this life. The classes of ascetics are taught to be these: Śaivas, Pāśupatas, the Mahāvratins, and fourthly the Kālāmukhas. The Bhaṣmāṅkuras should follow the same Śaiva *dharma*s (regulations/rights/duties) as devotees practising asceticism. This is [the definition of] the Bhaṣmāṅkura, [also known as] the Gurava.

Just before the *Jātiviveka* concludes that the Bhaṣmāṅkura's duties are the same as those of Śaiva ascetics, in some recensions of the text extensive quotations are inserted from the *Śivadharmśāstra* as well as from the *Puraścaryārṇava* on the Śaiva's rosary, on bathing in ashes, on the worship of ashes, and on the *nirmālya*, the remains of a garland-offering to a deity (see text in Appendix 1). This insertion probably serves to evoke the duties of Śaiva ascetics, from which the duties of the Bhaṣmāṅkura, in the absence of such prescriptions addressed exclusively to him, are to be deduced.

Later recensions of the *Jātiviveka* and texts that draw on it, or at least resemble it, contain several variants of the definition found in the *Jātiviveka*: The *Brhajjātiviveka* repeats the *Jātiviveka*'s definition, together with all the quotations from the *Śivadharmśāstra*.⁸ The probably sixteenth-century *Śatapraśnakalpalatā* gives a prose paraphrase of the *Jātiviveka*'s definition, omitting the remark on *caṇḍāṃśa/caṇḍīśa* and emphasising that

⁷ Note that some mss. read *caṇḍīśa* for *caṇḍāṃśa*. In both cases, the Bhaṣmāṅkura may be associated with, or even represented as, (a human form of) Caṇḍeśa, "the consumer of offerings that have been made to Śiva" (GOODALL 2009: 351).

⁸ The Bhaṣmāṅkura in the *Brhajjātiviveka* (fol. 22vff.): *śaivā yāḥ pāśupatāś* [corr.; *pāśupatāś* cod.] *caiva mahāvrataparāś tathā | turyā[h] kalāmukh(y)āḥ proktā[s] tapo* [em.; *tayor* cod.] *dharmaparāyaṇāḥ* [corr.; °*parāyaṇāḥ* cod.] *svakarmānirātāś te syuḥ śūdrapaṇyāṅganāratāḥ* [corr.; -*taḥ* cod.] | *tebhyaś ca tābhyaś ca jāto bhaṣmāṅkura itīritāḥ | sa jaṭābhaṣmadhārī ca śivaliṅgaṃ prapūjayet | tāmbūlam akṣatā dravyaṃ gāvaḥ kṣetrāṇi śākinī || śivāya prāṇibhir dattam anyat kim api bhaktitāḥ | caṇḍīśaṃ tad iti khyātaṃ tena tasyeha jīvanam || dhārayec chivanirmālyaṃ bhaktiyā lobhān na dhārayet | bhakṣaṇān narakam gacchet bhūṣaṇā[c] caiva mūḍhadhīḥ | nandikeśvaraṃ prati | śivadharmān uvāca...*

the Bhaṣmāṅkura collects the highly impure *śivanirmālya*.⁹ The *Śūdrācāraśiromaṇi* does not omit the reference to *caṇḍāṃśa/caṇḍīśa*, but it modifies the definition by stating that the mother of a Bhaṣmāṅkura is a Śūdra wife (*śūdrapatnī*), not a prostitute as such.¹⁰ The same is true for the seventeenth-century *Śūdrakamalākara*.¹¹ The gloss by Bālabhaṭṭa on the commentary *Mitākṣara* on the *Yājñavalkyasmṛti* in the eighteenth-century also echoes the *Jātiviveka*'s definition.¹² Bālabhaṭṭa classifies the Bhaṣmāṅkura, quite logically, as an Anuloma, or permitted birth, in which the father's *varṇa* is higher or equal to that of the mother.¹³

Most of these sources add that a Bhaṣmāṅkura is called a Gurava in the vernacular, more specifically in Marathi. The etymology of the term

⁹ The Śatapraśnakalpalatā's prose paraphrase (fol. 68rff.): *ye śūdrāḥ pāsupatāḥ tapodharmaparāyaṇāḥ ta ārūḍhapatitāḥ* [em.; ānūpatitā cod.] *syus ta eva śūdra-panyāṃganārata[s] tebhyaḥ tābhyas ca saṃjāto yaḥ sa bhaṣmāṅkuraḥ sa(m) bha-smajātādhārī śivaliṅgaṃ prapūjayet | śivaliṅgasyākṣatāphalātāmbūlavastadravya-kṣetrādi śivāya datta[m] tat sarvaṃ tenaiva śivanirmālyaṃ bhaṣmāṅkureṇa grāhyam* (= prose paraphrase of *Jātiviveka* 2.126–128) *| śivasvādhikārī sa eva bhaṣmāṅkura bhedaḥ śaivāḥ pāsupatāḥ mahāvratadharā turyā kālamukhā jaṅgamādayo nandikeśvareṇoktāḥ jñātavyāḥ | vistarabhayāt nātra* [em.; tātra cod.] *likhitāḥ | sarve pi te bhaṣmarudrākṣadhārakā loke jaṭilādayaḥ kālau draṣṭavyāḥ | bhaṣmāṅkuro* [em.; smābhekuro cod.] *loke guravasamjñāḥ ||39||*.

¹⁰ *Śūdrācāraśiromaṇi* (16th c.?, p. 21): *śaivāḥ pāsupataḥ kaścid ārūḍhaḥ patito yadi | tasmāḥ jātāḥ śūdrapatnyāṃ putro bhaṣmāṅkuraḥ smṛtaḥ || śivārcanaṃ tu tat-kāryaṃ śivadāyena jīvitam | sa jaṭābhaṣmadhārī ca śivaliṅgaṃ prapūjayet || tāmbūlam akṣatā dravya gāvaḥ kṣetrāṇi śakini (śākinī?) | śivāya prāṇibhir dattam anyat kim api bhaktitāḥ || caṇḍīśan tad iti khyātam tena tasyeha jīvikaḥ |*

¹¹ See *Śūdrakamalākara*, p. 284.

¹² See n. 4 above.

¹³ This is Bālabhaṭṭa's gloss on the *Mitākṣara* (18th c., in: *The Sacred Books of the Hindus*, Volume XXI, p. 204; note that the remark in brackets in the translation stating that the Bhaṣmāṅkura is "the priest of a Śiva temple" is not in the Sanskrit text of Bālabhaṭṭa's gloss.): "(22) Bhaṣmāṅkura. 'The Śaivas, and the Pāsupatas following the path of Yoga, when having attained a certain stage, fall down from it, and connect themselves with Śūdra and other public women, they give rise to children called 'Bhaṣmāṅkuras.' [sic] A Bhaṣmāṅkura keeps matted hair and besmears the body with ashes and worships the Śivaliṅga. (He is the priest of the Śiva temple) and maintains himself with the offerings made by the pious to that temple.' He is an Anuloma and is called Gurava in the Mahāraṣṭra language." Sanskrit text in *Bālabhaṭṭi*. Book I. p. 297: *śaivāḥ pāsupataḥ kaścid āsūtaḥ* [→ *ārūḍhaḥ*] *patito yadi | tasmāḥ jātāḥ śūdra-patnyāṃ putro bhaṣmāṅkuraḥ smṛtaḥ || śivārcanaṃ tu tat-kāryaṃ śivadāyena jīvitam | sa jaṭābhaṣmadhārī ca śivaliṅgaṃ prapūjayet || tāmbūlam ityādijīvikety antam ity anyatra | ayam anulomo gurava iti mahārāṣṭrabhāṣayā prasiddhaḥ*.

