

1 The *Daśavidhahetunirūpaṇa*

The *Daśavidhahetunirūpaṇa*,³⁵ “the description of the tenfold reason (why the Vaikhānasas are superior),” is the first extant Vaikhānasa text which explicitly expresses the central positions of this ritual school over against other vaiṣṇava traditions. The text’s date is unclear, but there is strong evidence that it was composed later than 1350 CE (see 1.2). The author Śrīnivāsa Dīkṣita felt himself obliged to differentiate his position from other traditions, and thereby to emphasize the merits of the Vaikhānasas. He clearly perceived his own ritual tradition to be under threat. The object of parts 1 and 2 of this book is to examine the underlying religious conflict on the basis of written sources, and to analyse the Vaikhānasas’ strategies, which were intended to establish them as a distinct and hierarchically superior group of vaiṣṇava temple priests in the religious milieu of South Indian temple culture.

In the *Daśavidhahetunirūpaṇa* several distinctive features of the Vaikhānasa school are emphasized and elaborated, often in order to demarcate them from rival ritual traditions such as the Pāñcarātrins. The explicitly stated intention of the *Daśavidhahetunirūpaṇa* is to demonstrate the Vaikhānasas’ superiority over other traditions (DHN^D 2.1–3):

Now the tenfold reasons will be mentioned to show the superiority of the Vaikhānasasūtra over all other sūtras, which is composed by the four-faced [god] Brahmā, who is (also) referred to with the word *vikhanas*, (and) who is created by the highest Brahman, (namely) the glorious Nārāyaṇa who is characterized by all the auspicious qualities like truthfulness etc., and to show the superiority of those following this (Vaikhānasa) sūtra over all others.

At the start of the *Daśavidhahetunirūpaṇa* the author presents, in abbreviated form, the ten statements which he employs to underpin these claims and for which the text is named (DHN^D 2.5–9):

These (ten reasons) are [1:] because it [the Vaikhānasasūtra] is established by Vikhanas, who is the cause of the entire world; [2:] because it is the first among all sūtras; [3:] because it follows the way of the śruti in all (its ritual) actions; [4:] because it teaches all its (ritual) actions with mantras; [5:] because it has niṣeka

35 The text is an introduction to the *Tātparyacintāmaṇi* by the same author, a commentary on the *Vaikhānasasmārtasūtra*, to which it is also prefixed in its Devanāgarī edition. The few statements of the editor Pārthasārathi Bhaṭṭācārya on the manuscripts he used suggest that the two texts have always been handed down together. The contents also suggest this, for the *Tātparyacintāmaṇi* occasionally makes reference to the *Daśavidhahetunirūpaṇa* or assumes knowledge of its contents.

as its first life-cycle ritual; [6:] because it teaches the eighteen bodily life-cycle rituals; [7:] because it contains the totality of (ritual) actions together with their components; [8:] because it is accepted by *Manu* etc.; [9:] because of the absolute supremacy of the glorious *Nārāyaṇa*, who is the only cause of the entire world; [10:] and because of the evidence, that those who practice the *dharma* as expounded in this *sūtra*, are dearest to the Adorable One.

These reasons are laid out one after another in what follows in the *Daśavidhahetunirūpaṇa*, the length of the ten sections differing greatly. Śrīnivāsa Dīkṣita cites different *Ṛg̃hya-* and *Dharmasūtras*, the *Mahābhārata*, the *Rāmāyaṇa*, diverse *dharmaśāstras*, *upaniṣads* and *purāṇas*, some ritual texts of the *Pāñcarātra* tradition, and *Vaikhānasa* texts on temple ritual. The author connects these (mostly metrical) quotations with his own statements and explanations in prose.

By and large Śrīnivāsa Dīkṣita relies in his arguments on texts which were apparently either generally accepted as authoritative in his time, or on texts of his own or the rival ritual tradition. All are anonymous in so far as they cannot be ascribed to any historical author. Śrīnivāsa Dīkṣita conspicuously neither refers to his contemporaries nor does he mention his immediate predecessors. A chronological classification is therefore very difficult (see 1.4). In what follows, the position of the *Daśavidhahetunirūpaṇa* within the *Vaikhānasa* literature shall be described.

1.1 On *Vaikhānasa* literature

Since the third century of the Common Era the *Vaikhānasas* have produced an extensive literature, chiefly in Sanskrit. The composition and publication of works in this tradition continues today, perhaps more than ever (see Hüsken 2001b). Unfortunately, the works not by contemporary authors are not yet even close to being chronologically classified. As so often with Indian literature, especially with texts on rituals, so also these texts have undergone many times a process which Hans Bakker (1989: 331f.) describes as “composition in transmission”: in the course of their being handed down, they are continually modified and amplified, the alterations being made in a formulaic style with little individuality. This certainly applies to the texts assigned to authors who cannot be placed historically, but also to the texts of historical authors.

One recurrent theme throughout all the *Vaikhānasa* literature is the appeal to the *Vaikhānasasūtra* as primary authority.³⁶ The term *Vaikhānasasūtra* is used as

36 Traditionally, a *sūtra* is described as “complete” when it contains each of the following sections: *ṛg̃hyasūtra* (relating to domestic ritual), *śrautasūtra* (relating to the solemn sacri-

a short form of *Vaikhānasasmārtasūtra* (also *Vaikhānasakalpasūtra*) which consists of *Vaikhānasagrhyasūtra*, *Vaikhānasadharmasūtra* and *Vaikhānasapravarasūtra*. These three parts are often handed down in one manuscript. The *sūtra* was probably not composed before the third century of the Common Era.³⁷ Both the *Vaikhānasasmārtasūtra* and *Vaikhānasaśrautasūtra* have been edited in India and Europe several times, but only the *grhya*- and *dharmasūtra* have been translated into western languages.³⁸ It was on the basis of these texts that a number of European scholars became preoccupied with the characteristics of this vedic school in the early 20th century.³⁹ This period also saw the start of active editorial work—prompted especially by the Vaikhānasa scholar Pārthasārathi Bhaṭṭācārya—in the small village Īgāvāripāḷem in the south of Andhra Pradesh. The publication series *Śrīvaikhānasagranthamālā* was established there, and it was there that a number of texts of the tradition were published—in limited editions and printed in Telugu script—for the first time.⁴⁰

While the only printed text on the solemn sacrifices is the *Vaikhānasaśrautasūtra*,⁴¹ there is a whole series of treatises dealing with domestic rituals of this tradition. Apart from the two extant commentaries on the *Vaikhānasasmārtasūtra*, namely the *Vaikhānasasūtrabhāṣya* of Nṛsiṃha Vājapeyin and the *Tātparyacintāmaṇi* of Śrīnivāsa Dīkṣita (see 1.2 and 1.4), a series of ritual handbooks must be mentioned here. These so-called Prayoga texts contain various detailed and practically-oriented instructions, which may be consulted for teaching or even during the performance of the rituals. By contrast to the commentaries, these texts mostly do not quote the *sūtra* word for word, but describe how that

fices), *dharmasūtra* (codes of conduct) and *śulvasūtra* (mathematical calculations relating to sacrifices and altars). The *Vaikhānasasūtras* do not contain a *śulva* section of their own, but a chapter entitled “*pravarasūtra*,” which deals with genealogy. There exists also an “appendix” to the *sūtra*, namely the *Vaikhānasagrhyaparīśiṣtasūtra*, which has most probably not been preserved but for some quotations given in the *Daśavidhahetunirūpaṇa* and the *Tātparyacintāmaṇi* (see 1.4).

37 On the dating, see Bloch 1896, Caland 1926 and Keith 1930.

38 A German translation of the *Vaikhānasadharmasūtra* by Eggers (1929) was published at the same time as Caland’s 1929 translation.

39 In 1896 the first western researcher to work on the *Vaikhānasasūtras*, Theodor Bloch, completed his habilitation thesis entitled *Über das Grhyasūtra und Dharmasūtra des Vaikhānasa*. This was followed by articles by Caland (1926, 1928, 1930), Sieg (1930), Charpentier (1930), Randle (1930) and Keith (1930).

40 See Colas 1984a; see also Hüsken 2001b.

41 In Andhra Pradesh a prayoga text by Bhāradvāja Kṛṣṇamācārya on the *Vaikhānasaśrautasūtra* entitled *Ādhānasaptaka* or *Vaikhānasaśrautaprayogakṛpti* is said to exist. I was not able to trace this text.

which is alluded to in the sūtra is to be translated into ritual action. In this the prayogas do not necessarily follow the order of events as specified in the sūtra, but are rather arranged according to the sequence of the performance in actual practice. In Andhra Pradesh and Tamil Nadu today, the texts *Pūrvaprayoga* and the *Sūtrānukramaṇikā* are used for domestic rituals, with the exception of death rituals (see 4.3).⁴² The death and ancestor rituals are described in separate ritual handbooks.⁴³ Besides these compendia there are also some publications devoted to the description of particular life-cycle rituals (*samskāra*). These works date from the twentieth century and are mostly composed in Telugu, Tamil and Sanskrit.⁴⁴ Finally there are some publications concerned with daily and other regular ritual activities such as the twilight rituals, the application of the sect marks, etc.⁴⁵

A particular mantra collection of the Vaikhānasas, the *Vaikhānasamantra-praśna*, is closely connected to the Vaikhānasasūtras. The formulae, hymns and verses which are to be recited in the course of various rituals are assembled in this collection.⁴⁶ The first four chapters (*praśna*) contain the mantras required for domestic rituals,⁴⁷ the remaining four chapters provide the mantras for temple rituals.⁴⁸ Among these the seventh chapter, entitled *Pāramātmikopaniṣad*, is of particular significance for the Vaikhānasa tradition and has several commentaries.⁴⁹ Willem Caland, the editor of the *Vaikhānasaśrautasūtra*, ap-

42 There is also the *Sūtradarpaṇa* of Nṛsiṃha Vājapeyin (see 2.2.2.2), the *Srīvaikhānasasūtriyāparaprayoga* and the *Sūtraprayoga*. There appears to have been a whole series of further ritual handbooks which are not extant as complete texts. Only short extracts are cited in Pārthasarāthi Bhaṭṭācārya's commentaries on the *Daśavidhahetunirūpaṇa* and on the *Ānandasamhitā* (see 2.2.2.3–4, 2.2.4.4–7).

43 *Paitṛmedhikaprayoga*, *Vaikhānasaśrāddhaprayoga* and *Vaikhānasasūtriyāparaprayoga*.

44 *Annaprāśanavivaraṇamu*, *Upanayanavivaraṇamu*, *Cauḷavivaraṇamu*, *Nāmakaraṇavivaraṇamu*, *Nāpatu samskāraṅkaḷil nāṅku samskāraṅkaḷ*, *Vivāhaprayoga* and *Vaikhānasa-sūtrīya Aṣṭāda Upākarma*.

45 *Ariya veṅṭiya 108 tarmaṅkaḷ*, *Āhnikapraśnapatramulu*, *Āhnikāmṛta*, *Ūrdhvaṇḍrapravivaraṇamu*, *Trikālasaṃdhyāvandanamu*, *Rāmadeśikāhnikā*, *Vadhūdharmacandrikā*, *Vaikhānasa-śrāvaṇaprayoga*, *Śāntikaḷyāṇamu*, *Śrāvaṇapūrṇimavaiśiṣṭyam*, *Samdhyāvandana*, *Samdhyāvandanavivaraṇa* and *Kanyakā jananaśoca nirṇaya / Brahmācārī āśoca nirṇaya*.

