Adapting Śaiva Tantric Initiation for Exoteric Circles: The *Lokadharmiṇī Dīkṣā* and Its History in Early Medieval Sources

Nina Mirnig

1 Introduction

A consistent concern in the study of early Śaivism is to understand the scope of the clientele texts were written for, and how representative this literature was of practices on the ground at given times. The methodological limitations we face in exploring this largely prescriptive body of literature in relation to actual practice are notorious. Yet, in his seminal works on Śaiva religious history, Alexis Sanderson developed groundbreaking insights into the socio-religious and political landscape in which the surviving texts were produced, reconstructing processes that led to the dominant position of Śaivism in the medieval Indic world. Thanks to his pioneering research, and that of other scholars who have taken up the subject in the wake of his work, our understanding of the relative chronology of Śaiva scriptures and medieval authors has also greatly improved.¹ This increasingly enables us to investigate these materials historically, and thus to pursue questions of a socio-historical nature, which are at the heart of Sanderson's work. In his own words (Sanderson 2005, 230),

[...] it is possible, I would say necessary, to read the literature and inscriptions with the sort of questions in mind that a social historian would wish to ask.

For this felicitation volume, the present article is intended as a small contribution of this kind, applying a social-historical approach to a certain form of Śaiva initiation, namely the *lokadharmiṇī dīkṣā*. In essence, this denotes a form of initiation that is compatible with maintaining one's socio-religious and ritual obligations in society—the *lokadharma*.

¹ See, e.g., Goodall 1997, xxxvi–lxxvi, and the preface and introduction to Goodall 2004, as well as Sanderson 2001 and 2014.

Scholars familiar with tantric traditions know well that initiation (*dīkṣā*) is one of the core tantric rituals. As Goodall explains, tantric initiation was novel and different from earlier Indic forms of religious initiation, being not only “a preparation for a particular religious undertaking, but ... also a transformative rite that purifies the soul.”² This purification is achieved through an innovative ritual technology, using the power of mantras to destroy an individual's *karmas* and connected rebirths at all reality levels (*tattvas*). This enables the Śaiva Guru to free the bound soul of all ties, and to guide the candidate to a cosmic level where he can either realize liberation through union with the highest form of Śiva, if he is a liberation seeker (*mumukṣu*), or attain divine powers, if he is a seeker of supernatural powers and enjoyments (*bubhukṣu*). As such, tantric initiation confers spiritual benefits to the candidate *a priori* to his practice. It is thus arguably the most powerful tantric rite, designed in principle for practitioners who intend to devote their lives to the religion, as was probably the case in its original setting of esoteric, probably ascetic, circles.

At the same time, we know from history that tantric Śaivism did not remain confined to the margins of society, but emerged as a religious movement which successfully interfaced with the mainstream, and gradually came to dominate the religious and socio-political discourse of the early medieval Indic world.³ As one would expect, this development is reflected in ritual and in changes to the constitution of the initiatory community, which by then encompassed not only ascetic practitioners fully devoted to Śaiva religious practice, but also brahmanical householders. The increasing engagement with the mainstream led to the creation of exoteric forms of initiation, including versions that would confer spiritual benefits without requiring the candidate to adopt a purely Śaiva ritual lifestyle. The most well-known example is the *nirbījā dīkṣā* (“initiation without the seed [of having to perform post-initiatory rites]”), which offers the candidate the highest soteriological goal of ultimate liberation at the time of death. However, according to the scriptures, such an initiation was only granted in special cases, namely when the candidates were considered unable to perform any kind of post-initiatory practice for special reasons. The list of such people classically comprises the king, but also the old, the young, the sick, and women.⁴

2 See Goodall's entry on *dīkṣā* in *Tāntrikābhīdhānakośa*, vol. III.

3 See, e.g., Sanderson 2009.

4 See, e.g., *Svacchanda*, 4.88, as quoted by Goodall in his entry on *nirbījadīkṣā* in *Tāntrikābhīdhānakośa*, vol. III.

The other, lesser-known form of exoteric initiation is the *lokadharmiṇī dīkṣā*, which forms the subject of this paper. This term translates as “the initiation which contains/adheres to the *lokadharmā*,” the *lokadharmā* denoting the sphere of observance that Śaiva sources consistently define as the exoteric religion of *śruti* and *smṛti*, that is to say the domain of the brahmanical householder.⁵ Unlike the *nirbījā*, access to the *lokadharmiṇī* initiation is not limited to specific groups, and in its original context, the initiation is mainly benefit-oriented: a *lokadharmī* initiate is said to pursue mundane spiritual goals before attaining some kind of divine status. He does so by means of the merit procured through lay worship, and not through Śaiva rites that require the propitiation of mantras. This seemingly antithetical initiatory category is little discussed by Śaiva authors, probably precisely because of the doctrinal implications of such an initiation, which foregrounds a level of practice and spiritual goals that Śaivas claim to surpass. In the course of time, the *lokadharmiṇī* initiation underwent several shifts in application. These developments are deeply entangled with the complex history of the system of initiatory categories, which was subject to processes of division and reassignment reflecting local and historical circumstances. A historical investigation into this form of exoteric Śaiva initiation therefore touches upon the larger issue of how tantric initiatory communities related to the brahmanical mainstream, at various stages, after their emergence from esoteric ascetic circles.

The first part of the paper investigates the *lokadharmiṇī* in its original setting, as an initiation for Sādhakas, first by surveying the available sources and then by contextualizing them in the socio-religious setting of tantric Śaivism’s early stages. The second part will examine how this category of exoteric *bubhukṣu* initiation is subsequently re-assigned to the sphere of the *mumukṣu*, thus becoming integrated into the Śaiva soteriological path, especially in the *Jaya-drathayāmala*. The third section looks into the usage of the *lokadharmī* category in the ritual manuals of the 11th–13th centuries, particularly sources from the South, tracing how in some works, notably the *Jñānaratnāvalī*, there is another shift in usage: the *lokadharmiṇī dīkṣā* comes to denote a regular Śaiva initiation for the householder, as opposed to the ascetic, who receives a *śivadharmiṇī dīkṣā*. The final section reflects upon how the initiatory category of the *lokadharmiṇī* fits within the larger context of tantric Śaivism’s development in medieval India.

5 For an example, see Kṣemarāja *ad Svacchanda* 4.85: *lokamārgaḥ śrutismṛtyācāraḥ ...*, also quoted in note 10.

2 The Original *lokadharmiṇī dīkṣā* as a Form of Sādhaka Initiation: Sources and Mechanics

The earliest sources that mention a *lokadharmiṇī dīkṣā*—always as the counterpart of the *śivadharmiṇī dīkṣā*—feature it as a form of Sādhaka initiation⁶ in the domain of the *bubhuṅṣu*, i.e. the seeker of power and enjoyment, as opposed to the liberation-seeker (*mumukṣu*). The first extant text to feature the *lokadharmiṇī* is the *Svacchanda*. In its fourth chapter, dedicated in its entirety to initiation, the text gives an overview of all the initiation categories, dividing the initiatory community into *mumukṣus* and *bubhuṅṣus*. The former may receive either a *sabījā* or *nirbījā* initiation, and the latter a *śivadharmiṇī* or *lokadharmiṇī* initiation.⁷ Of these, the *śivadharmī* Sādhaka is the Śaiva Sādhaka proper, who through initiation gains the ability to propitiate Śaiva mantras in order to attain benefits and supernatural powers, while the *lokadharmī* Sādhaka is his exoteric counterpart, seeking enjoyments and spiritual benefits through mundane religious acts rather than mantras:

The Sādhaka is of two kinds. On the one hand, there is the *śivadharmī*, for whom the cosmic path is purified by Śaiva mantras and who is yoked to [particular] mantras that are to be mastered; he is knowledgeable, consecrated [to office], and devoted to the propitiation of mantras. This Śaiva Sādhaka is capable [of mastering] the threefold supernatural powers.⁸ The second [kind of Sādhaka] adheres to the mundane path and

6 Brunner, in her 1975 paper dedicated to the figure of the Sādhaka, also outlines many of the general features of the Śaiva Sādhaka's initiation and practice thereafter. She does, however, not treat the *lokadharmiṇī* kind of initiation at length.

7 *Svacchandatantra* 4. 79b–81b: *atha dīkṣādhvaśuddhyartham bhuktimuktiphalarthīnām || vi-dhānam ucyate sūkṣmaṃ pāśavicchittikāraṇam | guruḥ saṃprcchate śiṣyaṃ dvividhaṃ phalākāṅkṣiṇam || phalam ākāṅkṣase yādṛk tādṛk sādhanam ārabhe*, “Next there is the initiation for the purpose of the purification of the cosmic path (*adhvan*) for those who seek the fruit of [either] enjoyment or liberation. The subtle method that causes the cutting of the bonds is explained. The Guru asks the candidate seeking benefits [about] the two-fold [option]. Whatever fruit he desires, accordingly he should start the propitiation of Mantras.”

8 This may be a reference to the old classification of *siddhis* into three kinds, which goes back to early sources such as the *Niśvāsa* and Buddhist Kriyātantras, as Goodall (2014, 16 and 80–82) discusses. Thus, in the *Niśvāsa* Guhyasūtra three levels of *siddhi* can be attained after preparing some potion. Which kind of *siddhi* has been obtained can be deduced from the manifestation of heat, if the power is to cover great distances on foot, the manifestation of smoke if he is to have the power to disappear, and the manifestation of flames if he is to have the power to walk through the sky (Goodall 2013, 81). For more on *siddhi*-practices in Tantric Śaivism, see Vasudeva 2012.

is devoted to the performance of good and meritorious works (*iṣṭāpūrtavidhau*); desiring the fruits produced by [his] *karma*, he abides solely [devoted to] meritorious [*karma*], free of the unmeritorious. [The Guru] should always perform the destruction of the unmeritorious portion [of the candidate's *karma*] with mantras.⁹

Kṣemarāja, in his commentary, further specifies that meritorious acts in the case of the *lokadharmī* consist of bathing at sacred places, providing food and building wells, tanks and monasteries.¹⁰ These are precisely the kinds of religious activity that we would expect of an ordinary lay worshipper. As we see in this passage, what the *lokadharminī* initiation does is to enhance the initiate's spiritual benefits by destroying bad *karma* connected to all reality levels, leaving only good *karma* and its positive outcomes in place.

This function of the *lokadharminī dikṣā* is reiterated later in the chapter, when the text explains how the two kinds of *bubhukṣu* initiations differ from that of the *mumukṣu*. These differences concern two points:¹¹ firstly, the portion of *karma* that is purified and thus removed for the candidate; and second, the cosmic level at which the candidate is united with the respective deity upon initiation's conclusion:

Next, he should then bring about destruction of the past and future *karma* for the liberation-seeker (*mumukṣu*), because of his indifference [to the world]. He should not purify the one [part of *karma*] that is the *prārabdha* [*karma*], [which fuels his present existence]. But for the Sādhaka, *he should purify [only] one [part of the] past karma for the purpose of power*,¹² and having manifested the past and future *karma* together (*ekastham*), he should initiate [the candidate]. This is the *śivadharminī dikṣā*. The

9 Svachchanda 4.83–86b: *sādhako dvididhaḥ tatra śivadharmy ekataḥ sthitaḥ | śivamantra-viśuddhādhvā sādhyamantranīyojitaḥ || jñānavāñ cābhiṣiktaś ca mantrārādhanaatparaḥ | trividhāyāḥ tu siddher vai so 'trārhaḥ śivasādhakaḥ || dvitīyo lokamārgastha iṣṭāpūrtavidhau rataḥ | karmakṛt phalam ākāṅkṣaṇ śubhaikastho 'śubhojjhitaḥ || tasya kāryaṁ sadā mantrair aśubhāṁśavināśanam |*

10 Kṣemarāja *ad Svachchanda* 4.85: *lokamārgaḥ śrutismṛtyācāraḥ. iṣṭaṁ tīrthasnānānnadānādi. pūrtaṁ kūpaṭāḍākamaṭhādi*, “The mundane path is the observance according to *śruti* and *smṛti*. The sacred rites (*iṣṭam*) [consist of] such actions as bathing at a sacred site and giving away food. The meritorious acts (*pūrta*) are [the donations and setting up of] such things as wells, tanks and monasteries for ascetics.”

11 See also, Brunner 1975, 417–420.

12 See pp. 254 ff. for a discussion of this problematic passage, here italicized.

other form [of *bubhuṣu* initiation] is the *lokadharmiṇī*, which destroys both past and future demerit. That *lokadharmiṇī* [*dikṣā*] is known to exclude the obligation to propitiate mantras [by means of *purvasevā* etc.]. However, when the current body breaks, [the candidate] experiences [the series of eight supernatural natural powers] starting with becoming very small (*aṇimā*). Having experienced [these] enjoyments he moves upwards to whichever [cosmic level] the Guru has joined him [by *yojanikā*]. Whether this is at the *sakala* or *niṣkala* level [of Śiva] depends on [the preference of] the candidate and Guru.¹³

Thus, we learn that the *lokadharmī* candidate can be united with any deity of any cosmic level at the end of the procedure, and could even choose to be united with the highest, *niṣkala* form of Śiva, a form of union synonymous with the state of ultimate liberation. In addition, while the *lokadharmī* initiate cannot propitiate Śaiva mantras, unlike the *Sādhaka*, he is nevertheless granted supernatural powers, which are usually said to result from mantra practice; the difference is that he experiences these powers after death.

