

Damanotsava: On love in spring,
on what Jñānaśambhu wrote, and on the
spread of public festivals into the Mantramārga

Studies in the Saiddhāntika Paddhatis II¹

Dominic Goodall²

The principal concern of this paper is the emergence of festivals (*mahotsava*) within the Mantramārga. It is well-known that elaborate *mahotsavas* involving numerous processions, typically with different vehicles on every day and attended by a socially diverse community of actors, are taught in several South Indian Temple Āgamas.³ But such events are not mentioned at all in pre-twelfth-century sources of the Śaivasiddhānta, whose focus is the religion of individual initiates aspiring to liberation (or, particularly in the earlier sources, aspiring first to enjoy supernatural powers before reach-

¹ This is the second of a planned series of articles about Paddhatis of the Śaivasiddhānta, the first, about Rāmanātha, being GOODALL 2014.

² This article is the revised version of a conference paper entitled “A note on *damanotsava* (a spring rite of reparation) and on the twelfth-century Saiddhāntika ritual manual called the *Jñānaratnāvalī*” given at the international symposium *Tantric Communities in Context: Sacred Secrets and Public Rituals*, organised at the Austrian Academy of Sciences in Vienna on February 5–7, 2015 in the context of an SFB project called “Visions of Community.” I am grateful to Diwakar Acharya for having informed me about the Nepalese manuscripts that transmit Damana-related material that I have quoted in this paper and to Shaman Hatley and Harunaga Isaacson for having offered numerous improving suggestions to the editions that figure in the appendix when I prepared them for a handout. Unfortunately, because I was in a rush, I seem not always to have noted which improvements were made by whom.

³ For an excellent recent study of an account attributed to the twelfth-century South Indian exegete Aghoraśiva, see DAVIS 2010. For the improbability of this attribution, see PADOUX 2014: 427, quoting GOODALL 1998: xiii–xvii, n. 24.

ing liberation). We do occasionally encounter the term *mahotsava* in pre-tenth-century scriptures, but only as an allusion, without any particulars, to a celebration that is to mark a moment of achievement of a significant ritual. For example, at the culmination of an installation (*pratiṣṭhā*) in the *Devyāmata*, we read that “With food and the like, one should satisfy the singers and dancers, the naked, the miserable, the blind, the wretched, children, and, having satisfied them, ask their forbearance [for any shortcomings]. At night, a great festival (*mahotsavam*) should be held, with the sounds of singing and instrumental music.”⁴

But even though we have no detailed evidence from the early scriptures of the Mantramārga, we do know that great processional celebrations must have been part of Śaiva festivals from at least the time of the *Śivadharmasāstra*,⁵ whose description of temple processions in 8.11–17, even if it is not entirely clear, sounds extremely lavish:⁶

[11] He who, on the calendrical festival days (*parvan*), performs the organisation of great *pūjās*, or of chariot-processions for Śiva by processing inside the town,

[12] with great multi-coloured flags, parasols with bells and capes, rows of flags on canopies, with bells, yak-tail whisks and mirrors,

[13] with the sounds of conches, drums and the like, mixed up with singing and instrumental music and such, with the Mothers, *yakṣas*, *gaṇas*⁷ and others [in the form of (?)] puppets (*yantraiḥ*?) made of painted wood,

[14] with machines that produce water and fire and with many marvels in plenty, and with swings [for?] women, and wheel-machines (?), [and] adorned (*śobhitām*) with chariot-palaces,

⁴ Devyāmata, NGMPP A 41/15, f.56r: *gāyakān nṛtyakān nagnān dīnāndhakṣapaṇān śiśūn* | (emended from *gāyakā nṛtyakā nagnā dīnāndhakṣapaṇāśiśūn*) *bhakṣabhojyādibhis tarpya tarpitāms tām* (emended from *tārpitas tām*) *kṣamāpayet* | *rātrau mahotsavam kāryaṃ gītavādītranisvanaiḥ* |.

⁵ HAZRA (1985: 296) has proposed dating the *Śivadharmasāstra* to between 200 and 500 CE. BISSCHOP (2010: 243) cautiously remarks that “this early dating remains to be confirmed.”

⁶ The text here is based on a collation of NGMPP A 3/3 [Nepal] *samvat* 321 [scil. 1201 AD], f.27v–28r (= A); NGMPP B 7/3 [Nepal] *samvat* 290 [scil. 1170 AD], f.26r–26v (= B); IFP T. 32 (C20th transcript of a Grantha palm-leaf ms.) (= T); and the Nepalese “print” (hand-written by the editor for these verses) of Naraharinath (= E).

⁷ Mothers (*mātr*), nature spirits (*yakṣa*), and Śiva’s “troops” (*gaṇa*) are three classes of potentially threatening semi-divine creatures.

[15] with gardens, earthworks, drinking spots (?),⁸ with large machinery (?), busy with important people, arranged in accordance with their wealth,

[16–17] such an excellent man, having attained the merit of all acts of giving, the fruits of all sacrifices, the merit of extreme acts of asceticism, and the fruits of [visiting] all sacred sites, possessed of glory from organising a Śiva-procession, will constantly delight in great enjoyments, like Śiva [himself], in Śivaloka.

[18] At the end of that time, he will attain the status of a king among the gods for a long time, and after that in turn he will become the glorious overlord of Jambūdvīpa.^{9, 10}

⁸ The South Indian reading here (beginning *dadhyanna*°) sounds as though it might be referring to the contemporary practice of setting up stalls of food and drink, in particular buttermilk, on or near processional routes, such as one may witness, for instance, in Pondicherry at the festival of Mācimakam.

⁹ In Purāṇic geography, Jambudvīpa is the central continent. It is further divided into nine subcontinents and it is surrounded by seven concentric bands of ocean that are separated from each other by further continents. See, e.g., *Parākhyatantra* 5.61ff, translated in GOODALL 2004: 294ff.

¹⁰ *Śivadharmasāstra* 8.11–17: *yaḥ kuryāt parvakāleṣu mahāpūjāpravarttanam | śivasya rathayātrām vā nagarāntaḥparikramāt || 11 || mahācitradhvajaiś chatraiḥ kiṅkiṇīvarakāṇvitaiḥ | vitānadhvajamālābhīr ghaṇṭācāmaradarpaṇaiḥ || 12 || śaṅkhabheryādinirghoṣair gītavādyādīsaṃkulaiḥ | lepyadārumayair yantrair mātṛyakṣagaṇādibhiḥ || 13 || udakāgneyayantrais ca bahvāścaryair anekasāḥ | strīdolācakraayantrais ca rathamandiraśobhitām || 14 || udyānakhānapānaiś ca mahāyantraiḥ samāyutān | mahājanasamākīrṇān yathāvibhavaḥkalpitān || 15 || sa sarvadānapuṇyāni sarvayajñaphalāni ca | atyugratapasām puṇyam sarvatīrthaphalāni ca || 16 || labdhvā naravaraḥ śrīmān śivayātrāpravartanāt | śivaloke mahābhogaḥ śivāvan modate sadā || 17 || tasyānte devarājatvaṃ suciraṃ kālam āpnuyāt | jambūdvīpādhipaḥ śrīmāns tasyānte ca bhavet punaḥ || 18 ||*

11b *mahāpūjāpravarttanam*] BT; *mahimāyā pravarttanam* A; *mahāpūjāpravarddhanam* E **11c** *nagarāntaḥ*° E; *nagarātam* A; *nagarāntam* B; *nāgarāntaḥ*° T **12a** °*citradhvajaiś chatraiḥ*] ABE; °*citrāiḥ dhvajaiś citraiḥ* T **12b** *kiṅkiṇīvarakāṇvitaiḥ*] ET; *kiṃkiṇīravakāṇvitai* A; *kiṃkiṇīravakāṇvitaiḥ* B **12d** °*darpaṇaiḥ*] BTE; °*bhūṣitaḥ* A **13b** °*vādyādīsaṃkulaiḥ*] ABE; °*nāṭyādīsaṃyutaiḥ* T **13c** *lepya*° ABE; *lekhyā*° T **13d** *mātṛyakṣagaṇādibhiḥ*] BTE; *nirmānaturagādibhiḥ* A **14a** *udakāgneyayantrais*] BE; *udakāgneyamantrais* A; *udakāntoyayantrais* T **14b** *bahvāścaryair anekasāḥ*] BTE; *varuṭai(?)veraṭe(?)kapāḥ(?)* A **14c** °*dolā*° BE; °*dolās* AT **14d** *rathamandiraśobhitām*] B; *gajanārībhiḥ sobhitāḥ* A; *rathamandiraśobhitaiḥ* T; *rathamandiraśobhitām* E **15ab** *udyānakhānapānaiś ca mahāyantraiḥ samāyutān*] BE; *udyānakhānapādāndaimmahāsaṃbhogasaṃyutāḥ* A; *dadhyannapānakhānādyaiḥ mahāsatrasamāyutaiḥ* T **15c** °*samākīrṇān*] E; °*padākīrṇā* A; °*samākīrṇā* B; °*samākīrṇam* T **15d** °*kalpitān*] ABE; °*vistaram* T **16a** *sa sarvadāna*°] ABE; *sarva-*

What this paper will touch upon is one of the first annual festivals, albeit one without processions, to be found described in works of the Mantramārga.

The primary purpose of this paper when it was first conceived, however, was to examine a Nepalese palm-leaf manuscript that transmits a small portion of the *Jñānaratnāvalī*, a twelfth-century ritual manual written in Benares by Jñānaśambhu, a Saiddhāntika *guru* from the Cōḷa country, with a view to explaining why it should seem almost entirely different from what purports to be the same section of the same text as transmitted in two South Indian manuscripts.¹¹ It so happens that the portion in question treats the annual spring rite known as *damanotsava*, a rite that appears to have been introduced into the liturgy of the Śaivasiddhānta from elsewhere and that seems to duplicate another festive annual rite of reparation prescribed for three months later in the year, in the month of *āṣāḍha*, known as *pavitrotsava*. Instead of using threads braided by maidens that are called *pavitrās* as expiatory offerings, Śiva is here worshipped with the various parts of the *damana* plant (*Artemisia indica* or some other variety of *Artemisia*). Now it might seem at once that the question that most obviously raises itself here might have been: how did a spring festival come to be adopted as a rite with an expiatory structure into the liturgy of a primarily soteriological system? So I should explain why this patent and curious problem was oddly not what first aroused my interest.

I was first intrigued to see that a Paddhati from as late as the twelfth century, describing Saiddhāntika practices that appear gradually to have died away after the twelfth century from every part of the Sanskrit world except the Tamil-speaking South, should have been copied in Nepal. Second, I was excited by the possibility that a Nepalese palm-leaf manuscript, written probably several centuries earlier than all the surviving South Indian witnesses, should transmit a better text of Jñānaśambhu's rich work. It is

dānāni T 16c *atyugratapasām puṇyam*] TE; *atugratapasām puṇyām* A; *atyugratapasā puṇyam* B 17a *labdhvā naravarah*] E; *lavdhā naravarah* A (unmetrical); *labdhā naravarah* BT 17c *mahābhogaiḥ*] AB; *mahābhāgaiḥ* TE 17d *sadā*] BTE; *ciraṃ* A 18a *devarājatvaṃ*] ABT; *devarājasya* E.

¹¹ For the date, provenance, and place of work of Jñānaśiva, see GOODALL 2000: 209–212. For remarks on the manuscript of the *Jñānaratnāvalī* then known to me (IFP T. 231) and on two manuscripts which might appear to transmit the work but do not (IFP T. 106 and 107), see n. 11 on p. 209. For the two principal manuscripts, both from South India, namely Madras GOML R 14898 (from which IFP T. 231 was copied) and Mysore ORI P. 3801, see GOODALL 2004: cx–cxi.

well-known, after all, that many ancient Sanskrit works have survived in a much older state of text in palm-leaf manuscripts kept in the cool, dry climate of the Kathmandu valley.

It was a worrying surprise to me to discover that the account of the rite in the Nepalese text of the *Jñānaratnāvalī* is much shorter than that of the two southern manuscripts, containing none of the discussions and justificatory quotations. Why? Could this have been because the southern text had been expanded by interpolations? The matter is of some importance because the southern sources present Jñānaśambhu's work as a rich, digest-like manual that is interesting to the historian of religion largely because of the wide range of material it quotes and thereby helps to date and contextualise. If the much shorter style of the Nepalese fragment is authorial, then the value of the *Jñānaratnāvalī* for historians is diminished. Instead of being a large corpus of ordered material that can be confidently dated to the twelfth century or earlier, it becomes a hotchpotch of quite undatable snippets that could have been added piecemeal at any time over the course of the transmission of the work in South India.



Now that we have introduced the various issues at stake that are alluded to in the title of this paper, let us turn first to the first appearance of a *damanotsava* rite in the Mantramārga. The first known account appears to be that of Somaśambhu in the eleventh century,¹² and the way in which it is introduced plainly adverts to the rite's extraneous character.

