Cracow Indological Studies
vol. XVI (2014)
10.12797/CIS.16.2014.16.14

Somadeva Vasudeva
somadevah@mac.com
(Kyoto University)

Prasenā, *Prasīnā* & *Prasannā*: The Evidence of the *Niśvāsaguhya* and the *Tantrasadbhāva*

Summary: The literature of the Śaiva *Mantramārga* evidences differing strategies of incorporating *prasenā* divination into its theoretical frameworks. The early *Niśvāsaguhya* confines *prasenā*s a prognosticatory role in support of a more common method of dream divination used to determine reasons for failed initiation. Questions of intertextuality and doctrinal dependence are raised when the Trika's *Tantrasadbhāva* envisages *prasenā*s as fulfilling exactly the same function.

Keywords: *Prasenā*, divination, possession, oracle, onychomancy, catoptromancy, mirrors, intertextuality, Trika, Śaivasiddhānta.

Introduction

The early literature of the Śaiva *Mantramārga*[1] contains several detailed treatments of a type of scrying involving a divinatory apparition variously called *prasenā*, *prasīnā*,[2] *prasannā*,[3] *pratisenā* or

[1] This term is here used in preference to more ambiguous expressions such as "Śaiva Tantrism", "Tantric Śaivism", etc. See Goodall & Isaacson 2011.

[2] This is the name found in the *Niśvāsaguhya.* It is unlikely that this is a mere scribal corruption of *prasenā*, but it seems to be rather an early attempt to Sanskritise *pasiṇa/pasiṇā.* It is the earliest form to be found in any Śaiva scripture.

[3] This form occurs in the *Tantrasadbhāva.* It too does not appear to be a mere scribal corruption of *prasenā*, but rather a conscious variant presumably intended to signal the benign (*pra*+*sad*) nature of the *svasthāveśa* involved.

senikā.[4] In early scriptural sources, the most commonly encountered designation for these apparitions is *prasenā*.[5] This has been interpreted as a Sanskritization of **pasiṇā*, an unattested feminine of the MIA *pasiṇa*,[6] itself a *svarabhakti* form related to Sanskrit *praśna* (lit. "question") and the attested MIA forms *paṇha*/*paṇhā*. The most prominent morphological feature of these derivations is the ubiquitous feminine ending.[7] It is noteworthy that the term *prasenā* refers literally to the divinatory "question-apparition", that answers the question, and that a perhaps more expected designation "answer-apparition" such as *uttarā* (since the *prasenā* actually answers the questions) never developed.

While of marginal importance to the theoretical frameworks elaborated in the early *Mantramārga*, contemporaneous literary works suggest that *prasenā* divination enjoyed a widespread popularity and was favourably perceived as esoterically prestigious. This in itself may have been sufficient reason for the systematizers of the early Śaiva *Mantramārga* (and also the systematizers of Esoteric Buddhism) to acommodate a pre-existing practice taken over from divinatory traditions.

---

[4] *Jayadrathayāmala* 2, *Vidyāvidyeśvarīcakre Tr̥tīyapratīhārīsādhanavidhiḥ*, f. 117: *senikāsiddhir atulā…*

[5] A divinatory system involving *prasenā*s was also transmitted to the Far East in Esoteric Buddhist scriptures. Strickmann (1996: 221–229) identifies *prasenā* as the *Po-sseu-na* or *Sseu-na* ('the god Po') of the eighth century Chinese translation of the Esoteric Buddhist scripture *Subāhuparipr̥cchā.* See also *Hōbōgirin* 1:7ab, which derives the Japanese *hashina* from Skt. *praśna*, although Strickmann believes that a derivation from *prasena*/*prasenā* is possible.

[6] See Turner CDIAL 8818.

[7] The etymological connection with *praśna* is discussed in Strickmann (Strickmann 1996: 221–229). Faure (Strickmann and Faure 2002: 327, n. 43) reports that F. Staal suggested a connection with Skanda, though *prasena* (masc.) is not attested as a sobriquet of his. Jaini (apparently without knowing that the variant *prasannā* is found) suggested a derivation from *prasanna* and a link to a Gandharva of that name. See also Gray 2007: 345–346.

Prasenā divination may have been derogated for another reason too, for there is reason to believe[8] that it was a preexisting practice that deployed mantras (or at least magical spells) to generate a benign possession, thereby intruding into a domain that the early *Mantramārga* claimed privileged or even exclusive access to. Whether the early *Mantramārga* therefore may have been in some (unacknowledged) way indebted to *prasenā* divination needs to be investigated in more detail, particulary by looking at the earliest surviving accomodations, and by comparing these with more elaborate *prasenā* rituals such as those taught in the *Jayadrathayāmala*.

The following study therefore investigates how the Śaiva appropriation of *prasenā*s was achieved in the case of the *Niśvāsaguhya*, a supplement to the most archaic stratum of the Niśvāsa corpus, the earliest surviving scripture of the *Mantramārga*,[9] and in the *Tantrasadbhāva*, an early scripture of the Trika.

Before analysing the Śaivas' strategies we need to consider what they might have inherited, for there is evidence that *prasenā* divination predates the development of the *Mantramārgā* by quite some time.[10] As Orofino (Orofino 1994) notes, mirror divination was and is so widespread[11] that theories about its origin and spread should not be advanced without a detailed comparative study. Already the Pāli canon's *Dīghanikāya* includes three types of *pañha* (*praśna*, however, is here masc., and not fem.) divination in a list of wrong livelihoods (*micchājīvena jīvika*):[12] divination with

---

[8] That is, even Western cognates of thumb-gazing catoptromancy often require the use of magical spells.

[9] Recently dated by Goodall & Isaacson to approximately 450–550 AD. While the *Niśvāsaguhya* does not form a part of the very earliest stratum of the *Niśvāsa* corpus, it must nevertheless be ranked among the early scriptures of *Mantramārga* Śaivism.

[10] See Orofino (Orofino 1994: 614ff.) for a discussion of early attestations in Esoteric Buddhist literature.

[11] See Orofino (Orofino 1994: 618ff.) for some Greco-Roman sources.

[12] *Dīrghāgama* I.11: *… micchājīvena jīvika kappenti seyyathīda ... ādāsapañha kumāripañha devapañha… iti. DA* I.97: *ādāsapañhanti ādāse*

mirrors (*ādāsapañha*),[13] divination using a virgin (*kumāripañha*),[14] and oracular possession (*devapañha*).[15] Oracular possession and divination[16] were also the main topics taught in an early canonical work of the early Jainas, namely the original[17] *Paṇhāvāyaraṇa*, the tenth *Aṅga* of the Jaina canon, recently rediscovered by Acharya (Acharya 2007) in an early Nepalese manuscript.