Regarding the *śivadharmiṇī dikṣā*, we note that there is some difficulty interpreting how *karma* is held to be eliminated at this point. As evident from the translation, the problematic phrase is 142ab, *sādhakasya tu bhūtyarthaṃ prākkarmaikaṃ tu śodhayet*; this is supposed to define the difference in procedure from the *nirvāṇadikṣā* of the *mumukṣu*, for whom only *prārabdha karma*, the *karma* that fuels the current life, is to be preserved.¹⁴ Looking at the different treatments of this phrase, we find that commentators disagree on whether or not any additional *karmic* bonds are excluded from purification—and in effect, whether the *dikṣā* of the *Sādhaka* is very close to that of the *mumukṣu* Putraka or not. Kṣemarāja, in his commentary, wants to see a clear difference, and interprets this passage to indicate that two kinds of *karma* are excluded from purification, in case of the *Sādhaka*, namely (1) the *karma* that is necessary for the attainment of supernatural powers (i.e. *bhūtyarthaṃ*), without

13 *Svacchanda* 4.141–145: *prākkarmabhāvikasyātha abhāvaṃ bhāvayet tadā | mumukṣor nira-pekṣatvāt prārabdhṛ ekaṃ na śodhayet || sādhakasya tu bhūtyarthaṃ prākkarmaikaṃ tu śodhayet | prākkarmāgāmi caikasthaṃ bhāvayitvā ca dikṣayet || śivadharmiṇy asau dikṣā lokadharmiṇy ato 'nyathā | prāktanāgamikasyāpi adharmakṣayakāriṇī || lokadharmiṇy asau jñeyā mantrārādhanaavarjitā | prārabdhadehabhede tu bhūṅkte sa hy aṇimādikān || bhogān bhuktvā vrajed ūrdhvaṃ guruṇā yatra yojitaḥ | sakale niṣkale vāpi śiṣyācāryavaśād bhaved ||*.

14 For the *locus classicus* regarding the mechanics of *prārabdha karma*, see *Kiraṇa* 6.20–21, edited and translated in Goodall 1998.

making explicit what that means,¹⁵ and (2) the good portion of the *prārabdha karma*, which ensures the success of the *siddhi* practice by preventing its being blocked by bad *karma*.¹⁶ On the other hand, Abhinavagupta, when adopting this passage in his *Tantrāloka*, as discussed below, drops pādas 142cd and rephrases 142ab as *prākkarmetthaṃ tu śodhayet*, “He should purify the past *karma* in the same way [as in the case for the *mumukṣu*]”—thus indicating that for him, the procedure for the *Sādhaka* is exactly the same as for the *mumukṣu* Putraka, except that the *prārabdha karma* is directed towards supernatural powers rather than liberation. In his commentary on this passage, Jayaratha, in turn, criticizes Kṣemarāja’s reading of *ekam* instead of *itthaṃ*, undermining his understanding that the bad portion of the *prārabdha karma* is destroyed, instead saying that neither is it possible to remove any part of the *prārabdha karma*, since this fuels the current life force, nor does this interpretation have scriptural support.¹⁷ At the same time, he remains silent about the fact that the text teaches the removal of only the bad *karma* in case of the *lokadharmiṇī* *dīkṣā*.¹⁸

- 15 Kṣemarāja *ad Svachchanda* 4.142a (*sādhakasya tu bhūtyarthaṃ*): *bhūtiproyojanaṃ bhāvi-mantrārāadhanarūpaṃ yat tad api na śodhayet ity arthaḥ*, “He should not purify the [portion of *karma*] which is for the future propitiation of mantras for the purpose of supernatural powers; this is the meaning.”
- 16 Kṣemarāja *ad Svachchanda* 4.142b (*prākkarmaikaṃ tu śodhayet*): *bhūtyarthād yat prāg dehārambhi śubhāśubhaṃ tata ekam aśubhaṃ evāsyā śodhayet, evaṃ hi nirvighnaṃ bhogasiddhir bhavati || yat tu janmāntarasamcītaṃ śubhāśubhaṃ yac cāsmiṇ janmani kariṣyati, tat sarvaṃ uktanīyā mantrārāadhanavarjam asya putrakavac chodhyam evety āha*, “For the purpose of supernatural powers, from the past pure and impure [*karma*] that maintains the [current] body (i.e. the *prārabdha karma*) he should only purify the impure [portion] for him, for in this way (*evaṃ*) the achievement of enjoyment comes about without any obstacles. As for the pure and impure [*karma*] that is accumulated in other [past] births and which he will do in a [future] birth, all those should be purified for him according to the proclaimed procedure, like in the case of the Putraka, apart from [those *karmas* for] the propitiation of mantras (*mantrārāadhanavarjam*). Therefore he said, [*prākkarmāgāmi caikasthaṃ bhāvayitvā ca dīkṣayet* (*Svachchanda* 4.142cd)].”
- 17 Jayaratha *ad Tantrāloka* 15.28: *sādhakasya ca itthaṃ eva karmaśodhanaṃ, kiṃ tu tat bhūtyarthaṃ, tasya hi bhogaunmukhyāt tadvāsanābhedaṭ phalabheda iti pratijñāto ‘pi artho nirvāhitaḥ | yad uktaṃ “sādhakasya tu bhūtyarthaṃ prākkarmetthaṃ tu śodhayet | prākkarmāgāmi (corr. Hatley; prākkarmagāmi Ed.) caikasthaṃ bhāvayitvā tu dīkṣayet” iti. atra ca udyotakṛtā yad itthaṃ iti apāsyā ekam iti paṭhitvā dehārambhiśubhāśubhakarmamadyād ekam aśubhaṃ api asyā śodhayet iti vyākhyātaṃ, tad upekṣyam ārabdhakāryadehārambhikarmocchedāśakyatvasya prāgupapāditatvāt kva cid apy evaṃ anāmnātātvaḥ ca*.
- 18 A similar problem of interpretation also occurs in the passage of the *Mrgendra*, which outlines the superior and the inferior *bhautikī dīkṣā*, the former being the *śivadharmiṇī* and the latter the *lokadharmiṇī*. This passage appears to say that for the superior kind, i.e. the *śivadharmiṇī*, along with the *prārabdha karma* some undefined additional *karma* is

Another early source which distinguishes between the *śivadharminī* and *lokadharminī* *dīkṣā* is the *Mr̥gendra*, which was composed after the *Svacchanda*. This scripture maintains the same basic set of categories and organization of initiatory groups, even though it uses slightly different terminology. Thus, instead of referring to initiations for the *mumukṣu* and the *bubhukṣu*, the *Mr̥gendra* uses the terms *naiṣṭhikī* and *bhautikī*,¹⁹ the former of which is divided into the *sāpekṣā* and *nirapekṣā*,²⁰ corresponding to the *sabijā/nirbijā* distinction, and the latter again into *śivadharminī* and *lokadharminī*, for which we find the following description:

preserved for the success of the *siddhi* practice (*śaivasādhanasādhyena*), perhaps similar to Kṣemarāja's *bhūtyartham* category. *Mr̥gendra* 8.1146–148: *evam eva kriyāyogād bhautiky api parāparā | kiṃ tu dehāviyogārthaṃ prārabdhāṃ karma dehinaḥ || śaivasādhanasādhyena saṃdhāya paripālayet | sānubandhaṃ dahed anyad dīpte dīkṣāhutāsane || kaṣṭa-kaṣṭapadāntasthe sādhaḥ pañcakeśvare | yogo 'syātmikadeśinyāṃ anyasyāṃ iṣṭavigrahe ||* (for a translation, see Brunner 1985, 258). However, Bhaṭṭa Nārāyaṇakaṇṭha, commenting on this passage, is against such an interpretation, and rather awkwardly interprets *śaivasādhanasādhyena* to refer to the post-initiatory discipline that the Sādhaka is to carry out, which would seem odd given that such post-initiatory practice is also to be carried out by the *mumukṣu*: ... *prārabdhāṃ karma prārabdhakāryaṃ dehinaḥ jantoḥ dehāviyogārthaṃ śārīrapātasamrakṣārthaṃ śaivasādhanasādhyena samayācārapālanena saṃdhāya saṃyojya paripālayet rakṣayet*. (For a translation, see Brunner 1985, 286).

- 19 That the terms *bhautikī* and *naiṣṭhikī* correspond at this point to the initiations for the *bubhukṣu* and *mumukṣu* respectively, is suggested by the commentary of Nārāyaṇakaṇṭha (*ad Mr̥gendra*, *Kriyāpāda* 2: *niṣṭhā kaivalyam. te bhūtinīṣṭhe prayojanaṃ yayos te tathā. bhautiki bhūtikāmasya. niṣṭhārthino naiṣṭhikī nairvāṇikity arthaḥ*), which also Brunner follows in her translation, translating *bhautikī* as “donneuse de jouissance” and *naiṣṭhikī* as “donneuse de liberation” (Brunner 1985, 199). Further, from later passages it is clear that the *bhautikī* is equated with the Sādhaka; e.g. in *Mr̥gendra*, *Caryāpāda* 11, where the *lokadharminī* is even referred to as a Sādhaka. As such, this division of the *Mr̥gendra* would reproduce the same structure as we found it in the *Svacchanda*; but internally we have to note that the category of the *bhautikī* and the *naiṣṭhikī*, if taken in this manner, don't overlap with what in the *Caryāpāda* of the *Mr̥gendra* is described as *bhautikavratins* and *naiṣṭhikavratins*, as Brunner (1985, 347, note 2) already points out. Thus, here, the *bhautikavratin*, i.e. one who has a temporary *vrata*, and the *naiṣṭhikavratin*, who has a permanent *vrata*, are both opposed to those who have no *vrata* at all (*avrata*), a category which, in turn, includes the *lokadharminī* *sādhaka* featuring under the *bhautikī dīkṣā*. However, it may be that the *Mr̥gendra* is simply not entirely consistent. Interpretative problems appear also in other places regarding the definitions and procedures for the *śivadharminī* and *lokadharminī*, and similarly, perhaps confusion also remains on the *bhautikī* and *naiṣṭhikī* distinction. Goodall also draws attention to the difficulties in interpreting the terms *naiṣṭhika* and *bhautika* in his entry on the term *naiṣṭhika* in *Tāntrikābhidhānaśāstra*, vol. III.

- 20 However, note that in her English summary it seems that Brunner (1985, 481–482) applies the divisions of *sāpekṣā* and *nirapekṣā* to both the *naiṣṭhikī* and *bhautikī*.

The *śivadharmiṇī* [initiation] is the root of success for the fruits of the Śaiva religion for the individual soul. There is another [kind of *śivadharmiṇī*] taught without the destruction of the body, up until the dissolution of the world.²¹ The remaining one is taught to be the *lokadharmiṇī*, for the purpose of [attaining the eightfold supernatural powers] starting with *aṇimā* after the current life, after all the bad portions [of *karma*] were destroyed at all reality levels.²²

While the description of the *śivadharmiṇī* initiation differs somewhat, implying that there are two levels of Śaiva Sādhaka,²³ the explanation of the *lokadharmiṇī* resonates much with what we found in the *Svacchanda*, namely that all bad *karma* is destroyed and the initiate attains supernatural powers after death. Regarding the end point of union for the *lokadharmī* candidate, the *Mṛgendra* offers a choice similar to that of the *Svacchanda*, namely that the candidate is either lifted up to the cosmic level of his choice and absorbs the applicable deity's divine powers, or that he is united with the highest form of Śiva, for liberation:

Having lifted up the *lokadharmī* to [the cosmic level of] the deity he desires, he should cause [this deity's] qualities to be present in the candidate, or, for those desirous of liberation, [join him] in Śiva. *He should establish the [regent] who is at the top of the [respective] path*,²⁴ together with his powers, recite the OM at the end of the mantra, and then join [him with the deity], while remaining untouched by unmeritorious [*karma*].²⁵

21 See below, note 23.

22 *Mṛgendra*, *Kriyāpāda* 8.6–7: *śivadharmiṇy aṇor mūlaṃ śivadharmaphalaśriyaḥ | hitetarā vinā bhaṅgaṃ tanor ā vilayād bhuvām || bhogabhūmiṣu sarvāsu duṣkṛtāṃśe hate sati | dehottarāṇimādyartham śiṣeṣṭā lokadharmiṇī ||*.

23 The definition of the *śivadharmiṇī* appears more general here, in comparison to the *Svacchanda*, since the *śivadharmiṇī bhautikī* initiation is simply said to confer the fruits rooted in the Śaiva religion, presumably through the propitiation of Śaiva mantras. In addition, the *Mṛgendra* also teaches a special version of the *śivadharmiṇī*, in which the candidate attains the ability to keep his body until the end of dissolution, the form of the *śivadharmī* that Bhaṭṭa Nārāyaṇakaṇṭha declares to be the superior one (see Nārāyaṇakaṇṭha *ad Mṛgendra* 8.6b: *itarā dvitīyā śivadharmiṇy eva tanoḥ bhaṅgaṃ vinā hitā vihītā śreyas sādhiḥ*.).

24 I am following Brunner's interpretation (1985, 287) of the problematic phrase placed here in italics.

25 *Mṛgendra*, *Kriyāpāda* 8.149–150: *lokadharmiṇam āropya mate bhuvanabhartari | taddhamāpādanaṃ kuryāc chive vā muktikāṅkṣiṇām || yasya yo 'dhvā tadantas tam upasthāpya satadbalaṃ | mantrānte tāram uccārya yojayet kaṣṭam asprśān ||*.

However, the *Mṛgendra* goes even further than the *Svacchanda* and makes explicit that this procedure can also be applied in case a candidate wishes to be united with a non-Śaiva brahmanical deity:

In exactly the same way (*evam eva*), [the Guru] may guide a devotee to union [with a deity such as] Ambikā, Sūrya, Smara, Viṣṇu or Brahmā, after having purified that path [up to the cosmic level of the desired deity] [of all bad *karma*]. And the same procedure (*evam eva hi*) [is applicable] for any other deity that is on the path [that the devotee wishes to be united with].²⁶

As for the mode of religious practice of the *lokadharmī*, we learn in the *Caryā-pāda* of the *Mṛgendra* that the *lokadharmī* is *avrata*,²⁷ presumably referring to

26 *Mṛgendra*, *Kriyāpāda* 8.151–152b: *evam evāmbikāsūryasmaraviṣṇuprajāsrjām | sāyujyaṃ bhaktimān neyas tad adhvani viśodhite || mārgasthānāṃ pareṣāṃ ca devānāṃ evam eva hi |*.

