The Blackwell Companion to Hinduism
Edited by Gavin Flood

CHAPTER 11

History of Vaiṣṇava Traditions: An Esquisse

Gérard Colas

Introduction

The present chapter will focus on the history of "Vaiṣṇava traditions" that is, of organized and institutionalized Vaiṣṇava movements, mainly on the basis of religious literature and epigraphy. We will use the term "Vaiṣṇava" in the rather anachronistic way in which it is often used today among scholars, namely as denoting those who worship Viṣṇu and his different aspects as well as the traditions which they follow. While "Vaiṣṇava" meant only "related with the god Viṣṇu" in the early period, it also assumed another denotation, namely an affiliation with the religion of which Viṣṇu is the god from around the fifth century AD, for instance, in the title *paramavaiṣṇava* found on the coins of Traikūṭaka kings Dahrasena and Vyāghrasena. Kings of the eighth century continued to use the title *paramavaiṣṇava*. The *Pauṣkarasaṃhitā*, one of the ancient Pāñcarātra saṃhitās, also refers to *paramavaiṣṇavas* (Jaiswal 1967: 204; Matsubara 1994: 19–20; von Stietencron 1978: 11). The term Vaiṣṇava evokes a conception of an overarching and syncretic religion for it includes the worshippers of all aspects considered as those of Viṣṇu, like Kṛṣṇa, Narasiṃha, etc. although a devotee of Kṛṣṇa, who is classified as a Vaiṣṇava, probably feels more a Kṛṣṇaite than a Vaiṣṇava.

Indian literature employs many terms (like *sampradāya*, *pantha*, *mata*, *siddhānta*, *paramparā*, etc.) which could be translated more or less precisely as "tradition" and which are sometimes translated as "sect," "system," "school." But a historical study of these Indian terms which often take particular shades of meaning according to the context is beyond the scope of this chapter. We will avoid using the term "sect," not only because this term, which has been used by scholars to signify socioreligious realities of great diversity, in an Indian context would need a lengthy discussion, but also because the very status of Indian

religious traditions and the definition of their members are often obscure and in any case evolved over the course of time. The use of "school" in this essay will be reserved for Vaiṣṇava doctrinal systems of the Vedānta which were often accompanied by socioreligious counterparts.

We will neither follow nor examine ancient Indian doxographical views on Vaiṣṇavism. Nor shall we study the relations of Vaiṣṇava with non-Vaiṣṇava traditions and with non-exclusivist milieux which, like Smārtas, worshipped several gods including Viṣṇu. This chapter is not a history of Vaiṣṇavism, which should discuss all facts and literatures related to the god Viṣṇu and the divine aspects retrospectively considered as his manifestations. Therefore we will not consider iconographical data, whose links with a specific Vaiṣṇava tradition are often difficult to demonstrate, nor fluid oral traditions associated with Vaiṣṇavism. A special emphasis is laid on the rather neglected Vaikhānasa tradition. The social and political background, for which we have a scanty and uneven documentation, is not examined.

This chapter does not claim to be exhaustive. It only discusses traditions which exercised some influence and it is limited by the state of research on the subject. Many Vaiṣṇava traditions still need a critical examination and study of their history and their literary sources. The views of scholars remain bound by the image which each tradition wished to project of itself and of other Vaiṣṇava traditions under specific historical circumstances. Research also focused on the aspects which these traditions themselves brought forward – rites with predominantly ritualistic traditions, doctrine with theologizing ones, devotion with devotional currents – though most of these traditions were not without specific views on each of these aspects. The chronology of several Vaiṣṇava traditions covers such a long period of time and shows such contrasted phases that we found it convenient to periodize their history according to the successive tendencies to which they gave shape.

Early Bhāgavatism

Bhāgavata aristocratic patrons (second century BC to eighth century AD)

Bhāgavatism is the first "Vaiṣṇava" tradition to appear distinctly in history. The earliest known use of the term *bhāgavata* (literally "relating to Bhagavant," that is, the Lord) is clearly associated with aristocratic patrons. Several inscriptions from the second to first century BC, all of them found in a limited area of the present Madhya Pradesh and Rajasthan states, except one from Maharashtra, record the existence of a Bhāgavata cult promoted by local rulers and men of political importance. This cult, associated with Nārāyaṇa, Vāsudeva (=Kṛṣṇa) and sometimes Saṃkarṣaṇa (=Balarāma, Kṛṣṇa's elder brother), all "Vaiṣṇava" divine aspects, is often marked by the erection of a Garuḍa-pillar (in front of a

temple according to an inscription from Besnagar). In these early inscriptions, the Bhāgavata faith is not in contradiction with the patronage of Vedic rituals but they do not show with certainty a ritual admixture between these two tendencies, contrary to what has been sometimes interpreted (Meth Srinivasan 1997: 196, about Ghosundi inscription).

The most famous of these epigraphs is the Garuḍa pillar inscription of Besnagar (near Sanchi, Madhya Pradesh) usually dated second or first century BC (Sircar 1942: 90). Its Prakrit text relates the setting up of a Garuḍa pillar in honor of Vāsudeva by a Greek ambassador Heliodora (=Hēliodōros) of Ta[khkha]silā (=Taxila), the Bhāgavata. It mentions that three steps to immortality, when well practiced, lead to heaven: self-control, generosity, and vigilance (*dama*, *tyāga*, and *apramāda*), three virtues also extolled in the Mahābhārata (Brockington 1998: 266). Another inscription from Besnagar, in probably the same period, records the setting up of the Garuḍa pillar of an "excellent temple" (*prāsādottama*) of the Lord (Bhagavat) in the twelfth regnal year of a king named Bhāgavata (here a proper name, not the name of a religious tradition), usually identified with a Śuṅga king (Jaiswal 1967: 153).

An inscription of Pratapgarh (not far from Besnagar and today in the Chitorgarh District of Rajasthan) dated probably second century BC records, in a sanskritized Prakrit, the erection of a pillar by Utararakhita who is said to be a sacābhāgavata, "true[?] bhāgavata" (Salomon 1998: 240). The Ghosundi stone inscription in Sanskrit dated first century BC (on the basis of its script) was found near Nagari (Chitorgarh District). This inscription, usually read with the help of the Hathibada inscription which bears a similar text, records the building of a "stone-enclosure for the place of worship" (*pūjāśilāprākāra*) called "the enclosure of Nārāyaṇa" for the gods Saṃkarṣaṇa and Vāsudeva by a Bhāgavata king Sarvatāta, performer of an *aśvamedha* sacrifice (Sircar 1942: 91–2).

The Nanaghat cave (Maharashtra) inscription of the Sātavāhana queen Nāyanikā, usually dated second half of the first century BC, though not explicitly using the term bhāgavata, begins with an invocation to various gods including Saṃkarṣaṇa and Vāsudeva and records the sacrificial fees given to priests for the queen's husband's sacrifices (including an installation of Vedic fires, two *aśvamedhas* and a *rājasūya*) (Sircar 1942: 186–90).

By contrast with that early period, the extant epigraphic documents of the first three centuries of the Christian era do not seem to specifically mention Bhāgavatas nor any other particular "Vaiṣṇava" tradition. In this regard, textual sources are the only possible evidence for this period. The Bhagavad-gītā (probably first century AD) (Brockington 1998: 147) has been assumed to correspond to a Bhāgavata tendency or even affiliation (Esnoul 1956: 155; Matsubara 1994: 2). However it does not contain the word bhāgavata. The Harivaṃśa, a "supplement" (*khila*) to the Mahābhārata (usually dated third to fourth, sometimes first to third centuries AD), mentions a *kṣatriya* devotee, Akrūra, paying hommage to Ananta (the lord of the serpents) who is qualified as Bhāgavata, with "Bhāgavata mantras," an expression which could refer to sacred formulas of a Bhāgavata religious community (Couture 1986: 224–5; Couture 1991: 77;

Brockington 1998: 326). The Nārāyaṇīyaparvan of the Mahābhārata, dated third to fourth/fifth century AD (Brockington 1998: 152; Schreiner 1997a: 1; Oberlies 1997: 86), does not associate any particular meaning with the term *bhāgavata*: the reference to *bhāgavatapriyaḥ* in verses 327.2 and 331.43 is too general, the Poona edition accepts *bhāgavataiḥ* in 332.16 but as an uncertain reading and rejects the term *bhāgavata* as a variant reading in 322.22 and 324.1.

The term *bhāgavata* reappears in epigraphy with the Gupta period mainly in the compounds *paramabhāgavata* ("supreme bhāgavata") and *mahābhāgavata* ("great bhāgavata"), current epithets of monarchs and rulers. The Gupta emperors from Candragupta II (fourth century) onwards styled themselves as Paramabhāgavatas. The same epithet was applied to Dhruvasena I (fifth century) in Saurashtra, Saṃkṣobha (early sixth century) in Central India, Caṇḍavarman and Nandaprabhañjanavarman, Kaliṅga monarchs of Orissa in the late fifth and early sixth centuries (Jaiswal 1967: 201 sqq.), several kings of the so-called Śarabhapurīya dynasty (seventh to eighth centuries) (von Stietencron 1978: 11), and king Śrīvijaya Nandivarman of the Śālaṅkāyana dynasty who ruled over the regions of Godavari and Kṛṣṇa in Andhra in the second half of the fifth century AD (Jaiswal 1967: 205). A Badami (Southern Deccan) sixth-century cave inscription records the patronage of the founding of a cave temple and the consecration of an image of Viṣṇu in it by king Maṅgaleśa, a Mahābhāgavata born in the family of the Calkya-s (=Cālukyas) who performed sacrifices like *agniṣṭoma*, *agnicayana*, *vājapeya*, *pauṇḍarīka*, *bahusuvarṇa*, and *aśvamedha* (Sivaramamurti 1966: 204–6). It appears from this sixth-century inscription that as in the earlier period, the aristocratic followers of Bhāgavatism did not see any contradiction between their performance of Vedic sacrifices and the worship of the image of Viṣṇu. It may be noted that the Tamil text Paripāṭal (fifth or sixth century) which depicts Kṛṣṇa with Balarāma, also mentions Garuḍa's banner and Tirumāl (=Viṣṇu or Kṛṣṇa) as manifesting himself in the Vedic sacrificial post and fire (Gros 1968: xlix). But this text does not contain any explicit reference to Bhāgavatism.

It however remains difficult to evaluate from the above evidence to what extent the aristocratic patrons of Bhāgavatism from the second century BC to the eighth century AD were personally engaged in this tradition or religion. We do not know whether Bhāgavata gods were merely their tutelary deity or whether these patrons underwent an initiation, nor do we have any precise information on the type of rite they performed. No documentation enables us to know whether Bhāgavatism had a popular basis and whether it was an independent tradition with organized institutions.

Bhāgavata priests in fifth- to sixth-century sources

The term *bhāgavata* was also applied to a group of priests in charge of ritual installation of images of Viṣṇu in epigraphical and textual sources from the fifth to sixth century AD. But this does not imply that all Bhāgavatas were priests. A

fifth-century Sanskrit inscription of southeast Asia found in the ruins of the monument of Prasat Pram Loven of the Fu-nan (a kingdom which comprised the Mekong delta), mentions Bhāgavatas among those who should enjoy the gift which Guṇavarman donated to a newly installed footprint of Viṣṇu named Cakratīrthasvāmin. These Bhāgavatas are probably the priests of that image (Cœdès 1931; Bhattacharya 1961). The Bṛhatsaṃhitā of Varāhamihira (sixth century) prescribes that the ritual installation of an image should be performed by those devoted to that god – Bhāgavatas in the case of Viṣṇu – according to their own rule (*svavidhi*) (chap. 60, verse 19, in Kern's edition). An earlier verse (12) in the same chapter stipulates that during this installation, the "twice-born" (*dvija*) priest should sacrifice into the fire with the mantras which correspond to the god to be installed. We may infer from this that in the case of Viṣṇu, a twice-born Bhāgavata sacrifices with Vaiṣṇava mantras.

Yogic and Ascetic Traditions (third to ca. fifth century AD)

Besides the Bhāgavata worship evidenced mainly through epigraphy, Sanskrit literature from around the third century AD, attests a tendency which stresses asceticism and yoga in association with devotion for Nārāyaṇa. The existence of organized Vaiṣṇava ascetic communities in this period cannot be excluded, though documentation to sustain this hypothesis is scanty. The early Pāñcarātra and Vaikhānasa traditions promoted this yogico-ascetic-cum-devotional tendency. A main trait of the early Pāñcarātra view of ritual is non-injury, perhaps in answer to the Buddhist criticism of Vedic rites. The Vaikhānasa tradition, especially as represented in its Smārtasūtra, transformed Vedic types of rite and included image worship. This probably answered the questions which arose about the nature of ritual itself, on what the relations between Vedic rite and *pūjā* could be, and, perhaps, how far they could be combined in a devotional context.

Early Pāñcarātra and the Nārāyaṇīyaparvan of the Mahābhārata

Scholars are not unanimous about the origin of the term *pāñcarātra* as applied to a Vaiṣṇava tradition. Some trace it to the Śatapathabrāhmaṇa (13.6.1) (usually dated between tenth and seventh centuries BC), which contains the oldest available occurrence of the term "pañcarātra": this passage describes the god Nārāyaṇa performing a *pañcarātra* ("five nights") *puruṣamedha* sacrifice, after which he is said to have surpassed all beings and become the entire universe. Modern scholars have proposed various explanations of the name (van Buitenen 1971: 6 sqq.; Neevel 1977: 8–10; Brockington 1998: 299–301). Pāñcarātra has also been said to be connected with the Ekāyana, a lost Vedic *śākhā* ("school"). Old Pāñcarātra texts mention Ekāyana mantras and Ekāyana adherents (Matsubara 1994: 54; Bhattacharya 1967: 206). But the Nārāyaṇīyaparvan

(NP) of the Mahābhārata (12, 321–39) does not seem to mention the word *ekāyana*, although it refers to Pañcarātra (Schreiner 1997 (ed.), Lemma-Index). Some scholars consider the link of the Pāñcarātra tradition with this Ekāyanaśākhā as a late fiction (Renou 1985a: 205).

The NP is the oldest known source to record several theological and ritual characteristics of an ancient Pañcarātra tradition, though it does not explicitely originate from the Pāñcarātra milieu. Devotion (*bhakti*), omnipresent in the NP, is addressed to the god Nārāyaṇa, who also bears other names like Hari, Vāsudeva, and Viṣṇu. Without being anti-Vedic or Tantric in character, it tends to subordinate Vedic rituals to its own renunciative ideology which upholds non-injury (*ahiṃsā*) and rites without animal sacrifice. The NP does not refute the way of ritual action (*pravṛtti*), but harmonizes it with suspending ritual activity (*nivṛtti*) and replacing it by yogic devotional practices. All sacrifices, whether executed with the expectation of fruits or not, are said to ultimately go to Nārāyaṇa in whom the "exclusive worshippers [of Nārāyaṇa]" (*ekāntins*) finally enter. It has been suggested that the NP perhaps evokes a concept equivalent to that of release while living (Schreiner 1997b: 178).