To see how the phenomenon of *prasenā*s was understood outside of the Śaiva *Mantramārga* or the Buddhist *Mantranaya* we must widen our scope to consider also other contemporaneous literature that mentions oracular prognostications, especially those describing apparitions, those deploying mirrors (and other forms of catoptromancy), or the characteristic "thumb gazing" technique that is the hallmark of *prasenā* practice in the early scriptural accounts.[18] That this too might be inherited is suggested by the widespread practice of onychomancy

---

devataṃ otāretvā pañhapucchanaṃ. kumārikapañhanti kumārikāya sarīre devataṃ otāretvā pañhapucchanaṃ. devapañhanti dāsiyā sarīre devataṃ otāretvā pañhapucchanaṃ.

[13] PTS p. 98: "Mirror-questioning".

[14] PTS p. 221: "Obtaining oracular answers from a girl supposed to be possessed by a spirit".

[15] PTS p. 330: "Questioning a god, using an oracle".

[16] For further Jaina sources see the entries in *Païasaddamahaṇṇavo* p. 655 *paṇha* m., *paṇhā* f. = *praśna*, *pr̥cchā*. Also *Païasaddamahaṇṇavo* p. 715 *pasiṇa* m.n. = 2. summoning a deity into a mirror etc. (*mantravidyāviśeṣa*), and also *pasiṇavijjā*.

[17] Acharya (Acharya 2007: 4): "Albrecht Weber (1883: 327; 1885: 17) noticed long ago that the original text of the *Praśnavyākaraṇa*, which the compilers of the above mentioned *sūtra*s had before them, was lost at some point in history and another entirely different text was substituted in the place of the original *aṅgasūtra*."

[18] Added to this textual dimension is the fact that many apparently related systems of oracular prognostication (even if the designation *prasenā* is not used) are still practised in South Asia, at least in Tibet, Kerala, and Nepal, but probably much more widely, as future fieldwork will hopefully determine.

(mostly derived from Greco-Roman models?), often involving the uttering of magical spells, current in medieval and Renaissance Europe.[19]

Rather than ritual instructions or doctrinal issues, Sanskrit literary accounts reveal commonly held beliefs about *prasenā*s. For example, the *Kapphiṇābhyudaya*[20] of the ninth century Kashmirian court poet Śivasvāmin uses the apparition of a *prasenā* in a mirror as a metaphor for the appearance of the sun in the sky:

> May this *prasenā*, embodied as the sun,
> appearing in yonder polished mirror of the sky,
> witnessed by the foremost among the mantra-chanters,
> their muttered spells empowered with visualizations of Sandhyā,
> recovering, all at once, the elements of the world that were completely lost,
> grant the heart satisfaction.[21]

---

[19] *Policraticus* II.28 of John of Salisbury (*ca.* 1159): "During my boyhood I was placed under the direction of a priest, to teach me psalms. As he practised the art of crystal gazing, it chanced that he after preliminary magical rites made use of me and a boy somewhat older, as we sat at his feet, for his sacrilegious art, in order that what he was seeking by means of finger nails moistened with some sort of sacred oil of crism, or the smooth polished surface of a basin, might be made manifest to him by information imparted by us, and so after pronouncing names which by the horror they inspired seemed to me, child though I was, to belong to demons, and after administering oaths of which, at God's instance, I know nothing, my companion asserted that he saw certain misty figures, but dimly, while I was so blind to all this that nothing appeared to me except the nails or basin and the other objects I had seen there before." (transl. J. B. Pike, *Frivolities of courtiers*, (1938: 147)).

[20] Yokochi 2012 has argued against Hahn's reception of the work as a Buddhist poem, noting that Śivasvāmin rather intended the *Kapphiṇābhyudaya* as a Śaiva work.

[21] *Kapphiṇābhyudaya* 15.35: *saṃdhyādhyānapraguṇitajapair mantravādipradhānair dṛṣṭā mṛṣṭe gaganamukure 'mutra kṛtvāvatāram | naṣṭān naṣṭān jhagiti jagato lambhayantī padārthān eṣā toṣaṃ diśati manasaḥ pūṣamūrtiprasenā* ||. Since everybody can perceive the rising sun, even without any special qualification, the compound *mantravādipradhānair* should

The notion that the sun "recovers" the elements of the world that have been lost in darkness parallels the main practical application of *prasenā*s: Finding and recovering items that have been lost or stolen. Śivasvāmin's verse implies that *prasenā*s must have been considered dazzling and even beautiful visionary apparitions to those who witnessed them. A more critical stance can also be found in satirical literature. Approximately two hundred years later, another Kashmirian poet and satirist, Kṣemendra,[22] who states to have studied literature (*sāhitya*) with the tantric authority Abhinavagupta (fl. ca. 975–1025 AD), mocks *prasenā* magic as worthless, labelling it derogatorily as *Indrajāla*, as illusion or low-level sorcery:

> The virgin sees a bewildering tumult of people,
> in a sword, in a thumb, in water,
> but the thief is not caught,
> this is the delusion of sorcery.[23]

---

refer to both mantra-sorcerers and also, by *arthaśleṣa*, to sincere mantra-chanters who are up at dawn to perform Sandhyā worship.

[22] Only four works of Kṣemendra are dated, his literary activity falls between 1049/50–1066 AD. The frequently encountered assertion that the *Bṛhatkathāmañjarī* is also dated appears to go back to a misunderstanding of *Bṛhatkathāmañjarī* 19.37 first seen in Sūryakānta (1954: 6), then in Mahajan (1956:i), who dated it to 1037 CE. Sternbach (1979: 1) placed it in 1039 CE, then (without explaining the discrepancy) in 1037 CE (1979: 10), the former date being presumably a typographical error. This would put the verifiable beginning of Kṣemendra's literary career back by 10 years, but it is based on no more than a misunderstanding of 19.37: *kadā cid eva vipreṇa sa dvādaśyām upoṣitaḥ | prārthito Rāmayaśasā sarasaḥ svacchacetasā*, "At one time, he who, full of love, was fasting on the twelfth [lunar day!] was requested by the clear-minded Brāhmaṇa Rāmayaśas." Here the feminine *dvādaśyām* cannot mean "in the twelfth [Laukika] year," i.e. 4112 = 1037 AD, there is no word for "year" in the verse and all of Kṣemendra's other dates explicitly use masculine the terms *saṃvatsara* and *abda*. For a bibliography of his works see Kirde, *Bibliographie zur Bodhisattvāvadānakalpalatā des Kṣemendra**.