27 *Mṛgendra*, *Caryāpāda* 11: *sādhako lokadharmī yaḥ putrakaḥ snātako grhī | samayī prāg-grhasthaḥ ca śaivāḥ syur vratavarjitāḥ ||*, “The *lokadharmī* Sādhaka, a Putraka who is a married householder, a Samayin and someone who was previously a householder [and had become a *saṃnyāsī*] are Śaivas without *vrata*s.” (I follow Brunner (1985, 349) here in separating the Samayin and *prāggrhastha*, i.e. one who was previously a householder, as two kinds of initiates intended here; Kṣemarāja also interprets the passage thus. However, as Brunner already points out, this category makes little sense in the present context.) See Kṣemarāja ad loc.: *sādhakasya śivadharmilaukikadharmibhedād dvaividhye sati lokadharmī yaḥ sādhaḥ, putrakaḥ, tathā snātako grhī grhasthatve sati snātaḥ, samayī, prāg-grhasthaḥ pūrvam grhasthaḥ cety ete vratavarjitā jñeyāḥ | prāggrhasthaḥ ca ity uttarakālaṃ gārhashtyatyāgāpekṣayā | yataḥ sambhavanti kecana ājīvanam ujñhitagrhāvasthitayaḥ | tadvailakṣaṇyārthaṃ prāggrhasthagrahaṇam ||*. As Brunner (1985, 350, note 5) argues, *vrata* appears here to refer to a Śaiva observance with mantras, as in the *Svacchanda*, perhaps combined with an abstinent ascetic lifestyle, rather than to the performance of a Śaiva post-initiatory discipline as a whole; this is indicated by the fact that the *lokadharmī* is mentioned here next to the Putraka who is a *snātaka* and thus married, the Putraka who is a head of the household, the Samayin, and someone who is the head of the household, though this last category is dubious. In any case, of those we can expect that at least the Samayin and the married Putraka—unless he received a *nirbījā* initiation—would have had to comply with the *samayas*. On the other hand, the other interpretation of *vrata* above would fit for all those cases, since such an ascetic lifestyle would not be appropriate for the married Putraka, and the Samayin would perhaps not be considered able yet to do so given his neophyte status. Nevertheless, there appears also to be the possibility of becoming a *bhautikavratin* with a temporary *vrata*, in which case the practitioner is instructed to reject the paraphernalia he received for the practice and offer them back to the deity after the successful outcome of his *vrata* (see *Mṛgendra*, *Caryāpāda* 9b–10).

his not being able to perform religious observances involving propitiation of mantras, just as we have seen in the *Svacchanda*.

Aside from the *Svacchanda* and the *Mṛgendra*, there is one more scripture that features the *lokadharmiṇī* as a type of Sādhaka initiation, namely the *Tantrasadbhāva*. However, this scripture does not provide any details concerning the *lokadharmiṇī*; it mentions this initiatory category only for the sake of completeness while introducing the *śivadharmiṇī dīkṣā*, here also called *vidyādīkṣā*,²⁸ as the initiation undertaken by the Śaiva Sādhaka before receiving consecration.²⁹

The *lokadharmiṇī*/śivadharmiṇī distinction between Sādhaka initiations is carried over into Abhinavagupta's early-11th-century *Tantrāloka*,³⁰ since Abhinavagupta incorporates the *Svacchanda* passage into his work, somewhat mod-

28 Cf. the *vidyādīkṣā* in the *Nīśvāsa*, Goodall et al. 2015, 280–282.

29 *Tantrasadbhāva* 9.516cd–522 (the variants are recorded from the text of Dyczkowski; emendations and conjectures are my own): *sa guruḥ śivatulyaś tu śivadharmaphalapradaḥ* (em.; śivadhāmaphalapradaḥ Ed.) ||516|| śāntyaṃte bhūtidīkṣā tu sadāśivaphalātmikā | *śivadharmī (kh; śivadharmo K, g) tu sā jñeyā lokadharmī matānyathā ||517|| śivadharmī tu yā dīkṣā sādhakānāṃ prakīrtitāḥ | teṣāṃ kuryābhiṣekaṃ tu sādhakatve (kh, g; *sādhakam *? K) nīvojayet ||518|| sādhakasyābhiṣeko 'yaṃ vidyādīkṣād anantaram | †vidyādīkṣā bhavet sā tu vāsanā *bhedataḥ (corr.; -bhedata mss.) sthitā ||519|| na karmabhede vidyeta *sarvo 'syādhvani (conj.; sarvāsyādhvani Ed.) saṃsthitāḥ | kṛtāni yāni karmāni sarvāṇy adhva *gatāni (K, kh; -sarvānya- g) tu ||520|| tāni saṃśodhya (K, g; sa -- kh) vidhivat kalāpaṇcāsthītāni vai† | yojanyāvasare bhedaṃ vijñātāṃ (conj. Hatley; bhedo vijñānaṃ mss.) sādhakasya tu ||521|| prārabdhakarma paśvarthe tam ekastham tu bhāvayet | śivam uccārya sakalam sadāśivatanaḥ (K, kh; sadāśiva -- g) nyaset ||522||, “That Guru is equal to Śiva, bestowing the fruits of the Śaiva *dharma*. The *bhūtidīkṣā* contains the fruits of Sadāśiva at the end of the Śānti [level]. This [initiation] is known as the Śivadharmī; the other is called the Lokadharmī. The Śivadharmī is known to be the initiation for Sādhakas. For them [the Guru] should perform consecration, and unite them with the state of being Sādhakas (*sādhakatve*). The consecration for the Sādhaka [should be performed] after the *vidyādīkṣā*. †The *vidyādīkṣā* is based upon a difference in intention (*vāsanā*); one should not understand it on the basis of difference in action (*karma*). Everything is established on the path: all actions which have been performed, associated with [various levels of] the cosmic course [of *tattvas*] [and] established on/with the five *kalās*, should be duly purified. † The difference [in procedure] for the Sādhaka is known to be at the time of union [with the deity]: he should manifest together (*ekastham*) the *prārabdha karma* for the sake of the bound soul, pronounce the mantra of Śiva in its *sakala* form, and place [the consciousness] into the body of Sadāśiva.”

30 *Tantrāloka* 15.23c–24b: *sādhako dvividhaḥ śaivadharmā lokojhitasthitiḥ* || *lokadharmī phalākāṃkṣī śubhasthaś cāśubhojjhitaḥ* |, “There are two types of Sādhakas. The one following the Śaiva *dharma* [i.e. Śivadharmī] is free of mundane [observances]. The *lokadharmī* Sādhaka is desirous of fruits, rooted in meritorious [actions] and free of impure [actions].”

ified.³¹ However, Abhinavagupta does not deal with the *śivadharmī/lokadharmī* Sādhaka distinction beyond quoting this passage. On the other hand, Jayaratha returns to this division among *bubhukṣus* in his commentary on the 13th chapter, which is dedicated to the different degrees of *śaktipāta*, the descent of Śiva's divine power upon souls, which causes them to seek initiation. In this chapter, Abhinavagupta ranks the intensity of *śaktipāta*, relating each degree—from highest, middle, and lowest, each further divided into three levels—to a certain kind of initiatory category. The principle is that the more intense the descent of power, the more immediate is the candidate's final liberation; and by this criteria he is to receive the appropriate form of initiation.³² On this scale, the enjoyment-seeking *bubhukṣu* is at the lower end, but Abhinavagupta himself does not make explicit how he correlates different degrees of *śaktipāta* to the *śivadharmī* and *lokadharmī* initiates. Rather, he restricts himself to the *bubhukṣu*, assigning the middle (*madhya-madhyā śaktipāta*) and lower levels (*manda-madhyā śaktipāta*) of the middling kind of *śaktipāta* to two unspecified categories thereof. Of those, the middle level is for the *bubhukṣu* who attains Śivahood after enjoying the *siddhis* of his respective *tattva*,³³ and the lower level for the *bubhukṣu* who enjoys *siddhis* in his subsequent

31 *Tantrāloka* 15.27–30: *abhāvaṃ bhāvayet samyak karmaṇāṃ prācyabhāvinām* (< *Svacchanda* [Sv] 4.141ab: *prākkarmabhāvikasyātha abhāvaṃ bhāvayet tadā*) | *mumukṣor nirapekṣasya prārabdhīr ekaṃ na śodhayet* (< Sv 4.141cd: *mumukṣor nirapekṣatvāt prārabdhīr ekaṃ na śodhayet*) || *sādhakasya tu bhūtyartham ittham eva viśodhayet* (< Sv 4.142ab: *sādhakasya tu bhūtyartham prākkarmaikaṃ tu śodhayet*) | *śivadharmiṇy asau dikṣā lokadharmāpahāriṇī* (< Sv 4.143ab: *śivadharmiṇy asau dikṣā lokadharmiṇy ato 'nyathā*) || *adharmarūpiṇām eva na śubhānām tu śodhanam* (< Sv 4.143cd: *prāktanāgamikasyāpi adharma-kṣayakāriṇī*) | *lokadharmiṇy asau dikṣā mantrārāadhanavarjitā* (< Sv 4.144ab: *lokadharmiṇy asau jñeyā mantrārāadhanavarjitā*) || *prārabdhadehabhede tu bhuṅkte 'sāv aṇimādikam* (< Sv 4.144cd: *prārabdhadehabhede tu bhuṅkte sa hy aṇimādikān*) | *bhuktvordhvaṃ yāti yatraiṣa yukto 'tha sakale 'kale* (< Sv 4.145ab: *bhogān bhuktvā vrajed ūrdhvaṃ gurunā yatra yojitaḥ* | *sakale niṣkale vāpi śiṣyācāryavaśād bhaved*) ||, "He should destroy all the past and future *karmas* for the liberation-seeker who is indifferent. He should only purify the *prārabdha karma*. For the Sādhaka he should purify [the *karmas*] in the same manner for the purpose of powers (*bhūti*). This is the *śivadharmiṇī dikṣā*, which removes the worldly religion (*lokadharmāpahāriṇī*). The purification of only the bad *karma*, and not the meritorious, is the *lokadharmiṇī dikṣā*, which is without the worship of mantras. Upon the death of his current body he enjoys [the supernatural powers], starting with *aṇimā*; and having enjoyed these he goes upwards to where he was joined [during the initiation ritual], at a *sakala* or *niṣkala* level."

32 See Takashima 1992, 72–75, who explains the different levels of *śaktipāta* and the corresponding initiation categories.

33 *Tantrāloka* 13.242. See also Takashima 1992, 72–73.

rebirth and only attains union with Śiva after that.³⁴ In his analysis of this chapter, Takashima (1992, 73) points out that the *śivadharmiṇī* and the *lokadharmiṇī* division would fit these two respective levels well, yet Jayaratha's commentary nonetheless interprets these differently. He instead equates the two levels of *bubhukṣu* with two levels of the *śivadharmī* Sādhaka, a distinction encountered in the *Mṛgendra* passage above, which spoke of an ordinary Sādhaka and one who retains his body until the time of cosmic dissolution.³⁵ It is of course not clear whether Jayaratha had precisely this distinction in mind, but be that as it may, by assigning these two levels to the *śivadharmiṇī* category, Jayaratha frees up the category of the *lokadharmī* Sādhaka to cover the three remaining, lowest levels of *śaktipāta*, which are concerned appropriately with practices focused on worldly enjoyments.³⁶ In order to create three levels of *lokadharmī*, he uses the following distinctions, according to which the way to liberation is increasingly remote: the highest (*tīvra-manda śaktipāta*) concerns the *lokadharmī* who automatically attains Śivahood after an interval of some period, which he spends in a desired cosmic level—a category of *lokadharmī* Jayaratha equates with the standard form we have so far encountered;³⁷ the second highest (*madhya-manda śaktipāta*) concerns the *lokadharmī* who is initiated again in another world before reaching liberation;³⁸ and the third (*manda-manda śaktipāta*) concerns the *lokadharmī* who first experiences enjoyments for a very long period, as well as different levels of proximity to the deity (*sālokyasāmīpyasāyujyāsādanakrameṇa*)³⁹ of the cho-

34 *Tantrāloka* 13.243. See also Takashima 1992, 73.

35 See p. 255. Note that this passage caused some confusion of interpretation, even for Nārāyaṇakaṇṭha.

36 *Tantrāloka* 13.245c–246b. See also Takashima 1992, 73.

37 Jayaratha even quotes the *Mṛgendra* (cf. note 25) passage at this point, *ad Tantrāloka* 13.246: *yaḥ kaś cit tīvramandaśaktipātavāṇl lokadharmī, sa dikṣābalāt dehānte kva cana yathābhimate bhuvanādau bhogān bhuktvā śivatām yāyāt | yad uktam: lokadharminam āropya mate bhuvanabhartari | taddharmāpādanam kuryāc chive vā muktikāṃkṣiṇam ||, vakṣyati ca: prārabdhadehabhede tu bhuṅkte 'śāv aṇimādikam | bhuktivordhvaṃ yāti yatraiṣa yukto 'tha sakale 'kale ||*. See also Takashima 1992, 73.

38 Jayaratha *ad Tantrāloka* 13.246: *kaś cic ca madhyamandaśaktipātavān kva cana bhuvanādau kañ cit kālaṃ bhogān bhuktvā, tadīśvaradīkṣitaḥ paryante śivatām gacchet*.