Gurava is unclear. One could suggest that it stands for Sanskrit *gaurava*, meaning “of the *guru*,” i.e., “the *guru*’s son,” but the Guravs/Guraos are also a known *jāti* in Maharashtra, in parts of Karnataka, Andhra Pradesh, and Madhya Pradesh, and some of them insist on *gurava* being the plural of Sanskrit *guru* (*guravaḥ*).¹⁴ Traditionally, they have been temple priests as well as musicians. They even have their own Jātipurāṇas, composed at the beginning of the twentieth century, to support their earlier claim to Brahminhood. In one of these modern Jātipurāṇas, they are identified with the Devalakas, or temple priests, in another one, a lustrous being called Bhasmāṅkura(!) is born from the earth when the Śuddhaśaivas engage in battle with the god Agni.¹⁵

Turning back to the Bhasmāṅkura, it is easy to see that the term has managed to maintain a blossoming career up to modern times, from a rather low status Devalaka-type figure to a *jāti* claiming Brahminhood. An examination of the Bhasmāṅkura as he appears in sources that *predate* the *Jātiviveka*, i.e., those prior to the fifteenth century, could broaden our perspective even more. While I have been unable to find any occurrences of the term in pre-Tantric texts, the Bhasmāṅkura does appear in Śaiva Tantric texts: Chapter 23 of Abhinavagupta’s *Tantrāloka*, for example, paraphrases certain prohibitions that are taught in Tantras and concern categories of men ineligible for consecration such as *ācāryas*. A citation from the lost¹⁶ *Devyāyāmala* also mentions the Bhasmāṅkura next to the *vratisuta* (“an ascetic’s son”) and the *duḥśīlātanaya* (“the offspring of a woman of ill repute”). In *Tantrāloka* 23.9, the same two categories, *vratisuta* and *duḥśīlātanaya*, seem to be distinct from and non-synonymous to the Bhasmāṅkura, at least that is what *tathā* suggests.¹⁷ Or do they rather clari-

¹⁴ See SOUTH ASIAN FOLKLORE: AN ENCYCLOPEDIA, p. 274 (with *guru* spelt *gūrū*).

¹⁵ BAPAT 2001: 66. On the Guravas/Guravs/Guraos in general, see RUSSEL 1916: 175–181; BAPAT 1993 and 2001; PEOPLE OF INDIA: MAHARASHTRA. Part One. Volume XXX, pp. 768–777; SOUTH ASIAN FOLKLORE: AN ENCYCLOPEDIA, p. 272–274. Photos of Guravs can be found, e.g., in RUSSEL 1916: 176 and SOUTH ASIAN FOLKLORE: AN ENCYCLOPEDIA, p. 273.

¹⁶ See SANDERSON 2014: 41.

¹⁷ *Tantrāloka* 23.7cd and 9–10: *samastaśaivaśāstrārthaboddhā kāruṇiko guruḥ ||7|| (...) paśvātmanā svayambhūṣṇur nādhikārī sa kutracit | bhasmāṅkuro vratisuto duḥśīlātanayas tathā ||9|| kuṇḍo golaś ca te duṣṭā uktam devyākhyayāmale | punarbhūś cānyaliṅgo yaḥ punaḥ śaive pratiṣṭhitah ||10|| (...)*, “The guru should be knowledgeable in the meaning of all Śaiva Śāstras and should be compassionate. (...) The Svayambhūṣṇu is nowhere [held to be] entitled [to become an *ācārya*] because he is a bound soul (*paśu*). The Bhasmāṅkura, the son of an ascetic, also the

fy the meaning of Bhasmāṅkura, stating that a Bhasmāṅkura is the son of both a *vratin* and a woman of ill repute, so the Bhasmāṅkura is the son of a Śaiva ascetic and probably a prostitute, just as the *Jātiviveka* puts it? Jayaratha the commentator remains silent on this matter.

In any case, the Bhasmāṅkura is mentioned here in a list which also contains the Kuṇḍa, “the son of a woman by another man than her husband while the husband is alive,” and the Gola, “a widow’s bastard.”¹⁸ These suggest that the Bhasmāṅkura must indeed be somebody with a problematic origin, resembling the Kuṇḍa and the Gola. Apparently though, for Abhinavagupta this is not problematic to such an extent that it would pose a problem, for he states that no prohibition concerning these categories is taught in the *Mālinīvijayottaratantra*, the root scripture, and as Jayaratha summarises: “In our religion there is no such rule, except for [the requirement that the *guru*] must be knowledgeable.”¹⁹ This fits in well with the *advaitācāra* attitude of non-Saiddhāntika Tantras in general, or to put it very simply, with the notion that one should usually not distinguish between good and bad, pure and impure, high and low.

Naturally, the Śaivasiddhānta’s view is different from that of Abhinavagupta. For example, in the *Uttarakāmika* a Bhasmāṅkura is not allowed to be consecrated as *ācārya*, like all others characterised by impure practices, impure bodily and mental features, and problematic origins.²⁰

son of a woman of ill repute, the Kuṇḍa and the Gola, they are impure: this is taught in the *Devyāyāmala*. Also the Punarbhū, who was attached to another religion and then returns to Śaivism (...)” (On the *Svayambhūṣṇu* [a self-appointed guru] and the Punarbhū, see TĀNTRIKĀBHIDHĀNAKOŚA III in the entry on punarbhū.)

There is the theoretical possibility the *tathā* connects *bhasmāṅkura* with *svayambhūṣṇu*, as suggested by Judit Törzsök (personal communication).

¹⁸ Both in MONIER-WILLIAMS sub vocibus.

¹⁹ *Tantrāloka* 23.11 with Jayaratha’s introduction: *asmaddarśane tu jñānavattvam antareṇa na kaścid ayaṃ niyama ity āha “śrīpūrvaśāstre na tv eṣa niyamah ko ’pi coditaḥ | yathārthatattvasaṅghajñas tathā śiṣye prakāśakaḥ |*.” “In our religion there is no such rule, except for [the requirement that the guru] must be knowledgeable. This is why the author says: In the root scripture, there is no such prohibition taught. [The guru] knows all the various ontological entities as they really are, and he exposes them to the disciple according to truth.” See also *Tantrāloka* 23.16c-17b: *ato deśakulācāradehalakṣaṇakalpanām || anādṛtyaiva sampūrṇajñānaṃ kuryād gurur gurum |*. “Therefore the guru creates an omniscient guru without considering his place of birth, family, conduct, and bodily features.”