Formerly [a] Bhairava called Damana was born from Hara's anger. He subdued all the gods and the mighty Dānavas. Being pleased, Śiva said to him: "Be a plant on earth! Having taken this embodiment, you will serve for my pleasure. Those mortals who worship God [scil. me] with your shoots and other parts will reach the highest state, O Damana, thanks to your power. But for those men who do not observe the calendrical festival (*parva*) of Damana, all the fruits of their meritorious

¹² On the perhaps still changing front of evidence fixing the completion of Somaśambhu's *Kriyākāṇḍakramāvalī* at different dates (namely 1048/49 CE, 1073 CE, and 1095/6 CE), suggesting perhaps that the work was released in more than one "edition" in the eleventh century, see SANDERSON 2007: 420–421, GOODALL 2014: 172–173 and 177–179, and SANDERSON 2014: 21 (quoting a lecture-handout of 2011).

deeds belonging to the month of Caitra will be given to you.” Although this [ritual] is taught in the *Svacchandabhairava*, nonetheless, because that work is [of] shared [scriptural stock] with this [system] (*iha*),¹³ it is practised also in the Siddhānta.¹⁴

We observe here that this myth, which in this extremely abridged form makes no allusion to anything vernal, seems not really coherent, and that the purpose of the ritual, namely to make sure that merit accrued in the month of Caitra does not pass to Bhairava, is odd, since there is no evident reason why anybody’s *karman*, good or bad, should be transferred to that particular god.¹⁵ Striking too is that no account of a *damanoṭsava* has been found in the various versions known to us of the *Svacchanda*: has Somaśambhu chosen a fictional scriptural affiliation to “justify” an eclectic borrowing? The fact that he includes an apology at all might seem to suggest that he is either responsible for introducing the festival into the ritual

¹³ BRUNNER (1968 [SP2]: 202) translates *samānatvāt* with “puisque [les deux écoles] sont dans la même position,” but it is perhaps more likely that Somaśambhu uses the expression in the way that Aghoraśiva often does in his commentary on the *Sarvajñānottaratantra*: there, when he draws on passages from other recensions of the *Kālottara*, he mentions that they are Tantras that are *samāna*, in other words “[from a] shared scriptural [stock]” (e.g. IFP RE 47852, p. 5). Cf. also Rāmakaṇṭha’s use in the *Paramokṣanirāśakārikāvṛtti* of the expression *samānatāntrika* to refer to those who share a common scriptural tradition (for which, see WATSON, GOODALL & ANJANEYA SARMA 2013: 18).

¹⁴ SP2 2.1–5 (From volume 2 of Brunner’s edition [1968: 196ff]. In the Kashmiri-an edition [KSTS], these verses are 496–501.): *harakopāt purā jāto bhairavo damanāhvayaḥ | dāntās tena surāḥ sarve dānavās ca mahābalāḥ || 1 || prītenātha śivenokto: viṭapo bhava bhūtale! | tāṃ tanuṃ tvam anuprāpya madbhogāya bhaviṣyasi || 2 || pūjayiṣyanti ye martyā devaṃ tvatpallavādibhiḥ | te yāsyanti paraṃ sthānaṃ damana tvatprabhāvataḥ || 3 || ye punar na kariṣyanti dāmanaṃ parva mānavāḥ | teṣāṃ te caitramāsoṭthaṃ dattaṃ puṇyaphalaṃ mayā || 4 || svacchanda-bhairave tantre yady apīdam udāhṛtam | tathāpiha samānatvāt siddhānte ’py upayujyate || 5 ||. 1c tena surāḥ] Brunner; tenāsurāḥ KSTS 4c te] Brunner; na KSTS 5d upayujyate] Brunner; upapadyate KSTS.*

¹⁵ Cf. verse 24 of Appendix III, which contains the same odd justification for the performance of the rite.

Kacchapeśvara’s commentary on Aghoraśiva’s *Kriyākramadyotikā* recounts a myth that takes into account the elements mentioned by Somaśambhu (see BRUNNER 1968 [SP2]: 198–199), but this may well be the result of Kacchapeśvara joining up the dots to “explain” Somaśambhu’s allusion, rather than of Kacchapeśvara recounting the myth that Somaśambhu actually knew.

calendar or that he considers himself to be close in time to the moment of its introduction. But we should be wary of putting much weight on such a supposition, for we find the apology echoed in the *Jñānaratnāvalī* a century later. Furthermore, Trilocanaśiva's twelfth-century commentary on Somaśambhu's work quotes a half-verse attributed to the tenth-century paddhati of Brahmaśambhu that alludes, according to Trilocana, to the possibility of performing an initiation ceremony on the occasion of the *damanotsava* on the first day of the second month of spring.¹⁶ Of course this need not mean that Brahmaśambhu prescribed a Śaiva version of this rite: it might simply mean that Brahmaśambhu recognised the existence of a popular spring festival and mentions the occasion as a possible suitable moment for conducting a *dīkṣā*. Trilocana also quotes from a description of *damanotsava* in another Saiddhāntika work, the *Bṛhatkāḷottara*,¹⁷ but that text appears to have been unknown to the Kashmirian commentators of the tenth century and may have been contemporary with the *Somaśambhupaddhati* or composed just after it, for the first quotations we know of it are those of Jñānaśambhu and his South Indian contemporaries. Brunner was troubled not only by the existence of this Saiddhāntika account that belied Somaśambhu's claim that the *damanotsava* was not Saiddhāntika, but also by those taught in certain Temple Āgamas, since she had at that time (1968) only begun to suspect them of being later South Indian compositions (SP2, p. 202):¹⁸

... mais aucune référence n'est faite aux *Āgama* ou *Upāgama* dont nous avons dit plus haut qu'ils avaient le même chapitre que nous (ce qui, entre parenthèses, peut faire naître des doutes quant à l'ancienneté de l'*Uttara-Kāmika* et de l'*Acintyaviśvasādākhya*). Quoi qu'il en soit, le fait même que Somaśambhu soulève le problème de la légitimité de ce rituel pour les Śaivasiddhāntin, montre qu'à son époque au moins il n'était pas couramment pratiqué dans ce milieu śaivāite, et que les sectes du *Trika* (où Bhairava joue un rôle infini-

¹⁶ Madras GOML M. 14735, p. 89: ... *ata eva brahmaśambhupādaiḥ pavitrotsave damanotsave 'pi dīkṣā kāryety uktam "cāturmāsyanimittāni vaiśākhīdamanotsavaḥ" iti*. For the date of the composition of Brahmaśambhu's work in 937/938 CE, see GOODALL 2004: xx and SANDERSON 2014: 20.

¹⁷ The passage in question is quoted by BRUNNER 1968 (SP2): 203.

¹⁸ Cf. BRUNNER 1968 (SP2): xiv: "[...] il serait bien téméraire de notre part de déclarer sans autre preuve que ces deux textes, ou tout au moins quelques-uns de leurs chapitres, sont postérieurs à Somaśambhu."

ment plus important) en avaient pratiquement le monopole, sous une forme que nous ignorons.

Brunner had, in other words, begun to ask many of the questions addressed in this article, but she had not yet come to the firm conclusion that the South Indian Temple Āgamas must have borrowed from Somaśambhu, and she suspected that the ultimate source of Somaśambhu's account might have been a spring festival belonging to a Bhairava-centred current of the Mantramārga. Nonetheless, she credits Somaśambhu with having assured, by including the rite in his manual, the continued popularity of the *damanotsava* in South India down to the present day.¹⁹ Although Brunner may well be right that the ritual spread across the traditions of temple worship in South India under the influence of Somaśambhu's Paddhati,²⁰ there seems to be little trace of the worship in South India today: Brunner, writing in 1968, implies that she knew of numerous South Indian temples where the rite was practised, but Mr. Sambandhaśivācārya, priest of a Vināyaka temple in Cuddalore and employee for many decades of the IFP, has told me today (2015) that it is extremely rarely observed and could cite no instance known to him in the contemporary temple-scene in the Tamil-speaking South of the observance of *damanotsava*.

But let us now turn to the *Jñānaratnāvalī*'s account. Rather than give the whole text of Jñānaśambhu's chapter here, which would involve giving a complete translation and would therefore in turn mean getting wrapped up in the intricacies of interpretation of all its many ritual elements, I have

¹⁹ BRUNNER 1968 (SP2): xiv: "... la décision de Somaśambhu a eu des conséquences durables puisque Aghoraśiva, dont on sait que ses livres font encore autorité, devait reprendre la damanapūjā dans son manuel de rituel privé, et surtout dans son manuel de rituel public, si bien que nombreux sont encore de nos jours les temples du Sud qui célèbrent ce festival printanier."

²⁰ I speak of "traditions" in the plural, because I mean to include also Pāñcarātra temple worship. It seems natural to suspect borrowing from the Śaivas by the Pāñcarātra in this case, since the border between the Śaiva and the Vaiṣṇava Temple Scriptures seems to have been porous in the post-twelfth-century period and there are many other instances of shared notions and terminology that must have developed in the shared South Indian temple milieu. Examples that come to mind that illustrate this are, for instance, the practices referred to as *diśāhoma* and *nityotsava* (q.v. in TĀNTRIKĀBHIDHĀNAKOŚA 3), and terminology that occurs in the South, such as *mūlabera* ("principal image of worship").

given the chapter in its entirety in an appendix (Appendix I), beginning from the concluding verse of the immediately preceding verse, which wraps up the account of the *pavitrotsava*. I shall translate here only the opening, which contains some elements that are relevant to our discussion. (Readers interested in the details of a similar Śaiva version of this festival may of course find a full, annotated translation of Somaśambhu's account in BRUNNER 1968: 196–221.)

In the *Svacchandabhairava-tantra*, Bhairava is known to be [the] Damana [plant]. Elsewhere (*kvacit*), [we learn that this plant] arose from the ashes of Kāmadeva when they were watered by the tears of [his consorts] Rati and Prīti. (JR 1)

In the Siddhānta, no attention is accorded to it, even by those devoted to expiatory rites. Nevertheless, there is a shared [scriptural] identity here too [scil. in the Siddhānta]. But its performance is taught here because it is mentioned in the chapters on flowers and because it is taught by earlier *ācāryas*. (JR 2–3b)

On the seventh or the thirteenth day in [either of] the two fortnights in the month of Caitra, having performed his daily duties, he should in the evening approach a Damana plant. (JR 3c–4b)

Among the numerous points to comment upon here, we see that although there is the same allusion to the *Svacchanda*, borrowed no doubt from Somaśambhu, Jñānaśambhu refers also to another aetiological myth from some other source. Whereas the myth to which Somaśambhu alludes is incomprehensible to us (and perhaps also to Jñānaśambhu, since he gives no further clues about it), the other myth can be guessed at, not because we know the source from which Jñānaśambhu knew it, but because the *Īśānaśivagurudevapaddhati* contains what must be a related tale (*kriyāpāda* 22). There is no need to give that passage in full here, since Brunner has furnished a parallel text and translation of the whole chapter (SP2 Appendix II), but we may outline the story as follows: When Kāmadeva attacked Śiva, Śiva's anger came out as fire from his third eye, which took form as Bhairava; Bhairava reduced Kāma to ashes; Śiva, pleased, told Bhairava that since he had “tamed” (*dāntaḥ*) the triple world, he would henceforth be called the “tamer” (*damana*); Rati, Kāma's spouse, who was among the goddesses waiting upon Gaurī, fainted away, whereupon Gaurī furiously cursed Damana to become a plant:

And he, being cursed by Ambikā, accordingly at once then became a plant, called Damana, [rooted] in the ashes of Kāma's body, of sweet fragrance and with tender parts, watered by the flow of Rati's tears.²¹

One difference from Īśānaśiva's account is clear: in Jñānaśambhu's version the tears of both Kāmadeva's spouses, Rati and Prīti, water his ashes.

As for the plant Damana, it is clear that it is some sort of wormwood or mugwort (Fr. armoise, Ger. Beifuß, Tam. *marikoḷuntu/marukoḷuntu*, etc.). Giving a more precise Latin identification than *Artemisia* is tricky, for it is possible that slightly different fragrant plants may be identified with *dama-na* in different regions, as Zotter has remarked.²²

Once again, as for Somaśambhu, the detailed rite that follows consists essentially in the identification and uprooting of the Damana plant, which is held to be a transformation of Bhairava, and the use of its sprouts, roots, and various parts for worshipping Śiva and his pantheon in a manner that is parallel to the annual autumnal festival known variously as *pavitrotsava*, *pavitrārohaṇa*, *pavitrāropaṇa*, etc. For a succinct description of this rite, see TĀNTRIKĀBHIDHĀNAKOŚA 3 (s.v. *pavitrāropaṇa*), whose article begins as follows:

This is an annual rite of reparation for all omissions and mistakes committed in rituals. Whereas a given *prāyaścitta**, an exculpatory rite taught for a particular transgression, is of course only to be performed after committing such a transgression, the *pavitrārohaṇa* is an annual ceremony. The rite is thus logically to be classed as a regular obligatory one (*nitya**), but some works treat it as *naimittika**, e.g. SP2 1.7. As for the time of its performance, certain days in the four-month period

²¹ Īśānaśivagurudevapaddhati, *kriyāpāda* 22.14: *tathā sa śapto 'mbikayā tathābhavat kṣaṇena vīrud damanāhvayas tadā | smarāṅgabhasmany abhirāmasaurabhaḥ sukomaḷāṅgai ratibāspasekajaḥ ||*.

²² ZOTTER 2010*: 179 and 203: "In der Literatur wird *damanaka* durchweg als *Artemisia vulgaris* L. (Syn. *A. indica* WILLD; fam: Asteraceae) identifiziert. Eine solche Identifikation wurde aber von allen von mir befragten Ritualspezialisten abgelehnt. Newars benutzen heutzutage eine wohlriechende, buschige Pflanze [...], deren botanisches Äquivalent ich bislang noch nicht bestimmen konnte. Es könnte sich dabei um eine regional begrenzte Identifikation handeln, denn diejenige Pflanze, die man mir in Benares als *damanaka* präsentierte, war wiederum eine andere."

in which Viṣṇu is said to sleep are typically recommended, particularly the month of Āṣāḍha (see SP2 1.2–4 and notes).

The focus of the ceremony is the offering of knotted rings of woven cotton thread (*pavitraka* [2]*) and the offering of a collection of things used in religious undertakings (*vratāṅga**) and sometimes also a collection of things conducive to pleasure (*bhogāṅga* [2]*).

We cannot delve here into the origins or early history of the *pavitrāropana* rite, which is similarly to be found also in Pāñcarātra sources (once again, see Rastelli's contribution to the same article of the TĀNTRIKĀ-BHIDHĀNAKOŚA) and in Purāṇic ones (KANE V/1: 339–340 cites some of these, mediated through various Dharmanibandha works). It is sufficient for our purposes here for the moment to state that the *pavitrāropana* rite entered (or emerged within?) the Mantramārga at a much earlier stage, since we find versions of it already detailed in the *Kiraṇatantra* (chapter 36) and in the *Mohacūḍottara*.