39 On these different grades of “theistic liberation,” see Watson et al. 2013, 249–250, note 154; and Goodall 1998, xxxvii–xxxix, note 85. As Watson et al. (2013, 249–250 and note 167) discuss, an example of a “lower” level of liberation, associated with paurāṇic spiritual goals, is to become a *gaṇapati*, or chief attendant, of the lord, thus experiencing being in the same world (*sālokyā*) as the Lord or in his vicinity (*sāmīpya*)—spiritual goals, as the authors point out, which are also expressed in the lay literature of early medieval India, such as the old *Skandapurāṇa* and *Śivadharmasāstra*.

sen universe, and only then receives initiation again, through which he attains Śivahood.⁴⁰ In creating these different levels, Jayaratha might have had a system similar to the *Mr̥gendra* in mind, where we also found various levels of *lokadharmiṇī dīkṣā*, whose recipients range from those seeking final liberation to those who want to be united with and experience enjoyments related to a non-Śaiva deity.⁴¹

3 Tracing the Socio-historical Context of the Emergence of the *lokadharmiṇī dīkṣā*

Thus, to sum up, the following five features consistently appear in descriptions of the *lokadharmī* initiate:

1. His source of merit lies in lay religion, the *lokadharma*, namely what is taught in *śruti* and *smṛti*.
2. During initiation all the bad karma connected with any level of reality is to be purified, leaving good *karma* intact to be enjoyed by the initiate.
3. He is not entitled to perform the propitiation of mantras (*mantrārādhana*).
4. He experiences supernatural powers after death.
5. He can choose whether he eventually attains ultimate liberation, or instead union with any deity of the cosmos he wishes; in the case of the *Mr̥gendra* these include even non-Śaiva, brahmanical deities.

For obvious reasons, this initiatory category is difficult to position within a Śaiva doctrinal framework, for it offers not only enhanced merit through destruction of all bad *karma*, but also attainment of any cosmic level, including liberation, without the commitment to perform Śaiva ritual with mantras. In this light, even the very label “Sādhaka” to such a candidate appears inappropriate, given the Sādhaka’s paradigmatic association with seeking supernatural attainments through the power of mantras. Perhaps with this hesitation in mind,

40 Jayaratha *ad Tantrāloka* 13.246: *mandamandaśaktipātavān punas tatraiva sālokyasāmīpyasāyujyāsādanakrameṇa cirataram kālāṃ bhogān bhuktvā, tata eva dīkṣām āsāḍya śiva-tām iyat*. See also Takashima (1992, 73), who has a slightly different interpretation of the *sālokyasāmīpyasāyujyāsādanakrameṇa*, taking it to denote “various stages of enjoyment.”

41 Cf. pp. 257–256. Note that in his conclusion, Takashima (1992, 74–75) proposes that Abhinavagupta intended the *manda* level of *śaktipāta* for those who only received *samaya-dīkṣā*, contrary to Jayaratha’s interpretation of different levels of *lokadharmī* initiates.

Kṣemarāja *ad Svacchanda* 4.85, offers a weak explanation for the *lokadharmī* being called a Sādhaka, leaning on the meaning of the underlying verbal root “*sādh-*,” “to be successful, achieve;” he says that the *lokadharmī* is referred to as a Sādhaka “because he achieves (*sādhanāt*) the fruit by his pious acts alone.”⁴² One could argue that a stronger reason to refer to the *lokadharmī* as a Sādhaka is that he will experience supernatural powers, like the Śaiva Sādhaka, except that he does so after death. Yet this addition to the professed outcome of the *lokadharminī dīkṣā* seems almost to be a doctrinal elaboration added to warrant its place among Sādhaka initiations. Another sign that the *lokadharminī dīkṣā* held a doctrinally difficult position might be the meager commentary these passages receive. Bhaṭṭa Nārāyaṇakaṇṭha, for instance, restricts himself to rather self-explanatory comments on the entire *lokadharminī* passage in the *Mṛgendra*.

Regardless of this awkward near-silence, at least for these scriptural sources and Kashmirian Śaiva authors, such an initiatory category appears to have been a social reality that needed to be accommodated and acknowledged. In addition to the sources discussed, the *lokadharminī/śivadharminī* distinction also features in a fourteenth century Kashmirian initiation manual, the *Kalādīkṣā-paddhati* of Mānodatta,⁴³ and Kṣemarāja introduces these initiatory categories into his commentary on the *Netratantra*, even though the root text itself does not contain them.⁴⁴ Additionally, we have seen how Jayaratha uses the category of the *lokadharmī* Sādhaka to speak of initiates who pursue mundane spiritual goals, giving the impression that there exists a wide range of *lokadharmī* initiates with different degrees of involvement in the Śaiva religion, similar to the model in the *Mṛgendra*.

However, the question remains why such an initiatory category, which seems so counter-intuitive and difficult to justify doctrinally, came into existence in the first place. From a socio-historical perspective, the creation of a *bubhukṣu*-orientated exoteric form of Śaiva initiation appears to be connected to the position of tantric communities in an early phase, when the sphere of the

42 Kṣemarāja *ad Svacchanda* 4.85: *śubhakarmanāyaiva tu phalaśya sādhanāt sādhamo 'yam*.

43 I thank Professor Alexis Sanderson for sharing with me his handout, “Bhaṭṭa Rāmakaṇṭha’s commentary on the opening passage of the *Matanigapārameśvara*,” which quotes the *Kalādīkṣāpaddhati* on this point (pp. 36–37), and through which I found out about the usage of the *śivadharmi/lokadharmi* categories in this manual. For more information on Mānodatta’s work, see Sanderson 2004, 362, note 34.

44 See Kṣemarāja *ad Netratantra* 4.1: *bhuktīdīkṣā śivadharmalaukikadharmabhedena bhinnā sādhakasya*, “The *bhuktīdīkṣā* for the Sādhaka is divided into the *śivadharma* and *laukikadharma* kind.”

power-seeking practitioner had a more prominent role. Brunner (1975, 439) long ago noted that the *Svacchanda* and the *Mṛgendra*—both of which contain the *lokadharmiṇī*, as we have seen—appear to preserve a comparatively prominent position for the power-seeking Sādhaka, which she suspects harkens back to an early phase of the tantric traditions, when the gulf between soteriological and power-orientated goals was not so vast. Her hypothesis finds confirmation in findings of the past decade, particularly those resulting from study of the *Niśvāsatattvasaṃhitā* (Goodall et al. 2015). As the earliest extant Śaiva tantra, the *Niśvāsa* affords important insights into the early stages of the “tantric age,”⁴⁵ particularly in that—as Goodall points out—it envisages a time when tantric communities appear to have been restricted to limited esoteric circles⁴⁶ with much focus on the propitiation of mantras for magical purposes, which were pursued prior to liberation. He further observes that the classical fourfold hierarchy of Samayin, Putraka, Ācārya and Sādhaka is entirely absent at this stage, with all practitioners simply referred to as Sādhakas—a category of initiates associated with the utilization of mantras for both supernatural powers and liberation. The community had not yet been divided into those who sought one to the exclusion of the other.⁴⁷ That the pursuit of power and soteriological goals belonged to the same spiritual path is reflected in the *Niśvāsa*’s initiation system, which teaches rites of two types, namely *vidyādīkṣā*,⁴⁸ through which a candidate is admitted to the community and becomes a Sādhaka with authority to propitiate mantras, and the *muktidīkṣā*, through which the confirmed Sādhaka attains liberation.⁴⁹ Of neither initiation is there an exoteric form at this stage.⁵⁰

Theoretical repercussions caused by separating the liberation- and power-seekers’ goals are visible, for instance, in the ambiguous treatment of *karma*’s

45 The *Niśvāsa* is the earliest extant tantric scripture, preserving a stage of the development of tantric communities where non-tantric, Atimārgic roots are often visible, as Sanderson (2006) observed.

46 On the absence of the domain of social ritual in the *Niśvāsa*, see Goodall et al. 2015, 47.

47 See Goodall et al. 2015, 47–50. As for all initiates probably being referred to as *sādhakas* at this stage, see also Goodall et al. 2015, 281.

48 See Goodall et al. 2015, 50. And, in fact, the *dīkṣā* for the Sādhaka is sometimes referred to as *vidyādīkṣā*, as in the *Tantrasadbhāva*. For more see Goodall’s entry *nirvāṇadīkṣā* in *Tāntrikābhidhānaśāstra*, vol. III.

49 See Goodall et al. 2015, 280–282, 289. However, Goodall also notes that this interpretation that any initiate takes first the *vidyādīkṣā* and then the *muktidīkṣā* is a working hypothesis at the moment, not completely excluding the possibility that these may be two separate modes of initiation, which at the same time seems less likely.

50 See also Goodall et al. 2015, 51.

elimination during the initiation ritual for the Śaiva Sādhaka.⁵¹ Nevertheless, we find that the status and centrality of the “original” Sādhaka’s position and practices are preserved in most early tantric scriptures, even after the community came to be divided into different initiatory ranks, and centered around the Ācārya and liberation-seekers. It is tempting to conclude that the creation of the *lokadharmiṇī dīkṣā* is directly connected to this early sphere of tantric religion, which put so much emphasis on the pursuit of magical powers and benefits. While in due course Śaiva literature grew to put more emphasis on the soteriological aspirations of the *mumukṣu*—reflected in the fact that the soteriological-orientated *nirbījā dīkṣā* has a more prominent role—the attraction of the powers and benefits gained through mantras must nonetheless have played an important role in the initial popularization of tantric groups. For the *lokadharmiṇī dīkṣā* would hold obvious attractions for laypeople desiring to enhance the fruits of their current practice without committing to the disciplinary regimen of tantric Śaiva ritual. Another appealing aspect may have been that through this initiation, a *lokadharmī* became part of the initiatory community and perhaps privy to services accessible only to initiates, especially those offered by Śaiva Sādhakas. That broadening access to initiation may have played an important role in popularizing tantric Śaivism at an early stage is suggested by the fact that the *Mṛgendra* extends the scope of the *lokadharmiṇī dīkṣā* to those who are not even Śiva-worshippers, people who may nonetheless have desired specific services distinctive to the Śaiva tantric domain. However, the doctrinally awkward position of the *lokadharmī* Sādhaka, combined with the increasing emphasis on purely soteriological goals, may have led to the gradual oblivion of this category, causing its reassignment in later sources, as will be seen below.

51 See *ibid.*, pp. 254ff. I am not aware of an established, coherent theory on what kind of *karma* needs to be left in place in order to pursue supernatural powers. But note that—in quite a different context—the idea that the success of a Sādhaka’s practice is intertwined with his *karmic* position is also found in the *Brahmayāmala*. In his analysis of the chapters on the Sādhaka, Kiss shows how the *Brahmayāmala* teaches complex mechanics underlying a logic of *karma*, according to which the level of a Sādhaka’s practice is dependent on actions in past births and on whether he had received initiation in a past life, as well as special rituals to remove *karmic* bonds that would block the success of the Sādhaka’s practice (see Kiss 2015, 35–55, in particular 52–53 concerning the rites to remove *karmic* bonds).

4 The *lokadharmiṇī dīkṣā* in the Context of the *nirvāṇadīkṣā*

The two other early Śaiva scriptures which make a distinction between *śivadharmiṇī* and *lokadharmiṇī* initiations are the *Jayadrathayāmala*⁵² and the rather later *Br̥hatkālottara*, both composed after the *Svacchanda*, and in the latter case certainly after the *Mrgendra* as well. However, in both of these works the association of these initiatory categories with the Sādhaka gets lost; they become reassigned to the context of *nirvāṇadīkṣā*, the initiation for those seeking liberation rather than supernatural powers and enjoyments. However, unlike the *Br̥hatkālottara*, the *Jayadrathayāmala* preserves in part the original logic of *karma*-elimination seen in the *bubhuṅṣu* category of *lokadharmiṇī dīkṣā*, despite this reassignment.

In the *Jayadrathayāmala* we find both of the initiatory categories in question—here referred to as *śivadharmadīkṣā* and *lokadharmadīkṣā*—in the description of initiation types⁵³ outlined in the first *ṣaṭka*. This is the portion of the text which Sanderson (2007, 235–236) identifies as its oldest layer, deriving originally from a work called the *Śīraścheda*. Unlike the *Svacchanda* and *Mrgendra*, the *Jayadrathayāmala* does not here employ the broad division between the *mumukṣu* and *bubhuṅṣu* in its exposition of initiatory categories, but rather makes a distinction between an initiation that bestows *adhikāra*, that is to say the authority to perform certain rituals,⁵⁴ and those that bestow liberation (*mokṣadā*).⁵⁵ In presenting the latter, the *nirvāṇadīkṣā*, the

52 In search for references and access to this passage in the *Jayadrathayāmala* I am grateful to several people: to Dominic Goodall, who first drew my attention to the fact that the *lokadharmiṇī* features in the *Jayadrathayāmala*; to Olga Serbaeva, for searching her etext and locating references for me, which showed that the thirteenth chapter is relevant; to Csaba Kiss, for sharing with me the paper manuscript of this chapter; and to Alexis Sanderson, for sharing his preliminary edition of the passage, which is quoted below in note 57, and for reading and discussing the passage in question with me.

53 The immediate context here is Devī's question to Bhairava about the number of initiatory categories as well as the issue whether the initiatory procedure is the same for all four caste-classes.

54 The passage is problematic, and it is not specified what exactly is intended by the category of *adhikāradā* initiations. We may hypothesise that this refers to a kind of initiation that bestows to Śaiva office holders—i.e. the Ācārya and the Sādhaka—entitlement (*adhikāra*) to perform rituals for others. See Goodall's entry on *niradhikāradīkṣā* in *Tāntrikābhidhānakośa*, vol. III. See also note 83 for an example of the pair *adhikāradā* and *niradhikāradā dīkṣā* in a list of initiation types in the *Somaśambhupaddhati*.

55 The *Jayadrathayāmala* (1.13.3) appears to want to impose this distinction already on the *Samayadīkṣā*, which would be unusual, since the *Samayadīkṣā* by itself typically cannot grant *adhikāra*. For the Sanskrit text and translation, see note 56.