46 On the parallel transmission of two recensions of this mantra collection, in places differing considerably from one another in points of detail, see Colas 1996: 222ff.

47 In his introduction to the *Vaikhānasasmārtasūtra*, Caland discusses the structural correspondences of the relationships between the first four chapters of the *Vaikhānasamantra-praśna* with the *Vaikhānasaśrāghyasūtra* and of the *Āpastambīyamantrapraśna* with the *Āpastambīyagṛhyasūtra*.

48 The second part of the mantra collection is discussed and translated by Howard Ray Resnick in his 1997 dissertation.

49 *Pāramātmikacandrikā*, *Pāramātmikamantravyākhyā* and *Pāramātmikopaniṣadbhāṣya*.

parently also had a manuscript for a mantra collection (*mantrasaṃhitā*) of the śrautasūtra at his disposal. This text is, however, not extant.⁵⁰ In addition there exist more recent compilations of mantras and other texts to be recited during individual rituals in temples and in the domestic sphere.⁵¹

As members of a Brahmanic caste of vaiṣṇava temple priests, the Vaikhānasas have produced an extensive literature on temple ritual, the oldest texts of which are the so-called Vaikhānasasaṃhitās.⁵² Four Ṛṣis, namely Marīci, Atri, Kāśyapa and Bhṛgu, are regarded as the authors of these works.⁵³ They are direct pupils of the mythical founder of the Vaikhānasa school, Vikhanas. Together with the sūtras, the Vaikhānasasaṃhitās, which are all but two in verse, are traditionally taken to represent the canon of the Vaikhānasas (Vaikhānasaśāstra or Vaikhānasabhagavacchāstra). In these Vaikhānasasaṃhitās all aspects of the temple cult are dealt with: the preparation of a temple's construction site, its actual construction, the production of images of the deities and their installation, the ritual requisites and the preparation of fireplaces in the temple, and the regular temple rituals including the diverse temple festivals.

Only one of the Vaikhānasasaṃhitās has a commentary;⁵⁴ but there are many handbooks on temple ritual based on the saṃhitās. These shorter texts are nowadays turned to for practical advice.⁵⁵ For the most part these works consist of collections of quotations from different Vaikhānasasaṃhitās. As with the handbooks for domestic ritual, particularly the newer compilations add explanations

50 See Caland/Vīra 1941: xv; see also Gopalakrishnamurty 1966: 36–39.

51 *Ābdikamantravivaraṇamu*, *Vivāhapanayanādimaṃtrapraśnārthaprakāśika*, *Vaikhānasa-mūrtabhaḡavadyajanamantrabhāḡa*, *Nārāyaṇaṣṭākṣarī mahāmantrānuṣṭhāna*, *Śrīvaikhānasa-sūtrokta dvādaśasūktāni*, and *Śrīmatvikanasamuṇīranukruhītam śrīvaikhānasaśāst-rōkta viśeṣasūktankaḡ*.

52 As the structure and content of these texts closely resemble those of the āgamas of the śai-va schools and of the vaiṣṇava ritual school Pāñcarātra, most Indian and western authors refer to these texts as Vaikhānasaāgamas. This term is however, not used by the texts themselves. Rather, the terms kāṇḡa/khaṇḡa, adhikāra/adhikaraṇa or saṃhitā are used as self-designations (see Colas 1996: 45; see also Caudharī 1995: 406).

53 The printed saṃhitās are *Ādisaṃhitā* (Chapter 18), *Ānandasamhitā* and *Vimānārcanakal-pa* of Marīci, *Kriyādhikāra*, *Khilādhikāra*, *Prakīrṇādhikāra*, *Yajñādhikāra* and *Vāsādhikāra* of Bhṛgu, *Jñānakāṇḡa* of Kāśyapa and *Samūrtārcanādhikaraṇa* of Atri.

54 *Ānandasamhitāvyaḡhya*.

55 I was able to observe how during some rituals even complete passages from these handbooks were read out, where the acting priest did not know the text by heart. Moreover, these texts are also used in the education of the student priests.

in modern Indian languages. The texts deal above all with the regular temple worship, particular religious festivals and temple inaugurations.⁵⁶

Beyond strictly ritual works, the Vaikhānasa tradition has produced many more texts. There are collections of praise songs and poems,⁵⁷ more general vaiṣṇava religious texts not exclusively connected to the Vaikhānasa tradition⁵⁸ and treatises concerned with themes such as the dimensions of ritual implements and fireplaces.⁵⁹ Furthermore there exist accounts of teacher-pupil lineages specific to the Vaikhānasas⁶⁰ and hagiographies of Vikhanas and Śrīnivāsa Dīkṣita.⁶¹

Of interest here are above all those texts in which the Vaikhānasa seek to set themselves apart from other religious and ritual currents, in which they define their specific identity over against the other. Some of these works seek to provide a distinctive philosophical profile for the ritual school,⁶² others again draw contrasts between the ritual characteristics of their own tradition and those of other groups.⁶³

56 *Arcanātilaka*, *Arcanānavanīta*, *Arcāvatāramu Śrī Vaikhānasamu*, *Āgamavyāsasampuṭi*, *Ābdikaprayoga*, *Ārtistava*, *Kṛṣṇāpuṣkaravidhi*, *Dhṛvārcāyajānavidhi*, *Dhanvantaripratīṣṭhākālpa*, *Dhyānamuktāvālī*, *Nityārcanāvidhāna*, *Nityārcanavidhi*, *Pratiṣṭhānukramaṇīkā*, *Pratiṣṭhāvidhidarpaṇa*, *Pratyābdikaprayogadarpaṇamu*, *Bālakṛṣṇatiruvārādhanamu*, *Brahmotsavānukramaṇīkā*, *Bhagavadarcāprakaraṇa*, *Bhagavadārādhanakrama*, *Bhagavadārādhanacandrikā*, *Bhagavadutsavānukramaṇīkā*, *Mahāsaṃprokṣaṇam*, *Mahāśānti-prayoga*, *Mrutsaikrahaṇam/Ankurārpaṇam*, *Viṣṇvarcanāsārasaṃgraha*, *Viṣṇvālayārcanavidhi*, *Vaikhānasam*, *Vaikhānasaviṣṇvārādhanakrama*, *Śrīkāśyapasmṛti*, *Veṅkaṭeśvara-subhodhaya*, *Vaikhānasanityārcanavidhi*, *Samūrtasāmānyārcanāvidhi*, *Snapanavidhi*, *Snapanāni*, *Hanumadarcanoktavidhi* and *Hanumadarcanotsavavidhi*.

57 *Ācāryastava* + *Kodaṇḍāramastava*, *Kṛṣṇāryāṣṭottaraśataka*, *Triśati*, *Vikanasāccāryaḥ stotra-pāṭha*, *Vikhanasācārya Divyaprabandha*, *Vikhanasācāryastutiśataka*, *Vaikhānasācāryastutiśataka*, *Lakṣmīnārāyaṇaśaraṇāgatistavam*, *Śrīstutisumamañjarī* and *Vaikhānasastotraratnāvalī*.

58 *Abhijñānaśakuntalāvyākhyā*, *Īśāvāsyaopanitu*, *Īśāvāsyaopanīṣat*, *Gajendra Mokṣamu*, *Go-dāmahimā*, *Corasaṃvāda*, *Rasikarājanabhāṇa*, *Rāmabhadrastutiśataka*, *Rāmānuja vaibhavam*, *Rāmāryāśataka*, *Rukmīnikṛṣṇasaṃvāda*, *Lakṣmīhayaagrīvatatva*, *Lakṣmīhaya-grīvasahasranāmāvalī* and *Śatapramāṇādīpikā*.

59 *Yāgakuṇḍādinirṇaya*.

60 *Vaikhānasasāguru-paramparā* and *Vaikhānasācārya-paramparā-nusandhānakrama*.

61 *Vikhanasacaritra*, *Vikhanasotpatticaritra*, *Vaikhānasakathāmathanamu*, *Vaikhānasula caritra*, *Śrīnivāsādīkṣitendracaritra* and *Śrīvikhano Mune* - *Vaikhānasula*.

62 *Uttamabrahmavidyā*, *Uttamabrahmavidyāsāra*, *Uttamabrahmavidyāsārasaṃgraha*, *Mokṣopāyapradīpikā*, *Lakṣmīviśiṣṭādvaitabhāṣya* and *Nigamacūḍadarpaṇa*.

63 *Gṛhyasūtradharmanirṇaya*, *Daśavidhahetunirūpaṇāndhratātparya*, *Daśavidhahetunirūpaṇavyākhyāna*, *Dharmacandrikā*, *Dharmajijñāsāvivādapracuramu*, *Vaikhānasakalpasūtravaiśiṣṭyam*, *Vaikhānasamu*, *Vaikhānasavijaya*, *Vaikhānasavaibhavam*, *Vaikhānaso-*

These works constantly—if seldom explicitly—make use of the argumentative apparatus first systematically developed by Śrīnivāsa Dīkṣita in his *Daśavidhahetunirūpaṇa*,⁶⁴ which is discussed in detail in the present work. The central question, which drives the *Daśavidhahetunirūpaṇa*, concerns the Vaikhānasas' eligibility (*adhikāra*), to act as priests in Viṣṇu temples. Is it birth or initiation which makes a person eligible to act as intermediary between the world and the other-worldly? This debate persists until well into the twentieth century. It is discussed in some rather polemical works⁶⁵ on the basis of the question of whether the Vaikhānasas must undergo an initiation involving a brand on the upper arms, or whether for them their life-cycle rituals, and in particular the prenatal life-cycle ritual viṣṇubali, confers the right to perform temple ritual.

1.2 The author Śrīnivāsa Dīkṣita

The author of the *Daśavidhahetunirūpaṇa* enjoys high standing in contemporary Vaikhānasa communities as may be gathered, for example, from a letter of the Vaikhānasa paṇḍit Pārthasārathi Bhaṭṭācārya to Willem Caland. In his letter Pārthasārathi Bhaṭṭācārya (see 1.3) describes some differences between the Vaikhānasas and other vaiṣṇava groups and declares that only the Vaikhānasas acknowledge Śrīnivāsa Dīkṣita as their teacher:⁶⁶

[...] these Vaikhānasas do not worship in their houses the Alvars and Acharyas of the other Shree Vaishnavites, [...] They do not worship the Mathadhipatis of either Advaita or Dvaita schools of philosophy likewise. Thus they form a separate independent minority within the Vaishnava community, as the followers of their Acharya and Bhashyakara Srinivasa Dikshita.

Many Vaikhānasa texts—irrespective of their content—begin with a formula honouring Vikhanas and Śrīnivāsa Dīkṣita, who is also known as Śrīnivāsamakhin,

pakhyāna Sajjanasambhava, Sārasaṃgraha, Sārasaṃgrahamardana and Siddhāntaleśa-darśa.

64 The arguments used by the same author in the *Vaikhānasamahimamañjarī* are also based on those developed in the *Daśavidhahetunirūpaṇa* (see 1.4).

65 *Taptacakrāṅkanakhaṇḍana, Paramārtharāmabāṇa* and *Vaikhānasataptacakrāṅkanavijayatūlavātūla.*

66 Quoted as “A short note on the Vaikhānasasūtra” in Caland’s introduction to his edition of the *Vaikhānasaśrautasūtra* (Caland/Vira 1941: xxviii-xxxi).