Now we saw above that Somaśambhu mentioned a curious benefit as the reward for observing the *damanotsava*, namely being able to keep all merit accrued in the month of Caitra rather than losing it to Bhairava. We can see that this further underlines the parallelism with the *pavitrārohaṇa*, which repairs ritual faults of omission and commission over the preceding year. Jñānaśambhu, by contrast, seems to make no clear statement of the purpose of the *damanotsava*, but we can see in the passage just cited that he too probably regards it as having an expiatory or reparatory function, since he observes that it is not typically followed in the Siddhānta, “even by those devoted to expiatory rites.”

So in Saiddhāntika accounts, the Damana-rite is a sort of reparatory one, and I have implied (following BRUNNER, e.g. 1968 (SP2): xii, who made the same observation²³) that this is because both its shape and purpose were calqued upon the reparatory *pavitrārohaṇa*. To understand why it is clear that they were so calqued, further evidence must be drawn into the picture: Damana-related rituals are, it turns out, to be found in other medieval reli-

²³ Brunner was in turn following what the primary sources themselves more or less explicitly allude to: even in the *Pārameśvarasaṃhitā*, a work of the Pāñcarātra, we find a reflection of the awareness that *damanotsava* was strictly parallel to *pavitrārohaṇa* (17.565c–566a): *tasmīṃs tu śukladvādaśyām kuryād damanakotsavam | pavitrārohavat kuryāt*. (The same passage occurs in the *Īśvarasaṃhitā* [12.63abc], which, as MATSUBARA (1994: 28–30) and RASTELLI [e.g., 2006: 59] have shown, is largely based on the *Pārameśvarasaṃhitā*.)

gious traditions, and in those traditions they seem unrelated to the Śaiva ones in every particular other than in that they involve the Damana plant and that they typically occur on or close to the thirteenth day of a fortnight in the month of Caitra (a date to which we shall return below).²⁴

Let us consider, for example, the *damanapūjā* taught in a sixteenth-century Gauḍīya Vaiṣṇava digest, the *Haribhaktivilāsa* (*vilāsa* 14, verses 105ff in the 1848 edition, pp. 491–493).²⁵ (The erratic verse-numbering is that of the edition.)

Next, the festival of festooning with the Damana. On the twelfth day of the brightening fortnight of Caitra, one should perform the festival of festooning with the Damana. Its performance, taught in such works as the *Baudhāyana*, is written next.

On the eleventh day of the brightening fortnight of Caitra (*madhoḥ*) after completing his morning duties, he should go to the garden of the Damana plant and there worship an Aśoka tree [as] the god of love (/worship the sorrow-free god of love).

[Here is] the *mantra* for that: “Obeisance to you Aśoka (/sorrow-free), O Kāma, O destroyer of the sorrow (*śoka*) caused by women. Remove the suffering of sorrow from me; bring about joy for me

²⁴ I should state at once that it is in no way my intention to give a complete list of textual accounts of spring festivals, since these may be found referred to in other works, such as that of ANDERSON (1993), nor even of all accounts of Damana-related worship in the month of Caitra. References to many more such accounts may be found given, for instance, in the *Jayasimhakaḥpadrūpa* (pp. 440–445), which mentions (p. 440) that it draws upon the *Madanaratna*, the *Brahmapurāṇa* quoted in the *Nirṇayāmṛta*, the *Nṛsiṃhaparicaryā*, and the *Rāmārcanacandrikā*. Of course one may also consult KANE (V/1: 310–311), who quotes particularly from other Dharmānibandha works, and the work of MEYER (1937). (My attention was drawn to MEYER’s remarkable, richly referenced, and extremely stimulating book, in which he devotes a large section to *damanaka* called “Kāmadeva als Beifuß” (1937: 38–53), by ZOTTER’s thesis (2010*). Only a few lesser known accounts and ones that are especially relevant to our theme are treated here.

²⁵ I am grateful to Dr. Māns Broo for kindly drawing my attention to this passage (after seeing online the abstract for this paper before it was delivered in Vienna in February 2015) and for sending me pages of a Bengali-script edition. For a useful characterisation of the *Haribhaktivilāsa*, which appears to have been composed in 1534, see BROO 2003, in particular pp. 20–23.

every day (*nityam*). I shall take you [home], O tree, you who give joy to Kṛṣṇa, in order to perform worship.”²⁶

Having thus asked and bowed he should take the bright Damana plant, sprinkle it with the five products of the cow, wash it with water, venerate it, cover it with a cloth, and take it home to the auspicious sound of Vedic recitation and the like.

Now the instruction for the incubation of the Damana plant. He should raise up in front of Kṛṣṇa the Sarvatobhadra-*maṇḍala*; placing the Damana on that, he should let it incubate there at night.

[Here is] the *mantra* for that: “In order to worship the god of gods, Viṣṇu, the spouse of Lakṣmī, the Lord, come here, O Damana, be present; obeisance to you.”

And upon the Damana, in the eight directions beginning with the East, he should venerate, using their seed-syllables,²⁷ (1) Kāmadeva, (2) Ash-bodied, (3) Ānanda, (4) Manmatha, (5) Friend of Spring, (6) Smara, (7) Sugar-Cane-Bow, and (8) Flower-Bow,²⁸ in due order, accompanied by Rati, in accordance with the rules.

Having recited over him the Kāmagāyatrī 108 times and having given a handful of flowers, he should venerate Kāmadeva using *mantras*.

²⁶ There are a couple of doubtful points here. If one begins with worship of the Aśoka tree, it seems odd that the end of the ritual speech is addressed to the Damana plant, which is to be taken away according to the text that follows. Perhaps *aśoka*, “griefless,” is intended rather to be a description of the Damana plant? And yet Kāmadeva, as well as being identified with the Damana, is evidently also identified with the Aśoka tree in the previous verse, as well as frequently elsewhere (see MEYER 1937, in particular pp. 33–38, in which he comments in particular on *Bhaviṣyapurāṇa*, *uttaraparvan* 135). A related problem is that of *vrkṣa*, which we have taken to be a vocative, even though we do not expect Damana to be any larger than a small shrub. But should we instead understand it to be part of a compound, *vrkṣapūjārthaṃ*?

The size and type of plant Damana is, by the way, not referred to with any degree of consistency in our sources: some texts refer to the Damana with expressions such as *taru* and *vrkṣa* (see, e.g., verses 20 and 22 of Appendix III) and others, like for instance chapter 2.45 of the *Vaiṣṇavakhaṇḍa* of the *Skandapurāṇa*, refer to it consistently as a sort of grass (*trṇa*).

²⁷ Perhaps each has a *mantra* that involves a seed-syllable based on the first letter of his name: KĀM, BHAM, ĀM, MAM, VAM, etc. ?

²⁸ All these are conventional names of Kāma and they presumably refer therefore here to manifestations of the god of love.

And this is the *mantra*:

“Obeisance be to [you] whose arrows are flowers, who give delight to the world, to Manmatha, the eye of the world, who bestow affection upon Rati.”

“You have been called, O Lord of gods, ancient one, best of souls. I shall worship you in the morning. Be present, O Keśava. I offer you in the morning the bright Damanaka. Obeisance be always and in every way to you, O Viṣṇu. Be kindly disposed towards me.” Having thus addressed the Lord of gods he should again give him a handful of flowers. With singing and dancing and the like he should joyfully observe vigil through the night.

Next, the rite of offering the Damanaka: Having accomplished ablutions and the like in the morning, and having performed regular obligatory worship, he should conduct a great *pūjā* for the purpose of festooning with the Damanaka-[plant]. Then he should reverentially take the Damanaka in his hands and offer it up to Śrī Kṛṣṇa, to the accompaniment of [auspicious] sounds of instrumental music, bells and the like.

The *mantra* for this is: “God of gods, Lord of the universe, bestower of desired boons, fulfil all my desires, O Kṛṣṇa, who are the beloved of Kāmeśvarī! Receive this Damanaka, O God, to favour me. O Lord, make this annual *pūjā* here complete!”

Then offering the garland of Damana, as well as incense and the like, having conducted a festival with singing and such, he should make this plea to Śrī Kṛṣṇa:

“May this annual worship, [performed] with garlands of jewels and coral and with Mandāra flowers and the like, be yours, O Garuḍa-bannered [Lord]! Just as [you wear], O God, the [garland known as the] Vanamālā and the Kaustubha [jewel] constantly against your heart, so too wear this garland of Damana and its *pūjā* next to your heart!”²⁹

²⁹ *Haribhaktavilāsa* (vilāsa 14, verses 105ff in the 1848 edition, pp. 491–493):
 atha damanāropaṇotsavaḥ | caitrasya śukladvādaśyām damanāropaṇotsavam |
 vidadhyāt tadvidhir baudhāyanādyukto 'tha likhyate || madhoḥ sitaikādaśyāñ ca
 prātaḥkṛtyaṃ samāpya ca | gatvā damanakārāmaṃ tatrāśokaṃ smaraṃ yajet | tatra
 mantraḥ | aśokāya namas tubhyaṃ kāma strīśoka**nāśana* (°*nāśana*) conj.; °*nāśanaḥ*
 ed.) | śokārttiṃ hara me nityaṃ ānandaṃ janayasva me iti || 105 || neṣyāmi vrkṣa
 pūjārthaṃ tvām kṛṣṇaprītikāraṇam | iti samprārthya natvā ca grhṇīyād damanaṃ
 śubham || 106 || prokṣya taṃ pañcagavyena prakṣālyādbhiḥ prapūjya ca | va-

There are several observations to be made here about how this account differs from Śaiva accounts of a rite of the same name, and perhaps we should begin with that name. The rite is repeatedly referred to as one of *damanakāropana*, even though there seems in this case to be no ritual parallel to the *pavitrāropana/pavitrārohana*, as there is in the Śaiva case. I have, for want of better ideas, translated *ārohana/āropana* with “festooning,” since I take it to mean “raising up and laying upon” and that it refers to the way in which the *pavitra*-threads are laid like garlands upon the substrate in which a deity is worshipped. The Damana plant here, however, seems not to be divided up into garland-like parts to parallel the different *pavitra*-threads, and it is not wholly clear whether it is used to garland Kṛṣṇa. So the use of the collocation *damanakāropana* might itself perhaps be evidence of a Śaiva influence, since the name might only be supposed fully to make sense if it describes a rite parallel to the *pavitrārohana/pavitrāropana*.

*streñacchādyā vedādighoṣeṇa grham ānayet || 107 || atha damanakādhivāsavidhiḥ | kṛṣṇasyāgre samuddhṛtya sarvatobhadramāṇḍalam | nidhāya damanaṃ tatra rātrau tam adhivāsayet | tatra mantraḥ | pūjārthaṃ devadevasya viṣṇor lakṣmīpateḥ prabhoh | damana tvam ihāgaccha sānnidhyaṃ kuru te namaḥ | iti || 108 || sabhājamādevaṇ ca tathā bhasmaśarīrakam | ānandaṃ manmathaṇ caiva vasantasakham eva ca | smaraṃ tatheṣucāpaṇ ca puṣpabāṇaṇ ca pūjayet | *prāgādīdikṣu (prāgādīdikṣu) conj.; pragādīdikṣu ed.) ratyāḍhyaṃ vidhivad damane kramāt || 109 || aṣṭottaraśataṃ kāmāgāyatrī cābhimantrya tam | dattvā puṣpāñjaliṃ kāmadevaṃ vandeta mantravat | mantraś cāyam | namo 'stu puṣpabāṇāya jagadāhlādakāriṇe | manmathāya jagannetre ratiprītipradāyine iti | āmantrito 'si deveśa purāṇa puruṣottama | prātas tvāṃ pūjayiṣyāmi sānnidhyaṃ kuru keśava | nivedayāmy ahaṃ tubhyaṃ prātar damanakaṃ śubham | sarvathā sarvadā viṣṇo namas te 'stu prasīda me | itthaṃ āmantrya deveśaṃ dattvā puṣpāñjaliṃ punaḥ | gītānṛtyādinā rātrau kuryāj jāgaraṇaṃ mudā || 110 || atha damanakārpaṇavidhiḥ | prātaḥ snānādi nirvartitya nityapūjāṃ vidhāya ca | damanāropanārthaṇ ca mahāpūjāṃ samācaret | tato damanakaṃ bhaktyā pāṇibhyaṃ parigrhya ca | ghaṇṭādivādyaghoṣeṇa śrīkṛṣṇāya samarpayet || 111 || tatra mantraḥ devadeva jagannātha vāñchitārthapradāyaka | kṛtsnān pūraya me kṛṣṇa kāmān kāmēśvarīpriya | idam damanakaṃ deva grhāṇa madanugrahāt | imāṃ sāmvaśarīm pūjāṃ bhagavann iha pūrayeti || 112 || tato dāmanakīm mālāṃ gandhādīni samarpya ca | gītādinotsavaṃ kṛtvā śrīkṛṣṇaṃ prārthayed idam || 113 || maṇividrumamālābhīr mandārakusumādibhiḥ | iyaṃ sāmvaśarī pūjā tavāstu garuḍadhvaja || 114 || vanamālāṃ yathā deva kaustubhaṃ satataṃ hṛdi | tadvad dāmanakīm mālāṃ pūjāṇ ca hṛdaye vahetyādi |.*

There are, however, a couple of considerations that seriously weaken such an assumption. One is that we find that the Damana plant is explicitly used to fashion a garland to be laid upon Kṛṣṇa, both here and in more than one of the different Vaiṣṇava versions of this festival related in the *Jaya-siṃhakaḥpadrūma* (e.g. on p. 442, where the Damana plant is used to make a *vanamālā*, and p. 444, where we have a clearer version of the last of the declaratory *mantras*: *vanamālām yathā deva kaustubham vahase hṛdi | tadvad dāmanakīm mālām pūjām ca hṛdaye vaha*³⁰ ||). For this, the expression *damanakāropaṇa* might be said to fit perfectly. The second consideration is that, in contemporary practice in Nepal and in Orissa, the festival apparently includes the planting of Damana plants,³¹ an act which could

³⁰ “Just as you wear the Vanamālā and the Kaustubha, O Lord, on your heart, in the same way bear this garland of Damana and these offerings [of Damana] on your heart!”