Jayadrathayāmala teaches the following options:⁵⁶ (1) the *śivadharmadikṣā*, (2) the *lokadharmadikṣā*, and (3) the *kṣīpraghnī*, which appears to be a synonym of the *sadyonirvāṇadikṣā* (i.e. “the initiation that instantly grants liberation”).

- 56 As mentioned earlier (note 52), a preliminary edition of this passage was kindly made available to me by Alexis Sanderson, who has also discussed the passage with me, helping to clarify points for the translation. I quote his text below, except that I mark his conjectures with “conj. S.,” and degeminate doubled consonants after “r” (any mistakes in the text and translation are, of course, my own). *Jayadrathayāmala*, *Ṣaṭka* 1, 13.3–18: *sā* **samayātha* (conj. S.; *samayātha* Cod.) *nirvāṇā dvibhinnā dvisvarūpata(h)* | *samayā hi punar yāti dvibhāvaṃ phalabhedataḥ* ||3|| *jñānayogapravṛttisthā prāṇinām adhikāradā* | *tad-vāsanavadhā* **nityavyāpti* (conj. S.; *nityā vyāpti* Cod.) *pada(pra)dāyikā* ||4|| **samayā* (conj. S.; *samayā* Cod.) †*yac ca† vijñeyā nirvāṇāpi dvirūpiṇi* | **mokṣādhikārabhedābhyāṃ* (conj. S.; *mokṣārthikārabhedābhyāṃ* Cod.) †*sthānubhis tantravedibhiḥ†* ||5|| *bhūyo vimuktidā dikṣā nirvāṇā bahubhedagā* | *śivadharmā* **lokadharmā* (conj. S.; *lokadharmā* Cod.) *kṣīpraghnī piṇḍapātikā* ||6|| **ekatamādhvacicchuddhyā* (conj. S.; *ekātamodhvacicchuddhyā* Cod.) *vyāvṛte bandhanatraye* | *śivāptidarśitāśeṣā* (conj. S.; *śivāptidarśitāśeṣa* Cod.) *samayācārapālānāt* ||7|| *mokṣāvāptikarīyā tu lokācāraviparyayāt* | *śivadharmā smṛtā dikṣā dvisvarūpā* **maheśvari* (corr. S.; *maheśvarī* Cod.) ||8|| *nirbījākyā* **sabijā* (conj. S.; *saviryā* Cod.) *ca dikṣābhedaḥ śivāgame* | *pākamūrkhasudīrṇāṅga* **ēḍaka*(conj.; *ēḍatva* Cod.) *kuṇi-yositām* ||9|| **sarujātyantabhaktānām* (conj. S.; *sarudhātyantabhaktānām* Cod.) *bhūbhṛt-sa(m)nyāsinām priye* | *viśuddhasamayācārā yā kṛtā daiśikena* tu ||10|| *nirbījā sā bhaved dikṣā sabijā syād vilomataḥ* | **vidvad*(em.; *vidhi* Cod.) *dvandvasahānām tu sundari kṛiyate tadā* ||11|| *gurudevāgnikāryāṇi yaiḥ kāryāṇi subhaktitāḥ* | *akurvātām hi tat teṣām vāñchitām na bhavet phalam* ||12|| *lokadharmā tu yā dikṣā sā syāt sthitivilomagā* | *śivadharmakṛiyā sā tu kin tu laukikavṛttigā* ||13|| *śodhayed atha vā sarvaṃ dharmam ekaṃ na śodhayed* | *laukikācāradharmasthaḥ tad bhuktvā nirvṛtīm vrajet* ||14|| *athāsitaṃ viśodhyaṃ tu karmaikaṃ daiśikena* tu | *malino dhvāthavā devī* **śodhyo bhogo* (conj. S.; *śuddho bhogyo* Cod.) *na jāyate* ||15|| **na bhogyam tad dhi bhuktatvāt* (conj. S.; *tad bhogyam tad vibhuktatvā* Cod.) *prayāty ātmā paraṃ padam* | *smṛteyaṃ* **lokadharmā* (conj. S.; *lokadharmī* Cod.) *tu dikṣā* **nirvāṇagāminī* (em. S.; *nirvāṇagāminī* Cod.) ||16|| *eṣātīte niruddhe tu prārabdhe karmaṇi priye* | *kṣīṇabhogyavaśād yā tu sā dikṣā piṇḍapātikā* ||17|| *kṣurikāstrogramantraiś ca* **yogenādāya* (conj. S.; *yogenādhāya* Cod.) *prakṣipet* | *parayogasamayoge sadyonirvāṇadā hi sā* ||18||, “And that [initiation] is either a Samayadikṣā or Nirvāṇadikṣā, divided into two because it has two natures. Now the Samayadikṣā is further twofold because of a difference in the result (*phala*). [The first] bestows *adhikāra* [and] follows the practices of *jñāna* and *yoga*, [the second] destroys the latent impressions (*vāsanā*) of that [soul?] and bestows a state of eternal pervasion [with the deity]. † [That is known] by the firm ones who know the tantras. † Besides (*bhūyas*) the *nirvāṇadikṣā* bestowing liberation is of many kinds: *śivadharmā*[*dikṣā*], *lokadharmā*[*dikṣā*] and the initiation which kills quickly, causing the body to fall. [The initiation] which reveals everything through the attainment of Śiva (*śivāptidarśitāśeṣā*) through the performance of post-initiatory rites (*samayācārapālānāt*) once the three bonds (i.e. the three impurities (*mala*)) have ceased due to the purification of the consciousness on one [of the six] paths, [that] initiation is known to be the *śivadharmadikṣā*, which bestows the attainment of liberation (*mokṣāvāptikarī*) because it is contrary to the mundane practice. [And], O Goddess, [the Śivadharmadikṣā] has two forms: in Śaiva scriptures the division of initiation

Of those, the *śivadharmadikṣā* is defined as twofold, namely *sabījā* (i.e. with the seed of post-initiatory practice) and *nirbījā* (i.e. without the seed of post-initiatory practice), which amounts to the bifurcation we typically expect of *nirvāṇadikṣā*. The *śivadharmadikṣā* initiate therefore attains liberation at death, either with the stipulation to perform post-initiatory rites (*sabījā*) or without this stipulation (*nirbījā*). The *lokadharmadikṣā* variations, on the other hand, lead to liberation only after the initiate has enjoyed the merit earned through his mundane ritual practice. In this category, two versions are taught: first is the *lokadharmiṇī* kind, which we have already encountered in the *Svacchanda*, *Mṛgendra* and *Tantrāloka*, namely an initiation involving the elimination of all bad *karma*, leaving meritorious *karma* in place to be enjoyed before the eventual attainment of liberation. The second appears to be a version of the *lokadharmadikṣā* in which only the impure universe is purified, the idea being that the initiate will go to some segment of the pure universe after death.⁵⁷

is called that without the seed (*nirbījākhyā*) and that with the seed (*sabījā*). The Ācārya performs the [initiation] which contains the duty to perform post-initiatory rites purified (*viśuddhasamayācārā*) for children, imbeciles, those whose limbs suffered trauma, deaf people, women, people who are suffering from chronic illness and kings and renunciators (*saṃnyāsin*) who are extremely devoted [to Śiva]; this [initiation] is the *nirbījā*. The *sabījā* is the opposite to this and is performed, O beautiful one, for those who are learned, endure extremes and are able bodied. By those the rituals towards the Guru, the God and the fire have to be performed with extreme devotion, since the desired fruit will not come about for them who don't do [these rites]. The *lokadharmadikṣā* is a Śaiva ritual [and therefore] proceeds contrary to established [practice] (i.e. the brahmanical order), but also conforms to worldly religion. Either [the Ācārya] should purify all [*karma*] or only not purify the *dharma* (i.e. the auspicious *karma*); [then the initiate] is dedicated to [the accumulation of] *dharma* through mundane observances (*laukikācāradharmasthaḥ*), and having enjoyed this [*dharma*] he proceeds to liberation. Thus, the Ācārya should only purify the bad [*karma*]. Alternatively, (*athavā*) [only] the impure path is purified, [so that] no experience (*bhogaḥ*) comes about [in the impure universe]. [In other words] that [experience] does not have to be experienced [anymore in the impure universe] because it has already been experienced [through the process of initiation]. The soul [of the initiate] (*ātmā*) goes straight to the higher level (i.e. the pure universe). That is known to be the initiation called *lokadharmā*, which leads to liberation. Such [an initiation] (i.e. the *śivadharmā* or *lokadharmadikṣā*?) [is performed] when the past action has been destroyed, but the *prārabdhakarma* [is present], O loved one. But that initiation which [is performed] after [all experiences that] need to be experienced have waned, that is the *piṇḍapātikā* (i.e. which causes the dropping of the body). [The Ācārya] should take hold [of the soul] through *yoga* and expel it with the razor and other fierce mantras in order to bring its union [with the deity] through the highest fusion (*parayogasamāyoge*). For this is the [initiation which] bestows liberation immediately (*sadyonirvāṇadā*)."

57 For the interpretation of the second kind of *lokadharmadikṣā* I am indebted to Alexis Sanderson.

While our sources discussed so far did not teach such a variation of the *lokadharmiṇī*, we did see that the *Mṛgendra* and Jayaratha conceived of different levels of *lokadharmī* practice, the latter even adding a level in which the *lokadharmī* is reborn and then initiated again on another cosmic level.⁵⁸ The *śivadharmadīkṣā* and the *lokadharmadīkṣā* thus differ broadly from each other in that the former bestows spiritual liberation through the power of Śaiva ritual alone, being opposed to the worldly practice (i.e. *mokṣvāptikarīyā tu lokācāra-viparyayāt | śivadharmā smṛtā dīkṣā*), while in the latter brahmanical ritual acts as the source of the immediate spiritual benefit, even though—as in the earlier cases—the power of initiation eventually brings about union with a deity on some or another cosmic level. That in the *Jayadrathayāmala* too this category holds a doctrinally awkward position can perhaps be inferred by the need the redactors felt to stress that the *lokadharmadīkṣā* is indeed a Śaiva ritual (*Jayadrathayāmala*, *Ṣaṭka* 1, 13.12).⁵⁹

In the case of the *Brhatkālottara*, the *śivadharmiṇī*/*lokadharmiṇī* terminology makes only a brief appearance. So far I have only been able to locate a single passage featuring this distinction, at the end of the chapter on initiation.⁶⁰ Here too these categories are not used in the context of the *Sādhaka* or *bubhukṣu*, but feature rather as variations of the *nirvāṇadīkṣā*. In contrast to the *Jayadrathayāmala*, the pair is used to describe the *nirbījā dīkṣā* and *sabījā dīkṣā*, respectively, and in the case of the *lokadharmiṇī*, there is no reference to the elimination of bad *karma* alone. What is curious is that the text, as preserved in the manuscript available to me, equates *nirbījā dīkṣā* with the *śivadharmiṇī* and *sabījā* with the *lokadharmiṇī*.⁶¹ This seems counterintuitive, since in all the classifications we have seen the *sabījā* is the initiation after which a candidate is obliged to observe Śaiva post-initiatory rites (*śamayas*) until death, whereas in the *nirbījā* case, the initiate is free of this obligation and maintains his ritual obligations in accordance with his position in society. It is tempting to conjecture that the transmission of the text is simply wrong at this point—that we should emend the order so that the *nirbījā* is equated with *lokadharmiṇī* and the *sabījā* with *śivadharmiṇī*. However, this remains conjectural, and a more thorough study of the initiatory categories will require critically editing at least

58 See here, pp. 255 ff. and pp. 261 ff.

59 For the Sanskrit text and translation, see above, note 56.

60 The text has not been critically edited yet and to my knowledge only some parts of it have been transcribed electronically, kindly shared with me by Nirajan Kafle; the passage in question appears at the end of what is termed “*dīkṣāpaṭala*” in the palm-leaf manuscript, also kindly provided to me by Nirajan Kafle.

61 *Brhatkālottara* 43r, line 2–3: *nirbījā śivadharmakhyā sabījā lokadharmiṇī*, “The *nirbījā* is called the *śivadharmā*[*dīkṣā*], the *sabījā* is the *lokadharmiṇī*.”

this portion of the text. Nevertheless, what we can extract for our discussion is that here the classification is associated neither with the Sādhaka, nor with the “karma logic” of the *lokadharmiṇī dīkṣā* found in the *Jayadrathayāmala*.

5 Pre-13th Century Saiddhāntika Manuals: Householders versus Ascetics

Labels for the initiation categories *śivadharmiṇī* and *lokadharmiṇī* are carried over into the Saiddhāntika manuals, though differently and inconsistently reassigned by various sources, and with weak links to the original Sādhaka context. The following surveys early Saiddhāntika manuals, with particular focus on the earlier sources, but is not exhaustive. Noticeably, the influential *Somaśambhupaddhati*, also called the *Kriyākāṇḍakramāvalī*, of Somaśambhu does not teach a mundane form of the *sādhakadīkṣā*, nor does it include *lokadharmiṇī* among the *mumukṣu* options; rather, the text speaks of the Śaiva Sādhaka receiving, as in the sources discussed earlier, a modified form of the *nirvāṇadīkṣā* right before his consecration to office.⁶² However, in the description of the *sabījā nirvāṇadīkṣā*, at the point when *karmas* are emplaced upon the *pāśasūtra*—representing all reality levels of the cosmos, which will be burnt and destroyed in the consecrated fire—the *Somaśambhupaddhati* presents various options for the *karma* that can be exempted from purification, namely the *prārabdha-karma*, the *karma* for *mantrasiddhi*, and the *karma* that results from meritorious acts, comparable to those of the lay devotee. While Somaśambhu himself does not explicitly correlate these options to specific initiation types, we may note that the latter two categories of *karma*, to be exempted for purification in certain circumstances, correspond to the procedures we have seen envisaged for the *śivadharmiṇī* initiation for the Śaiva Sādhaka, and the *lokadharmiṇī* initiation, respectively. In fact, in his commentary on this passage, Trilocana explicitly assigns these categories accordingly.⁶³

62 See, *Somaśambhupaddhati Sādhakābhīṣeka* 1–2: *sādhaskyābhīṣeke tu nīrṭyādikalātrayam | mumukṣor iva saṃśodhya śāntyatitāṃ viśodhayet || tataḥ sadāśivaṃ dhyātvā mūlamanṭreṇa pūrṇayā | śāntau saṃyojya kurvīta guṇāpādanam aṣṭadhā*. For a translation and notes, see Brunner 1977, 500–506.