[23] *Kalāvilāsa* 9.17: *khaḍge 'ṅguṣṭhe salile* (*khaḍge*] LQP, *baddhe* KEd) *paśyati vividhaṃ janabhramaṃ kanyā | na prāpyate tu cauro* (*tu*] LQP, ca

This verse affirms the most common and perhaps also the original purpose of *prasenā* oracles—the catching of a thief— and some of the main substrates in which a *prasenā* may appear. Kṣemendra does not deny that the medium, a virgin in this case, actually sees something. The problem is that it yields no useful results. It seems likely that this rather negative valuation of *prasenā* sorcery is one that his teacher Abhinavagupta might have shared, for there is no explicit mention of *prasenā*s in his *Tantrāloka.* This may seem surprising, for there is, in the third chapter, where such a reference would have been apt, a detailed discussion of the doctrine of reflection (*pratibimbavāda*). Even his commentator Jayaratha feels the need to include the *prasenā* as a simile in this context, citing a verse that he attributes to Abhinavagupta's grand-teacher Utpaladeva (fl. ca. 975–1025 AD), the systematizer of the Īśvarapratyabhijñā system:

> O Lord! Through your power
> You have revealed the universe in [your] pure [mirror-like] self
> without an "original" [source being present],
> just like a *prasenā* [who is not visible as a source, nevertheless appears]
> in a mirror.[24]

The metaphor (if we read *eva*) or simile (if we emend to *iva*) expressed in this verse has close parallels to a trope used to explain the attainment of the first stage of *Kālacakra* system's form of *Ṣaḍaṅgayoga* analyzed by Orofino (Orofino 1994). In none of the above similes and metaphors is a *prasenā* valued in itself as a significant ritual actor fulfilling a soteriological function. When more detailed descriptions of oracular apparitions appear in literary works, they fulfill a quite different function in the imagination of the poets and their audiences: the legitimisation of royal succession. A common trope is the visionary apparition of a *prasenā*-like goddess dressed in white who is identified as a visionary manifestation of Rājyalakṣmī, Rājyaśrī (the patron goddess of

KEd • *cauro*] LQ, *coro* KEd P) *moho 'sāv indrajālasya* ||

[24] *Tantrālokaviveka* 3.64: *nātha tvayā vinā bimbaṃ svacche svātmani darśitam* | *prasenā darpaṇenaiva prabhāvādbhāvamaṇḍalam* ||

the kingdom), or a local protective deity. She acknowledges the king, rewards his meritorious deeds, predicts the future greatness of his dynasty, and thereby endorses his right to rule. Sometimes this appears to imply that the succession was irregular, in doubt, or even contested. For example, in the *Harṣacarita* of Bāṇa, Rājyalakṣmī emerges from a divine sword called Aṭṭahāsa[25] that Puṣyabhūti/Puṣpabhūti[26] had won by assisting his Śaiva teacher Bhairavācārya in a *Vetāla* summoning.[27]

[25] The *aṭṭahāsa* is Śiva's wild laughter, the brightness and shape of his teeth serve here as a likeness for the sword. A doctrinal etymology (*nirvacana*) deriving as "eightfold laughter" (*aṣṭa* > *aṭṭa*) is given at *Bhairavamaṅgalā* 46-47ab: *mahābhairavadevasya ramane mātṛmaṇḍale / rabhasād utthitaṃ nādaṃ bhīṣaṇam atibhairavaṃ* // *aṣṭadhā hasito yasmād aṭṭahāsaṃ prakīrtitaṃ*, "The fearsome, terrible sound, suddenly bursting from Mahābhairava in the carousing circle of the Mothers is called *aṭṭahāsa*, because it is an eightfold laughter." Kauṇḍinya *ad Pāśupatasūtra* 1.8 explains the *aṭṭahāsa* laughter that is performed by Pāśupata ascetics as "a roaring (or snorting) performed with the throat and puckered lips": *tad atra hasitaṃ nāma yad etat kaṇṭhoṣṭhapuṭavisphūrjanaṃ yenāṭṭahāsaḥ kriyate tad dhasitam.* The same is paraphrased at *Sarvadarśanasaṃgraha Nakulīśapāśupatadarśanam* p. 169: *atra hasitaṃ nāma kaṇṭhoṣṭhapuṭavis phūrjanapuraḥsaramahahetyaṭṭahāsaḥ.* It is possible that *Timirodghāṭana* 1.15cd is paraphrasing *aṭṭahāsa* as the "cackling laugh" of Bhairava: *hasan{taṃ} kilakilāyantaṃ mahābhīmo ‹'›ṭṭahāsitam*. The *Aṃśumadāgama* 64.46cd describes it as a "loud guttural sound": *aṭṭahāsollasadvaktraṃ ghargharonmukharasvanam*. Outside of these Pāsupata or Śaiva works, the *Anargharāghavapañcikā* commentary 6.37 glosses it as an "excessive laugh indicating wrath", *aṭṭahāsaḥ = atihāsaḥ krodhānubhāvaḥ.* The *Bhāvapradyotinī ad Mahāvīracarita* 1.45 as a "dry (rasping) laugh", *āṭṭahāsāḥ śuṣkahāsāḥ "aṭṭas tv aṭṭālake pūre bhṛśaśuṣke tvayaṃ triṣu" iti Ratnamālā;* and later as a "laugh causing a flush", *Bhāvapradyotinī ad Mahāvīracarita* 3.28: *"aṭṭahāso mahānhāso mukharāgādikṛt" ity abhidhānavidaḥ.*

[26] Bakker (Bakker 2007) notes that therefore this dynasty is believed to have acquired its legitimacy and authority thanks to the magic of the Śaiva ascetic Bhairavācārya.

[27] On *Vetāla*s see Dezső 2010.

Since a sword is one of the reflective substrates in which a *prasenā* may appear, it seems likely that Bāṇa is deliberately implying a connection between this goddess and a *prasenā*. The initial manifestation of the goddess is described as follows:

> Thereafter he saw, all of a sudden, a flood of moonlight, and he smelled the fragrance of a night lily pad blossoming in autumn. Suddenly he heard the tinkling of anklets, and he trained his eyes to [the source of] the sound.[28]

This particular combination of seeing, hearing, and smelling was an important factor in the emergence of a *prasenā* too, for these sensory aspects of the vision are affirmed even in the invocatory mantra of the *Tantrasadbhāva* given below: "I see your body, I hear [you] clearly, I myself can smell [you]."[29] These literary sources highlight the brightness of the *prasenā*, who appears as a radiant female dressed in white, while Śaiva sources invoke *prasenā*s with Vidyās of the ferocious Goddess Caṇḍikā, who in the *Tantrasadbhāva* is given the epithets "red one" (*rāktā*, *piṅgalī*).