³¹ I have not observed this practice myself, nor have I seen it described in a Sanskrit text, but it is alluded to as being part of the ceremony in Puri on this website: www.iskcondesiretree.com/page/damanaka-ropana-dvadasi (accessed November 14, 2015):

“Damanaka Ropana Dvadasi

Damanaka Chori or Dayanalagi

The following days the following is observed in Jagannath Puri. This festival is celebrated on the thirteenth and fourteenth days of the bright fortnight of Chaitra (April). Deities of Lord Rama and Lord Krishna are taken in procession to the Jagannath Ballava Math. There the Deities get Their Dayana leaves from the garden at the math. On the fourteenth, the leaves are offered to Lord Jagannath, Lady Subhadra and Lord Balarama.

“Damanaka is a particular type of flowering tree, *Artemisia indica*. In modern Oriya it is called da-aNA. It is one of the two favorite flowers of Lord Jagannath, the other being campaka. It is said that Lord Jagannath comes to the Jagannath Vallabh garden in Puri to steal these flowers. Aropana means to plant. On this dvAdazI there is a ritual planting of the da-aNA tree.”

Such planting is not mentioned as forming part of the *damanabhāṅjikā* rite described as taking place in Puruṣottamakṣetra (Puri) on the night of the thirteenth of the bright half of Caitra in chapter 2.45 of the *Vaiṣṇavakhaṇḍa* of the *Skandapurāṇa*, where Viṣṇu, accompanied by Śrī and Satyabhāmā, are worshipped on a lotus-*maṇḍala* and Damana grass (*trṇa*) is put in his hand so that he may enjoy crushing it (2.45.5–11), and the following day a garland of Damana is taken to Jagannātha and placed upon his head (2.45.12–15). In this case, the garland is compared not to the Vanamālā, but to a garland made from the entrails of the defeated demon Hiranyakaśipu, since Damana, according to this text, was once a demon defeated by Viṣṇu.

also be naturally described as *damanakāropana*, for it would be parallel with the expression *aṅkurāropana*, “the planting of sprouts” (for this ritual act, see TĀNTRIKĀBHIDHĀNAKOŚA 1, s.v. *aṅkurārpana*). In other words, there are other ritual actions that could naturally be described as *damanakāropana* and we cannot be certain that the expression originates as a calque upon *pavitrāropana*. Nonetheless, I know of no old attestation for the practice of planting Damana plants as part of the festival,³² and the oldest attestations of the expression *damanāropana/damanakāropana* seem to be in Śaiva contexts where the ritual appears to have been calqued upon the *pavitrāropana*. It therefore seems more likely to me that applying it to the “planting of Damana” would be an inventive repurposing of the term, rather than that it originally referred to planting and was repurposed by the Śaivas to describe a ritual that is parallel to their *pavitrāropana*.

In one respect the *Haribhaktivilāsa* certainly preserves here something that is surely old and that has been effaced from Somaśambhu’s ritual, namely its essentially vernal character because of the integral involvement of Kāma: From the declaratory *mantras* here, we learn that the Damana plant is first identified with Kāmadeva and then offered to Kṛṣṇa. It makes much more sense that a sweet-smelling plant culled for spring-time worship should be identified with Kāma than that it should be a form of Bhairava! No Śaiva influence is acknowledged, of course, for the rite is instead presented here as a Brahmanical one of hoary antiquity; but the mention at the beginning of “such works as the *Baudhāyana*” as an ancient authority for this ritual looks suspicious. Just as Śaiva sources cannily give the *Svacchanda*, a vast scripture that claims several “versions,” as a probably fictional locus of attribution for this rite, it looks as though this Vaiṣṇava work has also sought to mention a textual authority and it has done so in such a

As for Damana-planting in the Kathmandu valley in Nepal, it is alluded to in ZOTTER’s thesis (2010*: 336): “Sehr bekannt ist im Kathmandutal [...] die Verwendung von *damana(ka)* im Frühling. Zum Pflichtprogramm der jährlich in den großen Tempeln zu verrichtenden Rituale gehören das Säen von *damana* (*damanāropana*) und das Verehren von Gottheiten mit dessen Blüten.”

³² There are descriptions that involve a rite of planting sprouts (*aṅkurāropana*) some days before the Damana-festival (see, for example, *Viśvāmitrasaṃhitā* 26.4, part of a Pāñcarātra account), but this is a standard prognosticatory procedure before most festivals in South Indian Temple Āgamas, whether Śaiva or Vaiṣṇava, and there is no indication in these cases that the seeds involved (the reference to “sprouts” in the compound *aṅkurārpana/aṅkurāropana* is of course proleptic: it is seeds that are planted) are those of the Damana plant.

vague way that no reader could know quite where to check: after all, perhaps there is somewhere some work that can be styled *Baudhāyana* which describes a Damana-festival?³³

While Śaivas appear to have colonised this spring festival by calquing its structure on another annual reparatory rite and by making the Damana plant into a transmogrified Bhairava rather than a form of Kāmadeva, there may seem at first blush to have been no Vaiṣṇavisation here, for Kāmadeva, who is in any case no enemy of Kṛṣṇa,³⁴ is a central figure. But the choice of lunar date for the festival might be a trace reflecting Vaiṣṇava assimilation. In the correlation of lunar days (*tithi*) with particular deities that began to involve in the *Grhyasūtra* literature (see EINO 2005: 101–111), the thirteenth day of the lunar fortnight is typically associated with Kāmadeva. The twelfth day, by contrast, is very frequently associated with Viṣṇu and the fourteenth with Śiva. Exactly these correspondences (Viṣṇu, 12th; Kāmadeva, 13th; Śiva, 14th) may be found in another relatively early account to which Eino in 2005 did not have access, namely the *Niśvāsa-mukhatattvasaṃhitā* (3.127ff., in KAFLE 2015; see also the tabulation of *Devīpurāṇa* 61 below). It seems likely that a popular tradition of Kāmadeva worship would have been widely associated with the thirteenth day (Kāmadeva's day) of the month of Caitra (Kāmadeva's month), and that this festival was sometimes tugged towards the twelfth by Viṣṇu-devotees, as here, and sometimes to the fourteenth by devotees of Śiva. We find the

³³ The same vague ascription is recorded by the *Jayasimhakaḥpadruma* (p. 440) as being mentioned in one of its sources, the *Rāmārcanacandrikā*: *rāmārcanacandrikāyāṃ tu dvādaśyāṃ damanotsavaḥ kārya ity uktam*:

*dvādaśyāṃ caitraṃ māsasya śuklāyāṃ damanotsavaḥ
baudhāyanādibhiḥ proktaḥ kartavyaḥ prativatsaram*

(The contrast alluded to here by the particle *tu* is with the other sources reported, the *Madanaratna*, the *Brahmapurāṇa* quoted in the *Nirṇayāmṛta*, and the *Nṛsimha-paricaryā*, all of which prescribe beginning the rite on the eleventh, keeping vigil at night, rather than on the twelfth.)

³⁴ The Sanskrit commentary (the *Digdarśinīṭikā*, which, according to BROO 2003: 21, is by Sanātana Gosvāmin) that is printed with the *Haribhaktavilāsa* even suggests the possibility of identifying Kāmadeva with Kṛṣṇa, as was pointed out to me by Māns Broo in an e-mail of February 4, 2015, for its commentary on 14.105 begins *tatra damanākārāme aśokavṛkṣarūpaṃ smaram akṣatacandanādinā pūjayet. atra ca kāmārūpeṇa śrībhagavata eva pūjādikaṃ jñeyam. yad vā ...* : “In this grove of the Damana plant, one should worship Smara in the form of the Aśoka tree, using unhusked [rice], sandal, and so forth. And here we may understand that the worship and such is of the glorious Lord in the form of Kāmadeva. Alternatively...”

fourteenth, prescribed for instance in the *Jñānārṇavatāntra*, in chapter 26.³⁵ Similarly, we find a spring festival (*vasantotsava*) involving the worship of Skanda with, among other things, Damana (*dāmaiḥ* in 39.44) enjoined on the sixth day of the bright fortnight of Caitra or Vaiśākha in the *Kumāra-tantra* (39.41–74), the sixth day being typically that of Skanda.

Since we find Śaiva-inflected, Vaiṣṇava-inflected, and Kaumāra-inflected accounts of *damanapūjā*, it will perhaps be no surprise to discover that the rite was also adapted by devotees of the goddess. Rather than quote and translate another long passage as evidence here in the body of this article, particularly since the text in question is not easy to edit because of doubts about which of its many anomalies of grammar and sense are authorial and which transmissional, I have added part of an unpublished account (kindly brought to my attention by Diwakar Acharya) of Devī-related *damanapūjā* to an appendix, so that interested readers may have an impression of the work. The text affects the style of a Tantra³⁶ and, once again, it begins (verse 1), with what looks like a fictional locus of attribution: The rite is said to have been taught in a scripture vaguely named the *Pārameśvara*. Here it is the goddess who, in response to a question of Maheśa, recounts an aetiological myth in which it is explained that Damana was an overweening Asura whom she fought and felled and who, transformed into a plant, has since been used for the worship of Hara. The story is plainly influenced by that best-known of all works of goddess-mythology, the *Durgā-Saptaśatī* (or *Devīmāhātmya*), of which, as Diwakar Acharya has pointed out to me, there are close verbal echoes (see, e.g., verse 16).

But might there be any accounts of Damana-*pūjā* that have not been inflected by Śaivism or Vaiṣṇavism or devotion to the goddess or to some

³⁵ Cf. also *Epigraphia Indica* 23, “No 29. Fragmentary Stone Inscription of Queen Uddaladevī: V.S 1294” (NĀGAR 1940: 188): ...*śrī-uddaladevyā ... saṃva-[tsa][rāṇam] dvādaśaśateṣu caturṇavatyadhikeṣu damanaka-caturdaśyām* [guru]vāre śrīvindhyeśvaradevasya ... [prā]śādayaṃ kārītaḥ pratiṣṭhāpitaś ca. My attention was drawn to this passage by KANE V/1: 310.

³⁶ Its colophonic concluding statement, however, on f. 5r, appears to read *anaṣṭayacchandasā proktaṃ ṣaṣṭhiśokerudāhṛtaḥ | nirṇītaṃ śrīkamalākhyena parvadvāmanasaṃjñītaḥ || 0 || damanārohaṇavidhi samāptaḥ || 0 ||* The verse, once adjusted for metre and sense, might have been intended to read *anuṣṭupchandasaṃjñītaṃ proktaṃ ṣaṣṭhiślokair udāhṛtaṃ | nirṇītaṃ kamalākhyena parva dāmanasaṃjñītaṃ*. “This [account of the] calendrical rite called *dāmana*, proclaimed in *anuṣṭubh* metre in 60 *śloka*s, was composed by Kamala.”

other divinity? Various works of classical literature, notably the *Ratnāvalī* and the *Kuṭṭanāmata*,³⁷ allude to spring festivals of Kāmadeva, but perhaps there is no surviving detailed prescriptive account of such an uninflected Damana-related festival of love in Caitra because there may never have been a community – of monotheistic Kāmadeva worshippers, for example – who would have felt the need to set down in writing the niceties of such a public festival in the way that, for instance, Saiddhāntikas did. Nevertheless, it is possible that the mentions in some Purāṇas capture details of practices that predate the appropriation of Damana-*pūjā* by the monotheistic devotional religions.

It is conceivable, for instance, that the *Devīpurāṇa* contains a faint trace of a barely inflected worship of Kāmadeva involving the Damana plant, but it is unfortunately not particularly rich in detail. Its chapter 61 lists the deities who are to be worshipped on each *tithi* of the month of Caitra. One of these is Kāmadeva:

On the thirteenth day, Kāmadeva is to be worshipped in accordance with the rules, together with Rati and Prīti, [and] adorned with amulets of Aśoka.³⁸ [He is to be worshipped] in a pot, or drawn upon a white cloth, using leaves and fruits and the like, [and] with offerings of rice cooked with sugar-cane; [if one worships him in this way], one will attain incomparable sexual prowess.³⁹

Now there is no mention of any Damana here, but worship with Damana-sprigs (*damanaīḥ*) figures explicitly in the prescriptions for the worship of six of the other deities in Caitra, as the table below shows, so its use here should probably simply be understood from the use of the expression *yathāvidhi*, as has been suggested by MEYER (1937: 53).

³⁷ These accounts are discussed at length, along with much else besides, by MEYER 1937: 11–59, as part of a long treatment entitled “Der altindische Liebesgott als Vegetationsdämon und sein Fest,” covering pp. 12–38.

³⁸ I had been inclined to guess that *aśokamaṇi* referred to “gem[-like buds] of the Aśoka,” but “amulet” is the interpretation, no doubt correct, of MEYER (1937: 44), when he translates the same line when it appears in another work.

