

## BOOK REVIEWS

Hara, Minoru, *Pāśupata Studies* ed. by Jun Takashima. [Publications of the de Nobili Research Library Volume XXX]. Wien 2002: Sammlung de Nobili, Institut für Südasiens-, Tibet- und Buddhismuskunde/Delhi: Motilal Banarsi Dass, pp. 320. ISBN3-900271-35-6.

This volume consists of the collected English articles on Pāśupata Śaivism by Professor Minoru Hara.\* It is divided into three sections: 1) Conceptual Studies, 2) Historical Studies, and 3) Textual Studies. A combined bibliography and two indices – one of Sanskrit and Pāli words and one of quoted passages – conclude the volume. The papers have been published in their original form, but obvious misprints have been corrected and they have been adapted according to a uniformity of style. The original articles are given chapter numbers, to which the cross references throughout the book refer. The book gives a good overview of the work Hara has done on Pāśupatas, continuing the subject of his (unpublished) Harvard PhD thesis *Materials for the study of Pāśupata Śaivism* (1966). It is remarkable to note that, amidst his other Indological studies, Hara has never left the subject: the book contains a continuous flow of articles spanning a period of more than forty years. The first article, ‘Nakulīśa-pāśupata-darśanam,’ an exemplary annotated translation of the sixth chapter of the Sarvadarśanasamgraha (SDS) of Sāyana Mādhaba, was published in the *Indo-Iranian Journal* as early as 1958, while the latest article, ‘Pāśupata Doctrine as transmitted by Vedāntins,’ was published in the 25th volume of the *Indologica Taurinensis* (1999–2000).

The division into three sections makes sense in that it shows the various methods employed by Hara. The first section, Conceptual Studies, contains most papers – eight in total – and presents a number of examples of

---

\* Research for this review was made possible by a TALENT – grant from the Netherlands Organization for Scientific Research (NWO). I thank Arlo Griffiths and Harunaga Isaacson for their comments on an earlier draft. Abbreviations used in this review are as follows: GK: Gaṇakārikā. PABh: Pañcarthabhaṣya. PS: Pāśupatasūtra. RT :Ratnātīkā. SDS: Sarvadarśanasamgraha.



studies of particular concepts, for which Hara is perhaps best known. Characteristic for his modest style are the titles of studies 4–6, which all share the phrase ‘[A Note on the] Pāśupata Concept of ...’ (respectively *śauca*, *ahimsā* and *duḥkha*).<sup>1</sup> In general these studies concentrate on a particular concept and clarify its use and meaning with extensive translations of relevant parts of the scriptures. A bit of an outsider in this section is ‘A Note on the Buddha’s Birth Story’ which, although also taking into account a passage from the Pañcārthabhāṣya (PABh), does not concentrate on Pāśupata Śaivism in particular but compares descriptions of *janmaduḥkha* (and its absence in the case of the Buddha’s birth) in Indian literature. The second section, Historical Studies, contains four papers and is more diffuse, although a general trend that can be observed in these papers is the attention paid to inter-textual relationships. Thus in ‘Sāṃkhya Commentaries and the Pañcārtha-bhāṣya’,<sup>2</sup> Hara observes that Kauṇḍinya, the author of the PABh, presupposes a simpler and more primitive form of Sāṃkhya than we find in the transmitted Sāṃkhya works, and postulates that Kauṇḍinya had access to earlier treatises that are now lost. In his most recent article ‘Pāśupata Doctrine as transmitted by Vedāntins’, he examines the short accounts of Pāśupata Śaivism by Vedāntic authors such as Śaṅkara, Vācaspati Miśra I and Bhāskara, as well as those by the Viśiṣṭādvaitins Yāmuna and Rāmānuja, classifying them according to the order into which the doctrine is presented. In the last section, Textual Studies, three papers are grouped together that each concentrate on one particular text. Besides the aforementioned study of the sixth chapter of Mādхava’s SDS, we find here a study of the quotations found in the Ratnaṭīkā (RT) and an extensive review of the translation of the PABh by Haripada Chakroborti. Aptly renamed ‘Critical Notes on [the] Pāśupata Sūtra’,<sup>3</sup> this rich paper is much more than a review of Chakroborti’s translation: in it Hara discusses a number of text-critical problems of the PABh and suggests possible emendations of corrupt passages.

All in all this book is a varied collection of studies of different aspects pertaining to the study of Pāśupata Śaivism. It is a pity that Hara did not

<sup>1</sup> The editor has omitted the first four words of these titles in the chapter names given in this book, apparently for reasons of clarity, although no mention of this is made in the preface.