Vedāntadeśika, Śrīnivāsāryadīkṣita, Śrīnivāsāryayajvan and Śrīnivāsamakḥivedāntadeśika.⁶⁷

What is known about Śrīnivāsa Dīkṣita's life comes from the introductory verses of the *Daśavidhahetunirūpaṇa* (DHN^D 1.1–20), from the text *Śrīnivāsādīkṣitendracaritra* (abbr: SDC),⁶⁸ from some verses of a Vaikhānasa guruparamparā⁶⁹ and from sporadic statements in *Tātparyacintāmaṇi*. According to these sources, Śrīnivāsa Dīkṣita was the son of Govindācārya and Rukmiṇī, from a Vaikhānasa family of the Kauśika clan. He was born in Śrī Veṅkaṭācala (Tirumalai, Andhra Pradesh, also known as Vṛṣagiri). Like his father Govindācārya, he was a follower of Veṅkaṭeśa/Veṅkaṭeśvara, the form of Viṣṇu worshipped in Tirumalai. His grandfather on his mother's side, Śrīnivāsa Yajvan, is the author of a now lost *Kārikā*, a commentary on domestic rituals.⁷⁰ Śrīnivāsa Dīkṣita is considered notably learned—for instance the Pāñcarātra doctrine is supposed to have been as well known to him as his own tradition. Moreover he was known for regularly performing diverse lavish śrauta sacrifices.⁷¹

Some clues regarding Śrīnivāsa Dīkṣita's relative place within the history of the Vaikhānasa tradition may be garnered from his position in several lists of teacher-student succession (*guruparamparā*). Such *guruparamparās* are an expression of respect towards those who transmit and embody the tradition and at the same time provide religious legitimation to the individual who recites and transmits the *guruparamparā*. In practice nowadays a neophyte during or after his initiation into a certain religious denomination is taught to recite a verse which mentions his teacher and his teacher's teacher. Thus, two generations of religious teachers are preserved in the living memory of a student. In contrast, the lists presented in Appendix 1 stretch from Viṣṇu-Nārāyaṇa as the first teacher to the reciter's own teacher in person.⁷² From a scholarly point of view, these *guruparamparās* are therefore not to be taken literally in their entirety. The lists

67 In the *Daśavidhahetunirūpaṇa* alone four different names or combinations of component parts of individual names are used for Śrīnivāsa Dīkṣita (DHN^D 1.3, 1.6, 1.19, 122.12; see SDC, p. 17). Here the name Śrīnivāsa Dīkṣita will be used throughout.

68 This text was published under the title *Śrīnivāsādīkṣitendracaritramu*, and is also quoted almost in its entirety in the Sanskrit commentary *Daśavidhahetunirūpanavyākhyāna* (pp. 12–19) and appended to the edition of the *Vaikhānasamahimamañjarī* (pp. 73–79).

69 “Śrīvaikhānasa-Guruparamparā,” in *Vaikhānasam*, p. 5 (see Appendix 1).

70 This is taken from a short passage in the *Tātparyacintāmaṇi*, where some verses from the *Kārikā* are quoted (TPC 464.6–14).

71 See SDC: pp. 15 and 17. The components of Śrīnivāsa Dīkṣita's name (-makḥin, -deśika or -yajvan) refer also to his sacrificial activity.

72 See, e.g. MOP, p. 1: *śrīlakṣmīvallabhārambhāṃ vikhanomunimadhyamām / asmadācār-yaparyantām vande guruparamparām ||*. See Colas 1985: 117.

consulted agree extensively for the distant past,⁷³ divide temporarily into two different strands which differ in detail but not substantially,⁷⁴ and then diverge ever more from each other. It can safely be assumed that Śrīnivāsa Dīkṣita, who is unanimously represented as being knowledgeable in many areas, had several teachers.⁷⁵ Śrīnivāsa Dīkṣita's father Govindā[cā]rya is included in four of the six guruparamparās. While two guruparamparās do not explicitly mention Śrīnivāsa Dīkṣita's immediate teacher, the *Lakṣmīhayagrīvasahasranāmāvalī* names Sundarārya, whereas *Āhnikāmṛta* and *Mokṣopāyapradīpikā* suggest that his teacher was Narahari (Naraharibhaṭṭācārya), for they place him between Śrīnivāsa Dīkṣita and his father. Three guruparamparās are in substantial agreement in respect of Śrīnivāsa Dīkṣita's successors, who are named as Vipranārāyaṇācārya, Vāsantayājīn,⁷⁶ Anantanārāyaṇā(cā)rya,⁷⁷ Tirumalācārya Śrīnivāsācārya,⁷⁸ Venkaṭācārya and Govindārya. In spite of all differences the most important facts for our purpose are that Śrīnivāsa Dīkṣita is consistently presented as hav-

73 One exception here is the text *Vaikhānasācāryaparamparānusaṃdhānakrama*, which names far more mythical Ṛṣis than the other guruparamparās.

74 They cite almost identical names up to Anantācārya. The *Vaikhānasācāryaparamparānusaṃdhānakrama* follows the *Śrīvaikhānasa-Guruparamparā* after the teacher Vipranārāyaṇa.

75 See the number of his teachers mentioned by Anantapadmanābhācāryulu Gāru (4.6.2).

76 In his introduction to his edition of the *Tātparyacintāmaṇi* (p. iv) Pārthasārathi Bhaṭṭācārya ascribes a text called *Gṛhyasūtrprayogavṛtti* to one Vasantayājīn, from which he cites the part on viṣṇubali in his commentary to the *Ānandasamhitā* (pp. 118–119). Eggers (1922: 16) mentions that Śiṅgarācārya names a text by Vasantayājīn called *Pāñcarātra-nirākāra*. The India Office Library Catalogue lists only one work of Vasantayājīn, a text named *Vaikhānasasamhitāvyaḅhyāna*. So far I have not been able to consult these texts. One Vasantayājīn has also commented on the 18th chapter of the Vaikhānasa text *Ādisamhitā*. Colas (1996: 93) assumes that this Vasantayājīn lived after Śrīnivāsa Dīkṣita. However, in two guruparamparās one Vasantaka or Vasantayājyācārya is also named before Śrīnivāsa Dīkṣita.

77 Anantanārāyaṇa is supposed to have written a commentary on the Vedāntasūtra entitled *Vārttikagrāhīnī*.

78 This is a namesake of our Śrīnivāsa Dīkṣita, who is also called Śrīnivāsamakṣin. A student of Anantanārāyaṇa, or of one of his students, possibly produced the text *Uttarabrahma-vidyā*. According to Mr. Charyulu (Kothalanka), manuscripts of this text are available in the Sanskrit Kendriya Vidyapeetha Library (Tirupati) and one manuscript is in the possession of V. Ayyamacharyulu (Kākināḁa). The commentary on this text, *Uttarabrahma-vidyāsāra*, was edited in early 2007 by Dr. Sudarśanan Bhaṭṭar of the Tanjavūr Sarasvatī Mahal library. The same Śrīnivāsa Dīkṣita is supposed also to have written a commentary on the *Abhijñānaśakuntalā* of Kālidāsa (ed. Rāmānuja Tātācārya, Chennai 1882; available in the Adyar Library, Chennai, shelfmark "Rare 1882 Kal AS sk Tat").

ing lived after Nṛsiṃha Vājapeyin, Bhaṭṭa Bhāskara⁷⁹ and Anantācārya, and that he lived several generations before any author whose date can be fixed with some certainty.

Neither *Daśavidhahetunirūpaṇa* nor *Tātparyacintāmaṇi* provide concrete evidence for the lifetime of their author. Nowhere does Śrīnivāsa Dīkṣita explicitly refer to the works of any historically placeable author. The citations which both texts contain allow only an approximate *terminus post quem* due to the equally uncertain dating of the cited texts. In the *Daśavidhahetunirūpaṇa*, among the Vaikhānasasaṃhitās, Śrīnivāsa Dīkṣita cites at length only the *Anandasamhitā* and the *Purātantra*.⁸⁰ The few further references to the saṃhitās are isolated verses from *Yajñādhikāra*, *Vāsādhikāra* and from Kāśyapa's *Jñānakāṇḍa*. In the *Tātparyacintāmaṇi* Śrīnivāsa Dīkṣita cites in addition *Vimānārcanakalpa*, *Kriyādhikāra*, *Prakīrṇādhikāra*, *Niruktādhikāra* and *Arcanādhikāra*.⁸¹ Thus both the earliest saṃhitā texts as well as those texts presumed to be the latest of the saṃhitā corpus are cited. It can therefore be safely assumed that *Daśavidhahetunirūpaṇa* and *Tātparyacintāmaṇi* have been composed after the *Anandasamhitā* was compiled, that is most likely after the 13th century CE (see Colas 1996: 69, 95). This fits with the date arising from the Pāñcarātra texts Śrīnivāsa Dīkṣita cites, and also with the fact that he refers to several Śrīvaiṣṇava concepts which were not widely in use before the 14th century CE. The other texts cited by Śrīnivāsa Dīkṣita do not give any additional hints as to his dates (see 1.4).⁸²

On the basis of Śrīnivāsa Dīkṣita's *Pāramātmikopaniṣadbhāṣya*, Gérard Colas (1996: 93) presumes that the author lived after Vedāntadeśika, that is after the second half of the 14th century CE.⁸³ The author of Śrīnivāsa Dīkṣita's hagiography *Śrīnivāsadīkṣitendracaritra*, Sundararāja, confirms that Śrīnivāsa Dīkṣita

79 Only the *Vadhūdharmacandrikā* names Bhaṭṭa Bhāskara before Nṛsiṃha Vājapeyin. In the *Tātparyacintāmaṇi* Śrīnivāsa Dīkṣita refers twice briefly to a Bhāskara (TPC 439.17–18, 503.8–9).

80 To the best of my knowledge, the *Purātantra*, which is ascribed to Bṛḥgu, is extant only in citations and not preserved as an independent text. The sections of text from the *Purātantra* and the *Anandasamhitā* cited in the *Daśavidhahetunirūpaṇa* and the *Tātparyacintāmaṇi* are very similar in content.

81 As of this writing, *Niruktādhikāra* and *Arcanādhikāra* have most probably been printed but were not at my disposal. Vaikhānasa scholars are mentioned by name at only three points in the *Tātparyacintāmaṇi*. Bhaṭṭa Bhāskara is mentioned twice, and there is one reference to Śrīnivāsa Dīkṣita's grandfather on his mother's side.

82 Ramachandra Rao (1990: 1) states that Śrīnivāsa Dīkṣita composed the *Lakṣmīviśiṣṭādvaitabhāṣya* in 1059 CE while Śrīdhara Babu (1977) supports the view that he lived in the 13th century. However, neither author gives any reason for the dating.

83 See Potter 1983: 296; see also Hopkins 2002, part 1.

lived after Vedāntadeśika when he states that Śrīnivāsa Dīkṣita in his *Vaikhāna-samahimamañjarī* comments on Vedāntadeśika's text *Sajjanasāmbhava*.⁸⁴ At the same time, however, he gives Śrīnivāsa Dīkṣita's year of birth as 1198 CE, which is several decades before Vedāntadeśika's birth.⁸⁵

The first secure *terminus ante quem* is the lifetime of the author of Śrīnivāsa Dīkṣita's hagiography, Sundararāja from the Illattūr agrahāram near Shenkotta in Kerala (b. 1841, d. 1905), son of Varadarāja Aiyangar and Kṛṣṇāmbāl.⁸⁶ It can certainly be assumed that more than a century must divide Sundararāja and Śrīnivāsa Dīkṣita, otherwise Sundararāja would surely not have placed him so long before himself. It is therefore probable that Śrīnivāsa Dīkṣita lived in the period after Vedāntadeśika and at least a century before Sundararāja, i.e. between 1370 and 1740.