²⁰ *Uttarakāmika* 24.12-14 (before the 12th c.?, see SANDERSON 2009: 279, n. 663;

Since the *Dīkṣādarśa* cites the *Kāmika* (see Appendix 2), initially the instructions here are similar to the ones above. However, when it subsequently cites the *Cintyaviśva*, it also provides further details (see verse 9 and the following). The text states that *gurus* are essentially defined by their being guardians of good conduct (*ācāra*). Those who fall from good conduct (*ācārāt tu paribhraṣṭās*) should be avoided and ignored, just as one abandons a broken stone *liṅga*. The offspring born as a result of a broken religious observance is called a Bhasmānkura, and he should not be allowed to grant initiation or to consecrate *liṅgas*. His offspring is named Antara, and the Antara's offspring in turn is termed Kauśika. A transcript of a manuscript of the *Jñānaratnāvalī* reads *bhagnānkura* instead of *bhasmānkura*,²¹ but it helps in understanding the previous passage, the one in the *Dīkṣādarśa*. Here the Bhasmānkura's offspring is called Kandhaka, whose offspring is named Kogika. The same text also refers to the Bhasmānkura with the synonym *bhasmapraroha* in a citation of the beginning of the fourth *pariccheda* of Brahmaśambhu's unpublished *Naimittikakriyānusandhāna*, completed in the tenth century.²² The context here is categories of people that are unqualified for *abhiṣeka*, and again, the Bhasmānkura/Bhasmapraroha is mentioned next to the Kuṇḍa, the Golaka, and a certain

Ācāryābhiṣeka, p. 1297): *abhakṣyabhakṣakaṃ caiva kuṇḍaṃ bhasmānkuraṃ tathā | khaṭvāṅgiśyāmadantaū cāpy ārūḍhaṃ patitaṃ tu vā ||12|| alasam vṛṣalam caivam vrātyam vaiśyāpatim (veśyā-?) tathā | asacchāstrakṛtaṃ [em.; -chastra- cod.] klībam vyādhitam kunakhaṃ tathā ||13|| atha vyasaninaṃ pāradārikaṃ vṛṣalīpatim | citrakam gāyakaṃ caiva nartakaṃ ca vīvarjayet ||14||*. “He should not allow these [to be consecrated as ācāryas]: anybody who consumes things that are forbidden, the son of a woman by another man than her husband while the husband is alive, the Bhasmānkura, one with a khaṭvāṅga [perhaps emend to khalvāṅga- (“bald”), see commentary by Jayaratha ad Tantrāloka 23.12, who cites Svachchandatantra 1:24ab: *kāṇo vidveṣajananaḥ khalvāṅgaś cārthanāśanaḥ*], one with blackened teeth, one who has fallen from his elevated status [i.e., an outcaste], who is lazy, a Śūdra, a Vrātya, a harlots's husband[?], the composers of heretic texts, an unmanly person, anyone who is ill or has ugly nails, anybody with addictions, who is with somebody else's wife or is the husband of a Śūdra woman, a painter, a singer, or a dancer.”

²¹ *Jñānaratnāvalī* (12th c.?, p. 313): *tāvat te guravo jñeyā yāvad ācārapālakāḥ | ācārāt tu paribhraṣṭās tyājyās te bhagnalīṅgavat | bhagnavratāt samudbhūto yo 'sau bhagnānkuraḥ smṛtaḥ || tajjātāḥ kandhakā jñeyās te [taj-?]jātāḥ kogikā matāḥ | dīkṣāsthāpanayoḥ [ete] santyājyā [em.; °ātyā cod.] śubhakāmṣibhiḥ [corr.; śubhā° cod.] ||*

²² I am grateful to Prof. Alexis Sanderson for this reference and for sending me the e-text of this passage in the *Naimittikakriyānusandhāna* edited by him, together with additional pieces of information (personal communication, August 18, 2015).

Katthaka/Kanthaka.²³ The *Somaśambhupaddhativṛyākhyā* echoes the *Jñānaratnāvalī*'s definition of the Bhaṣmāṅkura, and connects the Bhaṣmāṅkura with a certain *bhaṣmaprada*, which is most probably corrupted from *bhagnavrata*.²⁴ Note also the variants of names here for the offspring: Kalara and Kuśika. The (*Pratiṣṭhā*)*lakṣaṇa(sāra)samuccaya*, which may have been composed in the tenth century,²⁵ after giving definitions for the Svayambhū, the Punarbhū, and the Gola, defines the Bhaṣmāṅkura as follows (chapter 2, Ācāryādiparīkṣā, variants omitted here):

ācāryadharmapatnīṣu yo jātāḥ sa guroḥ suta[h] |
pṛāvṛjyān naśyate pūrvam strīyogād aparaṃ tathā ||99||
ubhābhyāṃ yaḥ pranaṣṭaḥ syāt tasyāpatyas tu katthakaḥ |
trikaṇṭhothās trikaṇṭhāś ca trikaṇṭhātmakarṇakā[h] [?] ||100||
nityanaimittikāgantugurudevāgnyapūjanāt |
bhaṣmāṅkuras tu katthothas²⁶ tatsutāḥ kauśikādayaḥ ||101||
bhojakā vratiputrāś ca kauśikānyāś ca kutsitāḥ |

The one who is born from the *ācārya*'s faithful wife is the *guru*'s son. [If] he first abandons his asceticism and [then sins] by union with a woman: the offspring of one who fails in both [matters] will be called a Katthaka. Those born from the Trikaṇṭhas and the Trikaṇṭhas are *trikaṇṭhātmakarṇakas* [?], because they do not worship the *guru*, the *devas*, and the fire during the daily, occasional, and optional [rituals]. Now, the Bhaṣmāṅkura is born from the Kattha. His offspring are the Kauśika etc. The Bhojakas, the sons of ascetics, the Kauśikas, and others are contemptible.²⁷

This passage is problematic. For example, the Trikaṇṭha is a category obscure to me, but what seems to be taught here is that the *guru*'s illegitimate

²³ *Jñānaratnāvalī* (p. 407–408): *avikhaṇḍitacāritro na punarbhūr* [em.; *punarbhin* cod.] *na kanthakaḥ* [em.; *kaṇḍhanam* cod.] *| nāpi bhaṣmaprarohākhyāḥ ṣaṇḍhaḥ* [corr. SANDERSON; *ṣaṇḍaḥ* cod.] *kuṇḍaś ca golakaḥ |*

²⁴ *Somaśambhupaddhativṛyākhyā* (p. 190): *tāvat te guravo jñeyāḥ yāvad ācāra-pālakāḥ | ācārāt tu paribhraṣṭās tyājyās te bhagnalīṅgavat || bhaṣmapradāt [→ bhagnavratāt?] samudbhūto yo 'sau bhaṣmāṅkura[h] smṛtaḥ | tajjātā[h] kalarā jñeyās tajjātāḥ kuśikā matāḥ || dīkṣāsthāpanayor ete santyajyās śubhakāṅkṣibhiḥ |*

²⁵ According to SANDERSON 2014: 28.

²⁶ *katthothas*] corr.; °*sthas* cod.

²⁷ The translation of this passage, especially of the second sentence, is tentative.

son is called Katthaka, and the Bhasmānkura is the Katthaka's son. This is slightly different from what we see in other sources. Note also that there seems to be another reference to Caṇḍeśa in the following passage:

*rāṣṭrakṣayakarā hy ete ye ca pāṣāṇḍino*²⁸ *narāḥ ||102||*
samayādi(m) vinā mūḍhaḥ sthāpanaṃ kurute tu yaḥ |
*śāstrāvilokanād*²⁹ *eva caṇḍeśas tasya śāsakaḥ ||103||*
yo 'śaivaḥ sthāpayed īsaṃ lobhavyāmūḍhamānasaḥ |
sa yāti narakaṃ sadyo yājñikaiḥ saha daiśikaḥ ||104||

These and the heretics are the destroyers of the kingdom. A fool who would perform without [conforming to] the appropriate rules etc. will be chastised by Caṇḍeśa, because he has neglected the Śāstric prescriptions.³⁰ If a non-Śaiva teacher, his mind confused by greed, installs Śiva[']s image], he will go to hell immediately together with the sacrificers.