To proceed, we need to first distinguish two separate levels in the Śaiva textual engagement with *prasenā*s; that of the revealed Śaiva scriptures, and that of the exegetical works. In the latter we find a nearly complete disregard of *prasenā* divination. Abhinavagupta's *Tantrāloka*, for example, does not mention it—even in contexts where it might be appropriate, such as the theorisation of the *pratibimbavāda*—, and his commentator Jayaratha does so only in a simile. On the side of the revealed scriptures, on the other hand, *prasenā*s are attested already in the third chapter of the *Niśvāsaguhya* and continue to be a topos in later works too. Several of these primary

---

[28] *Harṣacarita* p. 52: *anantaram ca sahasaivātibahalāṃ jyotsnāṃ* (p. 53) *dadarśa, śaradi vikasatāṃ kamalavanānām iva ca ghrāṇāvalepinam āmodam ajighrat.* (2) *jhaṭiti ca nūpuraśabdam aśṛṇot. vyāpārayām āsa ca śabdānusāreṇa dṛṣṭim.*

[29] Mantra before *Tantrasadbhāva* 9.375: *…asvakāyaṃ paśyāmi bāḍhaṃ śṛṇomi svayaṃ jighrāmi….*

sources remain unedited, or are inaccessible by virtue of their *aiśa* language and syntax.[30]

How then, does the *Mantramārga* accommodate *prasenā* divination?

The sequel attempts to show that the early Śaivasiddhānta set a pattern for inclusion of *prasenā*s, which presumably were judged to be heterodox practices, and how the Trika followed suit. The more radical *Jayadrathayāmala*, by way of contrast, accorded *prasenā*s a more expanded role. The Trika's indebtedness raises the texthistorical question of the intertextuality between the *Niśvāsa* corpus, the *Svacchandatantra* and the Trika's *Tantrasadbhāvatantra*. Sanderson has demonstrated extensive borrowings from the *Niśvāsa* corpus into the *Svacchandatantra* and from there into the *Tantrasadbhāvatantra.* So far, we have discovered no evidence of any material making its way from the *Niśvāsaguhya* into the *Tantrasadbhāva* either directly, or by way of some source other than the *Svacchandatantra*. Since discrete textual passages concerning *prasenā*s are however present in the both the *Niśvāsaguhya* and the *Tantrasadbhāvatantra* it is important to determine whether these reveal any evidence of textual dependence. The precise nature of the intertextuality between these Śaiva scriptures therefore has wide-ranging implications for the historical relationship and the doctrinal dependencies between the early *Trika*, the early *Śaivasiddhānta*, and the traditions of the *Dakṣiṇasrotas* preserved in the *Svacchandatantra*.[31] The earliest Śaiva Tantras are not the only textual sources of relevance to this question. Accounts of *prasenā*s, occasionally even detailed cycles of worship, such as the *Prasenācakreśvarīvidhāna* of the *Jayadrathayāmala*, recur in later Śaiva and Śākta works, and evidently not all of these can be directly derived from the *Niśvāsa* corpus. It is further possible that other, now no longer traceable, early *Mantramārga* sources may have existed. This possibility

[30] The present study addresses this issue by providing an edition, translation and discussion of a part of the *Tantrasadbhāva*'s ninth chapter.

[31] A fuller evaluation will have to wait until the Nepalese recension of the *Svacchandatantra* has been edited.

is made more likely by the existence of a substantial body of Buddhist *Mantranaya* materials concerning *pratisenā*s, first surveyed in Orofino (Orofino 1994), some of which have identifiable parallels with the Śaiva materials.

What form does the Śaiva appropriation of *prasenā* divination take?

A preliminary, composite account is found in Smith (Smith 2006: 421ff.) who bases himself on unpublished materials provided by Sanderson. As Smith notes, in the most common case Śaiva mantras are used to induce a benign trance (*svasthāveśa*) in a young girl or boy who then acts as a medium. To demonstrate how brief the instructions can be we can look at a late (12th cent.?) Saiddhāntika scripture, the *Bṛhatkālottara*, that teaches a paradigmatic procedure:

> *Bṛhatkālottara* N1 = NAK 1-273, fol. 321v:[32]
> ***raktoṣṭhi***[33] ***mātaṅgi***[34] ***bhūtamātṛ avatara 2 ehi ādarś[ā]darś[ā]vahi cauraṃ gṛhṇāpaya enam***[35]. *anena mantre[ṇa] kumārīdvaya[sya] mūrdhni puṣpāṇy āmantraṇadine*[36] *deyāni. dvitīye 'hni madhyāhnasamaye snātvā śucinottara*[37]*mukhenāmladravyeṇa*[38] *svamaṃtreṇa svavāmāṅguṣṭhaṃ vimardya tad anu ghanālaktakenopalipya bhūyaḥ sa*[39] *kumārīdvayasyānena mantreṇa śirasi puṣpāṇi dattvāṅguṣṭhaṃ darśayet. cauraṃ kathayati.*
>
> [The mantra is:] **O Red-lipped one! O Mātaṅgī! O mother of the ghosts! Descend! Descend! Come! Show, show! Bring the thief!**[40] **Seize him!** With this mantra flowers should be offered to the head of two virgins on the day of summoning. Purified after bathing at noon on the second day, facing north, one should rub one's own left thumb with *amla* [oil while

---

32 *raktoṣṭhi*] *em.*, *raktoṣṭhī* N1

33 *mātaṅgi*] *em.*, *mātaṃgī* N1

34 *bhūtamātṛ*] *em.*, *bhūtobhaï* N1

35 *enam*] *conj.*, *eṣāṃ* N1

36 *āmantraṇadine*] *em.* Sanderson, *amaṃtraṇāṃ dine* N1

37 *śucinottara*] *em.* Sanderson, *śucinondharā* N1

38 *dravyeṇa svamaṃtreṇa*] *em.*, *dravyeṇāsvamaṃtreṇa* N1

39 *bhūyaḥ sa*] *conj.*, *bhūyasā* N1

40 Reading as *ādarśa* + *ādarśa* + *āvahi* (*aiśa* imperative 2nd sg.) It would also be possible to interpret this as *ādarśāvahi* and take it as an *aiśa* opt. 1st pers. dual. ātm: "May you two see!"

> reciting] one's own mantra. Thereafter one should smear it with thick lac and abundantly offer flowers to the head of the two virgins and show them the thumb.[41] [One of them] tells of the theft.

The ritual has here evolved into a two day affair and the main aim remains the detection of a theft. The mantra, if it is not corrupt, seems to imply a female thief. In the *phalaśruti* in the *Tridaśaḍāmarāpratyaṅgirā*[42] too, we also find the *prasenā* closely associated with the power of *satyakathana*, "truth-saying": *lakṣajāpena vidhinā pātālaṃ tu rasātalam | prasenā satyakathana*[*ṃ*] *tathā vidhvaṃsamāraṇam*, "After one hundred thousand repetitions [of the mantra one masters] subterranean realms, the *prasenā*, truth-saying, [magical] destruction and murder."