The term *bhāgavata* which seems to refer to devotees of Nārāyaṇa in general in the NP does not appear to be synonymous with the term *pañcarātra* in this text. Sātvata (which originally referred to the clan of Kṛṣṇa and later to his worshippers) appears more or less as an equivalent of *pañcarātra* in chapter 336, which belongs to the later part of the text (chapters 327–39, probably completed by the fourth to fifth centuries according to Schreiner 1997a: 1). This is not certain in chapter 322, which belongs to the earlier part (chaps. 321–6, probably written in ca. 200–300 AD, ibid., and Oberlies 1997a: 86). Verses 17–25 of chapter 322 depict the domestic rites and conduct of King Uparicara Vasu who practiced non-injury towards all beings, and being a devotee of Nārāyaṇa, considered himself, his kingdom and his possessions as belonging to Nārāyaṇa. He worshipped the Lord of the gods following the Sātvata method (*vidhi*) of worship promulgated by the Sun god, he then worshipped the ancestors with the rest of the previous worship. He distributed the rest of the ancestor worship to vipras (Brāhmaṇas or priests?) and others and consumed that which remained. In verses 23–4, the king is said to have performed "the best rites" (*paramakriyāḥ*), optional (*kāmya*), periodical (*naimittika*), and daily (*yajñīya*), following the Sātvata method. He used to feed in his house the knowers of the Pañcarātra (*pañcarātravit*), a group which may or may not be different from the Sātvatas. But in another passage of the older part of the NP (324, 28), King Uparicara Vasu is described as offering the five *kālas* to Hari, an expression which could be understood as referring to the Pāñcarātra way of worship. This could either mean that the king practiced two ritual systems or that Sātvata is the same as Pañcarātra or, as it has been suggested, that Sātvata could be a branch of Pañcarātra (Schreiner 1997a: 10).

According to the NP, the Pañcarātra-knowers who have attained the state of *ekānta* enter Hari (337, 67). The Pañcarātra is said to be a "great upaniṣad" which subsumes the four Vedas, Sāṃkhya, and Yoga into itself (326, 100). The

NP refers to two concepts which became essential in later Pāñcarātra: the four-emanation theogony and the five-*kāla* worship. The four emanations bear the names of divine aspects known in mythology and iconography long before the NP: Kṛṣṇa-Vāsudeva, Saṃkarṣaṇa (Kṛṣṇa's elder brother), Pradyumna (Kṛṣṇa's son by Rukmiṇī), and Aniruddha (Pradyumna's son). The specificity of the Pāñcarātra teaching is its reinterpretation of these divine aspects in a cosmological perspective. While, at a later time, Pāñcarātra saṃhitās name these emanations as vyūhas, the NP employs the terms *mūrti* (326, 66–70) and *mūrticatuṣṭaya* (326, 43) to refer to them, though it uses the name *vyūha* in verse 336, 53, where Hari is said to consist of one, two, three, or four *vyūhas*. Chapter 326 (31–41) describes the unborn, unperishable Vāsudeva, supreme soul, *puruṣa* beyond qualities (*guṇa*), entering the five elements which together are said to be his body. Thus Vāsudeva is said to be born and is named *jīva* (soul), the "knower of the field" (*kṣetrajña*) and is called Saṃkarṣaṇa. From this soul proceeds Pradyumna who is the mind (*manas*) of all beings and into which all beings disappear at the time of dissolution. From this arises Aniruddha who is the ego (*ahaṃkāra*) as well as agent, effect and cause (*kartṛ, kārya, kāraṇa*) and from whom sentient and insentient beings come into existence. Saṃkarṣaṇa, Pradyumna, and Aniruddha as well as the entire universe arise from and dissolve into Vāsudeva. Verses 68–9 mention the four emanations and the creation which ensues from them, Brahmā the creator of the world being born of Aniruddha. Chapter 332 describes the four *mūrtis* in the path of release: having become minute, the "best of the vipras" enter the divine being (*deva*) from which they reach and stay in Aniruddha's body. Having become mind, they enter Pradyumna. Leaving Pradyumna they enter Saṃkarṣaṇa who is the *jīva*. Then, freed from the three *guṇas* and pure, they enter *kṣetrajña* who transcends the *guṇas*. Practicing penance and having attained *ekānta*, they finally enter Vāsudeva who is the abode of all beings (14–19).

The NP refers to the practice of *pañcakāla*. This characteristic Pāñcarātra notion, current in the Pāñcarātra Saṃhitās, refers to five observances of the day: *abhigamana* ("approaching [of the god]," that is, morning prayer, ablutions, etc.), *upādāna* (collection of material of worship), *ijyā* ("sacrifice," that is, worship), *svādhyāya* (textual study), and *yoga* (meditation) (Gonda 1977: 72). The NP qualifies the *ekāntin* worshippers of Hari as "knowers of the five kālas" (*pañcakālajña*) (323, 42). King Uparicara Vasu is described as offering the five *kālas* to Hari after he fell into a ravine because of non-observance of *ahiṃsā* (324, 28). Pañcakālakartṛgati, that is, "the one who is the resort of the performer of the *pañcakāla*," is one of the 171 epithets of Nārāyaṇa, who is also designated as *pañcarātrika* (325, 4).

Early Vaikhānasa tradition

Although an often discussed passage of the Chāndogya-upaniṣad (3.17.6) (which mentions a Kṛṣṇa) and comparatively late Vedic texts are associated to

some degree with Vaiṣṇavism, no Vedic *śākhā* is so closely and exclusively connected with Vaiṣṇavism as the Vaikhānasa *śākhā* is. Two medieval Vaikhānasa texts, the Ānandasaṃhitā and Ādisaṃhitā, ascribe the Vaikhānasa *śākhā* to the Yajurveda. The first identifies Vaikhānasa with Aukhya *śākhā*, whereas the second considers them as distinct. Dharmaśāstras often consider Vaikhānasas, like Phenapas and Vālakhilyas, as hermits (*vānaprasthas*), those who enter the third stage of life in the *varṇāśrama* system. In the NP, the Vaikhānasa seers are the second group after the Phenapas to receive the Ekāntadharma (336, 14), Soma is the third to receive it, and Vālakhilya seers are the fourth. However the Vaikhānasasmārtasūtra itself does not mention a category of hermits named Vaikhānasas unless the Vairiñca category mentioned in that text should be identified with Vaikhānasa hermits.

Both Vaikhānasa Vedic *sūtras* namely, *śrauta* and *smārta* (probably later than the fourth century and earlier than the eighth century) are attributed to a sage Vikhanas by the Vaikhānasa tradition. The oneness of their authorship is upheld by Caland in his posthumous edition of the Vaikhānasaśrautasūtra (1941: xxv). Their South Indian origin is sometimes questioned but with no serious arguments.

Several passages of the Vaikhānasaśrautasūtra reveal a strong tendency towards devotion to Viṣṇu or Nārāyaṇa. Meditation on these two divine aspects accompanies the performance of several ritual acts. The *ūrdhvapuṇḍra*, a main emblem in later Vaiṣṇavism, which the patron of the sacrifice should draw on several parts of his own body, is eulogized. Some of the mantras which the text prescribes do not belong to known Vedic collections, but their full text seems to be lost. The Vaikhānasasmārtasūtra which consists of both Gṛhya and Dharma parts, frequently mentions devotion to and meditation on Viṣṇu or Nārāyaṇa. It prescribes the installation and daily worship of Viṣṇu's image at home, in a temple (perhaps private), or in a sacrificial pavilion which contains ritual fires. These rites involve the recitation of two mantras: the 8-syllable (*oṃ namo nārāyaṇāya*) and 12-syllable (*oṃ namo bhagavate vāsudevāya*) mantras which became very important in the later Vaiṣṇavism. They also include elements which figure prominently in later medieval Vaikhānasa rituals, like the invocation of the four aspects of Viṣṇu, that is, Puruṣa, Satya, Acyuta, and Aniruddha and the introduction of divine power *(śakti)* into the image before worship.

The Vaikhānasasmārtasūtra is the only known text of its kind to prescribe a ceremony of entry into the hermit stage of life. It describes hermits devoted to Viṣṇu and practicing a *yoga* which involves 10 external observances (*niyama*) (bathing, cleanliness, study, ascesis, generosity etc.) and 10 internal observances (*yama*) (truthfulness, kindness, sincerity, etc.). The practice of *yoga* is still more important in the fourth stage of life, that of the renouncer who aims at uniting his self with the Supreme Self. Besides the practice of the varṇāśrama duties which culminates in renunciation, the Vaikhānasasmārtasūtra also describes yogic paths leading to the Brahman without qualities. It contrasts action "with desire" (*sakāma*) that is, seeking fruits in this world and the other, with "desireless" (*niṣkāma*) action that is, the disinterested performance of what is prescribed. Desireless action is of two kinds: "activity" (*pravṛtti*) and "disengagement"

(*nivṛtti*). "Activity" signifies yogic practices and procures yogic powers, but does not procure release from further births. "Disengagement" characterizes those *yogins* for whom the only reality is the Supreme Self and who, having abandoned householder life, realize the "union [*yoga*] of the individual self with the Supreme Self." The Vaikhānasasmārtasūtra distinguishes three classes of these *yogins*, Sāraṅga, Ekārṣya, and Visaraga (or Visaraka), the first two classes comprising respectively four (*anirodhaka*, *nirodhaka*, *mārgaga*, *vimārgaga*) and five (*dūraga*, *adūraga*, *bhrūmadhyaga*, *asaṃbhakta*, *saṃbhakta*) categories. The *anirodhakas* only practice meditation on Viṣṇu, while the rest of the Sāraṅgas employ methods known from the classical Yogaśāstra. Among the Ekārṣyas, the *dūragas* meditate on the occult body with its subtle veins (*nāḍikā*), whereas the *adūragas* meditate on the Supreme Self (*paramātman*). The *asaṃbhakta* conceives the deity as the unique object of his sensorial perceptions: he contemplates the deity in its form, enjoys its perfume, and salutes it, a devotional attitude reminiscent of the Āḻvārs, the Tamil Vaiṣṇava saints.

Several groups of *yogins* are disapproved or even rejected. The *vimārgagas* are "those who go the wrong way," probably because they distort the (right) object of the meditation (which is the Supreme Self, *paramapuruṣa*, according to a late commentary), although they practice "eight-limbed" (*aṣṭāṅga*) *yoga*, consisting of *yama*, *niyama*, *āsana*, etc. which the Yogasūtras describe. The *bhrūmadhyagas* are said to be "without authority" (*niṣpramāṇa*). The *visaraga* class of *yogins* which groups adherents of various currents and doctrines, is condemned. Qualified as "beasts" (*paśu*) and said to follow the "wrong path" (*kupatha*), they reject the possibility of release in their current lifetime. This suggests that the author of the Vaikhānasasmārtasūtra believes in what is generally known as release while living. This viewpoint as well as the primacy of Brahman without quality (*nirguṇa*) over Brahman with quality (*saguṇa*) differs from the position of the later Vaiṣṇava Vedāntic school of Viśiṣṭādvaita (Colas 1996: 17–44).

Ritualistic and Devotional Traditions (Sixth to Thirteenth Centuries)

From the sixth century onwards, several Vaiṣṇava currents gradually built up a textual corpus which helped them to fix and define their own tradition.

Āḻvārs

The 12 Āḻvārs, Tamil poet-saints, composed devotional poems (collected under the title Nālāyira-divyaprabandham in the tenth century) from about the sixth or the early seventh to about the ninth century. Although they did not form a homogenous tradition, their influence on other Vaiṣṇava currents gives them an important place in the history of South Indian Vaiṣṇavism. We know nothing of their affiliation to any specific Vaiṣṇava tradition, if they had any. Periya-āḻvār

and Toṇṭaraṭippoṭi may have been temple priests, but the ritual system (Vaikhānasa, Pāñcarātra, or other) they practiced is not known. Like other devotees of their time, the Āḻvārs were probably often engaged in pilgrimage, since their poems praise the presiding deities of 97 south Indian Vaiṣṇava temples. These poems exhibit a high degree of learning and literary skill and can hardly be termed as "popular literature."

Yogic practices like meditation play an important role in the Divyaprabandham. The earlier Āḻvārs, Poykai, Pūtattu, Pēy and Tirumaḻicai sing of the mystic union with Māyōṉ (Kṛṣṇa) attained through meditation and temple worship. Nammāḻvār (Caṭakōpaṉ), a later Āḻvār (seventh or early eighth century), is presumably the first to express devotion to Māyōṉ in terms of the passionate love of a girl for her beloved (Hardy 1983: 307). Several poems of the Divyaprabandham seem to show a kind of nondualism between the individual soul and God and even the notion of release obtained while alive (Hardy 1983: 440–1). Though they cannot be said to illustrate a particular theological system, they could be considered as poetical formulations of attitudes comparable to those found in the NP and in the Vaikhānasasmārtasūtra.

Soon after the last Āḻvār, South Indian Vaiṣṇava traditions encouraged the diffusion of the Divyaprabandham. Hagiography credits (Śrīraṅga-)Nāthamuni (probably tenth century) with the rediscovery of these poems. From his time onwards, the 4,000 stanzas of the Divyaprabandham were canonized and recited in the Shrirangam temple, a practice which spread to other Vaiṣṇava temples in South India. The Kōyil Oḻuku, chronicle of the Shrirangam temple, describes the duties of the Araiyars or Viṇṇappañ-ceyvār, literally "supplicants" who were and still are, in charge of chanting and illustrating (by stylized gestures) the Divyaprabandham and enacting simple religious dramas. The oldest known inscription mentioning the Araiyars goes back to the end of the eleventh century. Today, male descendants of hereditary lineages of Araiyars perform in three temples of Tamil Nadu (Shrivilliputtur, Shrirangam, and Alvar-tirunagari) and in the temple of Melkote in Karnataka (Hari Rao 1961: 78–9, 90; Vēṅkaṭarāmaṉ 1985).

Sāttvatas and Bhāgavatas

Sāttvatas and Bhāgavatas formed groups which are difficult to identify since the meaning of these terms changed according to the historical context. Though Sāttvata (sometimes in the orthography Sātvata) sometimes appears to be synonymous with Pāñcarātra (Matsubara 1994: 60–2), it may not always have been the case as we saw in a passage of the NP. A ninth-century Cambodian inscription (stele of Prasat Komnap) which records the foundation by Yaśovarman I of a Vaiṣṇava monastery (*vaiṣṇavāśrama*) designed to feed Vaiṣṇavas, mentions three denominations among them: *pañcarātra*, *bhāgavata*, and *sāttvatas*, but it does not yield any precise definition of sāttvata (Cœdès 1932: 88–112).