Apart from *Daśavidhahetunirūpaṇa* and *Tātparyacintāmaṇi* further six texts are ascribed to Śrīnivāsa Dīkṣita. Caland used three different manuscripts of Śrīnivāsa Dīkṣita's commentary on the *Vaikhānasaśrautasūtra* (entitled *Vaikhānasaśrautasūtravyākhyā* or *Śrīnivāsadīkṣitīya*) for his edition of the *Vaikhānasaśrautasūtra*.⁸⁷ In Sundararāja's *Śrīnivāsadīkṣitendracaritra* (p. 21) an astrological treatise entitled *Tīthinirṇayakārikā* is also named. This text seems to be no longer extant. In his commentary on the Brahmasūtra, entitled *Lakṣmīviśiṣṭād-vaitabhāṣya*, Śrīnivāsa Dīkṣita seeks to give the Vaikhānasa a philosophical profile of their own, which is in agreement with the postulated vedic descent and

84 See SDC: p. 25. Sundararāja refers here to the chapter *sajjanasāmbhavagranthaḥ vaikhānasotpattiprakāra* of the *Vaikhānasamahimamañjarī* (VMM: pp. 36–37). A text entitled *Sajjanavaibhava* (or *Sajjanasāmbhava*?) is ascribed to the Vedāntadeśika who is also the author of the *Pāñcarātrarakṣā*. The text was published in Telugu script as 7th volume (*anubandha*) of the series *Śrīvaikhānasagranthamālā* and a manuscript of the text is available in the Government Oriental Manuscript Library, Chennai (No. 5395). There is no consensus as to whether the text is actually authored by this Vedāntadeśika (see Colas 1996: 67). However, A. Kṛṣṇamācāryulu from Narsapur, who translated the text into Telugu, explicitly supports the view that the *Sajjanasāmbhava* is actually a work of the author of the *Pāñcarātrarakṣā*.

85 SDC 13: *triṃśatuttara(triśatyuttara)catussahasreṣu vyatīteṣu kalivarṣeṣu sarvajītvatsare tuṃgasthe savitari tathā caṃdre ca, vaiśāke prājāpatye nakṣatre ślāghanīye lagne sādhi-vī sā prāsaviṣṭaprabhūtaguṇaṃ kam api putraṃ bhuvanamitram*. This dating is, however, not internally consistent: the year 4300 of the Kaliyuga corresponds to the year 1198, but the expression *sarvajītvatsare* does not apply to this year. According to the southern calendar the closest *sarvajīt* years to the year given here are 1227 or 1167 CE.

86 He is also the author of the *Uttarabrahmavidyāsāra*. On his further works, see Kunjuni Raja 1958: 253.

87 See Caland/Vīra 1941: xii–xiv. Mr. Charyulu (Kothalanka, Andhra Pradesh) claims to be in the possession of several further manuscripts of this text.

with the temple ritual. Therein he argues for a position which differs from Viśiṣṭādvaita in some points (see Ramacandra Rao 1990: 104, 112). *Pāramātmikopaniṣadbhāṣya* is a commentary on the seventh chapter of the mantra collection of the Vaikhānasa (see 1.1). Finally Śrīnivāsa Dīkṣita composed the *Vaikhānasa-mahimamañjarī* (see 1.4), in which he elaborates on the characteristics of the Vaikhānasa tradition. Therein he deals in particular with the Vaikhānasa idea of “taking refuge in Viṣṇu-Nārāyaṇa” (see 2.2.5).

1.3 Pārthasārathi Bhaṭṭācārya, editor of the *Daśavidhahetunirūpaṇa*

The *Daśavidhahetunirūpaṇa* has been edited twice by the Vaikhānasa scholar Pārthasārathi Bhaṭṭācārya (b. 1895, d. 1987). When he first edited the text, in 1931 at the age of 36, he supplemented it with a commentary of his own in Sanskrit (*Daśavidhahetunirūpaṇavyākhyāna*, abbr. DHNV) and with detailed explanatory notes in Telugu.⁸⁸ In addition the work contains a citation index of 13 pages, so that in total the book comprises 748 pages. The size of the *Daśavidhahetunirūpaṇavyākhyāna* thereby surpasses that of the *Daśavidhahetunirūpaṇa* by far. The second edition of this text followed in 1967, printed this time in Devanāgarī characters and without Pārthasārathi Bhaṭṭācārya’s Sanskrit commentary. Now, however, Pārthasārathi Bhaṭṭācārya published the *Daśavidhahetunirūpaṇa* together with sūtra commentary *Tātparyacintāmaṇi* by the same author.⁸⁹ In the foreword to the Devanāgarī edition the editor simply remarks that the manuscripts used were all made available to him by Vaikhānasa families, and that the mistakes and omissions in all the manuscripts were identical. He consulted at least three manuscripts for this edition, made available to him by three persons from Andhra Pradesh (Ākuḷamannāḍu, Tirupati, Nallūru). As he does not mention his 1931 edition it remains unclear whether the textual basis for the two editions is the same. The Devanāgarī text of the *Daśavidhahetunirūpaṇa* comprises 122 printed pages. This edition is the source of all references to the *Daśavidhahetunirūpaṇa* in the present volume and of the reproduction in

88 This first edition of the *Daśavidhahetunirūpaṇa* was printed in Telugu script. The *Daśavidhahetunirūpaṇavyākhyāna* has not been drawn on systematically here, but only for unclear passages of text. The Telugu explanatory notes have not been used at all for the present work.

89 The older Telugu edition is available only in a few libraries worldwide, and can hardly be used due to the brittleness of the paper. Even in the restored copy in the Niedersächsischen Staats- und Universitätsbibliothek Göttingen (shelfmark A 2000 A 35512) many passages are illegible.

electronic form at the website “Göttingen Register of Electronic Texts in Indian Languages” (http://www.sub.uni-goettingen.de/ebene_1/fiindolo/gretil.htm).

Pārthasārathi Bhaṭṭācārya is a very important figure for the Vaikhānasa communities in the 20th century. Therefore a few words should be said here about him and his career, so far as it can be reconstructed.⁹⁰ Pārthasārathi Bhaṭṭācārya was one of six sons of a very conservative vaiṣṇava Brahman in a small village in Andhra Pradesh (Ākulamannāḍu, near Machilipatnam, Kṛṣṇā District). His father sent him to a mission school, so that he—alone among his family—should learn English, in order to be in a position to communicate with the representatives of the colonial power. Pārthasārathi Bhaṭṭācārya was so successful in this that he even won prizes in Bible Study. The knowledge of English he gained in his youth enabled him to establish contact with Willem Caland in the late 1920s, just at the time when the latter was preparing his edition of the *Vaikhānasasmārtasūtra*.

Pārthasārathi Bhaṭṭācārya dedicated a large part of his energy to the preservation and propagation of the Vaikhānasa ritual system. Most of the Vaikhānasa-saṃhitās which are in print today were edited by him⁹¹ on the basis of manuscripts collected by his father, his grandfather and himself in Andhra Pradesh and Tamil Nadu. However, many of the manuscripts which he used for his editions later fell victim to a fire in his house in his home village, to which he had retreated after his retirement. It is also essentially thanks to Pārthasārathi Bhaṭṭācārya’s initiative, that a centre for editing Vaikhānasa texts with its own press was established in the small village of Īgāvāripāḷem in southern Andhra Pradesh where since the beginning of the 1920s the *Vaikhānasagranthamālā* series of Vaikhānasa texts was published.⁹²

Pārthasārathi Bhaṭṭācārya’s comprehensive textual knowledge enabled him to participate actively from the 1920s in the discussions over whether the Vaikhānasas have to undergo an initiation with branding—as influential Śrīvaiṣṇavas demanded (see 3.1)—or whether they were qualified to perform temple ri-

90 Most of the information on Pārthasārathi Bhaṭṭācārya’s life and works was communicated orally to me in fall and winter 2000 by several Vaikhānasas in Tirumalai, Vijayawada and Machilipatnam; above all by the late D. V. Chari, the then secretary of the “Sri Vaikhānasa Divya Vivardhini Sabha.” These details have been further supplemented by information provided by Prof. Guy R. Welbon, Philadelphia.

91 Several texts which were in fact edited by Pārthasārathi Bhaṭṭācārya were not published under his name. He sought to honour others, for example his brothers, by ascribing editions to them.

92 See Colas 1984b; see also Hüsken 2001b.

tuals by virtue of their prenatal life cycle ritual viṣṇubali.⁹³ In 1927 he attended a joint meeting of the Vaikhānasa and the Śrīvaiṣṇavas, but was then excluded because he apparently represented the Vaikhānasa interests very uncompromisingly (see 3.1.1). Almost all the texts which Pārthasārathi Bhaṭṭācārya himself composed in Sanskrit and Telugu are concerned with the eligibility of the Vaikhānasa to perform temple ritual: the Sanskrit commentary *Daśavidhahetunirūpaṇavyākhyāna* and its Telugu gloss *Daśavidhahetunirūpaṇāndhratātparya*, the Sanskrit commentary on the *Ānandasamhitā*, the *Paramārtharāmabāṇa* and *Vaikhānasa vaibhavamū*, but also diverse articles in Sanskrit, Telugu and English published in the *Journal of the Śrī Venkaṭeśvara University Oriental Institute*. He was well-known as a very capable Sanskrit scholar and as an authority in both the theory and practice of the Vaikhānasa ritual system.

In the 1950s Pārthasārathi Bhaṭṭācārya was employed in the administration of the Journal of the Venkaṭeśvara temple in Tirumalai. In his position as “Āgama-panḍit” he did all that he could to further the interests of the priests employed in this and in other Vaikhānasa temples. To this end he founded in 1959 in Tirumalai the trans-regional Vaikhānasa organization “Sri Vaikhanasa Divya Vivardhini Sabha,” whose aim it is to facilitate the publication of more Vaikhānasa texts and to improve the education of the priests.⁹⁴ In general Pārthasārathi Bhaṭṭācārya sought to better the position of the priests vis-à-vis the temple administration on the one hand and the devotees and donors on the other. He is described by all who knew him as an intellectual, calm and gentle man.

Pārthasārathi Bhaṭṭācārya must have had an enormous textual knowledge at his command for in his extensive Sanskrit commentary on the *Daśavidhahetunirūpaṇa* he often supplements Śrīnivāsa Dīkṣita’s arguments with extended citations from diverse purāṇas, the *Mahābhārata* and many other relevant legal and ritual texts. From the many differences in details between the two editions, which after all are separated by more than thirty years, emerges indirectly also a

93 Guy R. Welbon reports that Pārthasārathi Bhaṭṭācārya was a legal advisor to a Muslim landholder in Nellore District before he came to Tirupati. As such he occupied an intermediary position between the landholder and his Hindu subordinates. Welbon found a document in Pārthasārathi Bhaṭṭācārya’s papers from the early 19th century, which was composed by the Tax Collector’s Office in Nellore and dealt with the question of branding. However, I do not have any further information on the contents and the circumstances of the document’s composition. Research in Tirumalai and Ākulumanāḍu have yielded nothing; possibly the document is no longer extant.

94 See “Sree Vaikhanasa Divya Siddhanta Vibardhini Sabha,” *Memorandum of Association*, No. 7 of 1959 (Registered under Act XXI of 11860), Tirupati; 1992. On this, see Hüsken 2001a.

development of the scholar Pārthasārathi Bhaṭṭācārya. In the Devanāgarī version he silently resolves some of the unclear or ambiguous passages of the Telugu edition, especially some of the prose passages, which quote Śrīnivāsa Dīkṣita's opinion.⁹⁵ The comparison of the two editions of the *Daśavidhahetunirūpaṇa* by one and the same scholar distinctly exemplifies the process of "composition in transmission" (Bakker 1989): in being transmitted (in this case in being edited), the text is "improved" from the point of view of those who hand it down. As the changes are not identified as such, the now altered text is again regarded as "authoritative tradition," and thus canonized.