Finally, the *Īśānaśivagurudevapaddhati* mentions the Bhasmānkura in a puzzling manner (or simply in a corrupted form): it mentions the term in the dual when stating that the Bhasmānkura should be excluded from rituals. He is defined here as the offspring of somebody whose observance (*vrata*) has been ruined, or broken, and thus is fallen, or an outcaste (*patita*).³¹

As regards the names of the Bhasmānkura's offspring (and in the case of the (*Pratiṣṭhā*)*lakṣaṇa(sāra)samuccaya* also that of his father), it seems certain that we are dealing with a fixed pair of terms modified by textual corruption and/or local variants. One appellation emerges from Kanthaka/Kandhaka/Kandhana/Katthaka/Kalara/Antara, the other from Kauśi-

²⁸ *pāṣāṇḍino*] corr.; *paṣāṇḍino* cod.

²⁹ *śāstrāvilokanād*] em. Törzsök ; *śāstrāvalokanād* cod.

³⁰ I am indebted to Judit Törzsök for the emendation in the Sanskrit of this sentence and for its translation.

³¹ *Īśānaśivagurudevapaddhati*, after 3.11.10, on who cannot be a guru: *atra yo-gaśivapaddhatau | [...] kāverīkoṅkaṇodbhūtā ninditā guravaḥ smṛtāḥ | kuṇḍādayaś ca rogārtā nindyāḥ syur deśajā api || bhraṣṭavratāc ca patitād utpanno yo narādhamah | bhasmānkurāhvayau[?] tyājyau ninditau sarvakarmasu*. “gurus born near the River Kāverī and in the Koṅkaṇa area are prohibited. The Kuṇḍa etc. and those who are ill are prohibited even if they were born in proper places. The vile man, who is born [from a man whose] vow has been broken [and is thus] an outcaste, is a Bhasmānkura and is to be excluded, and he is to be prohibited from [performing] any rituals..”

ka/Kuśika/Kogika. It is safe to say that of these Kanthaka (perhaps from *kanthā*, “a rag, patched garment [especially one worn by certain ascetics]”) ³² and Kauśika are the most probably correct Sanskrit forms. Regarding the exact meaning of the term *bhasmāṅkura*, one may suppose that its meaning is “a sprout grown from ashes,” i.e., an offspring of an ascetic who uses ashes during his observances, typically a Pāśupata or Śaiva ascetic, and who should be non-reproductive, dry as ashes, so to say, but from whom new life has now been produced. More specifically, the ashes here may refer to a Śaiva ascetic’s ash-bed, ³³ where the Bhasmāṅkura is conceived. To demonstrate that modern researchers are not always familiar with the connotations of the term *bhasmāṅkura*, we can refer to Gnoli’s Italian translation of this passage from the *Tantrāloka*. ³⁴ He translates *bhasmāṅkura* as “somebody who besmears his hair with ashes.” In fact, Monier-Williams’ *Sanskrit-English Dictionary* gives the secondary meaning “hair” for the word *aṅkura*. This may have been the reason for understanding *bhasma-aṅkura* as “ash-hair” or “hair with ashes.” To refute this interpretation, we can remark that it would be odd for any Śaiva text to say that those who use ashes in their daily rituals, a common practice among Śaivas, should be excluded from the office of *ācārya*.

As we have seen above, the descriptions of the Bhasmāṅkura point in the same direction but are richly varied. The original concept and some descriptions of the Bhasmāṅkura are possibly based on earlier models. One such model is the Brahmanical Avakīrṇin, a *sannyāsin* who has broken his *brahmacarya* vow. ³⁵ In the *Yājñavalkyasmṛti* (chapter 1, verses 222–224), for example, ³⁶ the Avakīrṇin occurs in a list of categories unfit for *śrāddha* rituals, a list that is reminiscent of those containing the Bhasmāṅkura found in the Śaiva Paddhatis and in Jātiviveka texts:

³² MONIER-WILLIAMS s.v. I am grateful to Prof. Alexis Sanderson for this suggestion.

³³ I am grateful to Prof. Alexis Sanderson for this suggestion.

³⁴ Gnoli’s translation of *Tantrāloka* 23.8cd-9 (GNOLI 1999: 474, emphasis mine): “[Riprovati come maestri in talune scritture] sono anche coloro che **portino i capelli sparsi di cenere**, che siano figli di asceti, figli di donne di facili costumi, figli adulterini e di vedove. Secondo il *Devyāyāmalatantra*, riprovati sono anche coloro che, dopo aver portato segni settari, hanno sì aderito alla doctrina di Śiva, ma debbono [per il loro passato] nascere un’altra volta.”

³⁵ See *Yājñavalkyasmṛti* 3.280ab: *avakīrṇī bhaved gatvā brahmacārī tu yoṣitam*. (“The Brahmacārī becomes an Avakīrṇin if he approaches a woman [sexually].”)

³⁶ See also, e.g., *Āśvalāyanaśrautasūtra* 12.8.25.

*rogī hīnātiriktāṅgaḥ kāṇaḥ paunarbhavas tathā |
 avakīrṇī kuṇḍagolau kunakhī śyāvadantakaḥ ||222||
 bhṛtakādhyāpakāḥ klībaḥ kanyādūṣy abhiśastakaḥ |
 mitradhruk piśunaḥ somavikrayī parivindakaḥ ||223||
 mātāpitṛgurutyāgī kuṇḍāśī vṛṣalātmajāḥ |
 parapūrvāpatih stenāḥ karmaduṣṭāś ca ninditāḥ ||224||*

Of these categories, the following terms occur in the Śaiva passages quoted in this article: *rogin/rogārta/vyādhita*, *kāṇa*, *paunarbhava/punarbhava/punarbhū* (albeit in different senses), *kuṇḍa*, *gola*, *kunakhin/kunakha*, *śyāvadantaka/śyāmadantaka*, *klība*, *vṛṣala/vṛṣalī*. Note especially that the Bhasmāṅkura is usually placed next to the Kuṇḍa and the Gola in lists of this kind, as is the Avakīrṇin here. The main difference between the two categories is of course that the Bhasmāṅkura is the offspring of somebody who has broken a vow, while the Avakīrṇin is one who has broken his own vow.

As regards later occurrences of the term and later models, the Bhasmāṅkura seems to be a Śaiva version of the Brahmanical Dola, which is defined thus, e.g., in *Jātiviveka* 2.184:

*viprah svīkrtya saṃnyāsam ārūdhapatito bhavet |
 brāhmaṇīm kāmaved raṇḍām tasyām ca janayet sutam |
 sa dolaḥ karmacāṇḍālo 'sya sparśāt pātakaṃ mahat ||184||*

184 omitted in A **184a** *svī°*] conj. ; *strī°* B • *saṃnyāsam*] corr. ; *sa(?)nyāsam* B **184c** *brāhmaṇīm*] em. ; *brāhmaṇī* B • *kāmaved*] em. ; *kāyamed* B **184d** *tasyām*] corr. ; *nasyām* B

If a Brāhmaṇa who has entered upon a life of renunciation falls from his elevated status and has sex with a Brāhmaṇa widow and begets a son, this [son] will be a Dola, a Cāṇḍāla by deed. It is highly sinful to touch such a person.