In the *Niśvāsaguhya* and the *Tantrasabhāva*, on the other hand, the original idea of finding thieves is missing. Instead, *prasenā*s have been co-opted to support the prognostications required when an initiation (*dīkṣā*) has failed to yield the desired results. The instructions are added as an appendix to the ritual of initiation as a secondary method to be attempted is the usual dream divination has not yielded any results.

Niśvāsaguhya 3.24–27[43]

> *śubhāśubhaṃ na dṛṣṭaṃ tu svapne vai sādhakena tu |*
> *prasīnāṅ kārayet tatra japtvā ayutam*[44] *uttamam* || 3:24||
> OṂ CAṆḌIKE KRAMA *2 ṭhaṭha*[45] | *caṇḍimantro 'yam*[46] |

---

[41] The conjecture *bhūyaḥ sa* for *bhūyasā* attempts to introduce a nom. subject, but perhaps we should emend rather to *aṅguṣṭho darśyeta* (causative passive optative). Alternatively it may even be permissible for a text like the *Bṛhatkālottara* to admit an instrumental agent with non-passive verb.

[42] NGMCP B 173/22, NAK 3-30 (etext entered by the staff of Muktabodha under the supervision of M.S.G. Dyczkowski) fol. 11 *recto*.

[43] The constituted text reflects the editorial stage it had reached at the TIWET conference in Hamburg in 2010.

[44] *aiśa* hiatus.

[45] *ṭhaṭha* is shorthand/code for the mantra inflection SVĀHĀ, see Rāghavabhaṭṭa on *Śāradātilaka* 10:109b.

[46] The completed mantra is therefore: OṂ CAṆḌIKE KRAMA KRAMA SVĀHĀ.

caṇḍimantraṃ tu yo japtvā tailālaktakasaṃyutam || 3:25||
aṅguṣṭhaṃ mrakṣayed vāmaṃ tailaṃ caivābhimantrayet |
dārikāñ ca kumārañ ca mukhaṃ prakṣālya vīkṣayet || 3:26||
tilataṇḍulabhakṣantau paśyantau yat tu cintitam |
tato dṛṣṭvā ca śrutvā ca sādhayen mantrasattamam[47] || 3:27||

But, if the *sādhaka* does not see any auspicious or inauspicious sign in his dream, he should invoke a Prasīnā by reciting at least[48] ten thousand times. OṂ CAṆḌIKE KRAMA KRAMA SVĀHĀ. This the mantra of Caṇḍī [that must be used]. After reciting the mantra of Caṇḍī he should mix oil and lac[49] and [then] smear his thumb while mantrically empowering the oil.[50] After washing the faces of a boy and a girl he should make them look [at the thumb]. Eating[51] sesame and rice they see what the problem is.[52] After [they have seen [it, the *sādhaka*,] hearing [it from them], should master the best of mantras.[53]

Tantrasadbhāva 9.375–379

The ninth chapter of the *Tantrasadbhāva*, which teaches the initiatory rite (*samayadīkṣā*[54]) for *samayin* neophytes, the lowest rank in a hierarchy of four initiates, calls these oracular apparitions *prasannā.* They appear again in a secondary, prognosticatory function, to be summoned only if the usual dream prognostication has failed.

---

47 *sattamam*] K *uttama* W.

48 *Uttamam.* I am interpreting this by analogy to the usage of *-uttara* with numbers to express "exceeding".

49 I am interpreting as: *...tailam ālaktaṃ ca saṃyutaṃ [kuryāt].*

50 Awkwardly, the *abhimantrayet* comes last.

51 Perhaps better interpreted as a causative too: "Being fed rice and sesame…"

52 I am interpreting *cintitam* as a synonym for *cintyam.* It could also simply mean whatever was thought about by the *sādhaka*.

53 That is, the boy and girl tell the *sādhaka* what they have seen.

54 *Samayin* initiates undergo an initiation culminating with the laying on of the "Hand of Śiva" (*śivahasta*), cf. *Svāyambhuvasūtrasaṃgraha* 10.12–13. This authorizes the initiate to study Śaiva scriptures and binds him to post-initiatory vows called *samaya*s. The usual progression from this initiatory level is the stage of being a *putraka.*

athānyat[55] *saṃpravakṣyāmi prasannāvidhim uttamam* | [fol. N_1 52^r, N_2 96^v]
[*prakṛtiḥ*:] OṂ NAMAŚ CAṆḌIKĀYAI YOGAVĀHINI PRAVARTTA PRAVARTTA
MAHĀMOHAYA MOHAYA[56] YOGAMUKHI[57] YOGEŚVARI MAHĀMĀYĀDHĀRIṆI[58] HIRI
2 BHŪTAPRIYE SVAKĀYAṂ[59] PAŚYĀMI BĀḌHAṂ ŚṚṆOMI SVAYAṂ JIGHRĀMI[60]
SARVALOKĀNI PAŚYĀMI TURU 2 SĀDHAYA 2 SVĀHĀ ||
rudrasthāne śucir[61] *bhūtvā sahasrā daśa yojayet* ||375||
siddhā[62] *bhavati sā vidyā daśa karmāṇi kārayet* |
candre sūrye 'thavā khaḍge darpaṇe[63] *vātha dīpake* ||376||
aṅguṣṭhe vā ghaṭe[64] *vāpi*[65] *dārikāṃ*[66] *vātha dārakam*[67] |
paśyāpayaty[68] *asaṃdehāt*[69] *tilād*[70] *vā taṇḍulād ataḥ* ||377||
bhūtaṃ[71] *bhavyaṃ*[72] *bhaviṣyaṃ*[73] *ca pṛcchataḥ*[74] *kathayanti*[75] *hi* |
atha vidyāṃ samāvartya rajanyāṃ[76] *svapayec chucihḥ* ||378||
svayam eva prapaśyeta[77] *svapnānte yac chubhāśubham*[78] |