³⁹ *Devīpurāṇa* 61: *kāmadevas trayodaśyām pūjanīyo yathāvidhi | ratiprītī-samāyukto hy aśokamaṇibhūṣitaḥ || kumbhe vā sitavastre vā lekhyāḥ pattraphalādi-bhiḥ | khaṇḍaśarkaranaivedyāiḥ saubhāgyam atulaṃ labhet ||*.

tithi	deity	verses	substances used	rewards
1	Brahmā	1	Damana, <i>gandha</i> , <i>dhūpa</i> , <i>homa</i>	fruits of all <i>tīrthas</i> and <i>abhiṣekas</i>
2	Umā, Śiva, Fire	2-3b	<i>haviṣya</i> , <i>naivedya</i>	
3	Devī with Śaṅkara	3c-7	Damana, swing, vigil and many other offerings	<i>saubhāgya</i> and children for women
4	Gaṇeśa	8	Laḍḍus, etc	<i>vighnanāśa</i> , <i>sarvakāma</i>
5	Ananta and other serpents	9	Milk, ghee, <i>naivedya</i>	Removal of the effects of all poisons
6	Skanda	10		Happiness (<i>sukha</i>) and <i>saubhāgya</i> and attainment of Skanda-pura after death
7	Sun	11	Damana, etc.	<i>bhoga</i> , conquest of enemies, great <i>tapas</i>
8	Mothers	12	Damana	desired <i>siddhi</i>
9	Mahāmahi- ṣamardinī	13-14b	Damana, incense, banners, mirrors	victory
10	Dharmarāja	14c-15b		conquest of enemies and the supreme <i>pada</i> after death
11	Vṛṣa	15c-16b		wealth, sons and the world of Vṛṣa after death
12	Viṣṇu	16c-17b	incense, sandal, oblations	Viṣṇupada
13	Kāmadeva with Rati and Prīti	17b-19b	To be worshipped in a pot or drawn on a white cloth, with leaves and fruits, sugar-cane, <i>naivedya</i>	<i>saubhāgya</i>
14	Śiva	19c-22b	Damana, bathing in milk, incense, flowers, oblations, clothes, vigil, etc.	the fruit of a hundred <i>aśvamedha</i> sacrifices
15	Indra with Śacī	22c-23b		all desires

Much more interesting, however, is this snippet attributed to the *Bhaviṣyapurāṇa*, quoted in the detailed twentieth-century commentary printed in Tripathi's edition of the *Kuṭṭanīmata* (ad verse 907), for it may reflect an ancient custom of burning the Damana plant in echo of the burning of Kāmadeva by Śiva.⁴⁰

On the thirteenth of the brightening fortnight of Caitra, having fashioned [an image of] Madana made of Damana and having worshipped it in accordance with the rules, he should fan [it into flames] with a fan. Kāma being burnt in this context causes the increase of sons and grandsons. On the thirteenth day, Kāmadeva is to be worshipped in accordance with the rules, together with Rati and Prīti, [and] adorned with amulets of Aśoka.⁴¹

MEYER (1937: 44), after examining such evidence, combined with that of European practices of burning *Artemisia* plants at the summer solstice (Johannisfest) to assuage unhappiness in love (1937: 44ff.), indeed assumed that the burning of mugwort was an ancient custom.

Wir sehen also: Der Beifuß ist eine Form, eine Urform des Liebesgottes, und an seinem Fest wird der Beifuß mit dem vollen Bewußtsein dieser Identität v e r b r a n n t. Der innige Zusammenschluß der

⁴⁰ The same verses, with minor variations, occur elsewhere, for instance at the beginning of chapter 122 of *pāda* 4 or the *pūrvabhāga* of the *Nāradapurāṇa* (with the corruption *candanātmakam* in place of *damanātmakam*). Neither Meyer nor I have been able to find this passage in the *Bhaviṣyapurāṇa*, but MEYER records (1937: 42) that he has found the first three half-lines of it attributed to the *Pādmapurāṇa* in Hemādri's *Caturvargacintāmaṇi* and to the *Kūrmapurāṇa* in the *Smṛtisāroddhāra*. As we have just seen above, the last pair of half-lines is to be found in the *Devīpurāṇa*, and MEYER (1937: 53) also points to other places in which they occur. We should note that the fact that the verses are not found in the extant *Bhaviṣyapurāṇa* is not necessarily an indication that they did not once belong there, for it is clear that much that is quoted with attribution to the *Bhaviṣyapurāṇa* by commentators and compendium-compilers is no longer to be found there (see HAZRA 1940: 167–173).

⁴¹ *Kuṭṭanīmata* ad verse 907:

caitraśuklatrayodaśyāṃ madanaṃ damanātmakam
kṛtvā saṃpūjya vidhivad vījayed vījanena tu
tatra saṃdhukṣitaḥ kāmāḥ putrapautravivardhanaḥ
kāmadevas trayodaśyāṃ pūjanīyo yathāvidhi
ratiprītisamāyukto hy aśokamañibhūṣitaḥ

beiden drückt sich auch darin aus, daß der damanaka aus der Asche des Kāma, in der späteren indischen Vorstellung gewiß des von Çivas Augenfeuer verbrannten, entstanden sein soll.⁴²



Having now discussed the various traditions of *damanapūjā* that we have encountered, let us return briefly to the text-critical problem concerning Jñānaśambhu's work. When we compare the South Indian and Nepalese versions that purport to be Jñānaśambhu's text (compare appendices 1 and 2), the most obvious difference is that the Nepalese version is in prose, punctuated with just a few verses. These verses are common to the South Indian text, excepting one, which is presented as a quotation from another source, the *Mohacūḍottara*. At first blush, there is nothing here to surprise a reader familiar with other parts of the *Jñānaratnāvalī*, for although this particular section of the work in the southern sources is entirely in verse, most other sections are in a mixture of prose and verse and contain numerous marked and unmarked quotations from scriptural sources that justify or complement or contrast with what Jñānaśambhu prescribes.⁴³ But when we stop to look, we see that the shared verses are in this case, with one exception, simply part of the ritual: they are formulae that are to be addressed to the Damana plant and to Śiva in the course of the rite. The one exception is the verse right at the beginning that alludes to Jñānaśambhu's authorship and concludes the previous section of the text. In other words, no distinctive formulation is shared, other than the authorship-verse: what the two versions have in common is just the sequence of rites that are prescribed. The sequence is formulated in one case in verse and contains aetiological and other discussions – a sort of auto-commentary – and in the other case in prose with little comment. It thus seems clear that to transform the Nepalese version into the southern one would have required a vast intellectual effort of versification and reflection, an effort little different from fresh composition; to arrive at the Nepalese text from the southern one, however,

⁴² ANDERSON (1993: 136–137), who seems not to have been aware of Meyer's work, refers to anthropologists' accounts of such rituals of the burning of effigies of Kāma in South India in recent times.

⁴³ Of the three other hitherto edited sections of the *Jñānaratnāvalī* of which I am aware, those edited by MIRNIG (2018), namely the *antyestividhi* and the *śrāddhakarmavidhi*, are almost entirely in verse, but the treatment of Caṇḍeśa worship (edited and translated in GOODALL 2009: 360–366) is in a mixture of prose and verse.

would have been a relatively simple enterprise, requiring cutting out whatever was not necessary for ritual performance and restating the ritual acts in straightforward prose. The Nepalese text bears the appearance of a true “handbook,” a guide that an officiant might hold or lay beside him while performing the rite, designed only to cover the parallel Śaiva festivals of *pavitrotsava* and *damanotsava* and consciously based on the much more literary and reflective scholastic work of Jñānaśambhu.

Conclusions

Two conclusions are in order here. The first concerns the issue of transmission. It seems clear, when we juxtapose the Nepalese and South Indian texts of the *Jñānaratnāvalī*, that it is, fortunately, likely to be the more literary South Indian version – full as it is of quotations, discussions, and versified instructions – that is primary, rather than the Nepalese version, which makes the impression of being a stripped down prose version that can, as it were, be held in the practitioner’s hand while he conducts the ritual. This means that we can continue to consider the rich compendium that is the South Indian text, compiled by a South Indian living in Benares, as an indicator of which scriptures were and were not available to Saiddhāntika authors in the second half of the twelfth century.

The second conclusion concerns the subject matter of the various passages we have drawn upon, namely the *damanotsava*. What can explain this profusion of conflicting details in ritual performance, deity of worship, conception of purpose, and contradictory mythological explanations for the involvement of a certain plant or genus of plants? It is clear that we have with the *damanotsava* a widely practised rite associated with spring and with love that has been adapted by several different medieval religious communities and then coloured to suit their particular needs. In most cases, this has meant crafting a fresh aetiological myth⁴⁴ and imagining a scriptur-

⁴⁴ We have referred above to passages that mention or narrate myths in which Damana is variously to be identified with Kāmadeva, with Bhairava, and with a demon felled, like Mahiṣāsura, by the Goddess, but we have not hitherto made reference to a passage in which Damana is the transformation of a watery demon whom Viṣṇu sought out from the ocean, thrashed and transformed into a grassy plant. This is briefly narrated in 2.38.113ff. in the *Vaiṣṇavakhaṇḍa* of the *Skandapurāṇa*:

purā damanakaṃ daityaṃ samudrodakacāriṇaṃ |
bādhitāraṃ janānāṃ vai māyābalaparākramam || 113

al source of authority (*Svacchandatantra*, *Baudhāyana*, *Pārameśvara*) to which an account of the rite and myth could be attributed; but it has also meant altering profoundly the structure of the ritual. In the Śaiva case, the model of an expiatory rite, the *pavitrotsava*, has been adopted wholesale, leading in turn to the rather odd solution of making the ostensible purpose of the rite into something that prevents those who perform it from “losing” the merits that they would otherwise have acquired during the month of Caitra because of their being passed over to Bhairava.

We have seen above that Brunner, misled by the probably fictional ascription of an account of the rite to the *Svacchandatantra*, suspected that the Saiddhāntika *damanotsava* had its origin in a Bhairava-oriented tradition of the Mantramārga. But it seems much more likely that the roots of Damana-worship were to be found in a spring festival of Love that belonged to popular, non-sectarian social religion of the kind termed *laukika* by the *Niśvāsamukhatattvasaṃhitā*.

It seems, in other words, as though the Śaivas who worked the *damanotsava* into their ritual calendar may have started with a popular rite that was irrelevant to them in every way: the event was devoted to Kāmadeva and to the celebration of spring and it promised no rewards that could easily be connected to the often emphasised Mantramārga goals of attaining liberation or supernatural powers. So why did they bother to include the *damanotsava*? It seems to me that we should think in terms of a tension between the soteriological focus of the early religion on the one

bhagavān api māvāvi pitāmahanideśataḥ |
matsyāvatāreṇa vibhuḥ praviśya varuṇālayam || 114
anviśyākṛṣya velāyāṃ niṣpipeṣa mahītale |
madhoḥ śuklacaturdaśyām patito dānavottamaḥ || 115
bhagavatkarasamparkāt sugandhir abhavat tṛṇam |

“Formerly [there was] a demon [called] Damanaka who moved in the waters of the ocean and killed people, powerful because of the force of Māyā. At Brahmā’s command, the immanent Lord, who is also possessed of Māyā, entered the ocean in his piscine form, searched [Damanaka] out, dragged him to the shore and pummelled him on the ground. The great Dānava was felled on the fourteenth of [the month of] Caitra (*madhoḥ*). By contact with the Lord’s hands, he became a fragrant grass.”

There is perhaps a trace of a slightly different version of this myth a few chapters later in the same text when the festival (of *damanabhañjikā*) is described, since there the plant is said to sprout out from Damanaka’s body (2.45.7): *purā niśiṭhe ’pi vibhur babhañja damanāsuram | bhañktvā lebhe parāṃ prītiṃ tadan̐gottham ca tat tṛṇam ||*: “It was also at night that the Immanent Lord formerly broke the demon Damana. He took great delight in breaking him. This grass rose from that [demon’s] body.”

hand and its outreach into a growing community of followers on the other. We may imagine *śaivācāryas* seeing their sphere of authority being further and further widened by the broadening of scope of their religion that resulted from admitting larger categories of people to initiated life, a tendency that is suggested, for instance, by the creation of the category of a “seedless initiation” (*nirbīja-dīkṣā*), an initiation for people such as “women, fools, and kings,” in other words, those who for different reasons were held to be unable to follow the time-consuming post-initiatory rituals and religious activities of regular initiates.⁴⁵ As the social base broadened, so too did the liturgy, which could naturally be expanded by adapting the calendrical feasts of popular religion.

Early literature of the Mantramārga shows little interest in socio-religious rituals of any kind and appears, as we have seen, to describe no *utsavas* at all. We have seen that this is not because *utsavas* did not exist at the time of the early scriptures, and so it must be assumed that this is because such *utsavas* had no soteriological function. The first *utsava* to figure in the canon of rites, if one does not include the celebratory rituals surrounding a *pratiṣṭhā*, appears to be the *pavitrotsava*, which we find described, for instance, in the *Kiraṇatantra* and in the *Mohacūḍottara*. The inclusion of this festival before all others is perhaps to be explained by its being something that could be given a soteriological function: that of reparation of expiable offences of which one might not be aware. The *damanotsava* seems to be the next to have been roped in, after first being rewritten upon the model of the *pavitrotsava*. The motive for its inclusion was, I propose, to harness the popularity of a people’s festival that, in the early Siddhānta, would have been of no interest to those composing scriptures – to harness this popularity while reducing to an absolute minimum the relevance of spring and the god of love in the festival! Such a broadening of the ritual canon prefigures the total transformation of the religion that begins to be reflected a century later, in the twelfth century, in the South Indian Temple Āgamas, a huge corpus of literature that attempts to describe every aspect of the socio-religious life of a large South Indian temple. This literature, while purporting to belong to the Śaivasiddhānta, in fact pays almost no further attention to soteriologically important rituals such as *nirvāṇadīkṣā* (salvific initiation), and discusses instead at great

⁴⁵ For more detailed reflections on the gradual social broadening of the current of the Mantramārga that became the Śaivasiddhānta, see GOODALL, SANDERSON, ISAACSON et al. 2015: 47–59 and, with a particular focus on the growing prominence of women, GOODALL 2015: 23–49.

length the courtly protocol of rites and processions for temple images. The Śaivasiddhānta had, it seems, by then become so “mainstream” in South Indian society that it became transformed, almost beyond recognition, by the popular temple-based religious traditions that it had engulfed and swallowed.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary Literature

Īśānaśivagurudevapaddhati of Īśānaśiva

Isanasivagurudevapaddhati of Isanasiva Gurudeva Ed. by M. M. T. Gaṇapati Sāstrī with an Elaborate Introduction by Dr. N.P. Unni. Delhi, Varanasi: Bharatiya Vidya Prakashan, 1990 [first printed, without introduction, in 1920].