Although the circumstances of the conception of the Bhasmāṅkura and the Dola are similar, there is one significant difference in their descriptions in the *Jātiviveka*: the Bhasmāṅkura is not condemned as harshly as the Dola. By this time, the Bhasmāṅkura may have reached a status somewhat above that of a *karmacāṇḍāla* (see below). Alternatively, the author Gopīnātha's

Śaiva affiliation³⁷ may have caused him to tone down his description of the Bhasmāṅkura.³⁸ Further, in texts of the *Jātiviveka* genre, the Bhasmāṅkura also seems to represent a variant of the Devalaka, the temple priest (unfit for *śrāddha* and sacrifice, see, e.g., *Manu* 3.152) who subsists on the offerings made to an idol, as noted above.³⁹

But the main question remains: to what extent can we suppose that the definitions found in the *Jātiviveka* and related texts are applicable to Śaiva texts, such as the Saiddhāntika Paddhatis or the *Devyāyāmala* cited in the *Tantrāloka*? The main difference between the two kinds of definitions concerns the Bhasmāṅkura's association with the temple. We have no Śaiva reports on the Bhasmāṅkura as someone who lives on offerings made to an image in a temple, like a Śaiva Devalaka does, something that is confirmed, or at least suggested, by all *Jātiviveka* sources. Thus, there must have been a process in the course of which the Bhasmāṅkura, first only a category excluded from certain offices and rituals, was transformed into a Śaiva temple priest. But when was the category of the Bhasmāṅkura first associated with the Gurav *jāti*? Was it around or before the time of the composition of the *Jātiviveka*, i.e., the fifteenth century? Or is it a later interpretation inserted into that text? Several eleventh-century Old Kanarese inscriptions that are mentioned by LORENZEN (1991: 115) seem to refer to Goravas, who are said to have been the supervisors of temples.⁴⁰ Were these Goravas really “Śaiva mendicants”? Do they have anything to do with Bhasmāṅkuras?

And how real, or how theoretical, is this category as it appears in the earlier sources, before it is associated with a well-defined *jāti* with its own rights and duties? There is no reason to suppose that Śaiva ascetics never

³⁷ See O'HANLON & HIDAS & KISS 2015: 108.

³⁸ On Devalakas not being condemned in some communities, see SANDERSON 2009: 277.

³⁹ See, e.g., *Jātiviveka* 2.3–5 (O'HANLON & HIDAS & KISS 2015: 127, n. 53) and SANDERSON 2009: 277.

⁴⁰ See EPIGRAPHIA INDICA XV, pp. 85–94 (*goravar* in line 49, verse 14 on p. 90) and also *ibid.* p. 156: “*Goraga* [...] is the Telugu form of the Kanarese *gorava*, which according to Kittel means a Śaiva mendicant. It is now obsolete in Telugu. In the inscription [the Bezvada Pillar Inscription of Yuddhamalla] it is used in the sense of a Śaiva devotee or teacher.” N. 1 (*ibid.*) mentions “erotic *goravas*” in the “Yēwūr inscription of A.D. 1077” (EPIGRAPHIA INDICA XII, p. 290, from the translation of the inscription: “Whether it be the head of the establishment, or the Gorava, or such as are under the rules of this establishment; if there should be a man who lusts for venery in this establishment, the establishment and the king must expel him.”).

broke their *brahmacarya* vows, never visited Śūdra women or prostitutes, and never begot illegitimate children, so it must have been a real-life issue.⁴¹ (The Bhasmāṅkura might also originally have something to do with offspring produced as a result of Tantric sexual rituals,⁴² in which case there are no broken vows.) Also, the fact that the social status of a category of man is repeatedly discussed, with an emphasis on the fact that this category is denied certain rights, may suggest that we are not dealing with theoretical possibilities here. In fact, it may seem that prohibitions concerning groups of people could sometimes tell us more about what exactly happened in the past than prescriptive passages do when they tell us what should be done. The fact that the Bhasmāṅkura became a distinct category (probably long before Abhinavagupta's time) indicates that sons born from Śaiva ascetics were not an isolated and negligible phenomenon, and they posed a problem for the Śaiva socio-ritual world.

Another question could be raised about the extent to which the term was widespread. The oddities in the Sanskrit texts – the dual in the *Īśānaśiva-gurudevapaddhati*, the corruption of the term itself elsewhere, and the various obscurities – could be just the usual errors introduced randomly by scribes, or they could indicate that even the redactors sometimes had little idea what a Bhasmāṅkura was. Jayaratha's silence on the matter is again inconclusive, but it might be indicative: either he considered the Bhasmāṅkura sufficiently well-known to not comment on it, or he was himself unfamiliar with it. We are also left wondering when the Bhasmāṅkura ceased to be a well-known category.

Moreover, one would suppose that the Bhasmāṅkura may have posed less of a problem for non-Saiddhāntika sources than for the Siddhānta. Non-Saiddhāntika traditions “have shown themselves much less willing to tolerate such compromises [concerning peoples' origins and caste than the Siddhānta], seeing them as a contamination of the true Śaiva tradition [...]” (SANDERSON 2009: 292). Most of our available Śaiva sources for the Bhasmāṅkura are Saiddhāntika, and we have seen that all of our sources, apart from the *Tantrāloka*, condemn the Bhasmāṅkura. Even our only non-Saiddhāntika scriptural source, the lost *Devyāyāmala*, which is cited by Abhinavagupta and was probably a Vidyāpīṭha/Trika text,⁴³ treats the

⁴¹ See KANE vol. 2.2: 952 on *sannyāsins* having wives and concubines.

⁴² Such as described, e.g., in *Brahmayāmala* 45, see KISS 2015.

⁴³ See SANDERSON 2002: 4 and 2014: 41.

Bhasmāṅkura as problematic. Is Abhinavagupta's approach to categories such as the Bhasmāṅkura filled with idealisation or exaggeration? Were Bhasmāṅkuras ever really consecrated as *ācāryas* in non-Saiddhāntika communities?

And what is the exact problem with a Bhasmāṅkura in Śaiva texts that prohibits him to become an *ācārya*? Some sources, such as the *Dīkṣādarśa*, state that only those that belong to the four *varṇas*, plus the offspring of the six Anuloma unions in which the father's *varṇa* is higher or equal to that of the mother, can be consecrated as *ācāryas*. Theoretically, the child of a Śaiva ascetic and a Śūdra woman, even a prostitute, is very likely to be an Anuloma offspring, as Bālabhaṭṭa rightly tells us.⁴⁴ However, if the Bhasmāṅkura's father is supposed to be an ascetic, then his son is certainly the result of a sin, and this fact that the ascetic has broken a vow is relevant here. The issue is not primarily a problem of caste/*jāti* that concerns possible combinations of mother and father, but rather a question of sinful conception. One's sin makes one a *karmacāṇḍāla*, someone who would not be a *cāṇḍāla*, an outcaste, normally, but whom some sinful deed, some adharmic karma makes one. So it may be only secondarily, by his father sinking to the status of a special kind of *cāṇḍāla*, before the birth of his son, that the Bhasmāṅkura can be denied the office of *ācārya*. This is exactly what we see in the case of the Dola, a category which strikingly resembles the Bhasmāṅkura (see above, p. 94). This fact that the Bhasmāṅkura has neither truly condemnable caste-affiliations nor repulsive personal features may have acted as an important factor in his later rise to a higher status. It is also interesting to note that our texts never dwell on the impurity of the Bhasmāṅkura's mother. On the contrary, it is always the breaking of a vow by the father that is emphasised. One reservation concerning the Bhasmāṅkura could have been that he may inherit his father's lack of discipline, but more importantly, we may see in the rejection of the Bhasmāṅkura a hint at the office of *ācārya* being hereditary. The existence of an illegitimate son may have caused tension when the retiring *ācārya* chose his successor.⁴⁵ Prohibitions that stop a supposedly Brahmacārin *ācārya* of a *maṭha* to consecrate his son as his successor may well have been needed to maintain the integrity of the institution.

⁴⁴ See p. 89 above.

⁴⁵ On hereditary rights of a priestly community and *gurus* choosing their successors, see SANDERSON 2009: 255 and 279.