1.4 The *Daśavidhahetunirūpaṇa* in its literary context

The chief difficulty in dating Śrīnivāsa Dīkṣita arises from the fact that he does not explicitly refer to preceding or contemporary scholars of other traditions and their texts. The citations from other texts presented in the *Daśavidhahetunirūpaṇa*, which substantiate the 'ten reasons' consistently come from "śruti, smṛti, purāṇas etc." (DHN^D 2.11–12). These sources and how Śrīnivāsa Dīkṣita relates to them shall be described now.

Although Śrīnivāsa Dīkṣita refers to the vedic authority of the Vaikhānasa-sūtras in almost every one of his 'ten reasons', he only occasionally cites this text verbatim. One reference occurs in connection with the discussion of *devalakatva*, i.e. with the charge against the Vaikhānasas that, as temple priests, they "worship god for money" (see 2.1.2). Here he seeks to show through a reference to *Vaikhānasasmārtasūtra* 4.10 that worship of god in iconic form is prescribed already in the *Vaikhānasasmārtasūtra*, and that therefore the charge of being devalakas cannot be upheld against the Vaikhānasas (DHN^D 53.5–11).⁹⁶ Here and in another passage from the same part of the *Vaikhānasasmārtasūtra* (DHN^D 99.7–9),⁹⁷ Śrīnivāsa Dīkṣita seeks to show that only Vaikhānasas accept Nā-

95 The verse quotations from the authoritative texts, however, agree with the original texts, as they are now available in print, more often in the Telugu than in the Devanāgarī edition.

96 The cited text reads (VaikhSmS 4.10): *agnir vai devānām avamo viṣṇuḥ paramas tadan-tareṇa sarvā anyā devatā iti brāhmaṇam. tasmād guhe paramaṃ viṣṇum pratiṣṭhāpya sā-yaṃ prātar homānte 'rcayati:* " 'Agni is in truth the lowest of the gods, Viṣṇu the highest. All other gods are between these two' thus [reads] a Brāhmaṇa. Therefore, once one has installed the highest, Viṣṇu, in an enclosed room, one worships him evening and morning at the end of the sacrifice into the fire."

97 The cited text reads (VaikhSmS 4.12): *dvijātir atandrito nityaṃ grhe devāyatane vā bhak-tyā bhagavantam nārāyaṇam arcayet. tadviṣṇoḥ paramaṃ padaṃ gacchatīti vijñāyate:* "The twice-born should worship the glorious Nārāyaṇa always at home or in the temple with devoted love. He reaches the highest residence of this Viṣṇu, so it is taught." Refer-

rāyaṇa as the highest god (DHN^D 97.15–18). Reference is also occasionally made to *Vaikhānasasmārtasūtra* 1.1, the beginning of the sūtra. Niṣeka is there listed as the first life-cycle ritual (*samskāra*). This is the subject of the “fifth reason” in the *Daśavidhahetunirūpaṇa* (DHN^D 80.6–78 and 85.20; see 2.2.2).⁹⁸ The same passage is also referred to in the “sixth reason,” where the uniqueness of the *Vaikhānasasmārtasūtra* is attributed to the fact that only here are eighteen samskāras listed (DHN^D 86.5–8).

Thus in the whole *Daśavidhahetunirūpaṇa* which time and again asserts the centrality of the *Vaikhānasasūtras*, the sūtras themselves are in fact only quoted in a very few places. The main reason for this apparent imbalance is that the entire *Tātparyacintāmaṇi* which is attached to the *Daśavidhahetunirūpaṇa*, is a commentary on the *Vaikhānasasmārtasūtra*, and makes detailed reference to the sūtra, expounds it and cites it word for word. Evidently the author therefore did not feel the need to refer to the sūtra time and again in the *Daśavidhahetunirūpaṇa*.

It is far more remarkable, however, that precisely those sūtra passage cited in the the *Daśavidhahetunirūpaṇa* are even today the most frequently cited passages of the *Vaikhānasasūtras*. The *Vaikhānasas*’ reference to their vedic tradition appears to be expression of a more general tendency of contemporary Hindu traditions: while in daily practice constant reference is made to the textual corpus of the Veda, its actual content is largely detached from the religious practice (see B.K. Smith 1989: 13f. and 20f). In the case of the contemporary *Vaikhānasa* tradition reference is made time and again to the authority of the “*Vaikhānasasūtra*” but the living tradition is concerned primarily with temple ritual, which does not yet feature in the *Vaikhānasasmārtasūtra*. The *Vaikhānasas*, however, resolve this imbalance by designating the *Vaikhānasasūtras* together with the *Vaikhānasasamhitās* which describe temple ritual, as *Vaikhānasabhagavacchāstra*, the canon of their tradition.

Another mode of extending vedic authority to later texts is employed in the “seventh reason” of the *Daśavidhahetunirūpaṇa* (DHN^D 90.1ff): “The sūtra contains the whole of the ritual actions together their component parts.” From fictive opponents the objection is then raised that several rituals are not described at all in the *Vaikhānasasmārtasūtra*. For these Śrīnivāsa Dīkṣita refers to a text called *Vaikhānasagrhyapariśiṣṭasūtra*, in which all those rituals not mentioned in

ence is also made in *Daśavidhahetunirūpaṇa* 95.12 to the hierarchy of the Brahmins (on this see 2.2); the best Brahmins are those who acknowledge Nārāyaṇa as the only and highest god.

98 In *Daśavidhahetunirūpaṇa* 83.17–19 reference is made to *Vaikhānasasmārtasūtra* 3.10, where the signs of pregnancy are listed. In other sūtras the time for garbhādhāna is determined by these signs (see 2.2.1).

the *Vaikhānasasmārtasūtra* are dealt with. In order to substantiate this, he quotes in detail from this *Vaikhānasagrhyapariśiṣṭasūtra*, the complete text of which appears no longer to be preserved even in manuscript.⁹⁹ The only extant portions are the citations reproduced in Śrīnivāsa Dīkṣita's works,¹⁰⁰ some of which were then absorbed by the *Sūtrānukramaṇikā* (see 4.3.1).

Śrīnivāsa Dīkṣita quotes the sūtra of Bodhāyana considerably more often than the sūtra of his own tradition.¹⁰¹ This affirms the special connection between these two branches of the Taittirīya school, which is dealt with in detail by Krick (1977).¹⁰² There are several aspects which both sūtras have in common. For our purposes the most important agreement is that Bodhāyana is the only other sūtra author to describe a prenatal saṃskāra called "bali-offering to Viṣṇu" (see 2.2.2.1). Moreover, Bodhāyana also knows a ritual named nārāyaṇa-bali, which again is otherwise only described by the Vaikhānasas.¹⁰³ And just like the *Vaikhānasasmārtasūtra*, the *Baudhāyanagrhyapariśiṣṭasūtra* (a later appendix to the *Baudhāyanagrhyasūtra*) describes the installation of an iconic image of Viṣṇu.¹⁰⁴ Nevertheless, one cannot establish any direct dependence in one direction or the other (see Colas 1994: 523ff).

The special relationship between the Baudhāyana and the Vaikhānasa traditions is also reflected in the *Vaikhānasasaṃhitās*. In these Bodhāyana is occasio-

99 The first to draw attention to this text was Renou (1947: 189). Pārthasārathi Bhaṭṭācārya says nothing in his Sanskrit commentary about this text.

100 In the *Tātparyacintāmaṇi* Śrīnivāsa Dīkṣita often refers to this text as "grhya." From the citations it is apparent that the *Vaikhānasagrhyapariśiṣṭasūtra* was in verse, and that it contained many grammatical mistakes.

101 Both Kane and Olivelle date the Baudhāyanasūtras well before the Vaikhānasasūtras. Kane (1974a: xi) places the *Baudhāyanagrhyasūtra* between 600 and 300 BCE; Olivelle (2000: 4–10, 191, 7 fn. 10) dates the older parts of the *Baudhāyanadharmasūtra*, which is thought to be roughly contemporary with the *Baudhāyanagrhyasūtra*, to c. 500–200 BCE. Olivelle notes, however, that the sections added to the *Baudhāyanadharmasūtra* (2.17–18) appear to be a handbook for renunciators, and could have emerged at the same time as the Vaikhānasasūtras.

102 Krick (1977: 7) refers to the fact that both sūtras emerged in South India, both are the latest sūtras of the Taittirīya school, and both reflect post-vedic religiosity (including allusions to temples, pūjā, etc.).

103 For details, see Krick 1977. A hierarchisation of Brahmans on the basis of the saṃskāras they have undergone is also common to both texts (see VaikhSmS 1.1 and BaudhGrS 1.7.1–20). The texts differ in that for Bodhāyana the bodily saṃskāras are included in the list of pākayajñas and are therefore treated as domestic sacrifices (BaudhGrS 1.1.1–12), whereas for the Vaikhānasas there is a clear separation between bodily saṃskāras and sacrifices (see VaikhSmS 1.1; see also Pandey 1949: 29f.).

104 See the seminal work of Harting (1922).

nally mentioned as an apostate disciple of Vikhanas.¹⁰⁵ The close relationship is here expressed as competition. However, the attitude towards the Bodhāyana tradition is not uniform in the Vaikhānasasamhitās: Colas finds that on the one hand in the *Samūrtārcanādhikaraṇa* the Bodhāyanasūtra is brought into connection with a “better” Pāñcarātra tradition, but that on the other in the *Vāsādhikāra* following the “Baudhāyanaśāstra” is described, just like the Vaikhānasa tradition, as *vaidika*, in agreement with the Veda.

Likewise, Śrīnivāsa Dīkṣita sometimes repudiates the content of the Baudhāyanasūtras as inferior to the Vaikhānasa tradition while at other times he uses the Baudhāyana tradition to underpin his own position.¹⁰⁶ Nevertheless at all times he allocates to the Baudhāyanins a position subordinate to the Vaikhānasas. Thus Śrīnivāsa Dīkṣita repeatedly demonstrates on the basis of references to one or more ācāryas (“masters” or “teachers”) in the Baudhāyanasūtras, that the Baudhāyanins recognize Vikhanas as authority (DHN^D 10.6, 82.23–84.12). Śrīnivāsa Dīkṣita deals with the Baudhāyana tradition in more detail in the “fifth reason,” which demonstrates that only the Vaikhānasas have niṣeka as the first saṃskāra. Here a particular closeness between the Baudhāyanins and the Vaikhānasas emerges, which Śrīnivāsa Dīkṣita presents as significant difference by emphasizing the nuances (DHN^D 82.18–22; 83.2–5, 85.15). Similar structures are revealed also in the treatment of other rituals where Śrīnivāsa Dīkṣita is at pains to foreground the differences in spite of all common features (DHN^D 73.6–9, 73.13–74.2, 97.19–21, 97.22–25, 98.6–9).