Several scholars consider that the term *bhāgavata* refers to a group of Vaiṣṇava Smārtas which was already in existence in the sixth century AD and was still widespread in south India at the beginning of the twentieth century. These Bhāgavatas are said to adhere to nondualism and worship the five gods Viṣṇu, Śiva, Durgā, Sūrya, and Gaṇeśa, consider Viṣṇu equal to Śiva, by contrast with other Smārtas who prefer Siva to Viṣṇu. Their main scripture is said to be the Bhāgavatapurāṇa and their mantra *oṃ namo bhagavate vāsudevāya* (Farquhar 1967: 142–3; 181; 233; 297–8). A "Bhāgavatasampradāya" group of Vaiṣṇavas having the above characteristics was known until recently in the Kannaḍa country. Its priests officiate in temples, several of them in Udipi. Curiously, they follow the Śaivāgama (not the Pāñcarātrāgama) ritual, though they seem to have integrated Pāñcarātra ritual elements (Siauve 1968: 11–12). Bhāgavata is also the name of Brahmin actors of *kūcipūḍi* who enact plays on Vaiṣṇava themes in the Telugu country (Sastry 1991: 64).

The significance of the term *bhāgavata vis-à-vis* the term *pāñcarātra* fluctuated from the seventh century onwards. It signified devotee of the Lord in general including Pāñcarātrins or referred to the follower of a specific Bhāgavata tradition or was taken as synonymous with Pāñcarātrin. Bāṇa's Harṣacarita (seventh century) clearly mentions Bhāgavata and Pāñcarātrika as distinct groups. Vaikhānasa texts of around the tenth century set the Bhāgavatas and Pāñcarātrikas apart. They describe Bhāgavatas as "tonsured," their doctrine being "secondary" and their scriptures being "mixed" (Colas 1996: 173). But by the eleventh century Viśiṣṭādvaitins like Yāmuna and Rāmānuja identify Bhāgavatas with Pāñcarātrins.

Evidence from Cambodian epigraphy shows that a Bhāgavata could be one who performs temple rites and perhaps also a Pāñcarātra expert or one who resides in a Vaiṣṇava monastery. The mid-seventh-century deteriorated inscription of the stele of Baset found at Battamban records that the *ācārya* Dharmapāla who was born in a Bhāgavata family installed an image of Acyuta and mentions his (?) expertise in Pāñcarātra (Cœdès 1942: 193–5). A ninth-century inscription of Prasat Kok Po relates the ritual installation of an image of Hari in 857 AD by a "Bhāgavata kavi" named Śrīnivāsakavi who was the preceptor of Jayavarman III. It also mentions a member of Śrīnivāsakavi's family, Amṛtagarbha, who bore the title Bhāgavata (Cœdès and Dupont 1937: 389–90). The above-mentioned ninth-century inscription of Prasat Komnap lists the qualifications of those Bhāgavatas who are eligible to reside in the Vaiṣṇava monastery: they practice the three *sandhyā* rites, observe good conduct and textual study, are not householders, restrain their senses, have nowhere to stay during the rainy season, and eat one meal a day.

The expansion and influence of the Pāñcarātra system

The early history of the Pāñcarātra and of its corpus after the NP (see above) still remains uncertain (Matsubara 1994: 17 sqq.). Modern scholarship tends to

ascribe the oldest extant Pāñcarātra texts to the sixth century at the earliest, but still discusses the region of their compilation (Gonda 1977: 56; Gupta 1972: xxi; Matsubara 1994: 18–21). The Jayākhyasaṃhitā, one of the Pāñcarātra ancient texts, mentions the Vaikhānasa group which is presumably of south Indian origin (Colas 1996: 22 n. 1; 53 n. 1).

Bāṇa (seventh century) mentions the Pāñcarātrikas. The Advaitin Śaṅkara (eighth century) refers to the adherents of the Pāñcarātra (*pāñcarātrasiddhāntins*) in his commentary on Brahmasūtra 2, 2, 44. His criticism of their tenets proves that the Pāñcarātra doctrine was well-known in his time in south India. In spite of the importance of the Pāñcarātra tradition, inscriptions referring to it are scanty (Smith 1968). A Tirumukkudal (Chengalpattu district of Tamil Nadu) inscription of Vīrarājendra Cōḻa (1063–9) records a donation to the Vaikuṇṭhaperumāḷ temple partly for the maintainance of a Vedic college where Mahāpāñcarātra and Vaikhānasa, among other subjects, would be taught (Sankaranaranayan 1983: 18–19). A Tiruvarur (Tanjore district of Tamil Nadu) inscription of the twelfth century mentions the Pañcarātrasaṃhitās as authoritative in matters of architecture besides Vaikhānasa scriptures, Śaivāgamas, etc. (cf. S.I.I. 17: 270).

In fact, Cambodian epigraphy provides a comparatively larger and earlier documentation on Pāñcarātra (often in the orthography Pañcarātra). The seventh-century Thvar Kdei inscription mentions the well-known Pāñcarātra *caturvyūha* concept. This notion, though not the term *vyūha*, apppears in inscriptions of Koh Ker (during the reign of Jayavarman IV, 921–41 AD), Pre Rup (961 AD, Rājendravarman), Prasat Kok Po (during the reign of Jayavarman V, 968–1001 AD) (Bhattacharya 1961: 98). The already mentioned Baset inscription (between 648 and 657 AD) informs us about a person who performs the five sacrifices (*yajña*), follows the five timely observances (*pañcakālābhigāmin*), and knows the five elements "of those well-versed in the meaning of Pañcarātra doctrine." These observances probably refer to those of Pañcarātra, and *abhigāmin* in the compound *pañcakālābhigāmin* perhaps alludes to the first of them, *abhigamana*, that is, morning prayer, ablutions, etc. (Bhattacharya 1964: 50; 1965). A later inscription from the reign of Rājendravarman (944–68 AD) mentions a priest "proficient in Pañcarātra" and "knower of the five timely observances (*pañcakāla*)" (Cœdès 1953: 121). The already mentioned Prasat Komnap stele inscription (late ninth century) mentions knowers of the Pañcarātra precepts (*pañcarātravidhānajña*) among guests to be honored, which means perhaps that they were not permanent residents of the Vaiṣṇavāśrama (Cœdès 1932: 88–112, esp. 98). The Kup Trapan Srok stele in Khmer records the activities of a sacerdotal family, an ancestor of whom, named Kavīśvarapaṇḍita, followed the Pañcarātra observances, was the head of four hermitages, installed an image of Bhagavatī (in 1003 AD) and a *liṅga*. Other members of his family installed various non-Vaiṣṇava representations like Caṇḍī and *liṅgas* (Cœdès 1942: 129–33). Could this indicate a tolerant or syncretististic Vaiṣṇavism which would be peculiar to ancient Cambodia?

These inscriptions demonstrate the influence of Pāñcarātra in this part of southeast Asia as early as the seventh century, that is, not much later than the composition of the oldest known Pāñcarātra *saṃhitās*. Pāñcarātra rituals and doctrine often inspired such systems as Viśiṣṭādvaita, Dvaita, and later Vaiṣṇava schools. Important Pāñcarātra texts were still being written in India in the seventeenth century (Matsubara 1994: 34–5).

Vaikhānasa corpus of temple rituals

By contrast with the influential Pāñcarātra corpus, Vaikhānasa scriptures, their *sūtras*, and the texts which govern their temple rites (here called "medieval corpus" for the sake of convenience), remained comparatively less known to non-Vaikhānasas. This may be partly due to the fact that the Vaikhānasa tradition was reputed as a Vedic *śākhā* and not as a group to which one adhered through initiation. Nevertheless it greatly contributed to the growth of public temple worship in South India before the reforms of Rāmānuja who is said to have favored the Pāñcarātra method of worship.

The evolution of the Vaikhānasa community from its renunciative traits to professional priesthood practicing temple rites aiming at the prosperity of the society is not well known. It appears in a Karnataka copper-plate dated 828 AD that Vaikhānasas also worshipped non-Vaiṣṇava deities: this inscription mentions that a Vaikhānasa named Devaśarman of the Kāśyapa clan was commissioned to worship the image of a sword-bearing goddess for King Rājamalla II. Later south Indian inscriptions (especially from the eleventh century onwards), however, record Vaikhānasas as priests in Vaiṣṇava temples. One of them, an edict of the Cōḻa King Rājarāja I, applicable to Cōḻa, Toṇṭai, and Pāṇḍya regions, allows villagers to confiscate and sell properties on which Vaikhānasas (among others) have not paid due taxes, thus indicating the affluence of the Vaikhānasas of that period. Epigraphic evidence attests that in the eleventh to twelfth centuries the Vaikhānasa tradition was considered both as a Vedic *śākhā* and reputed for the architectural and iconographic teachings of its scriptures (Colas 1996: 58–64).

The main part or totality of the medieval corpus of Vaikhānasas was probably composed in a rather short period between ninth and thirteenth/fourteenth centuries, that is, much later than their *sūtras*. Vaikhānasas considered it as a continuation with their *sūtra* corpus and forming with it what they call the Vaikhānasaśāstra. Its designation by the late expression "Vaikhānasāgama" is anachronistic. Vaikhānasa tradition lists as many as 28 texts in the medieval corpus and attributes them to Vikhanas's four disciples: Bhṛgu, Kāśyapa, Atri, and Marīci, and sometimes to a fifth author, Aṅgiras, also often identified with Marīci. By 1997 nine texts of the corpus and the corresponding collection of mantras were published fully or in part.

Though the published texts mainly deal with ritual, they also provide some gnostic and theological teaching. The Vimānārcanākalpa contains a complete

gnosis (*jñāna*) section. Its physiology which involves mystical centers and a complex "vein" (*nāḍī*) system differs from that of such texts as the Haṭhayogapradīpikā (probably composed after the fourteenth century). Its metaphysical speculations consist of a kind of theistic Sāṃkhya with the emanation of successive "principles" (*tattva*) from the Primordial Matter (*pradhāna*, *prakṛti*), but this Matter ontologically depends on Viṣṇu. Its teachings are similar to those of the Viṣṇusmṛti and it borrows certain passages almost verbatim from the Bhagavadgītā. Certain ritual passages of the corpus also prescribe meditations on complex metaphysical notions, for example the visualization by the performer of the god from his "undivided" (*niṣkala*) aspect to his aspect "with divisions" (*sakala*). Mantric texts like the Ekākṣara, the Ātmasūkta, and the Pāramātmika contain the conception of an Ātman or Viṣṇu, both the creator of the universe and omnipresent in it.

The major Vaikhānasa theogonical notion is the group of "Five Manifestations" (*pañcamūrti*): Primordial Viṣṇu, Puruṣa, Satya, Acyuta, and Aniruddha, already announced in the Vaikhānasasmārtasūtra. The medieval corpus provides abundant instructions for the installation of this group of Manifestations in a temple. It considers the last four of these Manifestations as fractions of the Primordial Viṣṇu and as incarnating his four qualities (*dharma*, *jñāna*, *aiśvarya*, and *vairāgya*), four Vedas, four cosmic ages, etc. Puruṣa etc. are sometimes identified with Viṣṇu, Sadāviṣṇu, Mahāviṣṇu, and Nārāyaṇa (or Vyāpin) (also mentioned in Pāñcarātra texts), and sometimes they are said to arise respectively from them. The medieval corpus contains frequent and long descriptions of the iconography and ritual installation of Viṣṇu's incarnations (*avatāra*), sometimes divided into *āvirbhāvas* (Matsya, Kūrma, Varāha, Nṛsiṃha, and Vāmana) and *prādurbhāvas* (Paraśurāma, Rāghavarāma, Balarāma, Kṛṣṇa, and Kalkin).

While the Vaikhānasaśrautasūtra, in common with Vedic and Mīmāṃsaka texts, did not recognize Śūdras (the fourth class of the society) and Anulomas (groups born from fathers of a higher class than that of the mother) as qualified to be *yajamānas*, that is, institutors of Vedic sacrifices, the medieval corpus accepts them as *yajamānas* of several major temple rites like the installation of an image, festivals, marriage of the god with Śrī and Bhū. This admission was conditioned by the presence of devotion to Viṣṇu in the patron and by the ritual intermediary of a "king" (*rājan*), that is, of an economically and/or politically eminent person (though perhaps not specifically a person of a Kṣatriya class which was absent from south Indian society). An initiation called Nigamadīkṣā which Vaikhānasas conferred to non-Vaikhānasas served as a ritual recognition of the presence of devotion. This positive reevaluation of the role of Śūdras and Anulomas perhaps corresponded to the growing economic and social importance of these potential temple patrons. They could not be classified as twice-born, as was the case with Veḷḷāḷas, often agriculturists, whom inscriptions of the eleventh century mention as donors to Vaikhānasa temples. The rather rigid social pattern which the corpus prescribes is also mitigated by the omnipresence of devotion, ritualized or not, in the masses, for instance during the Festival (*utsava*), when strict rules against social promiscuity were lifted at least temporarily.

The medieval Vaikhānasa corpus was addressed to Vaikhānasas who were temple priests. Their qualification for this office was conditioned by their undergoing of the personal sacraments (*saṃskāras*) which the Vaikhānasasmārtasūtra enjoined and, in more recent texts of the corpus, the "initiation in the maternal womb" (*garbhadīkṣā*). The corpus limited temple priesthood to householders (*gṛhastha*) and Brahmanical students (*brahmacārin*), hermits and renouncers being denied this right (except in rare cases), thus making a remarkable shift from the ascetic values which the Vaikhānasasmārtasūtra promoted. While Vaikhānasas of this corpus considered themselves and were considered by outsiders as belonging to a Vedic *śākhā* (which signifies that they belonged to the Brāhmaṇa community), they perhaps practiced endogamy, as they do today, thus forming a "caste."

The medieval corpus while situating its tradition among Vedic *śākhās*, provides an interesting though somewhat confused picture of these *śākhās*. It also classifies cultic and doctrinal systems (*siddhānta*, *mata*, and *śāstra*, and *samaya* for "non-*vaidika*" systems). It claims Vaikhānasa tradition to be "*vaidika*," peaceful (*saumya*), bringing about enjoyment here and in other worlds as well as release, and procuring general well-being. By contrast, Pāñcarātra is considered as "*avaidika*," *tāntrika* and sometimes as "cruel" (*krūra*), meant for ascetics and for those who search exclusively for release, and is to be practiced in places outside villages and towns. This stern doxographical standpoint perhaps denotes a wish to restrain the influence of Pāñcarātra in public temple worship. Current practice, however, was probably less rigorous, for the corpus itself prescribes a ritual expiation in the case of admixing Pāñcarātra and Vaikhānasa systems of worship, which implies that admixing was not infrequent. Although allocating the main ritual functions exclusively to Vaikhānasas, it permits the employment of Pāñcarātrins as ritual assistants (*paricāraka*).