---

55 *anyat*] *em.*, *anyaṃ codd*
56 *mohaya*] N_1N_3, *omitted* N_2
57 *yogamukhi*] N_1N_3, *mogamukhi* N_2
58 *dhāriṇi*] N_2, *dhariṇi* N_1N_3
59 *svakāyaṃ*] N_1N_3, *svakāryaṃ* N_2
60 *śṛṇomi svayaṃ jighrāmi*] *em.*, *śṛṇomi svaya jighrāmi* N_2, *śṛṇomi* N_1N_3,
61 *śucir*] N_1N_3, *śuci* N_2
62 *siddhā*] N_1N_3, *siddha* N_2
63 *darpaṇe*] N_3N_2, *darppaṇo* N_1
64 *ghaṭe*] N_3, *ghaṭo* N_1
65 *vāpi*] $N_1^{pc}N_3$, *vātha* N_1^{ac}
66 *dārikāṃ*] N_1N_3, *dāyikāṃ* N_2
67 *dārakam*] *em.*, *dārakām* $N_1N_2N_3$ (*cf. Tantrasadbhāva* 21.35a: *dārakaṃ dārikāṃ vāpi*)
68 *paśyāpayaty*] N_1N_3, *paśyāmayaty* N_2
69 *asaṃdehāt*] N_3, *asaṃdehān* N_1, *asaṃdahān* N_2
70 *tilād*] *conj.*, *tilām* N_1N_3, *tirlā* N_2
71 *bhūtaṃ*] N_1N_3, *bhūta* N_2
72 *bhavyaṃ*] N_3, *bhāvya°* N_1, *sāvya°* N_2
73 *bhaviṣyaṃ*] N_1N_3, *bhaviṣyaṃś* N_2
74 *pṛcchataḥ*] *conj.*, *pṛcchate codd*
75 *kathayanti*] N_3N_2, *kathayānti* N_1
76 *rajanyāṃ*] *em.*, *rajānyāṃ* N_1N_3, *rajaṃnyā* N_2
77 *prapaśyeta*] N_3N_2, *prapasyeta* N_1
78 *chubhāśubham*] N_3, *chubhācchubham* N_1N_2

[*vikṛtiḥ* 1:]
OṂ RAKTE RAKTĀṄGUṢṬHE[79] UCCHUṢME AVATARA AVATARA PIŚĀCINI KATHAYA KATHAYA[80] KATHĀPAYA KATHĀPAYA[81] SVĀHĀ |
khaḍga -m- ādarśake vātha aṅguṣṭhe vā varānane |
paśyati[82] *kanyakā*[83] *sarvaṃ*[84] *śubhāśubhaṃ*[85] *phalāphalam* ||379|| [N_2 57^r]

[*vikṛtiḥ* 2:]
OṂ PIṄGALI PĀŚUPATI MAHĀVIDYE[86] SVĀHĀ |
eṣā vidyā mahādevi karma kurvati[87] *saptadhā* ||380||

[*vikṛtiḥ* 3:]
OṂ RAKTE VIRAKTE AVATARA 2 MĀTAṄGINI SVĀHĀ |
navavidhaṃ[88] *syād yat karma eṣā vidyā karoti hi* ||381||
saptabhir mantritaṃ hastaṃ kṛtvā svorasi[89] *vinyaset* |
svayam eva hi jānāti mantrasyāsya prabhāvataḥ ||382||

[*vikṛtiḥ* 3:]
OṂ NAMAŚ CAṆḌIKĀYAI AVATARA 2 TURU 2 SVĀHĀ |
sopavāsaḥ[90] *śucir*[91] *bhūtvā aṣṭotkṛṣṭaśataṃ*[92] *japet* |
rātrau svapne tv avatīrya kathayed[93] *yac chubhāśubham* ||383||
[*sāmānyavidhiḥ*:]
sarvāsāṃ caiva vidyānāṃ caṇḍikāgṛham āśritaḥ |
daśasāhasriko jāpyas tataḥ karmāṇi kārayet ||384|| [N_1 52^v]

---

79 *raktāṅguṣṭhe*] N_1N_3, *raktāguṣṭhe* N
80 *kathaya kathaya*] N_2N_3, *kathaya 2* N_1
81 *kathāpaya kathāpaya*] N_3N_2, *kathāpaya 2* N_1
82 *paśyati*] N_1, *paśyanti* N_3N_2
83 *kanyakā* N_1N_3, *kanikās* N_2
84 *sarvaṃ*] N_1N_3, *sarva* N_2
85 *śubhāśubhaṃ*] *em.*, *śubhāśubha°* $N_1N_2N_3$
86 *mahāvidye*] N_1N_3, *mahāvidya* N_2
87 *kurvati*] *conj.* (*aiśa* morphology), *kurvanti codd*
88 *navavidhaṃ*] *em.*, *navavidha* $N_1N_2N_3$
89 *svorasi*] *em.*, *svaurasi* N_2, *saurasi* N_1N_3
90 *sopavāsaḥ*] $N_3N_1^{pc}$ N_2, *sopavāsa* N_1^{ac}
91 *śucir*] N_1N_3, *śuci* N_2
92 *aṣṭotkṛṣṭa°*] N_3, *aṣṭautkṛṣṭa°* N_1N_2
93 *kathayed yac chubhā°*] N_1N_2, *kathayec chubhā°* N_3 *hypometrical*

Now I will reveal another[94] [method of prognostication], the supreme *Prasannā* procedure. [The mantra to be used is:][95]

[Basic ritual:] Oṃ Homage to Caṇḍikā! O bringer of yoga! Come forth! Come forth! Greatly beguile! Beguile! O face/mouth of yoga![96] O mistress of yoga! O supporter of great Māyā! possess! Possess! O beloved of the ghosts/lover of ghosts! I see [your] own body. I clearly hear! I myself can smell. I see all the worlds. Hurry! Hurry! Be successful! Be successful! svāhā! After becoming pure in a Śaiva temple one should recite the mantra ten thousand times. The spell is mastered and enables ten actions. He should make a girl or a boy look[97] at the moon, the sun, [the blade of] a sword, a mirror, a lamp, a thumb, or a pot [of water]. Immediately, or after [feeding them] sesame and rice, they reveal the past, present and future to the questioner. Then he should dismiss the mantra[-deity] and sleep after purifying himself. At the end of his sleep/dreams he will see the positive and negative prognosis himself.

[Inflection 1:] Oṃ! O red one! O red-thumb[ed one]! O crackling one! Descend! Descend! O flesh-eater! Tell! Tell! Make [her/him] tell! Make [her/him] tell! svāhā! In a sword[-blade], in a mirror, or in a thumb, O fair-faced one, the virgin sees all the positive and negative prognosis, the good outcome and the bad.

---

[94] The emendation from *anyaṃ* to *anyat* avoids the potential misunderstanding that other *prasannāvidhi*s have been taught elsewhere in the text. It is possible that *anyaṃ* is to be understood only with the *vidhi*-element of the compound, but such a *sāpekṣasamāsa* would be unclear, violating the cardinal rule of *sugamatva.*

[95] The resolved mantra is: oṃ namaś caṇḍikāyai yogavāhini pravartta pravartta mahāmohaya mohaya yogamukhi yogeśvari mahāmāyādhāriṇi hiri hiri bhūtapriye svakāyaṃ paśyāmi bāḍhaṃ śṝṇomi svayaṃ jighrāmi sarvalokāni paśyāmi turu turu sādhaya sādhaya svāhā!