Several times Śrīnivāsa Dīkṣita refers to other sūtras where these equate *vai-khānasa* with *vānaprastha*, a term describing those in the third stage of life (*āśrama*) as “forest-dwellers,” who have given up heading a household and withdrawn to the margins of the community.¹⁰⁷ In some sūtras the words *vānaprastha* and *vaikhānasa* are used synonymously. A close connection between the two is in fact suggested by the *Vaikhānasadharmasūtra*’s unusual close attention to the religious rights and duties (*dharma*) of vānaprasthas.¹⁰⁸ Śrīnivāsa Dīkṣita seeks here to make clear that Vaikhānasas are not necessarily vānaprasthas (see DHN^D 21.2–23.10). Followers of other traditions who are in the third stage of

105 See ĀS 2.79–80; see also Colas 1996: 18.

106 See, for example, DHN^D 75.11–14 and DHN^D 89.12–13. Reference to Bodhāyana as an authority is also occasionally made in later ritual texts of the Vaikhānasas (see 2.2.2).

107 For details on the vānaprastha stage of life, see Sprockhoff 1981, 1984, and 1991; see also Olivelle 1993.

108 On this connection see Bloch 1896; Caland 1926; Eggers 1929; Colas 1990, 1992a, 1996: 13–15; Pratap 1995; Muttu 1996. The actual connection between the *Vaikhānasasmārtasūtra* and the vānaprastha life-stage remains unclear at present.

life, he claims, often follow the Vaikhānasasūtra and it is for this reason that they are called *vaikhānasa* (DHN^D 27.20–29.15). Śrīnivāsa Dīkṣita thus emphasizes that all those texts, which connect Vaikhānasa and vānaprastha with one another, thereby refer to the section of the *Vaikhānasadharmasūtra*. This implies that the Vaikhānasasūtra chronologically precedes the other texts, and thus that—as Śrīnivāsa Dīkṣita puts it in his “second reason”—the Vaikhānasasūtra is “the first among sūtras” and further, as is stated in the “eighth reason,” that others recognize the Vaikhānasasūtra as authority.

At the beginning of the *Daśavidhahetunirūpaṇa* Śrīnivāsa Dīkṣita says explicitly that his argument is based upon “upaniṣads, *Mahābhārata*, *Rāmāyaṇa*, purāṇas etc.”¹⁰⁹ Śrīnivāsa Dīkṣita cites some upaniṣads in order to prove the importance of mantras in ritual,¹¹⁰ and to show that the saṃskāras contained in the *Vaikhānasasmārtasūtra* are already mentioned in the Veda.¹¹¹ Other quotations from the upaniṣads serve to prove that making a saṃkalpa (formal declaration) to “take refuge in Viṣṇu-Nārāyaṇa” is possible even before birth:¹¹² while still in his mother’s womb, Vāmadeva recognized the sorrowful nature of cyclical re-birth and made up his mind to take refuge in Nārāyaṇa after his birth. Very importantly, these quotations serve to connect the Vaikhānasas’ prenatal life-cycle ritual viṣṇubali with the concept of initiation: an initiation’s characteristic as being based on conscious decision is thus integrated into the prenatal life-cycle ritual and—only for the Vaikhānasas—thereby “brought forward” to the time before birth (see 2.2.3).

The *Mahābhārata* and diverse purāṇas are constantly quoted in order to underline or to prove Śrīnivāsa Dīkṣita’s own statements. The following purāṇas (in ascending order of frequency) are quoted:¹¹³ *Viṣṇupurāṇa*, *Bhāgavatapurāṇa*, *Padmapurāṇa*, *Bṛhannārādīyapurāṇa*, *Garuḍapurāṇa*, *Kūrmapurāṇa*, *Skandapurāṇa*, *Varāhapurāṇa*, *Brahmakaiivartapurāṇa*, *Brahmāṇḍapurāṇa*, *Viṣṇudharmottarapurāṇa*, *Nāradaipurāṇa*, *Vāyupurāṇa*, *Narasimhapurāṇa*, *Liṅgapu-*

109 The entire *Daśavidhahetunirūpaṇa* contains only two quotations from the *Harivaṃśa*. The *Rāmāyaṇa* is only brought in as it can be used to show that the Vaikhānasas are not just vānaprasthas (DHN^D 21.19–25, 22.2–8).

110 The sāvitṛī mantra is the subject of a quotation from the *Talavakāropaniṣad* (DHN^D 74.4–22). A quotation from the *Chāndogyopaniṣad* (DHN^D 77.20–22) is likewise drawn upon as proof that rituals should always be performed with mantras.

111 In DHN^D 81.14–18 he cites the *Muṇḍakopaniṣad* and the *Chāndogyopaniṣad*, and in DHN^D 86.9–10 and 89.10–11 he cites the *Muṇḍakopaniṣad*.

112 In DHN^D 103.24–104.8 he cites the *Garbhopaniṣad*, in DHN^D 104.9–13 he cites the *Mudgalopaniṣad*, and in DHN^D 104.21–22 he cites the *Kaivalyopaniṣad*.

113 The source of many quotations from the purāṇas are not given in the text; see DHN^D 18.24–19.6, 42.16–17, 56.14–15, 69.18–21, 121.16–122.3.

rāṇa, *Brahmapurāṇa*, *Matsyapurāṇa*, *Agnipurāṇa*, *Sāmbapurāṇa* as well as one quotation from the *Viṣṇudharma*.¹¹⁴ In some places the author, possibly deliberately, alters the content of the quoted text slightly. Thus in *Daśavidhahetunirūpaṇa* 105.21–106.13 Śrīnivāsa Dīkṣita introduces a quotation from the *Padmapurāṇa* in order to illustrate his idea of “tantric prapatti” (see 2.2.5.2). In the quotation branding of the upper arms as part of an initiation is rejected: as a Brahman is to be seen as a house of the gods, his body is not to be injured, for the damage or destruction of the house drives away the gods. As far as I can see, this verse is not contained the printed editions of the *Padmapurāṇa*. One chapter of the *Padmapurāṇa* does, however, deal in detail with branding on the upper arms. There, in complete contrast to the quotation cited in the *Daśavidhahetunirūpaṇa*, only those Brahmans with a branding are described as “true followers of Viṣṇu.”¹¹⁵ Similarly, in a citation from the *Padmapurāṇa* in *Daśavidhahetunirūpaṇa* 107.2–11 the Pāñcarātrins are accused of being “without loving devotion (*bhakti*)” towards the god, as branded, and as being the lowest of the Brahmans. The statement in the printed edition of the *Padmapurāṇa* is considerably more tolerant. There it reads that god is to be worshipped as taught by one’s teacher. The Pāñcarātrin and Vaikhānasa are there explicitly ranked equally.¹¹⁶

Beyond the purāṇas most quotations in the *Daśavidhahetunirūpaṇa* come from the *Mahābhārata*. Many of the verses can also be found in similar form in the critical edition, mostly in the appendices. What is striking is that especially those quotations which explicitly mention the Vaikhānasas or Vikhanas are not given in the critical edition. Here and elsewhere the background to the differences in wording between diverse recensions of the same text would repay investigation. For example Śrīnivāsa Dīkṣita presents the difference in Vaikhānasa and Pāñcarātra ideas of the manifestations (*mūrti/vyūha*) of god with a passage from the so-called Vaiṣṇavadharma from the *Mahābhārata*.¹¹⁷ According to his quotation here, the Vaikhānasas worship god in five forms as Viṣṇu, Puruṣa, Satya, Acyuta and Aniruddha, while the Pāñcarātrins worship god in four forms as Saṅkarṣaṇa, Pradyumna, Aniruddha und Vāsudeva (DHN^D 23.19–24.2). Exactly the

114 Many passages from the purāṇas mentioned by name cannot be verified on the basis of the printed editions available to me.

115 See PadmaP, uttarabhāga, 224.42–80.

116 See PadmaP, uttarabhāga, 253.54–56.

117 The so-called Vaiṣṇavadharma of the *Mahābhārata* is only preserved in the southern recension (see Grünendahl 1984: 51–54 and 1997: 233f.). On the vyūha concept(s) in some passages of the Pāñcarātrasaṃhitās, see Bock-Raming 2002 (esp. chapters 4 and 5); for critical assessments of Bock-Raming’s work see Padoux 2004, Rastelli 2004, and Colas 2005a.

same passage from the Vaiṣṇavadharma is later cited anew in the *Daśavidhahetunirūpaṇa*—this time in order to show that the Vaikhānasas also know the division into four vyūhas (DHN^D 44.22–45.2). The forms of god worshipped by the Vaikhānasas are now listed as Puruṣa, Satya, Acyuta and Aniruddha, unlike the four forms worshipped by the Pāñcarātrins named Saṅkarṣaṇa, Pradyumna, Aniruddha und Vāsudeva. It is quite clear here that the source text is re-interpreted and its wording even altered according to need.

The category of texts which Śrīnivāsa Dīkṣita calls “smṛti” is not easy to grasp. Often he himself does not name his source. As a text, *Smṛtyarthasāra* is named, as authors he names Vṛddhamanu, Bhāradvāja, Śaṅḍilya, Pracetas, Sumanu, Mārkaṇḍeya, more commonly Hārīta, Śaṅkha and Likhita, Yama, Vasiṣṭha, Viṣṇu, Manu especially often, Yājñavalkya and Vṛddhayājñavalkya. Here too, is much that cannot be found in printed editions that are available. At times, however, it is clear that Śrīnivāsa Dīkṣita interprets the cited texts detached of their original context. Thus, in an effort to show that only the Vaikhānasas have niṣeka as first saṃskāra (“reason five”), Śrīnivāsa Dīkṣita quotes from the *Yājñavalkyasmṛti* (DHN^D 83.9–10) which in its original context refers to the three twice-born varṇas. Śrīnivāsa Dīkṣita reinterprets this to refer only to the Vaikhānasas. Only by removing the quotation from its original context is Śrīnivāsa Dīkṣita able to use it as a proof of his argument.

In his *Daśavidhahetunirūpaṇa* Śrīnivāsa Dīkṣita frequently refers to saṃhitās of his own tradition. A quotation from the *Ānandasamhitā* occupies almost the whole of the fourth chapter, covering almost five printed pages.¹¹⁸ Śrīnivāsa Dīkṣita bases his account of the origin of the Vaikhānasas on this quotation. Nārāyaṇa’s commission to Vikhanas to take care of his worship is described in this quotation, which also explicitly prescribes the viṣṇubali ritual for the Vaikhānasas, forbids branding and deals with the question of why the Vaikhānasas are not devalakas. In many cases the *Ānandasamhitā* passages in the *Daśavidhahetunirūpaṇa* agree with those of the *Purātantra* (not available in print), which is likewise quoted at length.¹¹⁹ Śrīnivāsa Dīkṣita refers more seldom to the other Vaikhānasasamhitās mentioned by name, such as *Yajñādhikāra* (DHN^D 120.16–19), *Vāsādhikāra* (DHN^D 46.6–8) and *Jñānakāṇḍa* (DHN^D 97.11–14). Occasionally Śrīnivāsa Dīkṣita also quotes from the so-called Bhagavacchāstra, i.e. from a Vaikhānasasamhitā without indicating its precise source,¹²⁰ or he names only the

118 DHN^D 10.17–15.7, see 53.21–22, 53.24–54.8. A whole section of this passage in the *Ānandasamhitā* is given in the Telugu edition, but missing in the DHN^D.

119 DHN^D 4.8–9; 8.4–6; 32.20–39.32; 83.21–22; 103.14–17; 106.20–21.

120 DHN^D 10.4–5; 31.6–32.9; 60.21–61.1; 63.5–63.9; 71.5–9.

author and not the work.¹²¹ In the *Tātparyacintāmaṇi*, by contrast, Śrīnivāsa Dīkṣita quotes the *Ānandasamhitā* only once. In his text, he refers considerably more often to Bhṛgu (35 times) although without indicating a specific text. Overall Śrīnivāsa Dīkṣita ascribes as much authority to the Vaikhānasasamhitās as to the other vedic texts for they—as works of the disciples of Vikhanas/Nārāyaṇa—likewise have vedic authority.