The word *dīkṣā* bears several meanings in the corpus. Firstly, *dīkṣā* refers to a pseudo-Vedic practice consisting mainly of a series of ascetic commitments like fasting, supposed to prevent the pollution of the priests and patrons which would occur due to birth or death in their families during the performance of several long rituals (Colas 1999). Secondly, it refers to an "initiation in the maternal womb" (*garbhadīkṣā*) prescribed to all Vaikhānasas. According to the Vaikhānasasmārtasūtra, the sacrament of *sīmantonnayana* (tracing a furrow in the hair of a woman in the eighth month of her pregnancy) is followed by an offering of rice cooked in milk to Viṣṇu and feeding the rest of it to the Vaikhānasa pregnant wife. The rather late Ānandasaṃhitā adds an initiation which consists of branding this rice with hot metallic forms of a disk and a conch (symbols of Viṣṇu) before it is fed to the pregnant Vaikhānasa wife. There is no evidence for this practice being current at the time of the older and intermediate texts of the corpus, and the very expression "*garbhadīkṣā*" which the Ānandasaṃhitā employs to refer to it may be still later than the introduction of this ceremony. Vaikhānasas may have introduced this device perhaps under the pressure of Pāñcarātrins, as a proof of their Vaiṣṇavahood which they proclaim to be innate.

The corpus also prescribes two kinds of initiation (*dīkṣā*) to non-Vaikhānasas: the Nyāsacakradīkṣā and the Nigamadīkṣā. The Nyāsacakradīkṣā seems to be mentioned and described only in the Ānandasaṃhitā. Meant for non-Vaikhānasa hermits, it consists of the application of a santal paste etc. with forms of a conch and a disk on the arms of the disciple with the recitation of non-Vedic formulas. The Nigamadīkṣā, also called *taptacakrāṅkaṇa* ("branding with a hot disk"), is mentioned only in two texts, namely the Samūrtārcanādhikaraṇa, which is ancient in the corpus, and the Ānandasaṃhitā, probably a more recent one. According to the Samūrtārcanādhikaraṇa, this ceremony gives Śūdras and Anulomas the ritual qualification of offering a sacrifice and also enables non-Vaikhānasas to be employed as cooks and ritual assistants in temples of Vaikhānasa ritual, when born Vaikhānasas are not available for these tasks. According to the Ānandasaṃhitā, candidates to this initiation may be twice-born or Śūdras or belong to a "mixed class" (i.e., be Anulomas or Pratilomas). It describes this ceremony which, like the Pāñcarātra initiation, consists of five sacraments: branding the arms of the initiand with hot metallic forms of a conch and a disk, directing him to wear the Vaiṣṇava emblem (*ūrdhvapuṇḍra*) on 12 parts of his body, attributing him a Vaiṣṇava name, teaching him a mantra (on which details are not given), and introducing him to the Vaiṣṇava "sacrifice," that is, the worship of Viṣṇu.

While the corpus naturally extolls its own ritual, it nevertheless allows traditional and local customs to operate with regard to temples of "nonhuman" origin. Its rules are supposed to be applied to temples identified as those founded by human beings, but not to temples of "nonhuman" origin that is, those supposed to correspond to a direct manifestation of Viṣṇu, or to have been founded by other gods, or by a Seer or which are mythological (*paurāṇika*). The texts thus leave a large scope for innovation since the human origin of a temple may be obliterated within a few years of its actual foundation.

The main subject of the corpus, however, are the prescriptions relating to worship in public temples, for it is said that the all-pervasive Viṣṇu manifests himself in the image out of compassion for his devotees. The older texts of the corpus distinguish between domestic worship (*gṛhārcā*) and temple worship (*ālayapūjana*), that is, in a public shrine, more on the basis of the importance of the ritual than of its nature. More recent texts differentiate between worship performed "for one's own self" (*svārtha or ātmārtha*), which brings fruits to the performer, and that performed "for others" (*parārtha*), which benefits the patron who finances it. The notion of *yajamāna* which the corpus applies to the patron echoes the Vedic division between the ritual patron and actual performers of the rite. Temple rites and the results which they produce are often equated with Vedic rites and their results in a hyperbolic way. Temple worship is not only said to be an extension of Vedic rites, but also to last even after the *yajamāna* disappears and to benefit the whole village including those who do not practice the domestic fire-sacrifice.

Vaikhānasa temple worship consists of three aspects: yogic practices, pseudo-Vedic rites, and ceremonies performed to the material representation of the deity.

Though not numerous, yogic practices are not altogether absent from temple worship. Meditation plays an essential role at precise moments in the ritual performance and the priest is often enjoined the practice of breath-control (*prāṇāyāma*). The Vimānārcanākalpa contains a section on *yoga* which is intended for the Vaikhānasa temple priest though not exclusively for him. The final goal of *yoga* is *samādhi*, a state of release while living (*jīvanmukti*), a notion which the Vaiṣṇava Vedānta school of Viśiṣṭādvaita rejects. The Vimānārcanākalpa prescribes the classical pattern of an eight-limbed (*aṣṭāṅga*) *yoga*. Its description of *yoga* bears close similarities with two chapters of the Ahirbudhnyasaṃhitā, a Pāñcarātra text. It however conceives *brahmacarya* which forms part of *yoga* practice as fidelity to his spouse for the householder and sexual abstinence for those in the other three stages of life, while the Pāñcarātra text understands it as complete sexual abstinence even with one's own spouse. Temple rites also involve procedures which, though rather Tantric in character, can be understood as yogic broadly speaking. Mystical gestures (*mudrā*) are very rare in the corpus but imposition (*nyāsa*) of mantras and germ-syllables (*bīja*) are prescribed (more often on the image than on the ritual performer's body). The Khilādhikāra enjoins a "purification of the elements" (*bhūtaśuddhi*) of the performer's body through meditation, a procedure not found in the oldest texts of the corpus, but current in Pāñcarātra and Śaiva ritual traditions. Ritual conceptualization of the divine power (*śakti*), also found, for instance, in Śaivāgama, plays an important role in the corpus, since the installation of divine power in the image is a condition *sine qua non* for its worship.

Vedicized ceremonies often run parallel to ceremonies devoted to the image. They are borrowed from the Vaikhānasa Śrauta and Smārta Sūtras but are often transformed. Fire-sacrifices have a secondary importance during festivals and daily worship but they are numerous and elaborate during the solemn installation of an image in a temple. The fire-pavilion of the Vaikhānasaśrautasūtra was rectangular in shape; that of the medieval corpus is made square to suit ritual transformations. The five *śrauta* fires and a sixth lotus-shaped fire called Pauṣkara are installed around a central altar on which the image to be installed, and vases are placed. Each of these fires is identified with a world and with a divine Vaikhānasa manifestation. Domestic fires prescribed by the Vaikhānasasmārtasūtra are also sometimes added to these six fires. Fire-procedures, from their preparation and kindling to their abandonment or their keeping for daily worship, form a ritual cycle almost independant of image worship, though the corpus sometimes attempts to connect them through the notions of fire and divine power (Colas 1996: 280–3).

The worship of the image of Viṣṇu, his different aspects, and attendants is the most prominent feature of temple ritual. The corpus contains a great quantity of iconographic descriptions of the numerous deities to be installed ideally in large temples with several enclosures. The same divine aspect can be represented by as many as five images (*dhruva*, *kautuka-arcā*, *autsava*, *snāpana*, *balibera*), each of them fulfilling a specific function. For instance, the fixed (*dhruva*) image, said to represent the immovable and undivided (*niṣkala*) form of the god, is the reserve

of divine power. The mobile image of worship (*kautuka*, *arcā*) which receives the essential of the daily worship but draws its power from the fixed image, is said to represent the movable and divided (*sakala*) form of the god.

The main rituals are similar to those found in Pāñcarātra and Śaiva ritual traditions. The initial rite is the installation (*pratiṣṭhā*) of a new image in a new temple, a long rite in which major ceremonies are the opening of the eyes of the image and the final shower of water imbibed with divine power on the installed image(s). It could last several years because it is closely connected with the material construction of the temple. The daily rite of worship (*nityapūjā*) of the *kautuka* image is usually performed three times in the day (morning, midday, and evening before sunset). There are many varieties depending on the number of homages it includes. The rite of the festival (*utsava*) may be the regular yearly one (*kālotsava*) or motivated by faith (*śraddhotsava*) or of an exceptional character (*naimittikotsava*). It may last between one and 21 days. The texts of the Vaikhānasa corpus also prescribe expiatory rites (*prāyaścitta*, *niṣkṛti*) and different kinds of solemn baths which are purificatory or expiatory in nature. They often contain one or several chapters devoted to minor and optional festivals, thus giving a complete and vivid picture of the liturgical calendar of a south Indian temple around the tenth century.

The production of religious literature by Vaikhānasas did not cease with their medieval corpus but continued well into the twentieth century. Apart from *belles-lettres* works, this later literature consists of ritual manuals, hymns, commentaries on the Vaikhānasasūtras and Brahmasūtras, on medieval texts and parts of the mantra collection. The Mokṣopāyapradīpikā by Raghupati Bhaṭṭācārya (twentieth century?), for example, extolls the role of worship as a means of release.

Vaikhānasas also tried to impose themselves as a third division of Śrīvaiṣṇavism on a par with Teṉkalai and Vaṭakalai. This later doctrinal dependance of Vaikhānasas on Śrīvaiṣṇavism, even while they preserved their ritual specificity, reflects a major departure from their tradition as represented in the medieval corpus (Goudriaan 1965; Colas 1988, 1995, 1996).

The Rise and Development of Vaiṣṇava Schools of Vedānta

The tenth to thirteenth centuries saw the rise and development of three Vaiṣṇava schools of Vedānta which gave theistic interpretations of Upaniṣadic doctrines: Viśiṣṭādvaita, Dvaita, and Dvaitādvaita, to which modern scholars often add Viṣṇusvāmin's school. Though these early Vaiṣṇava Vedāntic schools are often grouped together, their destinies varied much in terms of geographical expansion and influence. We do not have any extant text of Viṣṇusvāmin's system. The other three schools produced articulated philosophical systems. They emphasized the role of devotion as a means of attaining release (by contrast with Śaṅkara's Advaita which considered knowledge as the sole means) and greatly

influenced directly or indirectly the later Vaiṣṇava traditions. Each was accompanied and more or less supported by a specific network of religious institutions, particular ritual systems and modes of transmission. Viśiṣṭādvaita and Dvaita developed and received a religious basis first and mostly in South India. There is no testimony of the influence of Nimbārka, the Dvaitādvaita founder, and of Viṣṇusvāmin in south India, though hagiography places their birth in this part of the subcontinent.

The school of Viśiṣṭādvaita

While Viśiṣṭādvaita ("nondualism of what is qualified") refers to a certain doctrine, the term Śrīvaiṣṇavism (to be differentiated from the more general word Vaiṣṇavism) could be said to refer to the socioreligious manifestation of this doctrine as it was integrated and promoted by Viśiṣṭādvaita in south India. Modern scholarship does not seem to have yet brought out a clear historical definition of this term. In fifteenth-century epigraphy the term *śrīvaiṣṇava* is used to qualify a Vaiṣṇava group known as Sāttāda. It is today often taken as referring solely to a group of Brahmins called Aiyaṅkārs, but it is admitted that the use of the word may have not been so exclusive in the past (Jagadeesan 1977: 323; Lester 1994: 44, 47, 48; Hardy 1998: 101). The word *śrī* in the expression Śrī-vaiṣṇava is sometimes explained as stressing the role of Śrī, the spouse of Viṣṇu, in this tradition (Renou 1985a: 652; 1985b: 22). Developed in south India, Viśiṣṭādvaita came to be known later as Śrīsampradāya in north India.

Viśiṣṭādvaita is also called Ubhayavedānta since it refers to both (*ubhaya*) Vedānta doctrine written in Sanskrit and the mystical experience recorded in the Āḻvārs songs in Tamil as its sources. Viśiṣṭādvaita usually considers Nāthamuni (probably born at the beginning of the tenth century) as its first teacher. According to hagiography, Nāthamuni was born in a Brahmin family in Vīranārāyaṇapuram (near Cidambaram) where he officiated in the temple of Rājagopāla. His role in the rediscovery and early propagation of the Divyaprabandham has already been mentioned. His instauration of the practice of singing the Divyaprabandham in the Shrirangam temple gave these hymns the status of Vedas. Scholars have argued for or against his being a follower of Pāñcarātra ritual (Mesquita 1979; Neevel 1977). Renowned for his yogic capacities, he is attributed with several doctrinal works in Sanskrit which are known only through quotations in later texts. His Nyāyatattva, quoted by Yāmuna and Vedānta Deśika, is considered as the first treatise which systematized Viśiṣṭādvaita doctrine. His main disciple was Puṇḍarīkākṣa (Uyyakoṇṭār), himself succeeded by Rāma Miśra (Maṇakkāl Nampi). The works of these authors are known only through quotations.

Yāmuna (Āḻavantār, eleventh century) is the first *ācārya* whose several complete works are preserved. He was the grandson of Nāthamuni and like him a native of Vīranārāyaṇapuram. He is said to have become an ascetic after several years of marriage. Hagiographical accounts relate that under the guidance of

Rāma Miśra, he left a life of luxury in the Cōḻa capital Gangaikondacholapuram and settled in Shrirangam as a renouncer. He wrote the Stotraratna and the Catuḥśloki, two well-known poems, and the Gītārthasaṅgraha, a summary of the teachings of the Bhagavadgītā. His Siddhitraya explains the Viśiṣṭādvaitic conception of the individual soul, the Supreme being, and knowledge. His Āgamaprāmāṇya which is the first extant Viśiṣṭādvaitic work to defend the authoritativeness of the Pāñcarātra texts, argues that these texts are revelations of the God and are equal to Vedas (Srinivasachari 1970: 512–16; Neevel 1977: 17).

Rāmānuja (Uṭaiyavar, said to have died in AD 1137) is the best known among Viśiṣṭādvaitin teachers. According to traditional accounts, he was born in Shriperumbudur near Kanchipuram in a Brahmin family. He was taught in Kanchipuram by one Yādavaprakāśa, probably an Advaitin, also sometimes identified with the Yādavaprakāśa, who propounded the Bhedābheda philosophy. He received instruction on the Divyaprabandham, Rāmāyaṇa, and the true meaning (*rahasya*) of mantras from five of Yāmuna's disciples. It is said that when Tirukoṭṭiyūr Nampi (Goṣṭhīpūrṇa) taught Rāmānuja the secret meaning of the eight-syllabled mantra (*oṃ namo nārāyaṇāya*), Rāmānuja immediately revealed it from the Tirukoshtiyur temple tower out of compassion for the crowd gathered in the shrine. Rāmānuja left the life of a householder, became a renouncer, and was called to preside over the activities of the Shrirangam temple. It is said that during his north Indian pilgrimage he read in Kashmir a manuscript of the Bodhāyanavṛtti, a commentary of the Brahmasūtras, which later formed the basis of his own commentary. To escape the persecution of Vaiṣṇavas by the Cōḻa king Kulottuṅga I, a fanatical follower of Śaivism, he fled from Shrirangam to Karnāṭaka where he converted the Jain Hoysala king Biṭṭideva (Viṣṇuvardhana) to Vaiṣṇavism. He is said to have returned to Shrirangam in 1118 where, as administrator of the temple, he replaced the Vaikhānasa mode of worship with that of the Pāñcarātra. He is also said to have established the Pāñcarātra system of worship in many other Vaiṣṇava temples. There is, however, no historical basis for this.