[96] This could be interpreted as ‘entrance to yoga’, or as ‘foremost in yoga’.

[97] An *aiśa* causative in place of *darśayati*. It does not appear to intend a double causative (on which, see the commentaries to Pāṇini’s *Aṣṭādhyāyī* 1.3.88).

> [Inflection 2:] Oṃ O TAWNY ONE! O CONSORT OF PAŚUPATI! O EXALTED SPELL! SVĀHĀ! This spell, O great goddess, accomplishes seven actions.
>
> [Inflection 3:] Oṃ O RED ONE! O PASSIONLESS ONE! DESCEND! DESCEND! O MĀTAṄGĪ! SVĀHĀ! This spell performs action that is ninefold. After empowering it with seven [repetitions] one should place one's hand on one's own chest, and, by the power of this mantra, one will know [what is sought] oneself.
>
> [Inflection 4:] Oṃ HOMAGE TO CAṆḌIKĀ! DESCEND! DESCEND! HURRY! HURRY! SVĀHĀ! After cleansing himself and abstaining [from food etc.] he should recite [the mantra] one hundred and eight times. Descending at night in a dream [the goddess] will reveal positive and negative prognoses.
>
> [Conclusion:] For all of these spells one should go to a temple of Caṇḍikā, and recite ten thousand times. Afterwards one should have the rites performed.

In 9.376b and in 9.380d the *prasenā* is said to enable or accomplish ten or seven *karma*s respectively. This presumably intends a list comparable to that found in a similar *prasenā* teaching in the *Jayadrathayāmala*:

> Bewitching, attraction, causing hate, killing, driving away etc., paralysing, stupefaction, bestowing courage, warding off of poison and thunderbolts, subduing serpents (or elephants), destruction of enemies, stopping the motion of ships, wagons or machines, or of celestial bodies.[98]

Synoptically, the available evidence now allows the following characterization of the early Śaiva appropriation of *prasenā*s. In the early Śaivasiddhānta *prasenā*s were relegated to a prognosticatory role in support of a more common method of dream divination. They are taught in what can be described as appendices to the ritual of initiation. This function was maintained and elaborated on with more options

[98] *Jayadrathayāmala*'s *Indīvarīkālīvidhi*, 2.17: *vaśyākarṣaṇavidveṣam āraṇoccāṭanādikam / stambhaṃ stobhaṃ tathotsāhaṃ viṣāśaninivāraṇam / nāganigraham atyugraṃ ripucakravighātanam / nāvāśakaṭayantrāṇāṃ stambhanaṃ divyasaṃtateḥ / siddhyanty akleśato devi yogamārgān na saṃśayaḥ.* I am interpreting *divyasaṃtati* here as "celestial bodies".

in the Trika's *Tantrasadbhāvatantra.* In addition, the *Tantrasadbhāva* also sees *prasenā*s as capable of effecting other, destructive, ritual *karma*s. If we compare the textual passages it seems unlikely that the *Tantrasadbhāva*'s *prasenā* teachings are direct rewordings of the material found in the *Niśvāsaguhya*. Other sources must be assumed. It seems even likely that the four inflections of the basic ritual derive from (four?) different scriptures. The *Svacchandatantra*, at least in its Kashmirian recension, lacks any reference to *prasenā*s, it cannot, in this case, have been the intermediary between the *Niśvāsaguhya* and the *Tantrasadbhāvatantra.* Even though we therefore cannot, with the present evidence, establish a direct textual link between the *prasenā* material found in the *Niśvāsaguhya* and the *Tantrasadbhāvatantra*, it is nevertheless clear that the *Tantrasadbhāva* follows exactly the same pattern of including *prasenā*s as an ancillary to the prognostications for failed initiations. In both scriptures *prasenā*s are functionally the same. Neither the chronologically and doctrinally more removed *Bṛhatkālottara* nor the Krama's *Jayadrathayāmala* follow this model. The latter evidences a much richer set of teachings foregrounding *prasenās* as the central deities of their own cycles of worship.

Abbreviations and Sigla:

CDIAL *A Comparative Dictionary of the Indo-Aryan Languages.*

N1 *Tantrasadbhāva*. NAK 5-445 *śaivatantra* 185, accessed through microfilm NGMPP A 44/2, palmleaf, 210 folios. Designated by "G" in Dyczkowski's etext.

N2 *Tantrasadbhāva*. NAK 1-363 *śaivatantra*, accessed through microfilm NGMPP A 44/1, palmleaf 140 folios. Designated by "KH" in Dyczkowski's etext.

N_3 *Tantrasadbhāva*. NAK 5-1985, NGMCP A188/22. Designated by "K" in Dyczkowski's etext.

NAK National Archives Kathmandu, Nepal.

NGMCP Nepal German Manuscript Cataloguing Project.

L *Kalāvilāsa.* India Office Library London, No. 114a, ff. 37, Devanāgarī, dated *saṃvat* 1725.

P *Kalāvilāsa.* Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute Poona, No. 65, 24 of 1873–74, ff. 21, Jaina Devanāgarī dated *saṃvat* 1931.

Q *Kalāvilāsa.* Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute Poona, No. 66, 373 of 1887–91, ff. 22–34, *sarga*s 5–10, Devanāgarī, undated.

conj. conjecture
corr. correction
em. emendation
om. omitted
<no.> supplies no. of *akṣara*s missing
+++ illegible *akṣara*s
x → y citation ranges from x to y

Primary Sources:

Anargharāghavapañcikā. Viṣṇubhaṭṭaviracitā Anargharāghavapañcikā. The commentary of Viṣṇubhaṭṭa on the Anargharāghava of Murāri. (2 volumes). A critical edition by Harinarayana Bhat. Institut Français de Pondichéry/ École Française d'Extrême-Orient. 1998. Publications du département d'indologie n°82.

Bakker, H. 2007. Thanesar, the Pāśupata Order and the Skandapurāṇa. Studies in the Skandapurāṇa IX. In: *Journal of Indological Studies 19* (2007), 1–16.

Bhairavamaṅgalā. NAK pam. 687 Śaivatantra 144 (NGMPP B27/21), ninth century palmleaf manuscript in Licchavi script.

Bṛhatkathāmañjarī of Kṣemendra. Ed. Śivadatta and Kāśīnāth Pāṇḍuraṅg Parab. Kāvyamālā 69. Bombay: Pāṇḍuraṅg Jāwajī, 1931.