<sup>2</sup> Originally published as ‘Pāśupata Studies I,’ in: T. Goudriaan (ed.), *Ritual and Speculation in Early Tantrism, Studies in Honor of A. Padoux*, pp. 209–226 (Albany 1992).

<sup>3</sup> Originally published as ‘Review, *Pāśupata Sūtram* with *Pañcārtha-Bhāṣya* of Kauṇḍinya, trans. H. Chakroborti (1970),’ in: *Indo-Iranian Journal* 16 (1974), pp. 57–80.

find the time to bring the papers up-to-date and enlarge them as he originally intended (cf. preface, p. 6), in which case also a number of slightly disturbing repetitions could have been removed, but the book serves a useful purpose by bringing together these thematically connected articles which are sometimes hard to trace. The inclusion of two indices adds to its value as a work of reference. As a minor point I may mention the absence of two important reviews related to the same subject: that of Schultz's study of the philosophical and theological doctrines of the Pāśupata system and of Lorenzen's study of the Kāpālikas and Kālāmukhas.<sup>4</sup> In addition, one could have considered including Hara's paper on the concepts of *guru* and *ācārya*,<sup>5</sup> in which some passages from the Ratnaṭīkā are discussed.

Instead of discussing briefly here the contents of each and every article, in the following pages I will examine three articles in more detail, as examples of the kind of work Hara has done on the Pāśupatas and to draw attention to aspects of the history of this school of thought that still need exploration. I shall follow the order of the volume and discuss one paper from each section.

A noteworthy paper concluding the 'Conceptual Studies' section is 'Transfer of Merit in Hindu Literature and Religion' (1994). Hara starts with the observation that "the concept of transfer of merit in general, whether it be Buddhist or Hindu, is rooted in the ancient Indian mental tendency of the reification of abstract concepts" (p. 106). He continues to observe that the idea of merit-transfer comes into conflict with the doctrine of *karman*, according to which each individual reaps the merits and demerits of his own actions. In the first three paragraphs of the paper a number of examples from classical Sanskrit literature are adduced showing that various abstract concepts are transferable from one person to another. In the fourth paragraph the problem of transfer of merit as it is found in the original Pāśupata treatises is discussed. One of the most peculiar practices described in the PS pertains to the second stage of the ascetic's career, in which the Pāśupata ascetic is to act in such a way as to court dishonour (*avamāna*) from the people. This practice is intrinsically

---

<sup>4</sup> M. Hara, 'Review, *Die philosophisch-theologischen Lehren des Pāśupata-Systems nach dem Pañcarthabhāṣya und der Ratnaṭīkā* by Friedrich August Schultz (1958)', in: *Indo-Iranian Journal* 4 (1960), pp. 165–170. M. Hara, 'Review, *The Kāpālikas and Kālāmukhas. Two lost Śaiva Sects*, by David N. Lorenzen (1972)', in: *Indo-Iranian Journal* 17 (1975), pp. 253–261.

<sup>5</sup> M. Hara, 'Hindu Concepts of Teacher—Sanskrit *guru* and *ācārya*', in: M. Nagatomi et al. (eds.), *Sanskrit and Indian Studies, D.H.H. Ingalls Felicitation Volume*, pp. 93–118 (Dordrecht 1979).

linked with the concept of transfer of merit (and for that matter demerit), for the contempt and false accusations by other people, generated by the Pāśupata ascetic by acting improperly, were thought to result in a transfer of the other people's merit and his own demerit. Hara observes that a kind of inversed *satya-kriyā* ('truth-act') comes into play here, in that the accusations are false and by their very falsehood trigger the transfer of merit and demerit, provided that the ascetic is capable of enduring these false accusations. The paper concludes with the (Buddhist) story of the Bodhisattva Sadāparibhūta ('Ever despised') who also incurs the merit of others by provoking false accusations from them, but in turn uses the incurred merit to save the same people that accused him. The Pāśupata doctrine, by contrast, "is a thoroughly selfish system of asceticism and not an altruistic moral doctrine" (p. 136).