Rāmānuja's Śrībhāṣya, a commentary on the Brahmasūtras, established Viśiṣṭādvaita as a full-fledged philosophical school. Its main conception is that the Brahman has the individual souls (*cit*) and the insentient world (*acit*) as his modes (*prakāras*). Both these modes are as real as the Brahman and dependent on him as the body is dependent on the soul. Rāmānuja also wrote short treatises on these *sūtras*, the Vedāntasāra and the Vedāntadīpa, as well as a commentary on the Bhagavadgītā. His Vedārthasaṃgraha refutes nondualist and dualist doctrines and explains seemingly contradictory Upaniṣadic passages. The attribution to Rāmānuja of the Nityagrantha, which gives instructions for the personal daily worship of an image, has been challenged. Three devotional poems are attributed to him (Vaikuṇṭhagadya, Śaraṇāgatigadya, Śrīraṅgagadya) (Hari Rao 1961: 45; Srinivasachari 1970: 516–21; Carman 1981: 24–64).

Piḷḷai Lokācārya and Vedānta Deśika are two major figures of Viśiṣṭādvaita after him. Piḷḷai Lokācārya seems to have flourished during the second half of

the thirteenth century. His works mainly written in a highly sanskritized Tamil (Maṇipravāḷa), are compiled under the title Aṣṭādaśarahasya, 18 texts of which the Tattvatraya, the Arthapañcaka, and the Śrīvacanabhūṣaṇa are well-known. Maṇavāḷamāmuṉi (also named Varavaramuni and Ramyajāmātrimuni, fourteenth century), a celebrated commentator of the works of Piḷḷai Lokācārya, also wrote the Yatirājaviṃśati, a well-known hymn on Rāmānuja. Following the preceptors of Shrirangam, he was actively engaged in expounding the devotional teachings contained in the hymns of the Āḻvārs. Vedānta Deśika (Veṅkaṭanātha), born and educated in Kanchipuram, was a younger contemporary of Piḷḷai Lokācārya whom he controverts in his works. He is credited with 130 works in Sanskrit, Tamil, and Maṇipravāḷa which contain commentaries on the works of Yāmuna and Rāmānuja, independent treatises, devotional hymns, and literary works. A brilliant logician, he not only perfected the doctrine of Viśiṣṭādvaita and refuted the doctrines of rival schools but also developed Viśiṣṭādvaita logic based on the works of Viṣṇucitta, Nāthamuni, and others. He gave a theistic interpretation of the Pūrvamīmāṃsāsūtras which he considered as forming one work with the Brahmasūtras. He emphasized the role of "self-surrender" (*prapatti*, the attitude whereby the soul surrenders the responsibility of its protection to God) towards release and defended the authority of Pāñcarātra scriptures. True to the spirit of Ubhayavedānta, he summarized Nammāḻvār's hymns in Sanskrit (Singh 1958).

The schism between the Vaṭakalai ("the Northern division") which traces its origin to Vedānta Deśika and the Teṉkalai ("the Southern division") which traces its origin to Piḷḷai Lokācārya and Maṇavāḷamāmuṉi is not attested before the late sixteenth century (Mumme 1988: 2). Some scholars explain this split as resulting from the Vaṭakalai preference for the Sanskrit tradition and the Teṉkalai preference for the Tamil Divyaprabandham (Appadurai 1977: 56). However the differences between these two divisions are based not so much on linguistic grounds as on doctrinal principles (Mumme 1988: 6–7). One of the principal differences (which later texts believe to be 18 in number) concerns the definition of *prapatti*. The Vaṭakalai, according to which the soul is required to make an effort to be saved by Viṣṇu, is often described as the school of the monkey's baby, which clings to its mother. By contrast, the Teṉkalai, according to which God alone chooses those whom he wants to save, believes that the soul should abandon all effort. It is known as the school of the kitten, for the kitten lets its mother carry it around in her mouth. Another subject of doctrinal dissension was the role of Lakṣmī. The two schools stress her role as an intermediary between God and the devotee, but the Vaṭakalai believes that she is infinite and ontologically of the same level as Viṣṇu while the Teṉkalai holds that she is only a soul (*jīva*) which is ever liberated. Vaṭakalai followers give more importance to ritual performance than the Teṉkalai. Both the divisions consider the initiation by the five sacraments (*pañcasaṃskāras*) indispensable, but while the Teṉkalai followers do not see the need of a further formal initiation into *prapatti*, the Vaṭakalai consider it to be necessary. In the course of time the antagonism between the two divisions expressed in such minor details as the shape of the

Vaiṣṇava emblem (*ūrdhvapuṇḍra*) applied on the body and the order of dishes served during a meal (Siauve 1978, Mumme 1988, Jagadeesan 1977: 171–208, Varadachari 1983). Quarrels between them even occasioned lawsuits throughout the eighteenth and until the twentieth centuries (Hari Rao 1964: 117–28). This split which concerned devotees who financed the temple rites affected the current administration of temples and minor aspects of rituals, but not the core of the rites which Vaikhānasa or Pāñcarātra priests continued to perform according to their own ritual tradition, even as the particular emblem of one of the two divisions was imposed on the walls of the shrine, its main idol, or its priests (Colas 1995: 124, 125–6).

The notion of lineage (*paramparā*) has a special importance in Śrīvaiṣṇavism in which various currents continuously tried to define themselves through distinct lines of affiliation, because during the daily ritual, a Śrīvaiṣṇava recites the names of teachers in an order of priority which reflects his spiritual lineage. Two types of lineages are invoked: the Ācārya- (or Samāśrayaṇa-)paramparā, that is, lineage of the initiating preceptor, and the Grantha-paramparā, that is, the lineage of the preceptor-commentator of sacred texts. Rāmānuja is said to have appointed 74 disciples called the Siṃhāsanādhipatis to spread Viśiṣṭādvaitic teachings. Prestigious Śrīvaiṣṇava families like the Uttamanampis and the Tātācāryas still claim that their religious honors and privileges originate from his time. Several Śrīvaiṣṇavas who did not belong to any line of preceptorial succession acted as masters and initiated disciples (Jagadeesan 1977: 42–3, 47, 51, 113–14).

The Kōyil Oḻuku (probably eighteenth-century in its present form) attributes Rāmānuja with the assignment of religious functions to Śūdra groups, not a revolutionary step, given the role already played by Śūdras as patrons in Vaiṣṇava temples. Among them, Sāttādas (also named Sātānis), identified as Veḷḷāḷas (that is ranked among Śūdras) but also sometimes as Brāhmaṇas, officiated as administrators of feeding houses for pilgrims at Shrirangam, Tirupati, and Kanchipuram during the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. They also were in charge of providing flowers and other ingredients for temple worship and participated in the recitation of the Divyaprabandham. Even today Sāttādas have the religious privilege of performing similar services in temples in Tamil Nadu, Karnataka, and Andhra Pradesh. Some of them also officiate as priests in small temples (Hari Rao 1961: 50, 90; Lester 1994).

The late fourteenth century saw the rise and development of Śrīvaiṣṇava monasteries (*maṭhas*, *mutts*). It is not known with certainty which part Yāmunācārya and Rāmānuja (also named *yatirāja*, "king of renouncers") played in the origin of Śrīvaiṣṇava ascetic orders, though both of them are said to have embraced an ascetic life. Viśiṣṭādvaitin renouncers (*saṃnyāsins*) are usually called "three-staffed" (*tridaṇḍin*) by contrast with the "single-staffed" (*ekadaṇḍin*) Advaitins who considered that the triple-staff custom is meant for lower classes of renouncers (Olivelle 1986: 53). Apart from Brahmin *saṃnyāsins*, Śrīvaiṣṇavism also comprised of non-Brahmin renouncers called *ekākī*/*ekāṅgī*

and known from fifteenth-century inscriptions. Heads of Śrīvaiṣṇava monasteries generally were (and still are) Brahmins and bore the title of *cīyar* (Jeer, Jiyar), though there are historical instances of non-Brahmin Ekāṅgī cīyars. These monasteries were instrumental in the conversion to Śrīvaiṣṇavism of lower castes and even of non-Hindu tribes, according to some sources. Several monasteries like the Ahobilam Maṭha and the Parakāla Maṭha (which initiated the seventeenth-century rulers of Mysore into Śrīvaiṣṇavism) belong to the Vaṭakalai division or were later affiliated to it. Among the well-known Teṉkalai monasteries, mention should be made of the Vānamamalai Maṭha (which had a special importance for the Rāmānandasampradāya, a Vaiṣṇava tradition of north India), the Tirukkurungudi Maṭha and the Śrīraṅganārāyaṇa-cīyar Maṭha which were probably founded about the fourteenth century (Appadurai 1977; Jagadeesan 1977: 147–68; Lester 1992; Clémentin-Ojha 1999: 74).

The school of Dvaita

Madhva (probably 1238–1317), also named Ānandatīrtha, Ānandajñāna, Ānandagiri, and Pūrṇaprajña, is the founder of the Dvaita, that is, dualistic school of Vedānta later known as "Brahmasampradāya" in the north Indian Vaiṣṇava milieux. Information about his life comes mainly from the Madhvavijaya, a hagiography by Nārāyaṇapaṇḍitācārya, the son of one of his direct disciples. Born of Tuḷu brahmin parents in the village of Pājakakṣetra near Udipi in Karnataka, Madhva became a renouncer at the age of 16 as an unmarried perpetual religious student (*naiṣṭhikabrahmacārin*). He acknowledged no other teacher than the mythical Vyāsa, but according to hagiography an Advaitin ascetic, Acyutaprekṣa (Puruṣottamatīrtha), was his master and initiated him. Though Madhva refused his doctrine, he succeeded him as the head of his monastery. The debates he had with scholars in the course of his tours all over India strengthened his conviction against Advaitic doctrine and he converted his master to his own views. He installed an image of Kṛṣṇa in Udipi and promoted several ritual reforms like the substitution of a flour-made sacrifice animal (*piṣṭapaśu*) in the place of a living one. The prestige of his school increased notably after the conversion of Trivikrama, a then-famous Advaitin and probably the court-pandit of King Jayasiṃha, to Dvaita.

Thirty-seven works are attributed to Madhva. Several of them consist of commentaries on basic texts of the Vedānta (Upaniṣads, Brahmasūtras, and Bhagavadgītā), on the Mahābhārata and the Bhāgavatapurāṇa, a text to which, unlike Rāmānuja, Madhva gave much importance. His *tātparyas* on Bhagavadgītā, Mahābhārata, and Bhāgavatapurāṇa, give the essential teachings of these texts important to Dvaita school. Madhva summarizes his main doctrinal principles in 10 very brief treatises called the Daśaprakaraṇas. Several devotional hymns are attributed to him. He also wrote several ritual treatises like the Yatipraṇavakalpa, which explains how to enter the renunciative way of life.

Madhva's works often quote from Pāñcarātra texts which he considers as authoritative as the Veda because, according to him, these two originally formed one tradition (Siauve 1968: 16). His Tantrasārasaṅgraha seems to follow the Pāñcarātra mode of temple worship.

Madhva maintains that the Brahman is the only independent (*svatantra*) entity; the world consisting of sentient beings (*cit* or *jīva*) and insentient (*acit*) objects does not have an existence independent of the Brahman (they are *asvatantra*). The five differences (*pañcabheda*) which exist between God and matter, God and sentient beings, matter and sentient beings, between sentient beings, and between material objects, prove the reality of multiplicity. While Madhva insisted on the absolute superiority of Viṣṇu on Śiva and other deities, his works and his hagiography do not show conflicting relations with Śaivas. Several Mādhva followers composed hymns in honor of Śiva. Till today, some Mādhva families maintain a Śaiva domestic temple. These facts seem to confirm ancient connections of the milieu of Madhva with Śaiva worship. His family may have belonged to a Smārta group (today known as the Bhāgavatasampradāya) (Sharma 1960; Siauve 1968: 1–36). Other major authors of Dvaita are Jayatīrtha (1365–88) and Vyāsarāya (Vyāsatīrtha, 1460–1539). The latter's mastery of *śāstras* won him great fame. Called to the Vijayanagar court, he may have been the preceptor (*guru*) of Kṛṣṇadevarāya (Sharma 1961: 30).

According to the Madhvavijaya, Madhva ordained his brother and seven other disciples as renouncers, directing them to perform the worship of Kṛṣṇa at the Maṭha founded by him in Udipi. These eight ascetics established their own lines of succession by ordination which resulted in the foundation of eight monasteries (*maṭhas*) in Udipi. Until today the heads of these monasteries are in charge of the worship in Kṛṣṇa Maṭha in turn for two years each, an arrangement known as *paryāya*. Other direct or later disciples are attributed with the foundation of monasteries outside the Udipi region. The Mādhva tradition had a following mostly in the Tuḷu country (today a part of Karnataka), but in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries a rather significant number of people converted to the Mādhva tradition in Tamil Nadu and in Kerala, including several local rulers and members of the Nambudiri Brahmin community (Sharma 1960; 1961; Hari Rao 1964: 133).

The Haridāsakūṭa (to be distinguished from Haridāsasampradāya, a later north Indian tradition) was closely associated with the Mādhva tradition. These wandering devotees spread all over the Kannaḍa region, held Viṭṭhala, the image of the temple of Pandharpur (in the southern part of the present Maharashtra) as their deity. They praised devotional, moral, and renunciative values in an easy nonliterary Kannaḍa language which appealed to the common man. While the Haridāsakūṭa tradition is said to have started with Acalānanda Viṭṭhala (ca. 888 AD) and others before Madhva, the earliest known poet-saint connected with the Haridāsakūṭa is Naraharitīrtha (fourteenth century), perhaps a direct disciple of Madhva. Like him, many prominent figures of the Haridāsakūṭa were distinguished Sanskrit scholars and held high positions in Mādhva monasteries.

Purandaradāsa (sixteenth century), who contributed greatly to Carnatic music, was a follower of the Haridāsakūṭa (Sharma 1961: 314–26).