Although it is quite clear from the content of the *Daśavidhahetunirūpaṇa* that the Vaikhānasas had to draw a dividing line between themselves and other vaiṣṇava movements, the text contains relatively few references to specific texts of other groups. At those places where Śrīnivāsa Dīkṣita makes reference to the rival group of the Pāñcarātrins or their authoritative texts, he very decidedly subordinates them to the Vaikhānasa tradition, for the most part, however, without directly attacking them. Occasionally he is at pains to prove that the Pāñcarātrins acknowledge the superiority of the Vaikhānasas, too. Thus a verse quoted from the apparently no longer extant (Pāñcarātra) *Ātmasamhitā* (DHN^D 4.4–5)¹²² speaks of Vikhanas as “cause of the world.” Respect and acknowledgment toward the Vaikhānasas emerges also from three further quotations from the Pāñcarātrasamhitās. The Vaikhānasas are there represented as admirable ācāryas.¹²³ A verse from the *Pauṣkarasamhitā* quoted repeatedly praises the Vaikhānasas as truth-loving devotees, who take Viṣṇu as the highest god.¹²⁴ In the printed text of the *Pauṣkarasamhitā*, however, a similar verse praises not the Vaikhānasas, but rather those Brahmans who have “only one goal,” whereas I could not make out the verse quoted by Śrīnivāsa Dīkṣita.¹²⁵ Conversely, according to the *Daśavidhahetunirūpaṇa* it follows from another quotation from the *Viṣvaksenasamhitā* that for the Pāñcarātrins Nārāyaṇa is interchangeable with Gaṇeśa (DHN^D 47.21–48.6). Śrīnivāsa Dīkṣita repeatedly refers to the differences between Pāñcarātrins and Vaikhānasas (DHN^D 23.14–24.4): the Vaikhānasas worship five forms (*vyūha*) of Viṣṇu, the Pāñcarātrins by contrast four. Moreover, while the

121 DHN^D 120.11–15: “Bhṛgu”; DHND 120.20–23: “Kāśyapa.”

122 One *Ātmasamhitā* is not among the texts listed by Schrader (1916: 6–12), nor is it mentioned in H.D. Smith/K.K.A. Venkatachari (1980) or in the 2002 *Catalogue of Pāñcarātra Samhitā*.

123 The quotations come from *Kapīñjalasamhitā* (DHN^D 62.16–19, 93.4–9) and *Pārameśvarasamhitā* (DHN^D 43.22–25).

124 DHN^D 24.6–8, 42.25–43.2, 48.18–19, 118.12–15.

125 DHN^D reads: *viprā vaikhānasākhyā ye te bhaktās tattvam ucyate*, PauṣkaraS 36.260cd reads instead: *viprā ekāyanākhyā ye te bhaktās tattvato 'cyute*. It might however be that the verse cited in the DHN^D is contained in the second volume of the *Pauṣkarasamhitā*, which was printed in 2006 and is not yet available to me.

Vaikhānasas know the correct method of worship of Viṣṇu's forms, the Pāñcarātrins perform this worship differently (DHN^D 44.22–45.4). A long quotation from the Pāñcarātra text *Pādmasaṃhitā* on the division of the day into five ritual sections (*pañcakāla*; DHN^D 49.2–51.15)¹²⁶ serves to present this description as incomplete and faulty in comparison with the corresponding Vaikhānasa idea. Likewise in order to show that the Vaikhānasa system is the better of the two a verse is cited from the *Saṅkarṣaṇasaṃhitā* according to which the Pāñcarātra system leads to salvation, whereas the Vaikhānasa system brings salvation *and* fulfills all desires (DHN^D 24.19–20). Unlike the Vaikhānasa ritual system, Pāñcarātra worship is performed without vedic mantras (DHN^D 24.17–19). Therefore the system of the Vaikhānasas is to be preferred. The idea of inferior “tantric” Pāñcarātrins in contrast to superior “vedic” Vaikhānasas in one form or another permeates the whole of the *Daśavidhahetunirūpaṇa*.¹²⁷ Śrīnivāsa Dīkṣita also differentiates between the “tantric” Pāñcarātra mode of “taking refuge (in Viṣṇu-Nārāyaṇa)” and the “vedic” Vaikhānasa mode. A further quotation, the source of which is also given as “Pāñcarātra,” states that the “tantric” taking refuge in Viṣṇu-Nārāyaṇa involves abandoning the Veda (DHN^D 105.6–7). This motif is very important in Śrīnivāsa Dīkṣita's argument for viṣṇubali and against the Pāñcarātra branding (see 2.2.4–6). Occasionally Śrīnivāsa Dīkṣita allows criticism towards the Pāñcarātrins to come from the mouths of others. Thus he introduces some quotations from the purāṇas, according to which those initiated in the Pāñcarātra—just like, for example, Śaivas and Buddhists—are outside of the vedic tradition and are therefore the lowest of the Brahmans, especially since they bear a branding (DHN^D 107.1–11). The citation continues that the Pāñcarātra is a doctrine for those who have deviated from the way of the Veda (DHN^D 107.12–108.15) and that whoever follows the Pāñcarātra doctrine has to undergo the same expiatory acts (*prāyaścitta*) as those who depart from the Veda (DHN^D 108.16–109.4). Following the Pāñcarātra as well as being marked with the disk and the conch is connected with the moral decline of the world in the Kaliyuga (DHN^D 109.15–110.11). Accordingly, argues Śrīnivāsa Dīkṣita, the traditions which demand branding have not universal validity. It should be noted that the quotations discrediting the Pāñcarātrins are not found in the editions of the texts available to me.

126 On *pañcakāla* see Rastelli 2000 and 2006: 63–90.

127 A quotation “from the Pāñcarātra” (*pāñcarātre*) deals with the origin of the two traditions. According to this, the Pāñcarātra system of Viṣṇu worship is “tantric,” while by contrast that of the Vaikhānasas is based upon the Veda (DHN^D 30.13–31.3).

However, the depiction of the Pāñcarātra is not entirely derogatory: Śrīnivāsa Dīkṣita describes the Pāñcarātrins as Vaiṣṇavas and occasionally characterizes them as *śuddha*, “pure” (DHN^D 25.16–24). At one point, on the basis of non-verifiable quotations from the Pāñcarātra tradition, he sketches the following picture of the Pāñcarātrins: they are adherents of the Kātyāyanasūtra (a branch of the white Yajurveda) and belong to five gotras, namely Aupagāyana, Śāṇḍilya, Bhāradvāja, Gautama, and Mauñjāyana (DHN^D 66.9–13). This sketch is close to but not identical with the depiction of those eligible to perform worship “for others” (*parārtha*) in some of the later Pāñcarātrasaṃhitās. The *Pādmasaṃhitā*¹²⁸ names only “Aupagāyana and so on,” whose descendents are either *mādhyandīnas* (a vedic school) or belong to the vedic *kāṇva śākhā* (so-called mantrasiddhāntins or bhāgavatas). They are the only group eligible to do worship for others.¹²⁹ The *Lakṣmītantra* says in an inserted passage (see Rastelli 2006: 233, note 682) which is explicitly based on the *Pādmasaṃhitā*, that those eligible to do “worship for others” follow the Kātyāyanasūtra, belong to the vedic *kāṇva* or *mādhyandīna* schools, and are descendents of Kāśyapa, Gautama, Bhṛgu, Aśvalāyana and Aṅgiras (see Rastelli 2006: 235f.). A 14th century insertion into the *Jayākhyasaṃhitā* names Aupagāyana and Kauśika, additionally Śāṇḍilya, Bharadvāja and Mauñjāyana, all of whom study the vedic *kāṇvī śākhā*.¹³⁰ In the *Parāśarasamhitā* (44.149–155)¹³¹ other Ṛṣis are mentioned. There it is stated that only those who belong to four gotras (ParāśaraS 1.51–54), namely Vedaśiras (Bharadvāja), Bhārgava (Vasiṣṭha), Marīcipa (Viśvāmitra) und Kavaṣa (Kauṇḍinya),¹³² are able and eligible to worship Viṣṇu “for others” (*parārtha*)—even those who have undergone an initiation (*dīkṣā*) cannot so this. The *Īśvarasaṃhitā*¹³³ (21.536cd) names the same Ṛṣis as the *Lakṣmītantra*, namely Śāṇḍilya, Aupagāyana, Mauñjāyana-

128 The *Pādmasaṃhitā* was composed before Veṅkadeśika (trad. dates 1270–1369), and before the *Pārameśvarasaṃhitā* (after 1100–1300?: see Rastelli 2006: 54): it is quoted by both. Internal evidence also suggests that it is one of the younger Pāñcarātrasaṃhitās, because it emphasises temple ritual and elaborates on the pañcakāla (see Rastelli 2006: 51f.).

129 PādmaS 21.2–13; see Rastelli 2006: 229f.

130 Jayākhyas adhika pāṭha 13; see Rastelli 2006: 237ff.

131 The *Parāśarasamhitā* was compiled before the 15th century CE (see Smith/Venkatachari 1980: 188).

132 Interestingly, these four Ṛṣis are said to have undergone a “garbhādīkṣā,” an initiation in their mother’s womb (ParāśaraS 1.51–54).

133 While H.D.Smith/K.K.A. Venkatachari (1980: 85) estimate that the origin of this text is to be placed about the 10th century CE, Rastelli (2006: 54 and 59, and note 55) convincingly argues that it cannot have been composed before 1100 to 1300, the time of the composition of the *Pārameśvarasaṃhitā*.

na, Kauśika and Bharadvāja. They are listed in the following context: Śāṅḍilya conveyed the teachings to the four other Munis. Since then they—with Śāṅḍilya as their leader—practise the worship of Hari (Viṣṇu) according to the so-called Sātvataśāstra and confer initiation according to this śāstra upon their disciples, who belong to their clans and who learn the *kāṇvī-sākhā*.¹³⁴ Thus the description of the Pāñcarātrins in the *Daśavidhahetunirūpaṇa* is very close to the presentation in the *Īśvarasaṃhitā* and *Lakṣmītantra*. Śrīnivāsa Dīkṣita's text might therefore have been composed only after the *Īśvarasaṃhitā*, that is after 1300 CE.

In addition to the tendency to demarcation and ranking, a ban on assimilation to the Pāñcarātrins is added in some places in the *Daśavidhahetunirūpaṇa*: a Vaikhānasa who undergoes the Pāñcarātra initiation is labelled a devalaka (see 2.1.2). Conversely, as a Pāñcarātrin one may only perform worship of god once one has undergone initiation (*dīkṣā*) (DHN^D 63.14–15). Even the four Pāñcarātra schools which each have their own initiation, should on no account be mixed, according to one quotation from the *Pādmasaṃhitā* (DHN^D 66.1–15).¹³⁵ Every type of conversion is thus rejected by Śrīnivāsa Dīkṣita.

While he does allow the Pāñcarātrins a place among the Vaiṣṇavas, this is only in the non-vedic area. The Pāñcarātrins are thus, by contrast to the Vaikhānasas, depicted as being not “true” Brahmans, “outside the Veda” and therefore also as having only limited right to perform rituals.¹³⁶

While Śrīnivāsa Dīkṣita deals extensively with other vaiṣṇava traditions, only a few śaiva texts are quoted in the *Daśavidhahetunirūpaṇa*.¹³⁷ Śrīnivāsa Dīkṣita

134 ĪvaraS 21.552–555; see Rastelli 2006: 239f.