63 *Somaśambhupaddhati, Nirvāṇadīkṣāvidhi* 31–32: *sabījāyāṃ tu dīkṣāyāṃ samayācārapāśataḥ | dehārambhakadharmāc ca mantrasiddhiphalād api || iṣṭāpūrtādīdharmāc ca vyatiriktaṃ prabandhakam | caitanyarodhakaṃ sūkṣmaṃ kalānām antare smaret ||*. For a translation and annotation, see Brunner 1977, 190–196. For Trilocana’s commentary on this passage, see Brunner 1977, 191, [32a] and notes thereon.

Another manual from this period is the *Vimalāvatī* of Vimalaśiva, who composed his work in 1101/2 and lived in Vārāṇasī (Sanderson 2014, 22). Vimalaśiva explicitly uses the categories of *śivadharmiṇī* and *lokadharmiṇī*; and though he partly draws on the passage from the *Mṛgendra* examined earlier, he does not assign these to different kinds of Sādhaka, but rather assigns the *śivadharmiṇī* initiation to the Putraka and Ācārya—a feature we also see in the *Ajitāgama*⁶⁴—and the *lokadharmiṇī* simply to the Sādhaka devoted to meritorious action.⁶⁵ However, it appears that in this passage the allocation of initiation categories has gone awry, such that the Śaiva Sādhaka is missing, unless the reason for this omission is the actual disappearance of the Sādhaka from medieval South-India.

Jñānaśiva wrote his *Jñānaratnāvalī* also while residing in Vārāṇasī, probably some decades later.⁶⁶ In his application of the *śivadharmiṇī*/*lokadharmiṇī* terminology he seems to be the most innovative of Saiddhāntika authors in this period. He also quotes sources for this classification that have yet to be identified. Jñānaśiva uses this terminology to denote divisions of the *nirvāṇadīkṣā*—that is to say, the full regular Śaiva initiation—in essence in order to distinguish, broadly, between initiations performed for the ascetic practitioner, here the *śivadharmī*, and those for the householder practitioner, here the *lokadharmī*.⁶⁷

64 *Ajitāgama* 77.14: *sabījā ca dvividhā bhinnā prathamā śivadharmiṇī || sādhakācāryayoh proktā deśakālādibhedanaḥ | dharmādharmātmakam karma prāgāgāmi vicitrakam || sañcintya śodhyate yatra saivoktā śivadharmiṇī | adharmamātrasaṃśuddhau dvitīyā lokadharmiṇī ||*.

65 *Vimalāvatī* f. 67r: *dvividhā syāt sabījāpi tatradīyā śivadharmiṇī | *putrakācāryayor (conj.; putrakācāryayo Ed.) mukhya dharmādharmakṣayakarī || iṣṭāpūrtādinirate sādhave lokadharmiṇī || śivadharmiṇy *anor (conj.; anau Ed.) mūlaṃ śivadharmā *phalaśrīyaḥ (conj.; *phalaṃ śrīyah Ed.) | *hitetarā (conj.; hitatarā Ed.) vinā bhaṃgam *tanor (conj.; tannaur Ed.) ā vilayād *bhuvām (conj.; bhavām Ed.) || bhogabhūmiṣu sarvasu *duṣkṛtāmśe (conj.; duṣkṛtāmśa- Ed.) hate śati | dehāntarāṇimādyartham śiṣṭeṣṭā lokadharmiṇī ||*.

66 See Goodall 2000, 209 for the date of Jñānaśiva. I am extremely grateful to Dominic Goodall for sharing with me his etext of the *Jñānaratnāvalī* as well as his photographs of the transcript (Re 1025/52) cited in this article.

67 *Jñānaratnāvalī*, p. 266: *tatra tāvat *sāpekṣānapekṣā (conj.; sāpekṣāpekṣā Cod.) dvividhā śivadharmiṇī lokadharmiṇī ceti. tatra tāvac chivadharmiṇī līnginām śikhāchedasamāyuktā anyā grhinām tadvirahitā. uktaṃ ca: dviedhā nirvāṇadīkṣā laukikī śivadharmiṇī | grhinām laukikī jñeyā līnginām śivadharmiṇī || śikhāchedo na yatrāsti dīkṣā sā lokadharmiṇī | śikhākhaṇḍena saṃyuktā dīkṣā sā śivadharmiṇī ||*, “Therein, now, [the initiation types] are twofold, [namely] dependent on [whether] there is a requirement to perform post-initiatory practice or not; and [they are also twofold insofar as being] *śivadharmiṇī* or *lokadharmiṇī*. Here [in the category of the *sāpekṣā nirvāṇadīkṣā* kind], the *śivadharmiṇī* is for ascetics and contains the cutting off of the topknot, while the other [initiation] is for householders and is without [cutting off the topknot]. And it is said: The *nirvāṇadīkṣā* is twofold, [divided into] the mundane (*laukikī*) [kind] and the *śivadharmiṇī*. The mun-

The actual procedures for the *śivadharmiṇī* and *lokadharmiṇī* initiations are the same, being those for the *nirvāṇadīkṣā*, with only one difference: for the *śivadharmī*, the topknot is cut off during the initiation, while for the *lokadharmī* it is not.⁶⁸ The topknot is believed to contain the *rodhaśakti*,⁶⁹ that is to say the power to delude the soul,⁷⁰ which is apparently eliminated by cutting the topknot off in the case of the ascetic. This is not done for the *lokadharmī*, who, after all, is by definition still engaged in worldly activity. In terms of post-initiatory practice prescribed for the *lokadharmī* initiate, the *Jñānaratnāvalī* differs from the earlier scriptural sources discussed in the first part of the paper, in which an initiate who received a *lokadharmiṇī* or *lokadharmadīkṣā* was only required to continue his ritual obligations of the brahmanical ritual sphere (the *lokadharmā*), without Śaiva-specific additions. In the *Jñānaratnāvalī*, however, we have seen that the *lokadharmiṇī* is clearly defined as a form of *nirvāṇadīkṣā*, which—unless otherwise specified—is of the *sabijā* kind. Thus, the significance here is that the initiate retains his socio-religious status in mundane society (*lokadharmā*) as a householder and keeps up these practices in addition to his Śaiva post-initiatory ritual obligations, a principle that is already expressed in early Śaiva sources.⁷¹ There is no mention of the procedure to

dane is known to be for householders, the *śivadharmiṇī* for ascetics. In the *lokadharmiṇī* initiation there is no cutting of the topknot. The initiation in which the topknot is cut off is the *śivadharmiṇī*." At the end of this section, all the *sāpekṣā* types are contrasted with the *nirapekṣā*; see *Jñānaratnāvalī*, p. 269: *evaṃ sāpekṣā bahudhā jñeyā nirapekṣā ca parā-paratvena dvīdihā sadyosadyonirvāṇā ceti*, "In this manner the *sāpekṣā* type is known to be manifold, and the *nirapekṣā* type is twofold on account of its higher and a lower forms, [namely] the immediate and the not-immediate types of *nirvāṇadīkṣā*."

68 For the Sanskrit text and translation, see note 67. Note that this is not the case in all manuals; for instance, the *Somaśambhupaddhati* does not maintain this distinction. See Brunner 1977, 338, note 395.

69 Also referred to as *tirodhānaśakti*.

70 See, e.g., *Somaśambhupaddhati*, *Nirvāṇadīkṣāvidhi*, verse 219 (Brunner 1977, 338–339): *śikhāmantritakartaryā rodhaśaktisvarūpiṇīm | śikhāṃ chidyāt śivāstreṇa śīsyasya catu-ṛaṅgulām ||*, and also *Jñānaratnāvalī*, p. 344: *śikhāṃ chidyāt tayā śaktiā rodhaśaktisvarūpiṇīm | kāraṇaṃ sarvapāśānāṃ sāvadhe dvādaśaṅgulāt*. See also Brunner 1977, xli, and for a discussion of the cutting of the topknot at other moments during initiation in some sources, see Goodall et al. 2015, 282–283.

71 Sanderson (2009, 302) has demonstrated how Śaiva scriptures and commentaries early on developed clear positions regarding the importance for Śaiva householder initiates of maintaining their brahmanical householder duties, i.e. the *lokadharmā*. This helped ensure that Śaiva initiation remained attractive to the householder mainstream, who, in this way, were not required to completely transform their public lives. However, it is emphasised in these sources that such full Śaiva initiates were asked to maintain brahmanical practice merely for the sake of conformity, or in order to avoid transgression, not as a source of spiritual merit.

eliminate only the bad *karma* linked to all reality levels, which we have seen associated with the *lokadharmiṇī dīkṣā*.

However, while this seems to be the underlying basic division of the *nirvāṇadīkṣā* in the *Jñānaratnāvalī*, these distinctions subsequently become entangled with aspects of the *śivadharmiṇī* and *lokadharmiṇī* initiations stemming from their original Sādhaka context. This happens in the context of creating sub-categories for both the *śivadharmiṇī* and *lokadharmiṇī* categories, based on a division between those who desire something (*sakāma*), i.e. what would otherwise be called the *bubhukṣu*, and those who do not desire anything except liberation (*akāma*, *niṣkāma*), i.e. the *mumukṣu*. For ascetic practitioners, the *śivadharmiṇī* is divided into kinds for temporary ascetics (*bhautika*) and permanent ascetics (*naiṣṭhika*),⁷² and each of these is further divided into the *sakāma* and *niṣkāma* type.⁷³ In the case of the *naiṣṭhikī sakāmā* initiation, the initiate is promised enjoyments of the pure universe, after which he is to attain liberation.⁷⁴ The *naiṣṭhikī niṣkāma* initiation, on the other hand, bestows liberation immediately. On the division of the *bhautikī* into *sakāmā* and *niṣkāma* types, Jñānaśiva quotes the first two verses of a passage from the *Mr̥gendra*, which mentions that there are two types of *bhautikī dīkṣā*, the superior and the inferior, the first being *śivadharmiṇī* and the second being the *lokadharmiṇī* type.⁷⁵ However, since Jñānaśiva uses these as sub-categories

72 *Jñānaratnāvalī*, p. 266 (with a conjecture by Goodall recorded from the etext): *tatra śivadharmiṇī dvidhā naiṣṭhikī bhautikī ceti tatra niravadhitapasvino naiṣṭhikāḥ. teṣāṃ yā sā naiṣṭhikī niravadhūty api kathyate dvitīyā *katipayadina* (conj. Goodall, *gāḍipayadina* ms.) *vratapālānād anantaram grhapadadāyī* |, “Here the *śivadharmiṇī* kind is twofold, [namely] *naiṣṭhikī* and *bhautikī*. Of these (*tatra*) the *naiṣṭhikas* are permanent ascetics. The [initiation] that is [performed] for them is the *naiṣṭhikī*, that is to say the one called the permanent. The second [kind of initiation] (i.e. the *bhautikī*) restores the state of being a householder immediately after the performance of an observance for a certain number of days.”

73 *Jñānaratnāvalī*, p. 266: *tatra naiṣṭhikī sakāmākāmabhedena dvidhā*, “In that case, the *naiṣṭhikī* initiation is divided into one for those who desire [enjoyments and supernatural powers] and one for those who don’t.”

74 *Jñānaratnāvalī*, pp. 266–267: *tatra sakāmasya śuddhādhvabhogan datvā tadanantaram śivapadapradā sakāmā*, “In that case, for the one who desires [enjoyments and supernatural powers] the *sakāmā* [initiation] [first] bestows the pleasures of the pure universe and immediately after that the level of the [highest] Śiva.”