Kiraṇatantra

Kiraṇāgamamahātantram. Ed. Pañcāpagesa. Devakōṭṭai, 1932.

Kuṭṭanīmata of Damodara Gupta

Kuttani-matam or Shambhali-matam. A Didactic Poem Composed about A. D. 755–786 by Damodara Gupta, the Chief Minister of King Jayapida of Kashmir, edited with a New Commentary Rasa-Dipika by Tanasukhram Manasukhraram Tripathi. Varanasi: Krishnadas Academy, 1991 [reprint of the Bombay edition of 1924].

Kumāratantra

Kumāratantram. Ed. E.M. Kandaswami Sarma. Madras: South Indian Archaka Association, 1974.

Kriyākramadyotikā of Aghoraśiva, with the commentary of Nirmalamāṇi

Aghoraśivācāryaviracitā Kriyākramadyotikākhyā Paddhatiḥ. Nirmalamāṇiguruviracitā Prabhākhyā Kriyākramadyotikāvyākhyā. Ed. Rāmaśāstrin and Ambalavānājñānasambandhaparāśaktisvāmin Cidambaram, 1927.

Jayasimhakaḷpadruma of Ratnākaradīkṣita

Jayasimhakaḷpadruma of Ratnākaradīkṣita or Devabhaṭṭātma-japaṇḍarīkayāji-Ratnākara. Ed. Harinārāyaṇa Śarman. Bombay, 1903.

Jñānaratnāvalī of Jñānaśambhu (JR)

South Indian manuscripts: Madras GOML R 14898 (from which IFP T. 231 was copied) and Mysore ORI P. 3801. Nepalese manuscript covering instructions relating to *pavitrāropaṇa* and *damanāropaṇa* only: NGMPP A 49/7.

Jñānārṇavatāntra

Īśvaraproktaṃ jñānāmṛtatāntram. ānandāśramaṇḍitaiḥ saṃśodhitam.
Poona: Ānandāśrama Press, 1952.

Durgāsaptaśatī

Devī-māhātmyam: The Glorification of the Great Goddess. Ed. and transl. Vasudeva S. Agrawala. Varanasi: All-India Kashiraj Trust, 1963.

Devīpurāṇa

Devī Purāṇam (First Critical Devanāgarī Edition). Ed. Puṣpen-drakumāraśarman. New Delhi: Śrīlālabahāduraśāstrīkēndriyasamskṛta-vidyāpīṭham, 1976.

Devyāmata

NGMPP A 41/15.

Nāradaṇḍapurāṇa

Atha Nārādīyamahāpurāṇaṃ prārābhyate. Ed. Śrīkrṣṇadāsa Khemarāja. Bombay: Śrīveṅkaṭeśvara Steam Press, 1867.

Nīśvāsamukhatattvasaṃhitā

See KAFLE 2015.

Pārameśvarasaṃhitā

Pārameśvarasaṃhitā govindācāryaiḥ saṃskṛtā, anekavidhādarśādibhiḥ saṃyojitā ca. Ed. Govindācārya. Śrīraṅgam, Tiruchi: Kodandaramar Sannidhi, 1953.

Bhaviṣyapurāṇa

Khemarāja śrīkrṣṇadāśena sampāditasya mumbāī śrī veṅkaṭeśvarasāṭim mudraṇālayena prakāśitasya punarmudraṇam. śrībhaviṣyamahāpu-rāṇam. The Bhaviṣyamahāpurāṇam. dillī viśvavidyālayastha hindū-mahāvidyālayasya ḍā° rājendranāthaśarmanā bhūmikā pāṭhaśodha-nābhyāṃ pariṣkṛtam nāgaśaraṇasimhasampāditaslokānukramaṇyā sa-hitam. Ed. Rajendra Nath Sharma. Delhi: Nag Publishers, 1984.

Viśvāmitrasaṃhitā

Viśvāmitra Saṃhitā. Ed. Undemane Shankara Bhatta. Tirupati: Kendri-ya Sanskrit Vidyapeetha, 1970.

Śivadharmasāstra

Printed in: *Paśupatināṭam: Śivadharmamahāśāstram, Paśupatināṭa-darśanam.* Ed. Naraharināth. Kathmandu: Bṛhadādyātmikaparīśadaḥ, Kāṣṭhamāṇḍapaḥ Gorakhāhinduraṣṭram, 1999.

– Also NGMPP A 3/3 [Nepal] samvat 321 [scil. 1201 AD], f.27v–28r (= A); NGMPP B 7/3 [Nepal] samvat 290 [scil. 1170 AD], f.26r–26v (= B); IFP T. 32 (C20th transcript of a Grantha palm-leaf ms.) (= T).

Sarvajñānottaravṛtti of Aghoraśiva

IFP RE 47852 (paper manuscript in Grantha script).

Somaśambhupaddhati (SP1, SP2, etc. = BRUNNER 1963, 1968, etc.)

See BRUNNER 1963–1998.

Somaśambhupaddhatiṭīkā of Trilocanaśivācārya

Forthcoming edition of S.A.S. Sarma, based on, among other manuscripts, Madras GOML M. 14735 (paper manuscript in Devanāgarī script).

Skandapurāṇa

The Skandamahāpurāṇam. 7 vols. Delhi: Nag Publishers, 1986–1987 [Reprint of Venkaṭeśvara Steam Press edition].

Haribhaktivilāsa

Śrīśrīharibhaktivilāsaḥ saṭīkaḥ mahāmahopādhyāya paramabhāgavata śrīgopālabhaṭṭa saṃgrhītaḥ ... śrīyuktamuktārāma vidyāvāgīśena śodhitaḥ. Kālikātā: Pūrṇacandrodayayantra, 1845. [Digital copy of this Bengali-script edition downloaded from the Deutsche Digitale Bibliothek on November 29, 2015]

Secondary Literature

ANDERSON, L. A. 1993. *Vasantotsava. The Spring Festivals of India. Texts and Traditions*. New Delhi: D.K. Printworld.

BISSCHOP, P. 2010. Once Again on the Identity of Caṇḍeśvara in Early Śaivism: A rare Caṇḍeśvara in the British Museum? *Indo-Iranian Journal* 53, pp. 233–249.

BROO, M. 2003. *As Good as God. The Guru in Gauḍīya Vaiṣṇavism*. Åbo: Åbo Akademi University Press.

BRUNNER, H. (ed. and transl.) 1963, 1968, 1977, 1998. *Somaśambhupaddhati*. 4 vols: *Première Partie. Le rituel quotidien dans la tradition śivaïte de l'Inde du Sud selon Somaśambhu*; *Deuxième Partie. Rituels Occasionnels dans la tradition śivaïte de l'Inde du Sud selon Somaśambhu I : Pavitrārohaṇa, Damanapūjā et Prāyaścitta*; and *Troisième Partie. Rituels occasionnels dans la tradition śivaïte de l'Inde du Sud selon Somaśambhu II : dīkṣā, abhiṣeka, vratoddhāra, antyeṣṭi, śrāddha*; and *Rituels dans la tradition śivaïte selon Somaśambhu. Quatrième partie : rituels optionnels : pratiṣṭhā*. Pondicherry: Institut Français d'Indologie.

DAVIS, R.H. 2010. *A Priest's Guide for the Great Festival. Aghoraśiva's Mahotsavavidhi Translated with Introduction and Notes*. New York: Oxford University Press.

- EINOO, S. 2005. Ritual Calendar. Change in the Conventions of Time and Space. *Journal Asiatique* 293.1, pp. 99–124.
- GOODALL, D. (ed. and transl.) 1998. *Bhaṭṭa Rāmakaṇṭha's Commentary on the Kiraṇatantra. Volume I: chapters 1–6. Critical edition and annotated translation*. Pondicherry: Institut français de Pondichéry / École française d'Extrême-Orient.
2000. Problems of Name and Lineage: relationships between South Indian authors of the Śaiva Siddhānta. A review article of *Somaśambhupaddhati : rituels dans la tradition sivaïte selon Somaśambhu. Quatrième partie : rituels optionnels : pratiṣṭhā. texte, traduction et notes*. Hélène Brunner-Lachaux. 1998. *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society* 10, pp. 205–216.
2004. *The Parākhyatantra. A Scripture of the Śaiva Siddhānta. A critical edition and annotated translation*. Pondicherry: Institut Français de Pondichéry / École française d'Extrême-Orient.
2009. Who is Caṇḍeśa? In: S. Einoo (ed.), *Genesis and Development of Tantrism*. Tokyo: Institute of Oriental Culture, University of Tokyo, pp. 351–423.
2014. Saiddhāntika paddhatis I. On Rāmanātha, the Earliest Southern Author of the Śaivasiddhānta of Whom Works Survive, and on Eleventh-century Revisions of the *Somaśambhupaddhati*. *Cracow Indological Studies* 16, pp. 169–201.
2015. Introduction to Sathyanarayanan & Goodall 2015.
- GOODALL, D., with A. SANDERSON & H. ISAACSON, et al. 2015. *The Nīśvāsātattvasaṃhitā. The Earliest Surviving Śaiva Tantra. Volume I. A Critical Edition & Annotated Translation of the Mūlasūtra, Uttarasūtra & Nayasūtra, in collaboration with Alexis Sanderson & Harunaga Isaacson, with contributions of Nirajan Kafle, Diwakar Acharya & others*. Pondicherry: IFP/EFEO/Asien-Afrika-Institut, Universität Hamburg.
- HAZRA, R.C., 1940. *Studies in the Purāṇic Records on Hindu Rites and Customs*. Dacca: University of Dacca.
1985. The Śiva-dharma. *Purāṇa* 27, pp. 282–299.
- KAFLE, N. 2015*. *The Nīśvāsamukha, the Introductory Book of the Nīśvāsātattvasaṃhitā. Critical Edition, with an Introduction and Annotated Translation Appended by Śivadharmasaṅgraha 5–9*. Doctoral thesis defended at the University of Leiden in October 2015.
- KANE, P. V. ³1994. *History of Dharmasāstra (Ancient and Mediaeval Religious and Civil Law). Volume V, Part I (Vratas, Utsavas, and Kāla, etc.)*. Poona: Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute.

- MATSUBARA, M. 1994. *Pāñcarātra Saṃhitās & Early Vaiṣṇava Theology. With A Translation and Critical Notes from Chapters on Theology in the Ahirbudhnya Saṃhitā*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.
- MEYER, J. J. 1937. *Trilogie indischer Mächte und Feste der Vegetation. Ein Beitrag zur vergleichenden Religions- und Kulturgeschichte, Fest- und Volkskunde*. Zürich/Leipzig: M. Niehans.
- MIRNIG, N. 2018. *Liberating the Liberated. A History of the Development of Cremation and Ancestor Worship in the Early Śaiva Siddhānta. Analysis, Texts and Translations*. Vienna: Austrian Academy of Sciences.
- NĀGAR, M.M. 1940. No. 29. Fragmentary Stone Inscription of Queen Uddalladevi: V.S. 1294. *Epigraphia Indica* 23 (1935–36), pp. 186–189.
- PADOUX, A. 2014. Review of Davis 2010, *BEFEO* 99 (2012–2013), pp. 427–431.
- RASTELLI, M. 2006. *Die Tradition des Pāñcarātra im Spiegel der Pārameśvarasaṃhitā*. Vienna: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- SANDERSON, A. 2007. The Śaiva Exegesis of Kashmir. In: Dominic Goodall and André Padoux (eds), *Mélanges tantriques à la mémoire d'Hélène Brunner. Tantric Studies in Memory of Hélène Brunner*. Pondicherry: IFP/EFEO, pp. 231–442.
2014. The Śaiva Literature. *Journal of Indological Studies* 24 & 25 (2012–2013), pp. 1–113.
- SATHYANARAYANAN, R. & D. GOODALL, 2015. *Śaiva Rites of Expiation. A First Edition and Translation of Trilocanaśiva's Twelfth-century Prāyaścittasamuccaya (with a transcription of Hṛdayaśiva's Prāyaścittasamuccaya), critically edited & translated by R. Sathyanarayanan, with an introduction by Dominic Goodall*. Pondicherry: IFP/EFEO.
- TĀNTRIKĀBHIDHĀNAKOŚA I, 2000, *Tāntrikābhidhānaśa I. Dictionnaire des termes techniques de la littérature hindoue tantrique. A Dictionary of Technical Terms from Hindu Tantric Literature. Wörterbuch zur Terminologie hinduistischer Tantren, sous la direction de H. Brunner, G. Oberhammer et A. Padoux*. Vienna: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- TĀNTRIKĀBHIDHĀNAKOŚA 3, 2013, *Tāntrikābhidhānaśa III. Dictionnaire des termes techniques de la littérature hindoue tantrique. A Dictionary of Technical Terms from Hindu Tantric Literature. Wörterbuch zur Terminologie hinduistischer Tantren, sous la direction de Dominic Goodall et Marion Rastelli*. Vienna: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.

- WATSON, A., GOODALL, D. & ANJANEYA SARMA S.L.P. 2013. *An Enquiry into the Nature of Liberation. Bhaṭṭa Rāmakaṇṭha's Paramokṣa-nirāsakārikāvṛtti, a commentary on Sadyojyotiḥ's refutation of twenty conceptions of the liberated state (mokṣa)*. Pondicherry: IFP/EFEO.
- ZOTTER, A. 2010*. *Von Blüten, Göttern und Gelehrten. Die Behandlung von pūjā-Blüten im Puṣpacintāmaṇi: Text, Herkunft und Deutung eines nepalischen Kompendiums*. Doctoral dissertation defended at the University of Leipzig in 2010.