In the course of this paper Hara casually remarks that "the seeking of dishonour, which the Pāśupatas shared with the Cynics and which is taught in the original Pāśupata scriptures, almost disappeared in the Pāśupata teaching mentioned in later Purānic literature" (p. 130). This is an important observation and certainly needs more exploration than these pages admit. Although various sections from predominantly Śaiva Purāṇas, such as Vāyupurāṇa 11–20, Liṅgapurāṇa 1.34 and 1.88–91 and Kūrmapurāṇa 2.11, profess to give a teaching of Pāśupata yoga, it has been observed that the teachings given do not always correspond with that of the Pāśupatasūtra.<sup>6</sup> It is indeed noteworthy that in particular the injunction to seek dishonour seems to be absent in these Purānic descriptions. The same can be said of the original Skandapurāṇa, whose Pāśupata yoga section (chapters 174–183) does not contain any reference to this practice.<sup>7</sup> Without venturing into details we may suggest here one possible reason for the absence of this teaching in the Purāṇa literature. While the principal Pāśupata scriptures (PS, PABh, GK and RT) were meant for the initiated Pāśupata ascetic, the Śaiva Purāṇas are addressed to a lay Śaiva public. Although the lay Śaivas needed to be informed about the ritual and practice of the ascetic, whom they should respect highly, they would not be given the intricacies of the doctrine, let alone be

---

<sup>6</sup> David N. Lorenzen, *The Kāpālikas and Kālāmukhas. Two lost Śaiva Sects*. Second Revised Edition (First Edition: 1972). Delhi 1991, p. 182. Minoru Hara, *Materials for the Study of Pāśupata Śaivism*, pp. 14–15.

<sup>7</sup> Cf. Peter Bisschop, *Early Śaivism and the Skandapurāṇa. Sects and Centres*. [Unpublished doctoral dissertation.] Rijksuniversiteit Groningen. 2004, p. 35. Reference is made here to the *editio princeps* of this early Śaiva Purāṇa: Kṛṣṇaprasāda Bhaṭṭarāī, *Skandapurāṇasya Ambikākhaṇḍah*. Kathmandu 1998. Mahendrаратнагрантамālā 2.

informed about the mechanism behind the transfer of merit and demerit. The mechanism only works if the provoked public is not aware of the false disguise under which the ascetic is performing his condemned activities.

In ‘Pañcartha-Bhāṣya and Gaṇa-Kārikā’ (1994) Hara argues, on doctrinal grounds, for the chronological priority of the PABh to the GK and the RT. The essence of the argument is that the GK has changed the original order of the technical terms of the system. As Hara observes there are two sets of enumeration in the PABh, one in prose, the other in verse. The prose passage (PABh p. 129, l. 8–p. 130, l. 3) distinguishes the five stages of the Pāśupata ascetic according to their respective *vasatyartha* ('dwelling place'), *bala* ('power'), *kriyā* ('action'), *śuddhi* ('purity') and *lābha* ('attainment'). Following this passage the Bhāṣya quotes five verses in which the five stages are enumerated according to their respective *lābha*, *mala*, *upāya* and *deśa* (PABh p. 130, ll. 4–13). Curiously Hara considers the prose portion, “which presents the items in the least systematic manner” (p. 179), to be the oldest, apparently taking the verses to be a later addition to the text of the Bhāṣya. At the same time he takes the order of the items in the verses to be authoritative, because the presence of a compound *lābhamałopāyajñah* in Kauṇḍinya’s commentary on PS 3.19 “seems to indicate that the order of enumeration is established somehow in the original treatises” (p. 180). To the present reviewer this rather seems to be an argument in favour of the priority of the verses to that of the prose passage than *vice versa*.

Hara continues to observe that the authoritative order of these four items, *lābha*, *mala*, *upāya* and *deśa* must have influenced GK 2, which adds four more items to the list, viz. *avasthā*, *viśuddhi*, *dikṣākārin* and *bala*.<sup>8</sup> The order of enumeration in this verse is twisted in Kārikās 3–8, which deal respectively with *bala* (GK 3), *śuddhi* (GK 4), *avasthā* (GK 5ab), *dikṣākārin* (GK 5cd), *deśa* (GK 6ab), *lābha* (GK 6cd), *upāya* (GK 7) and *mala* (GK 8). He rightly draws attention to a passage from the Ratnaṭīkā (RTp. 5, ll. 21–25) in which the problem of the difference in order is addressed: “Thinking that the order of enumeration which is found in the text is unimportant, but that knowledge of things themselves is important, the author puts aside the proper order (which would have described first the attainments [*lābha*]) and begins with the list (of powers [*bala*]"; devotion to the master, etc. (...)" (tr. Hara, p. 175). Although this