There could be many more questions raised, and there could hopefully be many more passages collected and edited concerning this exciting figure of the Bhaṣmāṅkura to see more clearly in these matters. His association with Caṇḍeśa is especially intriguing. What seems to be certain at this point is that the Bhaṣmāṅkura is the product of the Śaiva Age. It seems to be an original Śaiva category, based on earlier models of sinning ascetics, reflecting socio-ritual problems that were a result of Śaiva practices. It adds to our understanding as to what extent caste boundaries and problematic births were ignored in Śaiva ritual practice, and by doing so, it allows us to peek into the past and see a glimpse of real-life issues in mediaeval India, ones that usually remain obscured by our prescriptive texts.

Appendix 1

The *Jātiviveka* in the *Paraśurāmapratāpa* (sixteenth century?, fol. 50rff.) quoting the *Śivadharmasāstra* (diplomatic transcription):

rudrākṣa kaṁkaṇa haste syāj jaṭṭaikātha mastake |
*liṅgaṁ śivāśramaṁ sthānāṁ bhasmanāṁ trisaṁdhyakaṁ ||*⁴⁶
kaṁthe mūrdhni pavitre vā rudrākṣān dhārayet tataḥ |
āgamoddiṣṭasaṁkhyākān rudralokaṁ sa gacchati |
rudrabhaktaiḥ śirasy ekā dhāryā rudrajaṭā sthirā ||
dhvaṁsinī sarvaduḥkhānāṁ tayā rudratvaṁ āpnuyāt ⁴⁷
kṣiteṇa bhasmanā kuryāt trisaṁdhyam yas tripuṇḍrikam ||
sarvāpāvinirmuktaḥ śivaloke mahīyate ⁴⁸
*mūrdhni haste śarīre ca dhṛtvā rudrākṣamālikā ||*⁴⁹
yas tu bhuñjīta tadbhaktāḥ sa rudro nātra saṁśayaḥ ⁵⁰
rudrākṣadhāraṇam yasmā nityam loke pavitrakam |
sarvarogapraśamaṇam sarvakleśavināśanaṁ ||
sarvatīrtheṣu yat puṇyam sarvayajñeṣu yat phalaṁ ⁵¹

⁴⁶ ≈ *Śivadharmasāstra* 11.18 (pp. 129ff): *rudrākṣaiḥ kaṁkaṇam haste gale caiva hi mastake | liṅgaṁ śivāśramasthānāṁ bhasmanāṁ ca tripuṇḍrikam ||*.

⁴⁷ ≈ *Śivadharmasāstra* 11.43c-44b: *dhvaṁsanam sarvaduḥkhānāṁ rudratvaṁ samavāpnuyāt || sitena bhasmanā kuryāt trisaṁdhyam yas tripuṇḍrikam |*.

⁴⁸ = *Śivadharmasāstra* 11.44cd.

⁴⁹ ≈ *Śivadharmasāstra* 12.91cd: *mūrdhni hastopavīte vā kṛtvā rudrākṣamālikāṁ ||*.

⁵⁰ ≈ *Śivadharmasāstra* 12.92: *yaś ca bhuñjīta bhaṣmāṅgī rudrair bhuktan na saṁśayaḥ | rudrākṣadhāraṇan tasmān nityam eva praśasyate ||*.

tat phalaṃ labhate sarvaṃ bhasmasnānān na saṃśayaḥ ||
bhasmasnānāt paraṃ snānaṃ pavitraṃ naiva vidyate ⁵²
ity uktā munidevebhyaḥ snāto devaḥ svayaṃ śivaḥ ||
tataḥ prabhṛti brahmādyā munayaś ca śivārthinaḥ ⁵³
sarvaprasavaḥ yat tena bhasmasnānaṃ pracakrire ||
duḥśīla[h] śīlamukto vā yo pāpāpy upalakṣitaḥ ⁵⁴
bhūtiśāśanaśāmyogāt sa pūjyo nātra saṃśayaḥ |
na go brāhmaṇa bhasmāni liṅga chāyāṃ padā sprśet ⁵⁵
na laṃghayeta nirmālyam apsu tiṣṭhen na nagnakaḥ ⁵⁶
dhārayec chivanirmālyam bhaktyā lobhān na dhārayet ||
bhakṣaṇān narakam gacchet bhūṣaṇāc caiva mūḍhadhīḥ |
na tatra sthānapūjāccām pratigrhṇāti śaṃkaraḥ ⁵⁷
yatra naivedyanirmālyam malaṃ dhṛk pūjāyec chivaṃ ⁵⁸
asaṃsprśyo bhavet so 'pi yas tasyāṃ gamalaṃ sprśet ⁵⁹
tasmān naṃ saṃsprśel liṅgaṃ naro nirmālyadūṣitaḥ ⁶⁰
yatra naivedyanirmālyam saṃkīrṇa kalaśāṃ śubhiḥ ⁶¹
snānādyam kriyate bhaktyā na tad grhṇāti śaṃkaraḥ ||

rudrākṣān kaṇṭhadeśe daśanaparimitān mastake viṃśati dve
ṣaṭ ṣaṭ karṇapradeśe karayugulagatān dvādaśa dvādaśaiva |
bāhvor indro kalāni pṛthag iti gaṇitān ekam ekam śikhāyāṃ
vakṣasy āṣṭādhikā yaḥ kalayati śatasam sa(h) svayaṃ rudra eva ⁶²

⁵¹ = Śivadharmasāstra 11.50.

⁵² ≈ Śivadharmasāstra 11.52: *bhasmasnānāt paraṃ snānaṃ pavitraṃ naiva vidyate | uktam tat sarvadevebhyaḥ snāto yena śivaḥ svayaṃ ||*.

⁵³ ≈ Śivadharmasāstra 11.53: *brahmādyāś ca tadārabhya munayaś ca śivārthinaḥ | sarvaprasavaḥ yatnena bhasmasnānaṃ pracakrire ||*.

⁵⁴ ≈ Śivadharmasāstra 11.55: *duḥśīlāś śīlayukto vā yo vā ko vāpy alakṣaṇaḥ | bhūtir īśasya saṃyogāt saṃpūjyā rājaputravat ||*.

⁵⁵ ≈ Śivadharmasāstra 12.11cd: *na gobrāhmaṇabhasmāgniliṅgacchāyān na laṃghayet ||*.

⁵⁶ ≈ Śivadharmasāstra 12.12: *na laṃghayeta nirmālyam apsu bhūmau niveśayet | dhārayec chivanirmālyam bhaktyā lobhān na dhārayet ||*.

⁵⁷ ≈ Śivadharmasāstra 12.13: *bhakṣaṇān narakam gacchet tadvilaṃghī ca mūḍhadhīḥ | na tatra snānapūjādyam pratigrhṇāti śaṃkaraḥ ||*.

⁵⁸ ≈ Śivadharmasāstra 12.14ab: *-- naivedyanirmālyam mardayan pūjāyec chivaṃ |*.

⁵⁹ ≈ Śivadharmasāstra 12.15ab: *asaṃsprśyo bhavet so 'pi yathāsvāṅgamalasprśī ||*.

⁶⁰ ≈ Śivadharmasāstra 12.15cd: *tasmān na saṃsprśel liṅgaṃ naro nirmālyadūṣitaḥ ||*.

⁶¹ ≈ Śivadharmasāstra 12.16: *-- -- vedyanirmālyam saṃkīrṇaiḥ kalaśādibhiḥ | snānan tu kriyate bhaktyā na tadgrhṇāti śaṃkaraḥ ||*.

Appendix 2

Dīkṣādarśa (of Vedajñānaśivācārya, sixteenth century, compare with *Uttarakāmika* 24.12–14, see n. 20, verse numbering mine):

[*varjyagurulakṣaṇavidhiḥ*]

(...)