135 On these four siddhāntas in the Pāñcarātra literature, see Rastelli 2006: 185–255, and references there.

136 It should be mentioned that the Pāñcarātrins were also criticised for their being tāntrika not only by Vaikhānasas but also by others (e.g. Śaṅkara and Kumāṛila). There is ample evidence of this criticism in Yāmuna's *Āgamaprāmāṇya*. Rastelli (2006: 235ff.) is even able to show that such criticism also came from within the Pāñcarātra tradition.

137 In one place the *Suprabhedāgama* (DHN^D 25.4–14) is quoted. Here Śrīnivāsa Dīkṣita is not concerned with the content of the other tradition, but rather tries to prove that even there the precedence of the Vaikhānasas, who are described there as “vedic” (*vaidika*), is established. It is said there that the worship of Hari in larger settlements should take place according to the Vaikhānasa ritual system. Moreover, according to this passage, the Vaikhānasas are “equipped with the saṃskāras which begin with niṣeka.” The printed text of the *Suprabhedāgama* does not contain this passage. However, the list of saṃskāras in this text could well have been inspired by the Vaikhānasasūtra (see Suprabhedā, caryāpāda, chapter 5; see Brunner 1967).

does not concern himself with the content of śaiva doctrine or ritual.¹³⁸ For him the Śaivas are quite clearly not opponents. They are invoked primarily to disparage other vaiṣṇava groups by being placed on the same level (see DHN^D 106.2–6). Thus, according to a quotation from the *Kurmapurāṇa*, Rudra (Śiva) created the śaiva śāstras, which—like other śāstras—are designed for those who do not have the capacity to follow the (better) vedic path (DHN^D 109.15–111.3). The Śaivas are twice referred to when Śrīnivāsa Dīkṣita seeks to prove that different traditions each have their own idea of *adhikāra*, of “entitlement (to perform rituals),”¹³⁹ and that the existence of such a concept does not *per se* mean that “those entitled to worship” are to be perceived as devalakas (DHN^D 53.5–19). He concerns himself with the consecration (*pratiṣṭhā*) of a śaiva cult image and its worship only in connection with the *Baudhāyanagr̥hyaśeṣasūtra*. He quotes the relevant parts of it in order to demonstrate that the Baudhāyanins—in contrast to the Vaikhānasas—do not accept Nārāyaṇa as the highest god (DHN^D 97.19–98.15).¹⁴⁰ In some places Śrīnivāsa Dīkṣita reinterprets eulogies referring to Rudra or Śiva as referring in fact to Viṣṇu-Nārāyaṇa.¹⁴¹

To sum up, when dealing with the śaiva tradition, Śrīnivāsa Dīkṣita is concerned above all to prove that Viṣṇu is more powerful than Śiva/Rudra (see DHN^D 111.1–8).¹⁴² It is quite clear that for Śrīnivāsa Dīkṣita the superiority of the vaiṣṇava traditions over against others is self-evident. The much more important area of debate concerns other (competing) vaiṣṇava groups.

Apart from the canonical texts of the tradition, the Vaikhānasasūtra and the Vaikhānasasamhitās, Śrīnivāsa Dīkṣita conspicuously does not relate at all to other works by Vaikhānasa authors. He does not refer directly to the other important Vaikhānasa scholar, Nṛsiṃha Vājapeyin, in any of his works. The commentator Nṛsiṃha Vājapeyin most probably lived considerably earlier than Śrīnivāsa Dīkṣita: diverse teacher-pupil succession lineages place up to nine generations of scholars between the two (see Appendix 1). Two works by Nṛsiṃha

138 In a quotation from the *Padmapurāṇa* the śaiva purāṇas are categorized as *tāmasa*. Here too the content is of no concern to Śrīnivāsa Dīkṣita (DHN^D 88.4–5).

139 On *adhikāra* in a śaiva context see Gengnagel 2001.

140 Here Śrīnivāsa Dīkṣita also blames the Āpastambins for following different gods and doctrines (DHN^D 98.16–99.2 and 99.11–12).

141 See, for example, the eulogies of Śiva in the *Śvetāśvatara Upaniṣad*, referred to and re-interpreted in DHN^D 99.23–101.12, 111.9–14.

142 Rudra is also implicitly subordinated to Nārāyaṇa in DHN^D 81.7ff. There it is reported that Rudra himself originated through *niṣeka*. Most such quotations are found toward the end of the *Daśavidhahetunirūpaṇa*. These sections of the text have a rather edifying character: rather than difficult lines of argument with many technical terms, here instructive and didactic tales are told (see DHN^D 111.15–115.21 and 116.13–22).

Vājapeyin on domestic ritual have been handed down and printed. These are a sūtra commentary *Vaikhānasakalpasūtrabhāṣya* and the handbook *Vaikhānasa-grhyasūtradarpaṇa*. In the sūtra commentary the author primarily explains the wording of the *Vaikhānasasmārtasūtra*; the handbook, by contrast, covers in somewhat more detail the sequence of rites and matters not dealt with in the sūtra. Although Śrīnivāsa Dīkṣita does not refer directly to Nṛsiṃha Vājapeyin, in his *Tātparyacintāmaṇi* he obviously picks up on the function of the prenatal life-cycle ritual (protection of the unborn child) which is introduced by Nṛsiṃha Vājapeyin (see 2.2.2.2). Passing over an earlier scholar of his own tradition in this manner is of a piece with Śrīnivāsa Dīkṣita's usual way of proceeding, namely to refer only to works generally accepted to be authoritative, which are not ascribed to particular historical authors. The evident purpose is to borrow the “timeless” authority for his own text, and thus to transcend his own historical and sectarian context.

Śrīnivāsa Dīkṣita does not refer to other historical Vaikhānasa authors, and other authors do not refer to his works. The only exceptions are Pārthasārathi Bhaṭṭācārya's commentary and his Telugu gloss. Within Vaikhānasa literature the *Daśavidhahetunirūpaṇa* is, not surprisingly, closely related to another text by Śrīnivāsa Dīkṣita, the *Vaikhānasamahimamañjarī* (VMM), which is likewise concerned with highlighting the superiority of the Vaikhānasas. The *Vaikhānasamahimamañjarī* was edited in 1918 in Telugu script, together with a commentary by Sundararāja Bhaṭṭācārya called *Candrikā*, as volume (*kusuma*) 6 of the series *Śrīvaikhānasagranthamālā*. A reprint of this text was published in Tirupati in 1998. The work has so far attracted little attention, even among Vaikhānasa scholars. It mainly deals with the Śrīvaiṣṇava soteriological concept of “taking refuge in Viṣṇu-Nārāyaṇa” (*śaraṇāgati*, *prapatti*). For long stretches the *Vaikhānasamahimamañjarī* agrees word for word with the *Daśavidhahetunirūpaṇa* though without explicitly noting the reliance.¹⁴³ Themes mentioned only briefly in the *Daśavidhahetunirūpaṇa* are deepened and further developed. Thus in the *Vaikhānasamahimamañjarī* Śrīnivāsa Dīkṣita identifies elements of the “taking refuge”—primarily the mantras used in it—with ritual elements of the Vaikhānasas' prenatal life cycle ritual viṣṇubali (see 2.2.5.3).

143 VMM 16.26–27 / DHN^D 103.6–7; VMM 16.28 / DHN^D 103.10–11; VMM 16.29 / DHN^D 103.24; VMM 16.29–7.1 / DHN^D 104.21–24; VMM 17.1–4 / DHND 103.14–15; VMM 17.27–28 / DHN^D 104.15–16, VMM 17.28–18.1 / DHN^D 104.17–20; VMM 18.1–5 / DHN^D 104.21–24; VMM 18.6–8 / DHN^D 105.1–5; VMM 18.9–13 / DHN^D 105.6–10; VMM 19.2–14 / DHN^D 105.11–106.7; VMM 19.14–15 / DHN^D 106.14–16; VMM 19.15–21 / DHN^D 106.17–24.

On the one hand the central themes of the *Daśavidhahetunirūpaṇa* (the right to temple service, the obligation to be branded, the method of taking refuge in Viṣṇu-Nārāyaṇa, etc.) show that the work itself is a reaction to burning questions of Śrīnivāsa Dīkṣita's time, on the other hand in the *Daśavidhahetunirūpaṇa* he never explicitly refers to these discussions as current in his time. The objections raised against the Vaikhānasa tradition and named in the *Daśavidhahetunirūpaṇa* are not ascribed to any identifiable personality or tradition. We find there always "if one says ..." or "... this is what is in doubt." Śrīnivāsa Dīkṣita thereby transcends the historical conditions of his own life time and shifts the objections as well as his refutations to the "vedic" level, to the level of divine revelation. Conversely, this is also the reason why hardly any later authors explicitly refer to Śrīnivāsa Dīkṣita's *Daśavidhahetunirūpaṇa*, even though the arguments developed therein continue to be used up to the present: the significance of the *Daśavidhahetunirūpaṇa*, which otherwise has left hardly a trace in the Vaikhānasa literature and the contemporary tradition, lies above all in providing these "timeless" lines of argument.

As shall be argued in what follows, it was not their immediate rivals whom the Vaikhānasas had to resist but rather the Śrīvaiṣṇava religious leaders. The latter are therefore the audience to which the *Daśavidhahetunirūpaṇa* is addressed. These were not only important for their religious impact, but also for their influence on the rulers. As Appadurai (1978) clearly shows, in South India, between 1350 and 1700, temples were fundamental for the maintenance of the kingship. In this situation the sectarian leaders provided the links between kings and temples: endowments by the king were not necessarily made directly but through them. This dynamic set of relationships between warrior-kings, Śrīvaiṣṇava leaders and temples had important consequences not only for the sectarian development but also for the temples and their "staff," the priests. On the plane of king and sectarian leaders basically an exchange of politics and economics took place: the kings "linked themselves to the temple as a source of honor, through the patronage of sectarian leaders and the re-allocation of land and cash to these sectarian figures" (Appadurai 1978: 62). The temples and with them the priests were dependent on the Śrīvaiṣṇava leaders who were to provide or deny the temples the means to maintain or even enhance their ritual schedule. It is against this background that the discussion raised in the *Daśavidhahetunirūpaṇa* has to be understood. In Śrīnivāsa Dīkṣita's time evidently the idea prevailed that being a 'true Vaiṣṇava' inevitably meant "taking refuge in Viṣṇu-Nārāyaṇa," which went hand in hand with a branding of the upper arms of the adept. Those who were branded stood higher in the religious hierarchy than those without a brand. Most likely it was the Śrīvaiṣṇavas who pressed the Vaikhānasas to be branded so that in the speci-

al situation of temple worship they were not dependent on priests who were in a ‘unfit’ to perform worship and, most importantly, who did not accept the Śrīvaiṣṇavas as their religious leaders. Since conferring an initiation implies that the initiate is (and forever remains) in the inferior position, the acceptance of the branding on the side of the Vaikhānasas would have established a subordinate position with respect to the Śrīvaiṣṇavas. Although the Vaikhānasas evidently managed to maintain their more independent position, Śrīnivāsa Dīkṣita clearly sought to avoid attacking prominent representatives and religious leaders of the Śrīvaiṣṇavas. On the one hand this was surely for diplomatic reasons, especially since they were certainly socially and economically dependent on the Śrīvaiṣṇavas, on the other hand, however, it was also for exactly the reason given above: the arguments became irrefutable and timeless, as they were raised to the “vedic” level.