75 For the *Mr̥gendra* passage, see pp. 256ff. *Jñānaratnāvalī*, p. 267: **atha* (em.; *athā* Cod.) *bhautikī ca tathā dvidhā* | *uktaṃ ca: evam eva kriyāyogād *bhautiky* (conj.; *bhaumity* Cod.) *api parāparā* | *kin tu dehāvīyogārthaṃ prārabdhaṃ karma mōhinām* || *śaivasādhanaśādhya sandhāya paripālayet* | *sānubandhaṃ dahed anyad dīpte dīkṣāhutāśane* || *asyāpy ayam arthaḥ: evam eveti naiṣṭhika *sakāmākāmavad* (conj.; *-sakāmākāmavad*-Cod.) *bhautikasakāmākāmāyora api kriyāyogāt kriyā ca yogaś ceti kriyāyogam* | *tat kriyā*

of the *śivadharmiṇī*, this is not the way in which he wants the *Mr̥gendra* to be understood; rather, the prose after the quotation explains that the difference lies in the *sakāmā* entailing purification of the impure universe only up to *māyā*, thus providing enjoyments within the sphere of the pure universe; the *niṣkāmā* type, however, entails purification of all levels of the universe, and the initiate thus attains liberation at death.⁷⁶ If we are to understand these as two sub-categories of the temporary ascetic, the second type makes little sense, a confusion that is probably caused by the terminology *bhautikī* and *naiṣṭhikī dīkṣā* in the *Mr̥gendra*, where the terms are not, in turn, synonyms of the *bhautikavrata* and *naiṣṭhikavrata*,⁷⁷ as they are understood in the *Jñānaratnāvalī*.⁷⁸

The *lokadharmiṇī dīkṣā*, in turn, is divided into superior (*para*) and inferior (*apara*) forms. Of those, the superior version is what we expect of the *nirvāṇadīkṣā*, with all *karma* but the *prārabdha* destroyed, the candidate thus being united with Śiva at the end of the initiation ritual in anticipation of his ultimate liberation at the time of death.⁷⁹ The inferior form is assigned to an initiation in which only bad *karma* is destroyed, thus the version of the *lokadharmiṇī dīkṣā* seen in the *Svacchanda* and the *Mr̥gendra*.⁸⁰ Jñānaśiva even

sakāmasya māyāntādhvaviśodhanam | niṣkāmasya samastādhvaviśodhanañ ca yogaḥ | punaś śuddhādhvani bhogayogas sakāmasya niṣkāmasya śivayogaś ca [...], “Next, the *bhautikī* [dīkṣā] is twofold, and it is said [in the scriptures]: ‘In the same way the *bhautikī* [dīkṣā] is achieved] through ritual and union [and] is also of a superior and inferior kind. Rather, for the [still] deluded [souls] he should preserve the *prārabdha karma*, which has the purpose of keeping [the initiate] with his [current] body, after joining it with [the *karma*] to be cultivated for the practice of propitiating Śaiva mantras for supernatural powers (i.e. *śaivasādhana*). The other [*karmas*] together with their consequences he should burn in the blazing initiation fire.’ This is the meaning: ‘in the same way’ means through *kriyāyoga*, that it to say the rituals and union [with the respective deity] for the *sakāma* and *akāma bhautikī* are just like those for the *sakāma* and *akāma naiṣṭhikī*. Therefore the ritual for the *sakāma* kind is the purification of the universe up to *māyā*. For the *niṣkāma* it is the purification of the entire cosmic path and then union. Or rather, for the *sakāma* there is union with enjoyments in the pure universe, and for the *niṣkāma* there is union with Śiva. [...]”

76 Ibid.

77 See p. 254, note 19.

78 See note 72.

79 *Jñānaratnāvalī*, p. 268: *atha lokadharmiṇī ca parāparatvena dvivīdhā. tatra parā śivatvadā. uktaṃ ca: śivāśivātmakam karma śodhayitvādhvamadhyagam | yā yā nirvāṇam āpnoti sā parā lokadharmiṇī. iti*, “Now the *lokadharmiṇī* is divided into the superior and the inferior. Of these the superior bestows Śivahood. And it is said: ‘Having purified the pure and impure *karma* situated on the cosmic path (*adhvamadhyagam*), whichever [initiation] brings about liberation is the supreme *lokadharmiṇī* [initiation].”

80 *Jñānaratnāvalī*, p. 268: **śarīrapātottaram* (em.; *śarīrapādotaram* Cod.) *abhilakṣita bhuvane śiṣṭāparā lokadharmiṇī. aparā punar abhilaṣita bhuvanam yāvad adhvaśuddhau sa-*

quotes a verse which is shared with or probably original to the *Mṛgendra*, though embedded in a quotation from a different, unidentified text, which reiterates that the initiate can be united with the deity of his choice at the end of the initiation ritual.⁸¹ However, what is not made explicit in any of these passages is what the practice after initiation consists of; since both of them are *sabījadīkṣās*, we expect some form of post-initiatory practice to be applicable, which is fitting for the superior kind, but not for the inferior kind, as we have seen it so far. But given the context, we can probably assume that the intention is the same as it was in the original context, namely that the initiate of the lower (*apara*) form simply follows his *lokadharmā* after initiation. However, it is difficult to know whether this reflects actual practice—that is, whether this categorization intimates the convention of giving initiation even to lay worshippers of non-Śaiva deities—or whether this is an artificial distinction created in the process of accounting for the *Mṛgendra*'s shared terminology. Another place where Jñānaśiva invokes the *śivadharmiṇī*/*lokadharmiṇī* distinction is regarding the post-funerary *śrāddha* rituals, which vary according to initiatory types. Here, the mode of *śrāddha* for the *śivadharmī* appears to

tyām abhiṣṭabhuvane 'py aśubhāṃśakarmanivṛttau (conj.; *aśubhāṃ karmanivṛttau* Cod.) *tadbhuvaneśvara*gaṇāṇimādisiddhipradā* (conj.; **gaṇāṇimādisiddhipradā* Cod.). *uktañ ca: bhogabhūmiṣu sarvāsu duṣkṛtāṃśe hate sati | dehottarāṇimādyartham *śiṣteṣṭā* (conj.; *śiṣteṣṭā*- Cod.) *lokadharmiṇī || iti*, “The remaining one is the inferior *lokadharmiṇī* [initiation], [which] after death (*śarīrapātottaram*) [leads the candidate to] the universe he desired. But the inferior [*lokadharmiṇī* initiation] bestows supernatural powers, starting with the power to become as small as one wishes, and the qualities of the deity presiding over the [respective cosmic level], after the purification of the cosmic path up to the level of the universe [the candidate] desires. And even on this desired cosmic level, the cessation of *karma* is [only] of the unmeritorious part. And it is said: ‘The remaining [initiation], known as the *lokadharmiṇī*, [is performed] for the purpose of [obtaining supernatural powers], such as the power to become as small as one wishes, in a subsequent body, after the bad portion of [*karma*] is destroyed on all reality levels [through initiation].” Note that the appropriation of the *Mṛgendra* verse here to denote the inferior level of the *lokadharmiṇī dīkṣā* is not the original intention. Rather, the phrase *śiṣteṣṭā lokadharmiṇī* denotes the second kind of *bhautikī dīkṣā*, namely the *lokadharmiṇī* itself, in contrast to the *śivadharmiṇī*.

- 81 *Jñānaratnāvalī*, p. 268: **śivadharmīnam* (conj.; *śivadharmiṇīm* Cod.) *āsodhya *yojayet* (conj.; *yo jayet* Cod.) *parame pade | dehapāte ca *mokṣas* (conj.; *mokṣa* Cod.) *syāt samayācārapālānāt || *lokadharmīnam* (conj.; *lokadharmiṇīm* Cod.) *āropya mate* (conj.; *made* Cod.) *bhuvanakartari | *taddharmāpādanam* (conj.; *taddharmapālānam* Cod.) *kuryāc chive vā muktikāṃkṣiṇām ||*, “Having purified the *śivadharmī*, he should join him with the highest cosmic level, and after having performed his post-initiatory obligations liberation will come about at death. Having lifted up the *lokadharmī* to the desired [level] of the presiding deity, he should bring about the qualities of this [deity in the candidate] or [unite him] in Śiva, for those who desire liberation.”

be that which is intended for ascetic initiates, while that for the *lokadharmiṇī* is for householder initiates, thus being consistent with the basic distinction Jñānaśiva sets up in the beginning of the initiation section (Mirnig 2013, 292–295).

The *Jñānaratnāvalī*'s innovative application of the *śivadharmiṇī*/*lokadharmiṇī* terminology led to some interpretative confusion and inconsistencies in subsequent classifications,⁸² perhaps especially since the influential *Somaśambhupaddhati* does not mention this division of initiatory categories.⁸³ Thus Trilocana, for instance, who is a student of Jñānaśiva and wrote a commentary on the *Kriyākāṇḍakramāvalī*, when commenting on the initiation categories taught there, fits the *śivadharmiṇī* and *lokadharmiṇī* initiations into Somaśambhu's system under the category of *sāpekṣā* initiation, even incorporating such details as the difference in cutting or not cutting off the topknot.⁸⁴ However, he runs into difficulties when mapping the initiatory categories onto the various forms of *śrāddha*, which differ according to the initiate's spiritual status during his lifetime (Mirnig 2013, 296).

This distinctive idea that the topknot is to be cut off in the case of the *śivadharmiṇī* initiation, but not in the *lokadharmiṇī*, is carried over into subsequent sources that include these categories in their initiatory classifications.

82 See, for instance, Brunner 1977, 194, note 71.

83 *Somaśambhupaddhati*, *Samayadikṣāvidhi* 5–13: *nirādhārā ca sādharā dikṣā tu dvividhā matā | nirādhārā dvayosa teṣāṃ sādharā sakalaśya tu || ācāryanirapekṣeṇa kriyate śambhunaiva yā | tīvraśaktinipātena nirādhāreti sā smṛtā || ācāryamūrtim āsthāya mandatīvrādibhedayā | śaktyā yāṃ kurute śambhuḥ sā sādharānācyate || iyaṃ caturvidhā proktā sabijā bijavarjitā | sādharā niradhikārā yathāvad abhidhīyate || samayācārasaṃyuktā sabijā jāyate nṛṇāṃ | nirbijā tv asamarthānāṃ samayācāravartitā || nitye naimittike kāmye yaśya syād adhikāritā | sādharā bhaved dikṣā sādharācāryayor atah || nirbijādikṣitānāṃ tu tathā samayiputrayoḥ | nityamātrādhikāritvād dikṣā niradhikārikā || dvividheyaṃ dvirūpāpi pratyekam upajāyate | ekā kriyāvatī tatra kuṇḍamaṇḍalapūrvikā || manovyāpāramātreṇa yā sā jñānavatī matā | itthaṃ labdhādhikāreṇa dikṣācāryeṇa sādhyate ||* For a translation and notes, see Brunner 1977, 4–13.

84 Thus, Trilocana's *Somaśambhupaddhatīvyākhyā*, p. 184, is somewhat similar to Jñānaśiva's text (see note 67): ... yā dikṣaiva sabijā, nirbijā, sādharā, niradhikārā ceti caturvidhā proktā. tatra tāvat samayācārasaṃyuktā yā sā sabijā. sā ca dvividhā śivadharmiṇī lokadharmiṇī ca. tatra tāvac chivadharmiṇī śikhāyās chedasahitā. sā ca dvividhā naiṣṭhikī bhautikī ceti. tāvan naiṣṭhikī niravadhiḥ. dvitīyā katipayadinavrataparipālānanāntaram grhapadadāyini. And Trilocanaśiva ad *Somaśambhupaddhati*, *Nirvānadikṣāvidhi* 31, as quoted by Brunner 1977, 191, [32a]: *atraivāvasare tāvan nirbijānāṃ dehārambhakarmaṇaḥ | sabijāyāṃ tu dikāyāṃ śivadharmiṇyāṃ samayācāradehārambhakakarmadvayāt | atha sādha-kadikṣāyāṃ mantrasiddhiphalād api | lokadharmiṇyāṃ iṣṭāpūrtādidharmāc ca vyatiriktam prabandhakam kalānāṃ antare smaret*. For notes and a translation, see Brunner 1977, 190, note 66.

Thus, the *Siddhāntaśekhara* (18–22b)⁸⁵ of Viśvanātha, who wrote in Vārāṇasī in the first half of the thirteenth century (Sanderson 2014, 23), in essence teaches a structure similar to the *Jñānaratnāvalī*, with the *śivadharmiṇī* and *lokadharmiṇī* being the broad divisions of *sabjā* initiation, except that the *lokadharmiṇī* is not further divided; the *śivadharmiṇī*, in contrast, is divided into *naiṣṭhikī* and *bhautikī* varieties, but there is no further division into *sakāma* and *niṣkāma* kinds.⁸⁶

Even this brief survey of some early-medieval South-Indian sources, written some centuries after the sriptural material discussed in the first part of the paper, shows that there was no fixed consensus on what the different initiatory categories covered exactly; the same elements appear in various places, assembled together differently.⁸⁷ What the sources share, however, is that these categories are no longer in any case associated with the *bubhukṣu* category.

6 Conclusion

The material reviewed above allows us to trace how the emergence and development of the *lokadharmiṇī* initiation are linked to larger developments in tantric Śaiva history. To sum up: the initial stage appears to reflect an early phase of tantric Śaivism, when the power- and enjoyment-seeking aspects of

85 *Siddhāntaśekhara* p. 145, *Naimittikakāṇḍa*, chapter 2.18–22b: *sabjā dvidhā proktā prathamā śivadharmiṇī | dharmādharmātmakam karma sañcitāgāmicitrakam ||18|| saṃmṛḍya sādhyate yasmāt sā dīkṣā śivadharmiṇī | adharmasañcitam sarvaṃ karmāṅgam iva śodhyate ||19|| dharmāvaśeṣito yatra sā dīkṣā lokadharmiṇī | tatrādyā śāikhācchedā na śikhācchedanādarā ||20|| bhautikī naiṣṭhikī ceti dvidhā sā śivadharmiṇī | vratamokṣasamāyuktā bhautikīti nigadyate ||21|| śarīrapātaparyantā yathā sā naiṣṭhikī matā |.*

86 See, for instance, Nigamajñāna II's *Dīkṣādarśa*, for which see Ganesh 2009, 196; see also further mention of these categories on pp. 137, 164–165, 196, and 240.