Appendix I

Jñānaśambhu's *Jñānaratnāvalī* (C12th). From Madras GOML R 14898 (=M₁, pp. 202ff) and Mysore ORI ms. P 3801 (=M^Y), a palm-leaf ms. in Nandināgarī. (Also, for first verse only, NGMPP A 49/7 (=N).)

*śrīcoladeśasambhūtabhūsureṇa*⁴⁶ *tapodhinā*
*śrīmajjñānaśivenāyaṃ*⁴⁷ *pavitrakavidhiḥ kṛtaḥ*⁴⁸

*svacchandabhairave tantre bhairavo damanaḥ smṛtaḥ*⁴⁹
*ratipṛītyāśrusaṃsiktasmarabhasmabhavaḥ kvacit*⁵⁰ 1
*siddhānte nādaras tasya*⁵¹ *prāyaścittāśayair api*⁵²
*tathāpīhāpi sāmānyaṃ*⁵³ *puṣpādhyāyeṣu kīrtanāt*⁵⁴ 2
*pūrvacāryoditatvāc ca tadvidhānaṃ tu*⁵⁵ *kathyate*

⁴⁶ *śrīcoladeśasambhūta*°] M^Y; *coladeśasamudbhūta*° N; *śrīcoladeśasambhūtā* M₁

⁴⁷ °*śivenāyaṃ*] M₁N; *śivena* M^Y (unmetrical)

⁴⁸ There follows in M₁: *śrīmahāgaṇapataye namaḥ*; in M^Y: *śrīmatkāverīka-pilāṣṭaradakkisarovara-triveṇīsaṃgamaśrīmatrima-kūṅpuravarādhiśvaraśrīpūrṇamaṅgalakāmākṣidevīsametaśrī agastyēśvarāya namaḥ* // — // *śrīvaidyalingāya namaḥ* //.

⁴⁹ *bhairavo damanaḥ smṛtaḥ*] em.; *bhairavoditamantṛataḥ* M₁; *bhairavo damana smṛtaḥ* M^Y

⁵⁰ *ratipṛītyāśrusaṃsiktasmarabhasmabhavaḥ kvacit*] conj.; *iti pṛītyāśrusaṃsiktasmarabhasmabhavaḥ kvacit* M₁; *ratiripṛītyāśrusaṃsiktasmarabhasmabhayaḥ kvacit* M^Y (unmetrical). For this conjecture, cf. *Īśānaśivagurudevapaddhati, kriyāpāda* 22.14.

⁵¹ *nādaras tasya*] M₁; *nāradas tasya* M^Y

⁵² °*śayair api*] conj.; °*śrutair api* M₁; °*śrayair api* (?) M^Y

⁵³ *tathāpīhāpi sāmānyaṃ*] em.; *tathāpi bhāvasāmānyaḥ* M₁; *tathāpi hāpi sāmānyaṃ* M^Y

⁵⁴ *puṣpādhyāyeṣu kīrtanāt*] em.; *puṣpāndhyāyeṣu kīrtanāt* M₁; *puṣpādhyāye prakīrtanāt* M^Ypc; *puṣpādhyāye prakīrtanam* M^Yac

saptamyām vā⁵⁶ trayodaśyām caitre māsi dvipakṣayoḥ 3
 kṛtāhnikas tu sâyāhne gatvā damanakāntikam⁵⁷
 samprokṣyāstreṇa samśodhya pūjayet saṃhitāṇubhiḥ 4
 gandhapuṣpapavitrādyaiḥ dhūpadīpādibhiḥ sudhīḥ
 praṇamya ca yathāśāstraṃ dāmam āmantrayet tadā⁵⁸ 5
 oṃ haraprasādasambhūta tvam atra sannidhībhava⁵⁹
 śivakāryaṃ samuddiśya netavyo 'si śivājñaya⁶⁰ 6
 punaś cābhyarcya samrakṣya utpāṭya⁶¹ svagrhaṃ nayet
 yadi dūraṃ tad ānītaṃ⁶² samāropya samīpataḥ 7
 tatpūrṇapātreṇāropya grhe 'py āmantrapūrvaṭ⁶³
 yāgaṃ pūrvoktavat kṛtvā pavitrāṇīva śodhayan⁶⁴ 8
 phalaṃ⁶⁵ puṣpaṃ ca patraṃ ca mūlaṃ nālaṃ tadudbhavam⁶⁶ 9
 gavyaugham dantakāṣṭhaṃ ca bhasmabhṛddhātakīphalam
 īśānādyuttarāntāsu dikṣu⁶⁷ pātreṣu vinyaset 10
 gandhaṃ damanam āropya⁶⁸ sūryādīnām anukramāt
 devan damanakair iṣṭvā pañcāṅgair avikhaṇḍitaiḥ 11
 sāṅgaṃ damanakaṃ dhūpaṃ⁶⁹ dūrvāpuṣpākṣatānvitam
 vidhāyāñjalimadhyastham⁷⁰ idam āmantraṇaṃ vadet 12
 āmantrito⁷¹ 'si deveśa prātaḥkāle mayā prabho⁷²

⁵⁵ tu] M₁; ca M^Y

⁵⁶ saptamyām vā] M₁; saptamyāyām M^Y

⁵⁷ gatvā damanakāntikam] em.; kṛtvā damanikāntikam M₁; gatvā damanikānti-
 kam M^Y. Cf. SP2, 2.6 (of which 3c–4 in Jñānaśambhu's text seem to be an expanded
 version): saptamyām vā trayodaśyām gatvā damanakāntikam | śodhayitvāstrama-
 ntreṇa pūjayet saṃhitāṇubhiḥ ||.

⁵⁸ dāmam āmantrayet tadā] M₁; damāmamtreṇa tadyathā M^Y

⁵⁹ °sambhūta tvamatra sannidhī°] em.; °sambhūta atra sannihito M^Y; °sambhūta
 tvamatra sannidhī° M₁

⁶⁰ netavyo 'si] em.; tenavyosi M^Y; netavyāsi M₁

⁶¹ utpāṭya svagrhaṃ] M₁; yāmādyai svagrhaṃ M^Y

⁶² tad ānītaṃ] M^Y; tathānītaṃ M₁

⁶³ °nāropya grhe 'py āmantra°] conj.; vāropya grhe vyāmantra° M₁; māropya
 grhe pyāmamtra° M^Y

⁶⁴ śodhayan] M^Y; śodhayet M₁

⁶⁵ phalaṃ] M₁; phala° M^Y

⁶⁶ mūlaṃ nālaṃ tadudbhavam] M^Y; mṛṇālaṃ tattadubhavam M₁

⁶⁷ °ttarāntāsu dikṣu] M^Y; °ttarāntasya triṣu M₁

⁶⁸ gandhaṃ damanam āropya] M^Yac; gaṃdhaṃ damamanam āropya M^Ypc;
 gandhādamanam āropya M₁

⁶⁹ sāṅgaṃ damanakaṃ dhūpaṃ] M^Y; sadaṅgamanakandhūpaṃ M₁

⁷⁰ °madhyastham] M₁; °madhyasthām M^Y

*kartavyam tu yathākālam*⁷³ *dāmaparva tavājñayā* 13
*atra sadyodhivāsaś cet*⁷⁴ *sadyahkāle 'bhyudīryatām*
*śivāntam*⁷⁵ *mūlam uccārya sāṅgāyeśāya dīyatām*⁷⁶ 14
dhūpadīpādinaivedyais toṣayitvā puroktavat
dattvāgnaye ca taccheṣam kumbhādhasat puroktavat 15
*avaśiṣṭam ca nirvartya rātrau jāgarayed iti*⁷⁷
adhivāsavidhiḥ khyātaḥ prātar nityād anantaram 16
*sāḍambaram*⁷⁸ *yajed īsam dvāradikpaghaṭāḍibhiḥ*⁷⁹
*puṣpadūrvākṣatair*⁸⁰ *dhūpaiḥ kṛtvā damanakāñjalim* 17
*ātmavidyāśivais tattvair*⁸¹ *mūlādyair īśvarāntakaiḥ*⁸²
*namontais tryaṇjalim dattvā*⁸³ *caturdhāñjalinārcayet* 18
*om haum makheśvarāya makham pūraya pūraya*⁸⁴ *śūlapāṇaye †dama-na-*
kaṃ† namaḥ
*aṅgebhyaś ca śivāgneś ca dattvā*⁸⁵ *kṛtvā balidvayam*
*śeṣam pūrvavad atrāpi*⁸⁶ *kṛtvā gatvā*⁸⁷ *śivāntikam* 19
om bhagavann atiriktam vā hīnam vā yan mayā kṛtam
*sarvam tad astu sampūrṇam*⁸⁸ *parva dāmanakam mama*⁸⁹ 20

⁷¹ *āmantrito*] M₁; *om āmantrito* M^Y

⁷² *prabho*] M₁; *vibho* M^Y

⁷³ *yathākālam*] M₁; *yathālābham* M^Y

⁷⁴ *°vāsaś cet*] M^Y; *°vāsam cet* M₁

⁷⁵ *śivāntam*] M^Y; *śivānta°* M₁

⁷⁶ *sāṅgāyeśāya dīyatām*] M₁; *sāṅgeśāyamudīryatām* M^Y

⁷⁷ *jāgarayed iti*] conj.; *jāgarāṇam kuryāt iti* M^Y (unmetrical); *jāgayayāḍiti* M₁

⁷⁸ *sāḍambaram*] M^Y; *sāśambare* M₁

⁷⁹ *dvāradikpaghaṭāḍibhiḥ*] M₁ac; *dvāradikpaghaṭā * bhiḥ* M₁pc; *dvāradi Xkṣu?X k pa kpa ghaṭāñubhiḥ* M^Y (The capital X-s here bracket an uncertain cancelled syllable.)

⁸⁰ *puṣpadūrvākṣatair*°] M₁; *dūrvāpuṣpādānai°* M^Y

⁸¹ *ātmavidyāśivais tattvair*] M^Y; *āvidyāni śivaistadvaiḥ* M₁

⁸² *°kaiḥ*] M₁; *°gaiḥ* M^Y

⁸³ *namontais tryaṇjalim dattvā*] M^Y; *nomnaistryaṇjalirdatvā* M₁ (unmetrical)

⁸⁴ *makheśvarāya makham pūraya pūraya*] conj.; *makheśvarāya makhapūraya* M^Y; *magheśvarāya magham pūraya pūraya* M₁

⁸⁵ *śivāgneś ca dattvā*] M₁; *śivāṅge X?X ś ca kṛtvā* M^Y

⁸⁶ *śeṣam pūrvavad atrāpi*] em.; *śeṣam pūrvadatatrāpi* M^Y (unmetrical); *u ṣam pūrvavadatrāpi* M₁

⁸⁷ *gatvā*] M₁; *datvā* M^Y

⁸⁸ *tad astu sampūrṇam*] M₁; *tadasrasampūrṇam* M^Y

⁸⁹ *parva dāmanakam mama*] em.; *sarve dāmanakarmanah* M₁; *pārvadāmanakam mama* M^Y. This verse (20), with this emendation, is the same as verse 25 of the *damanapūjavidhi* of the *Somaśambhupaddhati*.

iti vijñāpya deveśe karmātmānaṃ samarpya ca
 yāgaṃ viśṛjya cañdeṣṭiṃ⁹⁰ kṛtvāthāvabhṛtaṃ⁹¹ caret 21
 sarvayajñeṣu yat puṇyaṃ tapaḥsarveṣu yat phalaṃ
 tat phalaṃ koṭiguṇitam abhiṣekād avāpyate 22
 atra śrīsomaśambhupādair⁹² yo viśeṣaḥ
 evaṃ dāmavidhiṃ⁹³ kṛtvā kurvīta gurupūjanam
 paritoṣakaraṃ⁹⁴ paścād dvijādīn api tarpayet 23
 gr̥hastho brahmacārī vā ya imaṃ kurute vidhiṃ⁹⁵
 japapūjādikaṃ⁹⁶ tasya saphalaṃ caitramāsajam⁹⁷ 24
 iti
 golakīvaśajātena śrīmatā jñānaśambhunā
 kṛpāvatā munīndreṇa⁹⁸ dāmaparvavidhiḥ kṛtaḥ 25

Appendix II

Transcription of part of NGMPP A 49/7 (ff. 20r–21r), an apparently complete palm-leaf Nepalese manuscript of 24 folios, numbered 1–24, whose index-card gives it the title *Pavitrakavidhi* (Diwakar Acharya kindly drew this manuscript to my attention):

coladeśasamudbhūtabhūsureṇa kṛpāvatā
 śrīmājñānaśivenāyaṃ pavitrakavidhiḥ kṛtaḥ
 murāmāmsī vacā kuṣṭhaṃ śaileyam rajanīdvayam
 śaṭhī caṃpakamustaṃ ca sarvauśadhiganaḥ smṛtaḥ⁹⁹

⁹⁰ cañdeṣṭiṃ] M₁; vaṇdegñiṃ M^Y

⁹¹ kṛtvāthāvabhṛtaṃ] em.; kṛtvāthāvabhṛtaṃ M^Y; kṛtvādāvabhṛthañ M₁

⁹² śrīsoma°] M^Y; śrīśambhusoma° M₁

⁹³ dāma°] M₁; dāna° M^Y

⁹⁴ °karaṃ] M₁; °guruṃ M^Y

⁹⁵ vā ya imaṃ kurute vidhiṃ] em.; vā ya imāṃ kurute vidhiṃ M^Y; va U te vidhiḥ M₁

⁹⁶ japapūjādikaṃ] em.; japahomādikaṃ M^Y; japaṃ pūjādikaṃ M₁

⁹⁷ saphalaṃ caitramāsajam] M^Y; sa calaṃ caitramāsanam M₁. This verse (24) is reproduced from the *Somaśambhupaddhati*: only the words *gr̥hastho* and *brahmacārī* are interchanged in Brunner's edition (SP2, 2.26–27).

⁹⁸ munīndreṇa] M₁; vinītena M^Y. With this verse (25), cf. SP2, 2.28: *paropakāraśīlena śrīmatā somaśambhunā | kriyākāṇḍakramāvalyāṃ dāmapūjāvidhiḥ kṛtaḥ ||*.