Bṛhatkālottara. NAK MS 4-139, NGMCP A 43/1: palm-leaf; Pāla script; 1161 CE.

Harṣacarita. Bāṇa, Śaṅkara and Alois Anton Führer. *Śrīharṣacaritamahākāvyam*, *Bâṇabhaṭṭa's Biography of King Harshavardhana of Sthâṇîśvara*, *with Śaṅkara's commentary*, *Saṅketa.* Edited with critical notes by A.A. Führer. Text and commentary. Bombay Sanskrit and Prakrit Series, No. LXVI. Bombay: Government Central Press, 1909.

Jayadrathayāmala. Ṣaṭka 2. NAK MS 5-4650, NGMCP B 153/3: paper; Nepalese Devanāgarī; 1925 CE copied from a palm-leaf exemplar.

Kapphiṇābhyudaya or King Kapphiṇa's Triumph. A Ninth Century Kashmiri Buddhist Poem. By Michael Hahn. Edited by Yusho Wakahara. Institute of Buddhist Cultural Studies, Ryukoku University, Kyoto, 2007.

Mahāvīracaritaṃ. Mahākaviśrībhavabhūtipraṇītam; *Vīrarāghavakṛtayā Bhāvapradyotinīvyākhyayā samalaṃkṛtam = Le Mahāvīracarita de Bhavabhūti*; *accompagné du commentaire de Vīrarāghava*; nouvelle édition, traduction de la pièce, notes, François Grimal. Pondichéry: Institut Français, 1989. Publications de l'Institut français d'indologie; no 74.

Niśvāsaguhya. Goodall, Dominic and Acharya, Diwakar. *Niśvāsatattvasaṃhitāyāṃ Guhyasūtram*: unpublished draft edition based on three manuscripts: MS N (National Archives of Kathmandu (NAK) accession no. 1-277, Nepal-German Manuscript Preservation Project (NGMPP) microfilm reel no. A 41/14, palm-leaf, 9th century?), MS K (NAK 5-2406, NGMPP reel no. A 159/18, paper apograph of N, 20th century), MS W (Wellcome Institute Sanskrit MS I 33, paper apograph of N, 20th century), 2010.

Pāśupatasūtra. Pāśupatasūtra (*=Pañcārtha*) *with the commentary* (*Pañcārthabhāṣya*) *of Bhagavat Kauṇḍinya*, ed. R. Anantakrishna Sastri. Trivandrum Sanskrit Series 143. Trivandrum: University of Travancore, 1940.

Sarvadarśanasaṃgraha. Sarvadarśanasaṃgraha of Sāyaṇa-Mādhava with a Sanskrit commentary by Vasudev Shastri Abhyankar, ed. T. G. Mainkar. 3rd edition. Government Oriental Series A1. Poona: BORI, 1978.

Svacchandatantra with the commentary (*Svacchandoddyota*) *of Rājānaka Kṣemarāja*, ed. Madhusūdan Kaul Śāstrī. KSTS 31, 38, 44, 48, 51, 53, 56. Bombay, 1921–35.

Svāyambhuvasūtrasaṃgraha. ed. Veṅkaṭasubrahmaṇyaśāstrī, Mysore: Rājakīyaśākhāmudrālaya, 1937.

Śāradātilaka. Śāradātilaka of Lakṣmaṇadeśika with the commentary (*-padārthādarśa*) *of Rāghavabhaṭṭa*, ed. [Sir John George Woodroffe] Arthur Avalon. Reprint. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1982. First published in 1933 as Tantrik Text Series 17, Madras: Ganesh & Co.

Tantrāloka of Abhinavagupta with the commentary (*-viveka*) *of Rājānaka Jayaratha.* ed. Mukund Rām Śāstrī. KSTS 23, 28, 30, 35, 29, 41, 47, 59, 52, 57, 58. Bombay and Srinagar, 1918-38.

Timirodghāṭana. NAK MS 5-690, NGMCP A 35/3: palm-leaf; Licchavi script.

Tridaśaḍāmarāpratyaṅgirā. NGMCP B 173/22, NAK 3-30 & etext entered by the staff of Muktabodha under the supervision of M.S.G. Dyczkowski.

Secondary Sources:

Acharya, D. 2007. The Original *Paṇhavāyaraṇa / Praśnavyākaraṇa* Discovered*. In: *International Journal of Jaina Studies* (*Online*). Vol. 3, No. 6 (2007) 1–10.

Dezső, C. 2010. Encounters with *Vetālas*. In: *Acta Orientalia*, 63(4), 391–426. doi:10.1556/AOrient.63.2010.4.1

Gray, D. B. 2007. *The Cakrasamvara Tantra* (*The Discourse of Śrī Heruka*): *A Study and Annotated Translation.* Treasury of the Buddhist Sciences Series. New York: American Institute of Buddhist Studies and Columbia University Press.

Hōbōgirin. Paul Demiéville, 1929–30 (fasc. 1–2); Paul Demiéville, 1974 (fasc. 3); Jacques May, 1967 (fasc. 4); Jacques May, 1979 (fasc. 5). *Hôbôgirin. Dictionnaire encyclopédique du Bouddhisme d'après les sources chinoises et japonaises*.

Kirde, S. 2002. *Bibliographie zur Bodhisattvāvadānakalpalatā des Kṣemendra**. In: D. Dimitrov, U. Roesler and R. Steiner (Eds). *Śikhisamuccayaḥ. Indian and Tibetan Studies.* (Wiener Studien zur Tibetologie und Buddhismuskunde. Heft 53). Wien: 109-128.

Orofino, G. 1992. Divination with Mirrors, observations on a simile found in the Kālacakra literature. In: *Tibetan Studies*, *Proceedings of the 6th Seminar of the the International Association for Tibetan Studies*, Fagernes 1992, Oslo, vol. 2: 612–28.

Pike, J. B. 1938. *Frivolities of courtiers*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Smith, F. M. 2006. *The Self Possessed*: *Deity and Spirit Possession in South Asian Literature and Civilization*, New York: Columbia University Press.

Strickmann, M. 1996. *Mantras et Mandarins*: *Le Bouddhisme tantrique en Chine*. Paris: Gallimard.

Strickmann, M. 2002. *Chinese Magical Medicine*, Stanford: Stanford University Press

Turner, Sir R. L. 1966. *A Comparative Dictionary of the Indo-Aryan Languages*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 1966.

Yokochi, Y. 2012. Triumph of Buddhism or Śaivism?: A Study in the ninth century Kashmirian poem Kapphiṇābhyudaya. In: *Journal of Indian and Buddhist studies.* The Japanese Association of Indian and Buddhist Studies. 2012. Volume 60. Number 3: 1153–1160.