The school of Dvaitādvaita

Nimbārka (Nimbāditya, Niyamānanda), the founder of the Dvaitādvaita ("Dualism-cum-nondualism") or (Svābhāvika-)Bhedābheda ("(natural) identity in difference") school (later referred to as Sanakādisampradāya in north India), probably flourished in the thirteenth century. His date and life still remain a subject of discussion among scholars. The earliest hagiography, the Ācāryacarita, probably does not predate the sixteenth century. Hagiographical accounts locate Nimbārka's birth in various places in the Telugu country, in Vrindavan or a nearby village, in a Brahmin family. His school traces Nimbārka's spiritual lineage to Viṣṇu's incarnation as a swan, through the four spiritual sons of Brahmā (Sanaka, Sananda, Sanātana, and Sanatkumāra) who in turn taught Nārada, whom Nimbārka acknowledges as his guru. Nimbārka, like Madhva, is said not to have received his doctrine from any historical teacher. Like Madhva again, he is said to have remained an unmarried perpetual religious student.

Nimbārka's main work is the Vedāntapārijātasaurabha, a brief commentary on the Brahmasūtras. Except this and probably the Daśaślokī, 10 verses which summarize his doctrine, the authorship of most of the works attributed to him like the Rahasyamīmāṃsā of which we know two sections only (the Mantrarahasyaṣoḍaśī and the Prapannakalpavallī), several hymns and several unpublished works (R. Bose 1943: 8–12, 16) still need to be confirmed. In the Vedāntapārijātasaurabha, Nimbārka recognizes three principles: the sentient (*cit*), the nonsentient (*acit*), and the Brahman. Their relation which is natural (*svābhāvika*) and not caused by any condition (*anaupādhika*) is neither of absolute nondifference (*abheda*), since they are distinct by nature, nor absolute difference (*bheda*), because *cit* and *acit* are inseparable from the Brahman. The Vedāntapārijātasaurabha does not mention the notion of *prapatti* which the post-Rāmānuja Viśiṣṭādvaita emphasized, but the Prapannakalpavallī describes it in terms similar to those of later Viśiṣṭādvaita. The path of *prapatti* or total surrender to the Lord is open to all including Śūdras, but does not imply absence of any effort on the part of the surrendering devotee, for he is required to lead a life of devotion and service. The Mantrarahasyaṣoḍaśī advocates complete self-surrender not directly to the Lord, but to the preceptor (*gurūpasatti*) and the abandonment of all other practices (R. Bose 1943: 54–7). These two attitudes are reminiscent respectively of the Vaṭakalai and Teṉkalai views on *prapatti*.

There is no historical proof that Nimbārka and the first 28 preceptors of this tradition settled in Braj in and around Mathura before the end of the fifteenth century. Keśava Kāśmirī Bhaṭṭa (born in 1479), the 29th *ācārya*, is the first whose historical association with the Braj area is certain. His direction is marked by the revival of the Nimbārka tradition and the propagation of its teachings all

over India. He composed doctrinal texts, devotional hymns, and an elaborate ritual treatise the Kramadīpikā, which influenced Caitanyaite authors. His successor, Śrī Bhaṭṭa, is the first *ācārya* of the Nimbārka school known to have written in Braj *bhāṣā*, the vernacular of the Braj region. His Yugalaśataka describes the divine loving couple of Kṛṣṇa and Rādhā, a theme which became increasingly popular also among several other Vaiṣṇava traditions from the sixteenth century onwards (Clémentin-Ojha 1990: 333–8, 374).

Śrī Bhaṭṭa's disciple, Harivyāsadevācārya (probably sixteenth century), who wrote in Braj *bhāṣā* as well as in Sanskrit, had a strong influence on the organization and theology of Nimbārka's tradition. This tradition developed into 12 branches based in 12 monasteries. A number of subdivisions later arose, progressively weakening its cohesiveness. While in its early stages, the Nimbārka tradition stressed the ascetic values, however initiating lay members into its fold. Under Harivyāsadevācārya, lay members received the right of initiating others and transmitting this right to their male descendants. These householder preceptors were later called gosvāmīs and the wealth which they accumulated significantly contributed to the developement of the tradition (Clémentin-Ojha 1990: 346–8).

The school of Viṣṇusvāmin

Information on Viṣṇusvāmin and on his school, later referred to as Rudrasampradāya by north Indian Vaiṣṇava traditions, is very scanty. Viṣṇusvāmin predates Vallabha (sixteenth century) and is often said to have lived in the thirteenth century. Vallabhite hagiography describes him as the son of a south Indian priest. None of his works including commentaries on Bhāgavatapurāṇa and Brahmasūtras have survived. According to Mādhava's Sarvadarśanasaṃgraha (fourteenth century) the followers of Viṣṇusvāmin's school maintained that the body of Nṛsiṃha (Viṣṇu's incarnation as man–lion) is eternal. It cites a verse from the Sākārasiddhi of a Śrīkāntamiśra which pays hommage to Nṛsiṃha whose body is made up of existence, consciousness, and continual inconceivable bliss, and who is esteemed by Viṣṇusvāmin. Some scholars mention that according to the Sarvajñasūtra attributed to Viṣṇusvāmin, God, whose principal incarnation is Narasiṃha, takes a form consisting of existence, consciousness, and bliss, is accompanied by his knowledge which is named *hlādinī* and has *māyā* at his disposition (Shukla 1971: 12). Śrīdhara (fourteenth to fifteenth centuries) refers to Viṣṇusvāmin in his commentary on Bhāgavatapurāṇa. In his commentary on the same text Vallabha differentiates Viṣṇusvāmin's views from his own. Viṣṇusvāmin's followers are said to have *oṃ rāmakṛṣṇāya namaḥ* and *oṃ rāmakṛṣṇahari* as mantras, the Gopālatāpanīya-upaniṣad and the Gopālasahasranāman as manuals. Farquhar claims to have met several ascetic followers of this school in Allahabad in 1918 (Farquhar 1967: 239, 304; Dasgupta 1975: 382).

North Indian Traditions from Thirteenth Century

While the four Vaiṣṇava schools of Vedānta were building or achieving their systems, other traditions of Vaiṣṇavism developed from the thirteenth century onwards in the Deccan and northern India. They crystallized around the pious personalities, and sometimes around the devotional works of poet-saints. Their origin and chronology often remains uncertain. Our knowledge of these traditions depends on mostly biased and anachronistic documentation. Several of these movements were closely associated with the then developing literature in New Indo-Aryan (NIA) languages. Two other traditions, those of Vallabha and Caitanya, which began in the late fifteenth century, expressed their doctrinal views and their devotion both in Sanskrit and in NIA languages.

Traditions associated with New Indo-Aryan literatures

The devotional fervor which nourished the traditions of NIA expression was in fact not so much Vaiṣṇavite properly speaking as Rāmaite and Kṛṣṇaite, that is, directed to Rāma and Kṛṣṇa which are however aspects of Viṣṇu. The practices and concepts which they valued and which since have long existed in Hinduism and Buddhism converged to some extent with several similar mystic techniques and notions of Islam and Sufism: ecstatic forms of worship, collective singing (*bhajan* and *kīrtan*), repetition of holy names (and devotion to them), notion of divine love, etc. Other means of release were devotion to the "Good preceptor" (*satguru*) who is God in human form, and the "company of the good" (*satsaṅg*), that is, of the poet-saints, but more generally of pious devotees. The social ideology of these traditions is difficult to circumscribe. They initially rejected caste barriers and were indifferent or even hostile to Brahmanic learning and to ritualism. They have sometimes been presented as revolutionary currents but they did not specifically denounce social structures (except perhaps Mahānubhāvas, who isolated themselves from mainstream Hinduism), nor did they seem to have raised strong opposition from the Brahmanical side. The figures around whom these traditions developed were often of a humble social origin, yet their following belonged to all strata of society including Brahmins. Though not professing formal renunciation, they often insisted on nonviolence (*ahiṃsā*), strict vegetarianism, and sexual restraint. Similar tendencies arose in south Indian Śaiva milieux, as illustrated by Basava (thirteenth century) who wrote in Kannaḍa and Vēmana (fifteenth century) who wrote in Telugu. Some North Indian Vaiṣṇava traditions which developed from the late fifteenth century frequently around a *guru* and left a literature in NIA languages, remain rather obscure. for example, the Caranadāsīs (whose tradition Caranadāsa founded at Delhi around 1730) who worshipped god in the form of Rādhā and Kṛṣṇa, and the Rāmasnehīs, a tradition founded in the eighteenth century which spread

mostly in Rajasthan (Farquhar 1967: 344–6; Renou 1985a: 660). Only those that are relatively better documented will be mentioned here. Vaiṣṇavism from Gujarat, of which Narasiṃha Mehatā (fifteenth century) is a main personality, is the subject of another chapter in the present volume.

Of the two Vaiṣṇava traditions of Maharashtra, the Mahānubhāvas (or Manbhaus), literally "those who have a great experience" and the Vārakārīs, "those who perform the tour," that is, the pilgrimage to Pandharpur, the first is probably older. Cakradhara (thirteenth century) is said to be its founder, and he was succeeded by Nāgadeva. During the leadership of Paraśarāmabāsa (which began in the late fourteenth century), the tradition isolated itself from the common fold of Hinduism and divided into 13 currents (*āmnāya*), each with its own line of initiating preceptors and particularities of doctrine and practices. Reduced to two *āmnāyas* in the twentieth century, it reopened itself to the surrounding Hinduism and revealed its scriptures which until then had been encoded and kept secret. The Sūtrapāṭha and the Līḷācaritra, which record Cakradhara's life and sayings, as well as the Smṛtisthaḷa, which describes the activities of Cakradhara's followers during the time of Nāgadeva, all in Old Marathi and of uncertain date, are among well-known texts of the Mahānubhāvas. The Mahānubhāvas direct their devotion to Parameśvara, the sole source of release who is said to have incarnated in five *avatāras* called "the Five Kṛṣṇas," who are Cakradhara, his teacher, his teacher's teacher, the god Dattātreya, and the god Kṛṣṇa. Their books prescribe mental exercises rather than external and ritual forms of worship (*sevā*). The main religious practice is the "recollection" (*smaraṇa*) of the names, deeds (*līḷās*), and manifestations of the above five incarnations, a recollection stimulated by pilgrimages to places which they are said to have visited and veneration of the relics of these incarnations, including objects used or touched by them. The Mahānubhāvas rejected social categorization in terms of *varṇas* and castes and several pollution rules. This institution is divided between lay disciples and wandering renouncers (*saṃnyāsīs*) initiated into ascetic life through a ceremony called *bhikṣā* (a term which also conveys the ordinary meaning of begging in the Mahānubhāva texts). In the early period of this tradition women were eligible for this initiation as well as for instructing and initiating others (Feldhaus 1983: 3–68; Feldhaus and Tulpule 1992: 3–53).

The Vārakarīpantha is more a devotional current associated with the god Viṭṭhala (or Viṭhobā, also called Pāṇḍuraṅga) of Pandharpur (Maharashtra) than a homogenous and organized tradition. In the eighteenth century its followers claimed a spiritual lineage of 50 Sants (holy men) (Schomer 1987: 4). They believe that Jñāneśvara (a Marathi author and saint of the end of the thirteenth century) established the Vārakarīpantha, but Nāmadeva was probably the founder of their movement (Vaudeville 1987b: 218, n. 9). A tailor by profession, Nāmadeva (1270 to 1350 according to tradition) could be assigned to the beginning of the fifteenth century from the linguistic analysis of his songs. Two other major Maharashtrian Sants, Ekanātha (a Brahmin, second half of the sixteenth century) and Tukārāma (a Śūdra, 1607–49) belonged to this movement.

Rāmadāsa (1608–81), an ascetic follower of the Vārakarīpantha, founded his own tradition (the Rāmadāsasampradāya) and became the preceptor of king Śivājī. Vārakarī Sants consider the god Viṭṭhala of Pandharpur as "father and mother" and often address him as a loving mother. According to the followers of the Vārakarīpantha this image of Viṭṭhala is the very form (svarūpa) of Viṣṇu-Kṛṣṇa (Vaudeville 1987a: 28–9; see chapter 9).

By contrast with the above Marathi poet-saints who were Vaiṣṇava devotees, the "Northern Sants," from the northwestern states of Panjab and Rajasthan and the Hindi-speaking area, are generally associated with devotion to a formless God conceived as being beyond the three *guṇas* of *sattva*, *tamas*, and *rajas* (*nirguṇabhakti*) and with the notion of nonduality of the individual soul with God. But at least three of these "Northern Sants," Rāmānanda, Dādū, and Haridāsa, are considered by traditions distinctly Vaiṣṇava as their founders.

The most basic details of Rāmānanda's life remain unknown. Modern scholarship tends to assign him to the fifteenth century (Pollet 1980: 142). Hagiography records that he reconverted to Hinduism persons who had previously been converted by force to Islam, and recruited women and intouchable castes in the tradition which bears his name and which enjoins devotion to Rāma. However, it is not even sure that he founded that tradition (Burghart 1978). Rāmānanda is attributed not only with a number of poems in the vernacular but also with several texts in Sanskrit. Most of the often undatable texts of this tradition are written in northern Indian languages, not in Sanskrit (Burghart 1978: 121, 124–5).

Special mention must be made in this context of the Bhaktamāla which Nābhādāsa (or Nābhājī) of the Rāmānanda tradition composed in the late sixteenth or early seventeenth centuries (Burghart 1978: 129; Pollet 1980: 142). This important text, very rich in hagiographical stories, declares that Rāmānanda was the disciple of Rāghavānanda, himself an indirect disciple of Rāmānuja (stanza 35), a statement which remains unproven.[1] It also declares that Hari (Viṣṇu) manifested himself as four vyūhas in this Kaliyuga: Śrīrāmānuja, Viṣṇusvāmin, Madhvācāraja (=Madhva=Madhukara in stanza 29), and Nimbāditya (=Nimbārka), each having established a "sampradāya" (28), named respectively Janma, Karma, Bhāgavata, and Dharma. The *paddhatis* ("paths") – Ramā-, Tripurāri-, Mukhacāri-, and Sanakādikā- – belong respectively to these four *sampradāyas* (29). Sindhujā (another name of Śrī) is called the *sampradāyaśiromaṇi*, the "summit of the *sampradāya*" to which Rāmānuja and others belonged (30). Nāma (=Nāmadeva of the Vārakarīpantha?) and Vallabha are said to belong to the Viṣṇusvāmisampradāya (48).

The nineteenth-century followers of Rāmānanda were called Rāmānujīs and claimed to be under the authority of the head of the Śrīvaiṣṇava Teṉkalai monastery of Vanamamalai. But in the early twentieth century, the Rāmānanda tradition no longer traced its historical origin to Śrīsampradāya which corresponds to the tradition of Rāmānuja, but designated itself as Rāmānandasampradāya (Burghart 1978: 133; Clémentin-Ojha 1999: 74). In about the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, the tradition combined a devotional and a

Tantric heritage and its following consisted of twice-born Hindus as well as untouchables, women, and converted Muslims (Burghart 1978: 124, 133). At the end of eighteenth century the Rāmānandī ascetics formed a militant order (*akhāṛā*), gathering ascetic-warriors named *nāgās* in view of retaining or regaining control over several pilgrimage centers against the concurrence of Daśanāmī ascetics (Burghart 1978: 126). By the nineteenth century, the tradition comprised of several lineages (some of them consisting of ascetic-warriors like the Bālānandīs) associated with different monasteries, of which the head bore the title of Mahant. Each lineage owned its own temples, villages, and territories (Clémentin-Ojha 1999: 73).