---

<sup>8</sup> GK 2 *lābhā malā upāyāś ca deśāvasthāviśuddhayah| dīkṣākāribalāny aṣṭa pañcakāś trīṇī vṛttayah||*

passage suggests that the order of enumeration given in GK 3–8 is as the author of the RT presents it, we should consider the possibility that the original order of the GK was different, i.e., followed the order listed in GK 2. This hypothesis is strengthened by the testimony of Mādhava's SDS, which, as Hara himself is well aware, indeed quotes the Kārikās in exactly this order. Although one could argue that Mādhava adapted the order of the Kārikās according to the order given in GK 2, there is another source indicating that the original order of the Kārikās may have been different. As I have mentioned elsewhere,<sup>9</sup> the eleventh chapter of the Uttarabhāga of the as yet undated Pampāmāhātmya, entitled 'Pañcartha-praśamsā', contains a quotation of the Gaṇakārikā in verses 5–15.<sup>10</sup> As in the SDS the order of the verses corresponds to the enumeration of items in GK 2. It seems to me to be excluded that the Pampāmāhātmya's quotation goes back to the SDS, because the same chapter also shows familiarity with passages from the PS, the PABh and the RT that are not transmitted

<sup>9</sup> Peter Bisschop & Arlo Griffiths, The Pāśupata Observance (*Atharvavedapariśiṣṭa* 40), in: *Indo-Iranian Journal* 46 (2003), pp. 315–348 (p. 319, n. 19).

<sup>10</sup> This chapter has been published as appendix 4 in: Vasundhara Filliozat, *Kālāmukha and Pāśupata Temples in Dharwar*, Chennai 2001. The passage at issue presents a number of textual problems; the following is a preliminary edition on the basis of Filliozat's: *pañcakās tv aṣṭa \*vijñeyā gaṇaś caikas trikātmakah* (conj.; *vijñeyo gaṇaś caiva trikātmakah* Ed.) |  
*vettā navagaṇasyāsyā sa ācāryah prakīrtitah* || 5 ||  
*lābho malas \*tathopāyo* (em.; *tathāpāyo* Ed.) *deśāvasthāviśuddhayah* |  
*\*dīksākāribalāny* (em.; *dīksakārī* Ed.) *aṣṭau gaṇāḥ pāśupate mate* || 6 ||  
*jñānam tapaś ca nityatvam sthitih siddhiś ca sanmate* |  
*ity eṣa pañcadhā lābho vijñayavāṇi kṛti bhavet* || 7 ||  
*mithyājñānam \*adharmaś ca saktihetuś cyutis* (conj.; *adharmaś cāśaktir hetucyutis* Ed.)  
*tathā* |  
*paśutvam mūlam ity eva pañcadhā mala iritaḥ* || 8 ||  
*vāsaś caryā tapo dhyānam rudrastutir iti kramāt* |  
*upāyah pañcadhā prokto deśaḥ parita īryate* || 9 ||  
*gurur jano guhāvāsaḥ śmaśānam rudrasaṁnidhiḥ* |  
*ity evam tattadavyakta (?) vyaktāvyaktajayājayāḥ* || 10 ||  
*vedaniṣṭhetv avasthāpi pañcadhā paripaṭhyate* |  
*ajñānādharma mayor hānīr hānīḥ saṅgakarasya ca* || 11 ||  
*\*hānīś cyutipaśutvasyety* (conj. Isaacson; *ahānitapeśutvasyety* Ed.) *evam pañca viśuddhayah* |  
*dravyam kālah kriyā mūrtir gurus ceti mahāmate* || 12 ||  
*sadyaḥ prasaktakaraṇam syād dīksākāri pañcakam* |  
*gurubhaktih prasādaś ca tathā dvandvajayaḥ sadā* || 13 ||  
*dharmas \*tathāpramādaś* (em.; *tathā pramodaś* Ed.) *ca balam pañcavidham smṛtam* |  
*tisṛbhīr vṛttibhir yukto gaṇaś cānyah* (v.l.; *cāsyā* Ed.) *śubhāvahāḥ* || 14 ||  
*evam navagaṇasyāsyā veditā gurur ucyate* |

in Mādhava's work. These two testimonies thus provide independent evidence for the view that the order of the Kārikās as quoted in the RT does not reflect the original order. Although there are other good reasons to date the PABh before the GK, the argumentation on the basis of the twisted order of topic in the Kārikās does not seem to be convincing.