īśvaraḥ kāmike |

kāmīkādiśivajñānaṃ vedārthajñānaṃ eva ca |

samaṃ yo manyate mohāt taṃ prayatnena varjayet ||4||

devayajñaṃ tathāmbaṣṭhaṃ ūhāpohavivarjitam |

samānagotrasaṃbandhaṃ kusumākṣaṃ ca varjayet ||5||

parivettā parivittā ca devalaṃ ca punarbhavam |

abhakṣyabhakṣaṇaṃ caiva kuṇḍa[m] bhasmāṃkuraṃ tathā ||6||

khaṭvāṅgamad⁶³ adantaṃ ca ārūḍhapatitaṃ tu vā |

*alasaṃ prakṣālaṇaṃ [vrṣalaṃ?] caiva prāśyaṃ [vrātyaṃ?] veśyāpatim
tathā ||7||*

asacchāstraparaṃ klībaṃ śaktiṃ sutakaṃ tathā |

asa [atha?] vyasaninaṃ pāradārikaṃ vrṣalīpatim |

citrakaṃ gāyakaṃ caiva nartakaṃ ca vivarjayet ||8||

(...)

cintyaviśve |

tāvat te guravo jñeyā yāvad ācārapālakāḥ |

ācārāt tu paribhraṣṭās tyājyās te bhagnalīṅgavat ||12||

bhagnavratāt samudbhūto yo 'sau bhasmāṃkuraḥ smṛtaḥ |

tajjātā antarā jñeyās tajjātāḥ kauśikās smṛtāḥ ||13||

dīkṣāsthāpanayor ete samtyājyāḥ śubhakāṃkṣibhiḥ |

etaiḥ pratiṣṭhitaṃ līṅgaṃ bhuktimuktyor asādhanam ||14||

evamādiguṇair yukto na pūjyo hi mahītale |

asyaivācāryanāmatvam abhiṣekaṃ na kārayet ||15||

pramāḍād abhiṣekaṃ tu kṛtaṃ ced doṣabhāk bhavet |

⁶² ≈ *Puraścaryārṇava* 6.232 (part II, p. 438): *tantrāntare | rudrākṣān kaṇṭhadeśe
daśanaparimitān mastake viṃśatī dve ṣaṭ ṣaṭ karṇapradeśe karayugalaḥ | bāhvor
indoḥ kalābhir nayanayugalaḥ caikaṃ ekaṃ śikhāyāṃ vakṣasy aṣṭādhikaṃ yaḥ
kalayati śatakaṃ sa svayaṃ nīlakaṇṭhaḥ ||*

⁶³ Perhaps emend to *khalvāṭa-* (“bald”), see commentary by Jayaratha ad *Tantrāloka* 23.12.

Witnesses: IFP transcripts T. 76 pp. 38ff., T.153A pp. 59ff., and T.372B pp. 1296ff.

4a °śiva°] T372B ; omitted in T76, °nivi° T153A **4c** *samaṃ yo*] T372B ; *samayo* T76, T153A **5a** *devayajñaṃ tathāmbaṣṭhaṃ*] em. ; *devaya-jñas tathāmbaṣṭha* T76, T153A, T372B **5b** *ūhāpoha°*] em. ; *kuhāpoha°* T76, *kuhāpohaṃ* T153A, *kuhāpoha°* T372B **7a** *khaṭvāṅgamad adantaṃ*] T76 ; *khātavagaṃgamardaṃ* T153A, - - *āṅgam adantaṃ* T372B **7b** *ārūḍhapatitaṃ*] T76 ; *ārūḍapatanāṃ* T153A, *ārūḍhapatanāṃ* T372B **7d** *veśyāpatiṃ*] T372B ; *vaiśyāpatiṃ* T76, *peśyāpatiṃ* T153A **8a** *asa-cchāstraparaṃ klībaṃ*] T76, T372B ; *asatśāstrataraṃ klībaṃ* T153A **8b** *śaktiṃ*] T372B ; *yāpatiṃ* T76, *yāpintaṃ* T153A • *sutakaṃ*] T372B ; *sunakaṃ* T76, T153A **8c** °*saninaṃ*] T76, T372B ; °*saniraṃ* T153A **8d** °*dārikaṃ vṛṣālīpatiṃ*] T76, T372B ; *dārikā prakṣālīpatiṃ* **8f** *nartakaṃ*] T76 ; *ratnakaṃ* T153A, - - *kañ* T372B (...) **12a** *tāvat te*] conj. ; *tatvato* T153A, *tavato* T76, T372B • *guravo jñeyā*] T76, T372B ; *guruvo jñeya* T153A **9b** *yāvad*] conj. ; *yathād* T76, *yayād* T153A, *yathādāv* T372B **12c** *ācārāt*] conj. ; *ācāryaṃ* T76, *ācāryan* T153A, *ācāryān* T372B • *paribhraṣṭās*] T153A, T372B ; *paribhraṣṭāḥ* T76 **12d** *tyājyās te*] T76, T372B ; *yājyā te* T153A • *bhagnaliṅgavat*] T76, T153A ; *bhagnannaliṅgaka* T372B **12a** *bhagnavratāt*] conj. ; *bhagnavratān* T76, *bhagnaprātānya* T153A, *bhagnavratā* T372B • *samudbhūto*] T76, T153A ; *samu* - - T372B **13b** *yo 'sau*] T76, T153A ; - *sau* T372B • *bhasmāṃkuraḥ*] T76, *bhasmāṃkura* T153A, T372B **13c** *tajjātā*] T76, T153A ; - *jjātā* T372B • *antarā*] T76, T153A ; - *ntirā* T372B • *jñeyās*] T76, T372B ; *jñeyā* T153A **13d** *kauśikās*] T76, *kauśika* T153A, *kauśikā* T372B **14b** *saṃtyājyāḥ*] T76, T372B ; *saṃtyājyā* T153A **14d** *bhuktimuktyor asādhanam*] T76, T372B ; *bhu-ktimuktyopi sādhanam* T153A **15b** *pūjyo hi*] T372B ; *pūjyā hi* T76, *pūjyā hī* T153A

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Manuscripts used for editions

Jātiviveka

A BORI no. 233 of the Viśrama (ii) collection, *Paraśurāmapratāpa* fol. 50v.

B 1638B, Eggeling Catalogue, British Library, *Jātiviveka*, fol. 13v.

Dīkṣādarśa

T76 Institut Français de Pondichéry (IFP) transcript T. 76

T153A Institut Français de Pondichéry (IFP) transcript 153A

T372B Institut Français de Pondichéry (IFP) transcript 372B

Paraśurāmapratāpa

BORI ms. no. 233 of the Viśrama (ii) collection.

Primary Literature

Āśvalāyanaśrautasūtra

Āśvalāyanaśrautasūtra: Nārāyaṇakṛtavṛtṭisametāśvalāyanaśrautasūtram.

Ed. G. Gokhale. Poona: Ānandāśrama Mudrāṇālaya, 1917.

Bālabhāṭṭi

(1) *Bālabhāṭṭi, being a Commentary by Bālabhāṭṭa Pāyagunde, on the Mitāksharā of Śrī Viṣṇaṇēśwara on the Yājñavalkyasmṛiti.* Book I. Ācārādhyāya. Ed. J. R. Gharpure. Bombay: Office for the Collection of Hindu Law Texts Girgaon, 1914.