87 For instance, in the 16th century *Śaivaparibhāṣā* (for the date of which see Sanderson 2014, 86) of Śivāgrayogin, the *śivadharmiṇī* and *lokadharmiṇī* are differentiated according to an original feature: that for the former all *karmas* are destroyed, and for the latter only the bad ones. The feature of cutting off the topknot, on the other hand, is connected with the *nirvāṇadīkṣā* as opposed to the *saṃyadīkṣā* and *viśeṣadīkṣā*; however, the text does link the cutting of the top-knot to the ascetic, saying that it should take place after his *nirvāṇadīkṣā*; see *Śaivaparibhāṣā*, chapter 5, p. 5: *īyam api śivadharmiṇī lokadharmiṇī ceti dvidhā. dharmādharmayor ubhayor api yatra saṃśodhanam sā śivadharmiṇī. adharmamātrasya yatra saṃśodhanam sā lokadharmiṇī. kriyāvati prakārāntareṇa trividhā. samayadīkṣā viśeṣadīkṣā nirvāṇadīkṣā ceti. yatra rudrapade yojanam kriyate sā samayadīkṣā. yatreśvarapade yojanam sā viśeṣadīkṣā. anayor ubhayor api nāsti śikhācchedaḥ. yatra śivapade yojanam sā nirvāṇadīkṣā. yatra nirvāṇadīkṣapūrvakam sanniyāsah tatra tv asti śikhācchedaḥ.*

tantric practice held a comparatively prominent role. It seems that the *lokadharmiṇī dīkṣā* was created in this milieu in order to extend the benefits and services of the tantric repertoire to various groups within the brahmanical mainstream, in this way appealing to the ordinary lay worshipper, who was perhaps attracted by the magical and merit-enhancing aspects of the religion but did not want to commit to the ritual life of a tantric practitioner. This initial function aligns with a gradual process of professionalization within tantric Śaiva communities, bridging the gap between esoteric practitioners and the laity. In this matter they followed in the footsteps of the Atimārga, for epigraphical evidence attests to members of these Śaiva ascetic initiatory circles serving as religious officiants for lay practitioners from as early as the fourth century (Sanderson 2013).⁸⁸ However, at the same time, the Sādhaka form of *lokadharmiṇī dīkṣā* is found only in the *Svacchanda*, *Mṛgendra*, and the *Tantrasadbhāva*, suggesting that in the broader Śaiva tantric world—apart from Kashmir—its function was of marginal or no importance, a circumstance likely contributing to its disappearance from subsequent sources.

We have seen that in other sources using the *lokadharmiṇī* category, this was reassigned to the sphere of the liberation-seeker. This allocation, in turn, may be correlated with two further developments. Firstly, increasing emphasis was given to the liberation-seeking aspect of the religion, a development that in the South culminates in the disappearance of the figure of the Śaiva Sādhaka, as Brunner (1974, 440) observes. Consequently, retention of an exoteric form of the enjoyment-seeker category may have gradually become obsolete. Secondly, we know that tantric Śaivism was successful in gradually adapting to the ritual needs of the brahmanical mainstream, even to the point of incorporating its practices within the tantric ritual repertoire, so that full initiation also became available to brahmanical householders, giving them unrestricted access to the religion.⁸⁹ This development is reflected in the use of the category *lokadharmiṇī dīkṣā* in the 12th-century *Jñānaratnāvalī*, where it is prescribed for precisely those householder initiates who had full access to the tantric repertoire but maintained their position and brahmanical ritual obligations in society (the *lokadharma*). Again, the need for a *lokadharmiṇī dīkṣā*, which made the *bubhukṣu* aspect of the religion more accessible and may originally have been a catalyst for outreach, may thereby have become less meaningful. The increasingly large-scale inclusion of the brahmanical main-

88 See also Sanderson 2009 for the many ways in which tantric officiants created strong links with the laity, also by acting as officiants in the domain of royal and consecration rituals.

89 See Sanderson 1995 and 2009.

stream from this time onwards is also visible in other areas of ritual, especially in South-Indian sources. Thus, for instance, we find the emergence of literature on penance rites regulating social interactions, such as the two works known as *Prāyaścittasamuccaya* by Hṛdayaśiva and Trilocana, respectively, the latter having been edited and translated by Sathyanarayanan (2015). In his introduction to this volume, Dominic Goodall draws attention to the socially all-encompassing nature of the work, showing how its prescriptions include even women as part of the community, and how the focus shifts to public temple ritual.⁹⁰ Goodall also points out another change within these tantric traditions, which we may find reflected in the history of the *lokadharmiṇī dīkṣā*, namely that along with these developments the goal of individual liberation gradually waned in importance. He observes also that the “colonization by the Śaiva Siddhānta of many large South Indian temples, and the dominance of Vedāntic non-dualism appear to have diminished the significance of ritual salvific *dīkṣā*.”⁹¹ As the tradition’s focus shifted from individual to public ritual life, it may be this waning importance of *dīkṣā*’s salvific function that has contributed to the confusion evident in Saiddhāntika manuals concerning how to categorize the *lokadharmiṇī* and *śivadharmiṇī dīkṣās*. The dominant concern in allocating these initiation types eventually became simply to differentiate the householder initiate from the ascetic, rather than to distinguish the spiritual goals attained through various initiations. This usage of the terminology is far removed from its original purpose: designating special types of tantric initiation for those seeking powers, access to higher cosmic realms, and, ultimately, liberation.

Acknowledgements

I am very grateful to Shaman Hatley for his careful reading and extremely helpful comments, suggestions and edits of the text.

90 In Sathyanarayanan 2015, 15–63.

91 See Goodall’s entry on *dīkṣā* in *Tāntrikābhidhānaśāstra*, vol. III. For more on the influences on the development and formation of Śaiva Siddhānta theology from the 10th century onwards, see Goodall 2006, in particular pp. 98–103.

References

Primary Sources

- Jayadrathayāmala*, *Ṣaṭka* 1. NAK 3–358; NGMPP A 995/6–996/1. Palm-leaf, Pāla script. *Jñānarātnāvalī* of Jñānaśivācārya. Transcript of Re 1025/52 (57) copied by V. Rangasvami (GOML); photographed and transcribed by Dominic Goodall.
- Tantrasadbhāva*. E-text by Mark Dyczkowski, dated 1 August 2006, accessed through the Muktabodha Indological Research Institute website, based on the following manuscripts: NGMPP A188/22, *śaivatantra* 1533 (siglum k); NGMPP A44/1 (NAK 1–363), *śaivatantra* (kh); NGMPP A44/2 (NAK 5–455), *śaivatantra* 185 (g).
- Tantrāloka*. Shāstrī, Mukund Rām, ed. *Tantrāloka of Abhinavagupta, with the commentary (-viveka) of Rājānaka Jayaratha*. Kashmir Series of Texts and Studies, no. 59. Bombay, 1938.
- Netratatantra*. Madhusūdan Kaul Śāstrī, ed. *Netratatantra, with the Commentary (Netrod-dyota) of Rājānaka Kṣemarāja*. Kashmir Series of Texts and Studies, nos. 46, 59. Bombay: 1926 and 1939.
- Brhatkālottaratantra*. NGMPP 4–131/VI Śaivatantra 127, Reel no. A43/1, Palm-leaf.
- Mr̥gendra*. Bhatt, N.R., ed. *Mr̥gendra Kriyāpāda and Caryāpāda, with the commentary (-vṛtti) of Bhaṭṭa Nārāyaṇakaṇṭha*. Pondicherry: Institut français de Pondichéry, 1962.
- Vimalāvatī* of Vimalaśiva. NGMPP reel number A186/10. Eletronic text of the Muktabodha Indological Research Institute typed under the supervision of Mark. S.G. Dyczkowski.
- Śaivasiddhāntaparibhāṣā* of Śivāgrayogin. Oriental Research Institute Sanskrit Series, no. 90, Madras: University of Madras, 1950. Eletronic text of the Muktabodha Indological Research Institute typed under the supervision of Mark. S.G. Dyczkowski.
- Siddhāntaśekhara* of Viśvanātha. Sītārāma Somayājīn and Śiva Śrī Talakāḍu Āvamika Kṛṣṇadikṣita, eds. *Ubhayavedānti Viśvanāthakṛtaḥ Siddhāntaśekharaḥ*. Manonmanigranthamālā, no. 20. Mysore: K. Sītārāma Somayājīn, 1971.
- Somaśambhupaddhati*. See Brunner 1977.
- Somaśambhupaddhativyākhyā* of Trilocana. IFP T. no. 170.
- Svacchandatantra*. Madhusudan Kaul Shāstrī, ed. *Svacchandatantra, with the Commentary (Svacchandodyota) of Rājānaka Kṣemarāja*. Kashmir Series of Texts and Studies, no. 38. Bombay: 1923.

Secondary Sources

- Bhatt, N.R. 1962. *Mr̥gendrāgama. Kriyāpāda et Caryāpāda. Avec le commentaire de Bhaṭṭa-Nārāyaṇakaṇṭha*. Pondicherry: Institut Français de Pondichéry/ Ecole française d'Extrême-Orient.

- Brunner, Hélène. 1975. "Le *sādhaka*, un personnage oublié du Sivaïsme du Sud." *Journal Asiatique* 263: 411–416.
- Brunner, Hélène, ed. and trans. 1977. *Somaśambhupaddhati, Troisième Partie. Rituels occasionnels dans la tradition śivaïte de l'Inde du Sud selon Somaśambhu 11: dikṣā, abhiṣeka, vratoddhāra, antyeṣṭi, śrāddha*. Pondicherry: Institut Français de Pondichéry/École française d'Extrême-Orient.
- Brunner, Hélène. 1985. *Mṛgendrāgama. Section des rites et section du comportement avec la vṛtti de Bhaṭṭanārāyaṇakaṇṭha*. Pondicherry: Institut Français de Pondichéry.
- Goodall, Dominic. 1998. *Bhaṭṭa Rāmakaṇṭha's Commentary on the Kiraṇatantra. Volume 1: chapters 1–6. Critical Edition and Annotated Translation*. Pondicherry: Institut Français de Pondichéry/École française d'Extrême-Orient.
- Goodall, Dominic. 2000. "Problems of Name and Lineage: Relationships between South Indian Authors of the Śaiva Siddhānta." *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society* 10 (2): 205–216.
- Goodall, Dominic. 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.
- Goodall, Dominic, Harunaga Isaacson, and Alexis Sanderson, et al. 2015. *The Nīśvāsattattvasaṃhitā. The Earliest Surviving Śaiva Tantra. Volume 1. A Critical Edition & Annotated Translation of the Mūlasūtra, Uttarasūtra & Nayasūtra*. Pondicherry: Institut Français de Pondichéry/École française d'Extrême-Orient.
- Kiss, Csaba. 2015. *The Brahmayāmala Tantra or Picumata, Volume Two. The Religious Observances and Sexual Rituals of the Tantric Practitioner: chapters 3, 21 and 45*. Pondicherry: Institut Français de Pondichéry/École française d'Extrême-Orient/Universität Hamburg.
- Mir nig, Nina. 2013. "Śaiva Siddhānta Śrāddha. Towards an evaluation of socio-religious landscape envisaged by pre-12th century sources." In *Puṣpikā. Tracing Ancient India Through Cults and Traditions*, edited by Nina Mir nig, Péter-Dániel Szántó and Michael Williams, 283–301. Oxford: Oxbow Books.
- Sanderson, Alexis. 1995. "Meaning in Tantric Ritual." In *Essais sur le Rituel 111: Colloque du Centenaire de la Section des Sciences religieuses de l'École Pratique des Hautes Études*, edited by Anne-Marie Blondeau and Kristofer Schipper, 15–95. Louvain-Paris.
- Sanderson, Alexis. 2001. "History through Textual Criticism in the Study of Śaivism, the Pañcarātra and the Buddhist Yoginītantras." In *Les sources et le temps. Sources and Time. A colloquium. Pondicherry 11–13 January 1997*, edited by François Grimal, 1–47. Pondicherry: Institut Français de Pondichéry/École française d'Extrême-Orient.
- Sanderson, Alexis. 2004. "The Śaiva Religion Among the Khmers, Part 1." *Bulletin de l'École française d'Extrême-Orient* 90: 352–464.

- Sanderson, Alexis. 2005. "Religion and the State: Śaiva Officials in the Territory of the King's Brahmanical Chaplain." *Indo-Iranian Journal* 47: 229–230.
- Sanderson, Alexis. 2006. "The Lākulas: New Evidence of a System Intermediate Between Pāñcārthika Pāśupatism and Āgamic Śaivism." *Indian Philosophical Annual* 24: 143–217.
- Sanderson, Alexis. 2007. "The Śaiva Exegesis of Kashmir." In *Mélanges tantriques à la mémoire d'Hélène Brunner. Tantric Studies in Memory of Hélène Brunner*, edited by Dominic Goodall and André Padoux, 231–442. Pondichéry: Institut Français de Pondichéry/École française d'Extrême-Orient.
- Sanderson, Alexis. 2009. "The Śaiva Age—The Rise and Dominance of Śaivism in the Early Medieval Period." In *The Genesis and Development of Tantrism*, edited by Shingo Einoo, 41–349. Tokyo: Institute of Oriental Culture, University of Tokyo.
- Sanderson, Alexis. 2014. "The Śaiva Literature." *Journal of Indological Studies* 24 & 25: 1–113.
- Sathyanarayanan, R. 2015. With an introduction by Dominic Goodall. *Śaiva Rites of Expiation. A First Edition and Translation of Trilocanaśiva's Twelfth-Century Prāyaścittasamuccaya (With a Transcription of Hṛdayaśiva's Prāyaścittasamuccaya)*. Pondicherry: Institut Français de Pondichéry/École française d'Extrême-Orient.
- Takashima, Jun. 1992. "Dīkṣā in the Tantrāloka." *Institute for Advanced Studies on Asia (Tohyobunkakenkyusho kiyo)* 119: 45–84.
- Tāntrikābhīdhānaśa. Dictionnaire des termes techniques de la littérature hindoue tantrique. Vol. III.* Dominic Goodall et Marion Rastelli, eds. Beiträge zur Kultur- und Geistesgeschichte Asiens, no. 76. Vienna: Austrian Academy of Sciences Press, 2013.
- Vasudeva, Somdev. 2012. "Powers and Identities: Yoga Powers and the Tantric Śaiva Traditions." In *Yoga Powers: Extraordinary Capacities Attained Through Meditation and Concentration*, edited by Knut A. Jacobson, 265–302. Leiden: Brill.
- Watson, Alex, Dominic Goodall and S.L.P. Anjaneya Sarma. 2013. *An Enquiry into the Nature of Liberation. Bhaṭṭa Rāmakaṇṭha's Paramokṣanirāsakārikāvṛtti, a Commentary on Sadyojyotiḥ's Refutation of Twenty Conceptions of the Liberated State (mokṣa)*. Pondicherry: Institut Français de Pondichéry/École française d'Extrême-Orient.