The final paper of the book is the already mentioned 'Critical Notes on [the] Pāśupata Sūtra.' Taking as its starting point the translation of the PABh by Chakroborti (1970) it consists of a list of critical notes on the text of the PABh. Hara's argument that we have to apply to the text the philological procedure of "higher criticism," in order to restore the text to a certain extent, is valid in principle. However, it should be noted that the Trivandrum edition by Anantakrishna Sastri (1940) is not based on a careful collation of all the manuscript evidence. The text is edited on the basis of a single manuscript from Trivandrum, while there exists another manuscript in the Asiatic Society of Bengal in Calcutta, which unfortunately covers only a portion of the first *adhyāya*. The latter has been used only to reconstruct a portion missing in the Trivandrum manuscript.<sup>11</sup> Hara occasionally refers to the Calcutta manuscript, drawing attention to variant readings, but apparently he did not have access to the original Trivandrum manuscript on which the edition is based. Recently I acquired copies of both manuscripts and could verify the readings of problematic passages for which Hara has suggested corrections. From this cursory look at the two manuscripts it appears that the editor of the Trivandrum edition has not always faithfully reported the text of the Trivandrum manuscript. Even with the scant manuscript evidence available the text of the edition can still be improved upon. To conclude this review I list below a few variant readings for some of the passages which Hara discusses in his paper:<sup>12</sup>

p. 14, l. 3: The additional phrase recorded by Hara before *nama* in C also occurs in T. Instead of the non-sensical *svalita* both manuscripts actually have *skhalita*: *na tu skhalitādipūraṇārthah* ("but not in the sense of completing actions such as stumbling").

---

<sup>11</sup> Cf. Sastri's remark on pp. 19 and 20 of the introduction to his edition, where he mentions that he copied the missing pages 8 to 13 from the Calcutta manuscript.

<sup>12</sup> Page and line references are to the Trivandrum edition of the PABh. The siglum T is used to refer to the Trivandrum manuscript (MS 2018) and C for the Calcutta manuscript (MS I.M. 5474). Recently Dominic Goodall drew my attention to the existence of a manuscript of the PABh in the Sarasvatībhavana (MS 86112) in Benares, but readings of this manuscript could not be incorporated because I had already submitted this review before acquiring a copy of the said manuscript. I am engaged in preparing a new, critical, edition of the PABh.

p. 15, l. 10: The extra sentences before the word *vidhi* in C also occur in T. The corresponding passage in ll. 16–18 of the edition occurs in both manuscripts as well.

p. 16, l. 6: The suggested reading *vartante* for (*ni*)*vartante* is actually the reading of both manuscripts. It is not clear what Sastri intended with the brackets here; the following *katham* which is also enclosed by round brackets in the edition is the reading of both manuscripts.

p. 26, l. 4: The *danya* is also present in T.

p. 33, l. 5: It is true that C has *yathā* for *yad yad*, but it does not have *nadāgatam* (sic) for *nirdhamaneṣv apeyam*. Rather it repeats *nadīgataṁ*: *yathā jalāṁ nirdhamaneṣv apeyam̄ nadīgataṁ nadīgataṁ tat punar eva peyam*. I may note here that *yathā* also appears to be the reading of T (corrected from *yartha*) and that *yad yad* is thus a silent conjecture by Sastri.

p. 38, l. 15: The reading reported by Hara for C (*svasthendriya* for *svacchendriya*) is also the reading of T.

p. 45, l. 8: The Sūtrapāṭha preceding the Bhāṣya in both manuscripts also combines PS 1.25–26 (*vikaraṇadharmitvam̄ ca*). Moreover T reads *yasmād āha vikaraneti* for the edition's *yasmād āha vikaranah*, indicating that Kauṇḍinya commented upon the first member of a compound?

p. 65, l. 15: T has *dūravīṣayagrāhakatvam̄ ālocana°* for *dūravīṣayagrāhakatvālocana°*.

p. 84, l. 6: The suggestion to remove the *alpha privans* in *avibhaktābhidhāna* is supported by T: although the scribe appears to have written *āhāvibhaktābhidhānād*, the vertical stroke after *āha* (yielding *āhā*) can also be interpreted as representing a *danya*.

p. 98, l. 12: The emendation *asam̄mānayantrasthena* is in fact the reading of T.

p. 141, l. 4: *apramād* is a silent conjecture by Sastri; T actually reads *apramādā* (wrong reading for *apramādī*).

*Asian Studies*  
*University of Edinburgh*  
*718 Buccleuch Place*  
*Edinburgh EH8 9LW*  
*United Kingdom*

PETER BISSCHOP