(2) *The Mitākshara with Visvarūpa and Commentaries of Subodhini and Bālabhāṭṭi.* Ed. Setlur, S. S. Madras: Brahmavadin Press, 1912.

Brhājñātiviveka

Brhājñātiviveka. Ms. no. 685 of Bhau Daji Collection, Asiatic Society, Mumbai.

Īśānaśivagurudevapaddhati

Īśānaśivagurudevapaddhati. [*Isaṇasivagurudeva paddhati of Isanasiva Gurudeva*]. 4 vols. Ed. T. Gaṇapati Sāstrī. Trivandrum: Government Press, 1920-1925, repr. Delhi: Bharatiya Vidya Prakashan, 1990.

Jñānaratnāvalī

Jñānaratnāvalī. Madras ms., IFP/EFEO transcript T0231.

Manusmṛiti

Manusmṛiti: with the Sanskrit commentary Manvartha-Muktāvalī of Kullūka Bhaṭṭa. Ed. J. L. Shastri. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1983.

Pratiṣṭhālakṣaṇasārasamuccaya

Pratiṣṭhālakṣaṇasārasamuccaya. Transcribed by the staff of Muktabodha under the supervision of Mark Dyczkowski,
<http://www.muktabodha.org> (accessed November 5, 2015).

Puraścaryārṇava

Puraścaryārṇava [sic]. 3 parts. Ed. M.D. J. Prabhakari & Co., Benares Cantt. 1901-1904.

Śatapraśnakalpalatā

Śatapraśnakalpalatā. BORI, Pune. P.M. Joshi Collection, Sanskrit ms. no. 19.

Śivadharmasāstra

Śivadharmasāstra. IFP transcript no. 72B, copy of Adyar Library Madras ms. no. 75429.

Somaśambhupaddhativyākhyā

Somaśambhupaddhativyākhyā. IFP transcript no. 170.

Śūdrakamalākara of Kamalākaraḥ

Śūdrakamalākara. Ed. Pānduranga Jāvajī. Bombay: Nirṇayasāgara Press, 1928.

Śūdrācāraśiromaṇi of Śrī Śeṣa Kṛṣṇa

Śūdrācāraśiromaṇi. Ed. N. Khiste. Benares: Government Sanskrit Library, 1933-1936.

Tantrāloka of Abhinavagupta

The Tantrāloka of Abhinava=Gupta. With Commentary (viveka) of Rājānaka Jayaratha. 12 Vols. Ed. M. Kaul. Allahabad: Indian Press, Bombay: Shri Venkateshvar Steam Press; Bombay: Tattva-Vivechaka Press, Bombay: Nirṇaya-Sagar Press, 1918-38.

Uttarakāmika

Kamikāgama Uttarakāmika. Edition in Grantha script published in Madras in 1909. Transcribed by the staff of Muktabodha under the supervision of Mark Dyczkowski, <http://www.muktabodha.org> (accessed November 5, 2015). Muktabodha.org e-text M00125.

Yājñavalkyaśmṛiti

Yājñavalkya Śmṛiti, with the commentary of Vijnanesvara called the Mitaksara and notes from the gloss of Bālabhāṭṭa. Book I: The Āchāra adhyāya. Mitaksara and Balambhatta. Book I - Acharya Adhyaya. Transl. S.C. Vidyarnava. Allahabad: Indian Press, 1918.

Secondary Literature

- BAPAT, J. B. 2001. The Jātipurāṇas of the Gurava Temple Priests of Maharashtra. *International Journal of Hindu Studies* 5/1, pp. 45–90.
- BAPAT, J. B. 1993. The Gurav temple priests of Maharashtra. *South Asia: Journal of South Asian Studies* 16:s1, pp. 79–100.
- BENKE, T. 2010. *The Śūdrācāraśiromaṇi of Kṛṣṇa Śeṣa. A 16th. Century Manual of Dharma for Śūdras*. PhD thesis, University of Pennsylvania.
- EPIGRAPHIA INDICA AND RECORD OF THE ARCHAEOLOGICAL SURVEY OF INDIA. Vols. XII. Ed. S. Konow (1913-1914) and XV, ed. F. W. Thomas (1919-1920). Bombay: British India Press.
- GNOLI, R. 1999. *Abhinavagupta. Luce dei Tantra. Tantrāloka*. Milano: Adelphi.
- GOODALL, D. 2009. Who is Caṇḍeśa? In: S. Einoo (ed.), *Genesis and Development of Tantrism*. Tokyo: Institute of Oriental Culture, University of Tokyo, pp. 351–423.
- KANE, P. V. 1939-1962. *History of Dharmasāstra*. 5 Vols. Poona: Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute.
- KISS, C. 2015. *The Brahmayāmala or Picumata. Vol. 2. The Religious Observances and Sexual Rituals of the Tantric Practitioner: Chapters 3, 21, and 45. A Critical Edition, Annotated Translation and Analysis*. Pondicherry/Hamburg: Institut Français de Pondichéry, École française d'Extrême-Orient, Asien-Afrika-Institut, Universität Hamburg.
- LORENZEN, D. N. 1991 [1971] *The Kāpālikas and Kālāmukhas. Two Lost Śaivite Sects*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.
- MONIER-WILLIAMS, M. 1993 [1899] *A Sanskrit-English Dictionary: etymologically and philologically arranged with special reference to cognate Indo-European languages*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.
- NOBILE, R. 1910. *Notizie sulle sotto-caste nell'India*. Estratte, pubblicate e tradotte dai codici inediti del *Jātiviveka* per opera di R. Nobile: memoria letta alla R. Accademia di archeologia, lettere e belle arti da Riccardo Nobile. *Lettre et Belle Arti*. Nuova Serie Vol. 1. Naples: Tip. della R. università.
- O'HANLON, R. & HIDAS, G. & KISS, C. 2015. Discourses of caste over the longue durée: Gopīnātha and social classification in India, ca. 1400-1900. *South Asian History and Culture* 6/1, pp. 102–129.
- PEOPLE OF INDIA: MAHARASHTRA. Part One. Volume 30. Ed. K.S. Singh. Mumbai: Popular Prakashan, 2004.
- RUSSEL, R. V. 1916. *The Tribes and Castes of the Central Provinces of India*. Vol. 3. London: Macmillan.

- SANDERSON, A. 2001. History through Textual Criticism in the Study of Śaivism, the Pañcarātra and the Buddhist Yoginītantras. In: F. Grimal (ed.), *Les Sources et le Temps. Sources and Time. A Colloquium. Pondicherry 11-13 January 1997*. Pondicherry: Institut Français de Pondichéry/École française d'Extrême-Orient, pp. 1–47.
2009. The Śaiva Age: The Rise and Dominance of Śaivism during the Early Medieval Period. In: S. Eino (ed.), *Genesis and Development of Tantrism*. Tokyo: Institute of Oriental Culture, University of Tokyo, pp. 41–349.
2014. The Śaiva Literature. *Journal of Indological Studies* (Kyoto) 24 & 25 (2012–2013 [2014]), pp. 1–113.
- SOUTH ASIAN FOLKLORE: AN ENCYCLOPEDIA. *Afghanistan, Bangladesh, India, Nepal, Pakistan, Sri Lanka*. Eds. Peter Claus et al. London/New York: Routledge/Taylor & Francis, 2003.
- TĀNTRIKĀBHIDHĀNAKOŚA III. Ṭ-PH. *Dictionnaire des termes techniques de la littérature hindoue tantrique. A Dictionary of Technical Terms from Hindu Tantric Literature. Wörterbuch zur Terminologie hinduistischer Tantren*. Eds. D. Goodall & M. Rastelli. Vienna: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 2013.