Several groups arose out of the Rāmānandī tradition. Two of them originated from Varanasi: the Rāidāsī group, a religious corporation of tanners, organized by Rāidāsa (or Ravidāsa) (fifteenth century) and the Sadhanapantha founded by a butcher named Sadhana (seventeenth century). The Senāpantha which claims the barber Senā (or Senānanda) (fifteenth century) as its founder and the Malūkadāsī group said to have been founded by Malūkadāsa in the seventeenth century also belong to the Rāmānandī fold (Farquhar 1967: 323–30; Renou 1985a: 655).

Dādū (Dādū Dayāla) (1544–1604) was born in Ahmedabad (Gujarat) according to the hagiographical work of his direct disciple, Janagopāla. He probably belonged to a family of humble origin. Having experienced several mystical visions in his youth, he left home in around 1562 and became an itinerant preaching ascetic. He is said to have married and become a cotton-carder. He died in Naraiṇā (near Jaipur) which continues to be the center of his tradition. The Dādūpantha developed soon after his death. One of Dādū's disciples, Rajjab, is said to have compiled his sayings (*bānī*), which consist of religious didactic verses and devotional songs in Braj *bhāṣā*. Another disciple, Sundaradāsa, composed many devotional hymns and short religious poems in a highly Sanskritized Braj *bhāṣā*. His Jñānasamudra integrated a yogic heritage from the system of Gorakhanātha and from the Pātañjalayoga, and was perhaps influenced by Caitanyaite theology. According to the Dādūpantha doctrine, devotion consisting of chanting God's name, etc., leads to a state of union with God who is the object of devotion. In this state of nonduality, the devotee becomes fully conscious of his total dependance on God (*dāsatva*). While Dādū himself converted members from all strata of society, Hindus and Muslims alike, to his way, the Dādūpantha today only accepts persons identified as twice-born. It is followed by laymen and by religious ascetics, mostly men, who are designated as *viraktas*. The Dādūpantha is divided into two main branches, Khālsā which is attached to the center of Naraiṇā and to Dādū's immediate disciples and Uttarādhā which traces its lineage to those preceptors of the Dādūpantha who migrated to northern regions after Dādū's death. While the *viraktas* of the Uttarādhā branch sometimes exercise a profession in society, the Khākhi ("ash-smeared") *viraktas*, another group of Dādūpantha ascetics, lead a life of complete renunciation. The Dādūpanthī Nāgās were originally organized as a militant group perhaps around the mid-seventeenth century, but today consist of laymen and ascetics (Thiel-Horstmann 1983).

Haridāsa belongs to the sixteenth century according to modern research. His hagiography seems generally unreliable. The canon of the Haridāsa tradition contains the poems of its successive heads of the organization till around 1750–60, and two works which are attributed to Haridāsa: the Kelimāla, a devotional poem which depicts the love sports of Rādhā and Kṛṣṇa, and the Aṣṭādaśasiddhānta, a brief didactic poem which warns against worldly life which is an illusion, emphasizes the value of meditation on God (Kuñjabihāri) and absolute devotion to him. The *sādhu* Bihārinidāsa (probably late sixteenth to early seventeenth century), a prolific writer, produced the main code of worship of this tradition. The two main subdivisions of the tradition could have originated from two disciples of Haridāsa: the Gosvāmīs, who are in charge of the main temple of this tradition, claim to have descended from Jagannātha, a married Panjabi Brahman, while Sādhus, renouncers who practice worship in which singing devotional hymns (*saṃkīrtana*) is of the utmost importance, trace their spiritual lineage to Vīṭhalavipula. In the early eighteenth century, in response to the organization of Vaiṣṇava groups into four main traditions (*catuḥsampradāya*) by Savai Jaisiṅgh, the Sādhu Pītāmbaradāsa defended the thesis that the Haridāsa tradition stemmed from the school of Nimbārka, while the Gosvāmīs claimed an affiliation with Viṣṇusvāmin's school. A schism occurred between these two subdivisions in the second quarter of the eighteenth century, after which Sādhus lived secluded in monasteries, a disposition which continued till the end of the nineteenth century. Apart from Sādhus and Gosvāmīs, the Haridāsa tradition has a following of lay people who receive varied types of initiation with different mantras from a preceptor of either of the two groups (Haynes 1974; Rosenstein 1997).

Sanskritizing traditions from the late fifteenth century

The fifteenth and sixteenth centuries which saw the growth of the traditions of NIA expression also witnessed the rise of two Sanskritizing Vaiṣṇava traditions, those of Vallabha and Caitanya, both closely associated with a devotion to images perceived as the very form (*svarūpa*) of Kṛṣṇa and with the mythology of Kṛṣṇa's life as described in the Bhāgavatapurāṇa. These two teachers (who lived around the same time) or their immediate disciples, identified several places in the Braj region as Gokula and as sacred sites of Vrindavan which mythology associates with Kṛṣṇa's life. The Vallabha tradition, from the time of Viṭṭhalanātha, glorified the role of Rādhā, Kṛṣṇa's favorite cowherd girl (*gopī*), and Caitanya tradition (and connected traditions) stressed the worship of the divine couple (*yugala*) which they formed (Barz 1992: 90–1). This mode of worship was not new but received a great impetus during the sixteenth century in traditions of NIA expression (like the Haridāsa tradition) as well. This was also associated with the revival of the Nimbārka tradition (Clémentin-Ojha 1990: 351–75). Both Vallabha's and Caitanya's traditions, like that of Madhva, gave great importance to the Bhāgavatapurāṇa. They held devotion superior to

knowledge and built religious doctrines rather than scholastic philosophies on the lines of the Vaiṣṇava schools of Vedānta of the tenth to thirteenth centuries. The importance which the Vaiṣṇava schools of Vedānta gave to devotion which could be practiced by all, irrespective of their social status, did not affect their social conservatism. By contrast, Vallabha's and Caitanya's traditions which held the same position with regard to access to devotion had to envisage integrating backward classes, women, and other converts in a congregation of devotees which implied social promiscuity.

Vallabha's tradition, called Vallabhasampradāya, consists of a doctrine, the Śuddhādvaita ("Nondualism of the pure," that is, of Śrīkṛṣṇa-Parabrahman), and a religious path guided by it, the Puṣṭimārga. According to hagiography, Vallabha was born in 1479 in a family of Telugu Brahmans in a village on the Godavari river. He passed his childhood in Varanasi, studied Vedas, Śāstras, and Purāṇas and spent 19 years debating with scholars and spreading his doctrine during pilgrimage tours. In 1493–4 he is said to have identified at Kṛṣṇa's command, an image on the Govardhana Hill in Braj as Śrīgovardhananāthajī, the very form (*svarūpa*) of Śrīkṛṣṇa whose worship became an important feature of his tradition. This image was later moved to Nāthadvāra in Rajasthan and is now known as Śrīnāthajī. In 1494 again, according to Vallabha himself, Śrīkṛṣṇa revealed to him the *brahmasambandha* (direct relation with the Brahman who is Śrīkṛṣṇa). This initiation is said to remove the impurities (*doṣas*) of the soul, who then proceeds to worship Śrīkṛṣṇa by dedicating all actions and possessions to him. According to hagiography, Vallabha, who was celibate, married in around 1502 under the order of the image of Viṭṭhala of Pandharpur. His tradition does not consist of ascetics and all preceptors and laymen are householders. In 1531 Vallabha became a renouncer and retired to Varanasi where he died (Barz 1992: 16–55).

Eighty-four Sanskrit works are ascribed to Vallabha, among which Subodhinī and Aṇubhāṣya commentaries on the Bhāgavatapurāṇa and Brahmasūtras, the Tattvārthadīpa, based on the Bhāgavatapurāṇa, the Ṣoḍaśagrantha, 16 tracts which discuss dedication to God and the three obstacles to it, are considered as important. According to Vallabha, sentient beings and insentient world are the real manifestations of Śrīkṛṣṇa-Parabrahman. Sentient beings are nondifferent from Śrīkṛṣṇa in nature but do not realize it due to ignorance (*avidyā*) imparted to them by Śrīkṛṣṇa himself. Their release (*uddhāra*) too is bestowed by the god himself through his grace (*anugraha*) and out of his own free will (*icchā*). Śrīkṛṣṇa appears in different incomplete divine "descents" (*avatāras*) in sport (*līlā*) and out of compassion for his devotees but his only complete *avatāra* is that of Śrīkṛṣṇa who lived in Braj and whose deeds are described in the Bhāgavatapurāṇa. The institutional and doctrinal connections which hagiography ascribes between his tradition and that of Viṣṇusvāmin remain uncertain (Barz 1992: 45).

Vallabha's elder son Gopīnātha, and later his younger son Viṭṭhalanātha, succeeded him at the head of the organization. Viṭṭhalanātha (died in 1586) received several grants from Emperor Akbar, one of which was used to found a new village at Gokula near Mathura, where he settled with his family and his

followers. He delegated the guidance of the Vallabha tradition among his seven sons, each of them in charge of one or several divine images of temples in different places in the present Uttar Pradesh, Rajasthan, and Gujarat states. These charges were transmitted to further generations through the eldest male descendants of Viṭṭhalanātha's sons. Vallabha and Viṭṭhalanātha initiated Muslims, women, and untouchables (Barz 1992: 47).

The Vallabha tradition produced a vast literature in Sanskrit (Dasgupta 1975: 373–81) and also developed a devotional literature of high quality in Braj *bhāṣā*. Four disciples of Vallabha, Sūradāsa (1483–1563, the author of the Sūrasāgara), Kumbhanadāsa, Paramānandadāsa, and Kṛṣṇadāsa, and four disciples of Viṭṭhalanātha who wrote and sang the glory of the image of Śrīgovardhananāthajī, are known as the *aṣṭachāpa*. Their songs (*kīrtanas*) form part of the disinterested service rendered to the god, called *sevā*. *Sevā* consists of collective praise of the god before his image, donation of wealth to the temples of the tradition, and finally constant contemplation of Śrīkṛṣṇa. This form of worship is characteristic of Vallabha's Puṣṭimārga, built around the notion of Śrīkṛṣṇa's grace. It is to be distinguished from the *maryādāmārga*, considered as inferior, that is, the conventional mode of worship such as *pūjā* and observance of scriptural injunctions. In Puṣṭimārga, where external and mundane actions represent divine events, meditation on and physical enactment of Kṛṣṇa's games (*līlās*) played an important role from the time of these poets (Barz 1992: 46 sqq., 52, 97–104).

Viśvambharamiśra, the future Caitanya, was probably a younger contemporary of Vallabha, but his exact dates (usually said to be 1486–1533) remain uncertain. Sanskrit and Bengali hagiographies written soon after Caitanya's death provide a detailed though often unreliable picture of his life. It is said that Viśvambharamiśra, born in a Vaiṣṇava Brahmin family of Navadvīpa (Nadiā) in Bengal, grew up in a milieu in which Kamalākṣa Bhaṭṭācārya (also named Advaitācārya) was influential. Kamalākṣa Bhaṭṭācārya was the disciple of Mādhavendra Purī who seems to have taught a Śaṅkarite nondualism combined with devotion. Viśvambharamiśra had a traditional *śāstric* education and was a householder who remarried on the death of his first wife. At the age of 22 he is said to have received in Gayā an initiation with Kṛṣṇamantra from Īśvara Purī (perhaps another disciple of Mādhavendra Purī), which debuted his mystical life. On his return to Navadvīpa, he organized the collective singing of *kīrtanas* with music and ecstatic dancing. Singing processions in the city (*nagarakīrtana*) were also organized with the agreement of the local Mohammedan authority. Possibly in 1510, Viśvambharamiśra was initiated into renunciation by Keśava Bhāratī (perhaps an Advaitin renouncer, De 1961: 20) and received his name Śrīkṛṣṇacaitanya, abbreviated to Caitanya. After many years of pilgrimage he settled in Puri, but continued to visit holy places, especially Vrindavan where he is said to have identified certain sites as places connected with Kṛṣṇa's life. Caitanya is said to have spent the rest of his life in ecstasy and in the worship of Jagannātha, the image of the main temple of Puri (De 1961: 17, 20, 30–2, 67–110; Hardy 1974: 37–40).

Caitanya's affiliation with the Mādhva tradition is a late construction. His followers came to be known as Gauḍīyavaiṣṇavas, that is, Vaiṣṇavas from the Gauḍa region (situated in present South Bengal). After his death an important group gathered around Nityānanda, an early companion of Caitanya (and perhaps previously an Avadhūta ascetic), who remained in Navadvīpa. Nityānanda seems to have accepted members of all social classes more easily than Caitanya, who allowed equal access to worship and to the role of preceptor but held a rather conservative view with regard to social rules. He became a householder and had two wives. Another group formed in Vrindavan around six of Caitanya's disciples, called Gosvāmins. Apart from these two main branches other smaller groups arose around several personalities and sometimes against certain teachers (De 1961: 13–15, 77–8, 107–9, 111 sqq., 84 n. 2; Majumdar 1969: 260–9).

Caitanya did not write any work except perhaps the Śikṣāṣṭaka, a collection of eight verses describing his intense joy of devotion to Kṛṣṇa (De 1961: 113). The Six Gosvāmins composed the basic scriptures of the tradition. Sanātana and Rūpa, two brothers, and their nephew Jīva, the most prolific of the three, are the authors of main literary as well as ritual and theological works. According to them Bhagavant, that is, Śrīkṛṣṇa, is the ultimate reality who possesses infinite powers and creates the universe which is real and ever dependent on him. He has an undifferentiated aspect (Brahman) in which his powers lay in a latent form and another aspect in which he is the inner controller of all creation (Paramātman). The individual soul (*jīva*) is neither different from Bhagavant (it forms a part of him) nor nondifferent from him (it retains its individuality in release which can be obtained either during his lifetime or after death). Devotion to Kṛṣṇa is the sole means of release. This devotion (*bhāva*) which is ever present in all beings is aroused by practice (*sādhana*) which comprises *rāgānugā* (spontaneous attachment to God) and *vaidhī* (practice of the injunctions of the Scriptures). Constant practice of devotion in all its aspects or the grace of Kṛṣṇa lead the soul to the experience of divine love (*preman*). An essential feature of the doctrine is the explication of devotion through the notion of aesthetical emotion (*rasa*) and its utilization of the terminology of Sanskrit poetics (De 1961: 166–244).