⁹⁹ This is a corrupt version of a verse of the *Mohacūḍottara* that is quoted, e.g., in Nirmalamaṇi's commentary on the *Kriyākramadyotikā*:

tathā śrīmanmohaśūrottare
 murāvāmsī vacā kuṣṭhaṃ śaileyam rajanīdvayam |

*atha damanakavidhiḥ| caitraśuklakṣṇapakṣayoḥ saptamyām trayo-
daśyām vā kṛtāhnikadvayaḥ san damanakāntikaṁ gatvā astramantreṇa sa-
mśodhya ṣaḍaṅgena sampūjya śivavākyena damanakam abhimantrayet|*

*haraprasādasambhūta tvam a(f. 20v)[tra sannidhībhava
śiva]kāryaṁ samuddiśya netavyo si śivājñayā [=verse 6 of Appendix I]*

*anenābhimantrya kavacāstrābhyām saṁrakṣya svagrhaṁ yāyāt.¹⁰⁰ dūraṁ
cet, samūlaṁ mṛtikāśahitaṁ damanakam āñīya mṛtpūrṇapātre nikṣīpya| astra-
mantreṇa vāriṇā saṁsicya pūrvavad gr̥he py āmantrya sāvāhnaśamaye yāga-
maṇḍapam alaṁkṛtya pavitrakavidhivad adhivāsanaṁ kṛtvā dvāraloka-pāla-
vāstvadhipatibrahmamahālakṣmīlokapālakalaśavardhanyādīn sampūrya vi-
dhivad vistareṇa pañcāmṛtādibhiḥ parameśvaraṁ sampūjya kuṇḍasaṁskārā-
dipūrṇāntaṁ karma kṛtvā vahnihṛdaye vidhivac chivaṁ pūjya mūlenāṣṭotta-
raśataṁ hutvā pūrṇāñ ca dattvā mantratarpaṇādīpanaṁ vidhāya pavitra-
kavidhivat damanakam catuḥsaṁskārāśuddhaṁ sampā-tāhuti(f. 21r) śodhi-
taṁ kṛtvā devasya paścime mṛdanvitaṁ damanakamūlaṁ sadyojātena hṛdā
vā dadyāt| tannālam āmalakaphalaṁ vāmena śirasā vā uttare| tatpatram
bhasma cāghoreṇa śikhayā vā dakṣiṇe tatpuṣpaṁ dantakā-ṣṭhaṁ¹⁰¹ tatpuru-
ṣeṇa¹⁰² kavacena vā prācyām tatphalasandhi(?) pañcagavyaṁ aiśānyām mū-
lena gāyatrīyā vā dadyāt| tadanu ādityadvāradīkpālakumbhavarddhanikāsu
gandhadamanakam dattvā dvāradīkpālagaṇagurvadvādiṣu gandhadamana-
kam¹⁰³ nivedya pañcāṅgair damanakaiḥ śivaṁ sampūjya dūrvāpuspākṣatā-
nvitaṁ gandhadhūpayutaṁ pañcāṁgadamanakam aṁjalimadhyasthaṁ kṛ-
tvā¹⁰⁴ devaṁ vijñāpayet|¹⁰⁵*

*āmantrito si deveśa prātaḥ kālē mayā prabho|
kartavyaṁ tu yathālābhaṁ dāmaparva tavājñayā|| [=v. 13 of Appendix I]¹⁰⁶*

iti vijñāpya ...

musalī caiva mustaṁ ca sarvauśadhigaṇas smṛtaḥ |

It also appears in the preceding chapter of the *Jñānaratnāvalī*, on the *pavitrakavidhi*.

¹⁰⁰ yāyāt] conj.; yāt ms.

¹⁰¹ danta°] ms.pc; tatta° ms.ac

¹⁰² tatpuruṣeṇa] em.; tatpuruṣe ms.

¹⁰³ °gurvadvādiṣu gandha°] conj.; °gurvānmasu gandhaṁ ms.

¹⁰⁴ kṛtvā] conj.; kṛ * ms.

¹⁰⁵ The immediately preceding prose corresponds to verses 11 and 12 in Appendix I.

¹⁰⁶ Note that it is also the same formula as that given in SP2, 2.16.

Appendix III

Text of a goddess-related account transcribed from an unidentified work, parts of which are transmitted by an apparently complete Nepalese palm-leaf manuscript of ten folios numbered 1–10, namely NGMPP A 49/5, whose index card titles it *Damanārohaṇa-pūjā* (Diwakar Acharya kindly drew this manuscript to my attention). Much further work would be required to make an edition of this text, for there are many doubts about which of its many anomalies of grammar and sense are authorial and which transmissional. I have silently corrected a number of dental sibilants to palatal ones and vice versa.

[*siddham*] oṃ namaḥ śivāya|
 praṇamya pārvatīnāthaṃ pārvatīm śaṅkarapriyām¹⁰⁷|
 procyate dāmanaṃ parvva yad uktaṃ pārameśvare|| 1||
 śāstroktam api sāmānyam aduṣṭa[ṃ?] parikīrtitaṃ|
 prakṛṣṭaṃ tyajyate sadbhīḥ śuddhasiddhāntakāribhīḥ|| 2||
 kimarthaṃ kriyate devi vidhyuktaṃ kena hetunā|
 ity ādiṣṭaṃ mahēśena gaurīdaṃ vākyam abravīt|| 3||
 śṛṇu deva jagannātha damanotpattim uttamām|
 yām vai śrutvā kathāṃ divyām¹⁰⁸ prāpyate padam akṣayam|| 4||
 adhobhuvanam ākramya saṃsthitāḥ¹⁰⁹ kālasaṃjñakāḥ|
 tasmā te aṅga vā śaktir damano nāma viśrutā|| 5||
 āsīt tatra¹¹⁰ pure ramye krīḍate saha yogibhīḥ|
 asurānām pure divye ramate muditātmanā¹¹¹|| 6||
 divyadānavagandharvai rakṣoyakṣorageśvaraiḥ|
 kinnarāmarasaṃsiddhaiḥ krīḍānandasamudbhavaiḥ|| 7||
 nityaṃ pramuditādbhiḥ ca madāścaryakāribhīḥ(?)|
 divyakrīḍāvinodena divyamelāpakotsavaiḥ¹¹²|| 8||
 tasmā[t] kāryā purā jāto bhīṣaṇo bhīmavikramaḥ|
 krāntās tena surāḥ sarve¹¹³ dānavāḥ prthivītale|| 9||
 bahukālāvyatī(f. 2r)tena darpeṇātīvasaṃyutāḥ¹¹⁴|

¹⁰⁷ śaṅkara°] em.; saṅkara° ms.

¹⁰⁸ yām vai śrutvā kathāṃ divyām] conj.; yāvai śrutvā kathāṃ divyā ms.

¹⁰⁹ saṃsthitāḥ] conj.; saṃsthitā ms.

¹¹⁰ āsīt tatra] conj.; āśītatra ms.

¹¹¹ muditātmanā] conj.; suditātmanā ms.

¹¹² °tsavaiḥ] ms.pc; °tsavai ms.ac

¹¹³ surāḥ sarve] em.; surā sarvve ms.

pātāla mathitaṃ sarvaṃ bruvan vākyam yadṛcchayā|| 10||
sa nāsti matsamo loke trailokye sacarācare
*puram gr̥hnāmy aśeṣaṃ*¹¹⁵ *hi brahmaviṣṇvendra kā kathā*|| 11||
martyalokaṃ samusthāya catuḥsāgaramekhalam
*bhavāmi tīrthasaṃsevi*¹¹⁶ *saṃkrīḍāmi yathecchayā*|| 12||
yāvad evaṃ vaded dhr̥ṣṭaḥ pṛthivyām ko mamādhikah
trailokye kaḥ pumān tiṣṭhet samāgadāyataḥ punaḥ(?)|| 13||
kṛīḍayā tatpuram gatvā duṣṭātmakanmuyam kilah(?)
devikāvacanaṃ śrutvā ruṣṭo 'sau damanāsurah|| 14||
*tataḥ kopaparādhīnaḥ khalo daityaḥ*¹¹⁷ *pratāpavān*
pātayami na saṃdehaś carvayāmi na saṃśayaḥ|| 15||
*tato yuddham atīvāsīd devyasurayoś cobhayoh*¹¹⁸
*damanāsurah*¹¹⁹ *saṃkruddhaḥ prayayau hantum ambikām*|| 16||
*vistāravadanā*¹²⁰ *devī jihvālalanabhīṣaṇā*
*sopaiti*¹²¹ *raktanayanā nādenākrāntadigmukhā*|| 17||
devyā saha tato yuddham ghoram rudhirakardamam
saṃjātaṃ vatsarārdhena tadāsau patito bhuvi|| 18||
*śūlam*¹²² *nipātya tatpṛṣṭhe*¹²³ *hūṃkāroccaiḥ samāhatam*
asṛgviliptā bhū(f. 2v)mayaḥ patito 'yaṃ mahītale|| 19||¹²⁴
tasmād vr̥kṣāḥ samutpannāḥ puṣparūpāḥ sugandhinaḥ

¹¹⁴ *darpeṇā*°] em.; *darppenā*° ms.

¹¹⁵ *aśeṣaṃ*] conj.; *aśeṣā* ms.

¹¹⁶ °*sevi*] em.; °*sevi* ms.

¹¹⁷ *kopaparādhīnaḥ khalo daityaḥ*] conj.; *kopaparādhīnakhalādaitya* ms. Cf. *Durgāsaptasatī* 8.2ab: *tataḥ kopaparādhīnacetāḥ śumbhaḥ pratāpavān*.

¹¹⁸ Unmetrical. Cf. *Durgāsaptasatī* 9.7ab: *tato yuddham atīvāsīd devyā śumbha-niśumbhayoh*.

¹¹⁹ *damanāsurah*] conj. (unmetrical); *damanāsura*° ms. Alternatively one could retain the transmitted reading and treat it as a metrically constrained use of the *prāti-padika* for a nominative. Cf. *Durgāsaptasatī* 9.15: *tasmin nipatite bhūmau niśumbhe bhīmavikrame | bhrātary atīva saṃkruddhaḥ prayayau yoddhum ambikām*.

¹²⁰ *vistārā*°] conj.; *vistora*° ms. Cf. *Durgāsaptasatī* 7.7: *ativistāravadanā jihvālalana-bhīṣaṇā | nimagnāraktanayanā nādāpūritadinmukhā*.

¹²¹ *sopaiti*] em.; *sopeti* ms.

¹²² *śūlam*] conj.; *sūram* ms.

¹²³ *tatpṛṣṭhe*] conj.; *ta pṛṣṭe* ms.

¹²⁴ The syntax is irregular, but the verse can perhaps be interpreted (without further repairs) to mean: “Once she had driven down her trident onto his back – [the back of] him who had been struck down by shrill cries of *hūṃ* – the ground-surfaces were smeared with blood [there where] he fell down on the earth.”

ato devī susaṃtuṣṭā varam dātum samudyatā|| 20||¹²⁵
yāvad vai tiṣṭhate candro yāvad devo divākarah|
tāvad damanaka medinyāṃ harapūjā bhaviṣyasi|| 21||¹²⁶
tataḥ prasādenādiṣṭo martyaṃ gaccha tarur bhava||¹²⁷
pauspīyatanutām prāpya mama bhogyo bhaviṣyasi|| 22||¹²⁸
arcayiṣyanti ye martyā damanāṃgasamudbhavaiḥ|
yāsyanti te paraṃ sthānaṃ yatra devo maheśvaraḥ|| 23||
pālayanti na ye parvva dāmanaṃ nāma mānavāḥ|
teṣāṃ puṇyādikaṃ dattaṃ mayā te vai nu māsikam|| 24||
kṛtaṃ tasyotsavaṃ pūrvaṃ caitraparvanisaṃbhavaḥ|
prokta vai devadevena damanasya mahātmanaḥ|| 25||
damanābhañjanaṃ pūrvaṃ saṃkṣiptaṃ vidhivistaram||¹²⁹
sāmprataṃ procyate devi yāgapūrvādhivāsanam|| 26||
caitrasya śuklapakṣe tu trayodaśyāṃ samāhitaḥ|
jalasnānādikam śuddho nityāhnikakriyāparaḥ|| 27||
aparāhnikavidhi kṛtvā yāyan nārusamīpakam|
kedārike suvistīrṇe upaviśya tataḥ punaḥ|| 28||
vīkṣaṇādisuvi(f.3r)śuddham āmantrokādaśānubhiḥ(?)
taroh sambodhanaṃ kuryāt śivavākyena mantriṇaḥ|| 29||
devyāḥ prasādasampūrṇaṃ māmārthe saṃnidhībhaḥ|
*harayajñaṃ samuddiśya grhṇāmi*¹³⁰ *tvāṃ harājñayā*|| 30||

...

¹²⁵ Once again, the phrasing could be clearer, but we may understand as follows: “From him/there, blossoming fragrant shrubs sprang up. Thereupon the goddess, being pleased, began to give [this] boon.”

¹²⁶ This is hypermetrical, unless we emend *damanaka* to *damana*. The meaning appears to be: “For as long as the moon and the sun-god remain, you, O Damana, will be upon the earth [for the sake of] worship of Śiva.”

¹²⁷ *tataḥ prasādenādiṣṭo martyaṃ gaccha tarurbhava*] conj.; *tataḥ prasādenādiṣṭo martyaṃ gaccha XpunaX tarur bhavat* ms. “And so, being ordered out of [my] grace, go to [the world] of mortal[s] and become a tree.”

¹²⁸ “Once you have become flowery-bodied, you will be a means for my enjoyment.”

¹²⁹ °*vistaram*] conj.; °*vistaran* ms.

¹³⁰ *samuddiśya grhṇāmi*] em.; *samuddisya grhṇāmi* ms.