The other three Gosvāmins are Raghunātha Bhaṭṭa, Raghunāthadāsa, and Gopāla Bhaṭṭa. No work of Raghunātha Bhaṭṭa is extant. Raghunāthadāsa composed devotional hymns imbued with mysticism expressed in an erotic fashion and centered on the worship of the couple Rādhā-Kṛṣṇa. The well-known Haribhaktivilāsa is attributed (though with some uncertainty) to Gopāla Bhaṭṭa (Joshi 1959). It codifies the behavioral and ritual rules of the Caitanya tradition, is influenced by Purāṇic, Pāñcarātra, and Tantric texts. Its prescriptions include the possibility of also initiating Caṇḍālas, but with Tantric mantras (De 1961: 454). Besides doctrinal and ritual texts, the Caitanya tradition produced a large quantity of Sanskrit poems, dramas, and biographical works. Its early literature also comprised devotional songs in Bengali. Caitanya directly or indirectly inspired a number of traditions, the most important being the Rādhāvallabhīs and the Sahajiyās.

Little is known about Hitaharivaṃśa (1502–52) and the tradition of the Rādhāvallabhīs (mentioned in Nābhādāsa's Bhaktamāla) which claims him as its founder. Hagiography describes him as born in a rich family near Mathura. He is said to have settled in Vrindavan at the age of 32 where he founded the Rādhāvallabha tradition. The Rādhāsudhānidhi in Sanskrit and two Hindi works are attributed to him. On his death, his son Kṛṣṇadāsa (probably born in 1531) became the head of the organization. He constructed a temple for the image of Rādhāvallabha which had been discovered by Hitaharivaṃśa, and the worship of this image formed one of the features of this tradition. This temple was destroyed by Aurangzeb (Shukla 1971: 21–2). Works attributed to Kṛṣṇadāsa reveal a strong influence of the Caitanya tradition, especially of Rūpa Gosvāmin. They consist of a Padāvali in Braj *bhāṣā* and 13 Sanskrit texts, several of which were commented upon in Braj *bhāṣā* by later authors. His Karṇānanda, a poem on the sports of Rādhā and Kṛṣṇa, with his own commentary is his main work (Shukla 1971: 22–3, 68–91). The works of Hitaharivaṃśa and Kṛṣṇadāsa show no interest in religious practices or philosophical discussions. Their main theme is the constant and eternal union of Rādhā and Kṛṣṇa. The contemplation of this union by the individual soul who is said to be the female friend (*sakhī*) of Rādhā, gives rise to an emotion of joy (*hita*) which forms the aim of devotion to Rādhā and Krṣṇa and is considered as release (Shukla 1971: 24 sqq.). The Sakhībhāva group, where men dressed and behaved like Rādhā's female friends, may have been a branch of the Rādhāvallabha tradition (Renou 1985a: 647).

The links of the Bengali Vaiṣṇava Sahajiyā (from *sahaja*, "innate," "natural") tradition with the Buddhist Sahajiyā tradition (which flourished in Bengal at least three centuries before Caitanya) are uncertain. Though modern scholarship does not rule out a Sahajiyā influence on Caitanya himself (through his direct disciples Rāmānanda Rāya, Nityānanda, and Jahnavī, Nityānanda's wife, who are said to have been Sahajiyās) (Dimock 1966: 46–55), it seems more probable that the Caitanya tradition influenced Sahajiyās.

Sahajiyā followers had no regard for Vedic texts, but accepted texts written by Vaiṣṇava authors (Dimock 1966: 185–6). The Vaiṣṇava Sahajiyā tradition produced a vast amount of literature often kept secret by its followers (M. M. Bose 1930: 261–302). It contains a great number of lyric songs, the date of which modern scholarship has not yet fixed. Its Tantras (of which 79 titles are known) were written in Bengali, in an obscure and coded language (*sandhā-bhāṣā*), between the early seventeenth and nineteenth centuries (Dimock 1966: 38, 124; Gupta 1981: 177, 201). They adopted the Caitanya theology besides their own views. Sahajiyās considered Caitanya as the teacher of their doctrine and believed he was incarnated as both Rādhā and Kṛṣṇa in a single body. Besides the conventional mode of devotion, they prescribed mystic worship in order to realize the divine presence of Rādhā and Kṛṣṇa and their union in one's own self (Dimock 1966: 228). Their mystical physiology, influenced by Tantric traditions, insisted on the role of chastity and the control of *rasa* (semen) (Dimock 1966: 157) in a spiritual progress which is said to be divided into three stages. During the first stage the adept learns certain mantras from an initiating preceptor and

conducts such practices as the repetition of Kṛṣṇa's names. The second stage involves ritualized copulation with meditation on the divine couple. In the third stage the adept, transcending all physical desires, experiences the eternal divine union of Rādhā and Krṣṇa which is pure bliss (M. M. Bose 1930, *passim*; Dimock 1966: 124–248). Though it had no consideration for orthodox social conceptions and believed in the personal evaluation of moral principles, the Sahajiyā tradition with its esoteric rituals conducted in secrecy did not enter into conflict with society (Dimock 1966: 105, 121). The Sahajiyā tradition is said to no longer exist, but the possibility of its continuation in contemporary India is evoked (Dimock 1966: 249).

Other minor movements inspired by the Caitanya tradition remain less well known due to a lack of documentation. Kartābhājās recognized Kartābābā (end of the eighteenth century) of Navadvīpa and his descendants as their only deity. The Spaṣṭadāyakas, followers of Rūparāma Kabirāja, lived in celibacy in monasteries which gathered men and women (Renou 1985a: 646–7). A group of Vaiṣṇavas of Orissa, called the *pañcasakhās*, "the five friends," who worshipped the formless Kṛṣṇa, are also said to have been followers of Caitanya (Majumdar 1969: 240; Mukherjee 1978: 313–14).

Except Vallabha's, Caitanya's, and related traditions, mention must also be made of Śaṅkaradeva (1449–1548). The tradition which claims him as its founder was independent from the Caitanya tradition though seventeenth-century hagiography mentions a meeting of both the religious leaders. It remained confined mostly to Assam. Twenty-seven works, written in Sanskrit and Assamese, are attributed to Śaṅkaradeva. Among them six plays (called *nāṭas*, *nāṭakas*, and *yātrās*) still extant show that the extensive use of dramatic performances was from the beginning a main feature of his tradition. His teachings were based on devotion as explained in the Bhāgavatapurāṇa. He and his first disciple, Mādhava, a main propagandist of the tradition, were *kāyasthas*. Śaṅkaradeva's granddaughters and great-granddaughters played an important role in the creation of its monasteries, called *sattras*, where monks and married devotees lived in separate quarters. Soon after Śaṅkaradeva's death the tradition subdivided into several currents; the four main ones are usually counted Brahma-, Nikā-, Puruṣa-, and Kāla-saṃhatis. The ceremony of conversion to this tradition is called *śaraṇa*. The main object of worship is a book (normally the Bhāgavatapurāṇa) while the use of images is not strictly forbidden. Objects used by the gurus of the tradition are also worshipped (Neog 1965).

Late Vaiṣṇava Tantras

Apart from Pāñcarātra texts, several Tantric works were of special importance for the different Vaiṣṇava traditions. The Rāmānanda tradition favored the use of several texts, like an Agastyasaṃhitā (different from the Pāñcarātra text of the same title and probably from the twelfth century) for their worship of Rāma. The

sixteenth-century Caitanya texts quote the Gautamīyatantra as their authority. Later tantras like the Īśānasaṃhitā and the Ūrdhvāmnāyasaṃhitā either mention Gaurāṅga, that is, Caitanya, or promote him as the main object of worship (Goudriaan 1981: 105 sqq.). Several ritual Tantric texts, tentatively called "Kālī-Viṣṇu Tantras," like the Kālīvilāsatantra, the Utpattitantra, the Kāmadhenutantra, tried integrating Vaiṣṇavism into Śāktism by claiming Kṛṣṇa to be a son of Kālī. They seem to be associated with the Vaiṣṇava revival which arose in northeastern India from the sixteenth century onwards (Goudriaan 1981: 82–4).

Late Modern and Contemporary Vaiṣṇava Traditions and Groups

New Vaiṣṇava movements developed in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. The Svāmināràyaṇa tradition (nineteenth century) from Gujarat promoted both social and religious reforms. The Assamese reformist movements that arose in the 1930s, like the Haridhaniyas (or Nama Kirtaniyas), the Mahākīyas, etc., may also be mentioned in this context (Cantlie 1985). At the end of the nineteenth century, Bengal saw a revival of Vaiṣṇavism inspired by the Caitanya devotional current. While reformist movements like Brāhmo Samāj and Ārya Samāj scorned this tradition, several historical personalities illustrate the opposite tendency. For instance, Bijoy Krishna Goswami (born in 1841), previously an ardent and influential missionary of the Brāhmo Samāj, left it in 1889 and became a follower of Caitanya. He had several disciples like Bipincandra Pāl whom he initiated, but did not found any organized movement (Jones 1989: 39–41; Lipski 1971). By constrast, Kedārnāth Datt (1838–1914) founded a branch of the Caitanya tradition, the International Society for Kṛṣṇa Consciousness, which spread outside India and is popularly known as Hare Kṛṣṇa movement. Serving as a magistrate in the British Government, in 1868 he discovered the Caitanya tradition into which he had been born and subsequently wrote and edited around a hundred books on the subject. He took the Vaiṣṇava *saṃnyāsin* Jagannātha Dāsa Bābājī as his master and received the name of Bhaktivinoda Ṭhākura from the Gauḍīya Gosvāmīs in 1887. In the same year he established a printing press in Calcutta to help circulate Vaiṣṇava texts. He was initiated as a renunciate in 1908. His son Bhaktisiddhānta Sarasvatī succeeded him at his death in 1914. He reestablished the use of the sacred thread in the tradition (which his father had abolished) as a symbol of "real brahminhood" for every initiate irrespective of his caste or origin. A. C. Bhaktivedānta Svāmī, who succeeded Bhaktisiddhānta in 1937, aimed at spreading the message of Caitanya among English-speaking people and undertook a translation of the Bhāgavatapurāṇa. Having become a renouncer in 1959, he visited New York in 1965 at the age of 70 and died in 1977 (Hopkins 1984, *passim*).

Conclusion

Vaiṣṇava traditions did not develop in themselves and by themselves. They were under constant pressure from political and socioeconomic powers which considerably influenced them as protectors, as in the case of the early Bhāgavata tradition, but sometimes also as controllers. For instance, the fortunes of rival Śrīvaiṣṇava tendencies may have varied according to the support of Vijayanagar kings (Appadurai 1977). Another illustration is the political instrumentalization of the notion of *catuḥsampradāya* ("fourfold tradition" of Vaiṣṇavism which refers to the traditions of Rāmānuja, Viṣṇusvāmin, Nimbārka, and Madhva) by the rulers of Rajasthan in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries (Clémentin-Ojha 1999).

The perception of Vaiṣṇavism as a single religion with an homogenous development can only be an ideal view. The notion of Vaiṣṇavism partly corroborated by comparatively late Indian doxographies and adopted by modern scholarship, corresponds in fact to the aggregation of a multitude of varied traditions. The above overview shows the successive rise of Vaiṣṇava traditions (and sometimes, their reappearance in another form) and their multiple aspects. This is because these traditions had to cater for a variety of human needs in terms of devotion, rituals, doctrine, and these furthermore towards a chosen divine aspect. Again, our comprehension of Vaiṣṇavism according to its successive tendencies depends on extant historical evidence which project to forefront merely fragmented and crystallized images of Vaiṣṇava traditions. This should not hide the fact that such trends as asceticism, devotion, image worship probably coexisted at the same time in Vaiṣṇavism, though the texts do not give them equal importance.

Only critical research can disentangle a historical perspective from textual views. A comprehensive study of the multifarious and often biaised descriptions and classifications of Vaiṣṇava traditions in Vaiṣṇava Sanskrit and vernacular texts, as well as a complete historical study of such vital themes as the notion of *guru* or of initiation in the different Vaiṣṇava traditions, are required. A methodical evaluation of the influence of these traditions on each other and on other traditions, as well as that of the non-Vaiṣṇava traditions on Vaiṣṇava traditions, would help to locate them more precisely in Indian religions.

More or less institutionalized traditions form only a part of religious culture. These structures which we tried to circumscribe are, so to say, superficial. Larger socioreligious realities in fact nourish them: patrons and devotees form the core of historical Vaiṣṇavism. This continuously changing social substance facilitated influences and conversions and partly explains the growth and decay of these traditions.

Acknowledgments

I would like to thank C. Clémentin-Ojha for her observations on a first draft of this chapter. Unfortunately M. Rastelli's article on the *pañca kālas* (*Wiener*

Zeitschrift für die Kunde Südasiens 44: 101–34) was published after I had submitted the manuscript of my chapter (April 2000) so could not be included for discussion here.

Note

1 Another text, the Rāmārcanapaddhati, sometimes dated to the fifteenth century (Burghart 1978: 127), also contains this declaration, but more recently it has been assigned to the late nineteenth or early twentieth centuries (Bakker 1986: 120).

Short Bibliography and Abbreviations

Appadurai, A. 1977. "Kings, Sects and Temples in South India, 1350–1700 AD," *Indian Economic and Social History Review* 14: 47–73.

Bakker, H. 1986. *Ayodhyā*. Groningen.

Bāṇa. *Harṣacarita*, eds. K. P. Parab and Dh. P. Vaze. Bombay, 1892.

Barz, R. 1992. *The Bhakti Sect of Vallabhācārya*. Delhi (1st ed. 1976).

BEFEO: *Bulletin de l'École Française d'Extrême-Orient*.

Bhattacharya, K. 1961. *Les religions brahmaniques dans l'ancien Cambodge d'après l'épigraphie et l'iconographie*. Paris.

——. 1964. "Recherches sur le vocabulaire des inscriptions sanskrites du Cambodge," *BEFEO* 52: 1–70.

——. 1965. "Sur une stance d'une inscription sanskrite du Cambodge," in *JA* 253: 407–8.

——. 1967. "Le 'védisme' de certains textes hindouistes," *JA* 255: 199–222.

Bose, M. M. 1930. *The Post-Caitanya Sahaji[y]ā Cult of Bengal*. Calcutta.

Bose (born Chaudhury), R. 1940, 1941, 1943. *Vedānta-pārijāta-saurabha of Nimbārka and Vedānta-kaustubha of Śrīnivāsa (Commentaries on the Brahma-sūtra)*, vol. III: *Doctrines of Nimbārka and his followers*. Calcutta.

Brockington, J. 1998. *The Sanskrit Epics*. Leiden/Boston/Köln.

van Buitenen, J. A. B. 1971. *Yāmuna's Āgama Prāmāṇyam or Treatise on the Validity of Pañcarātra*. Sanskrit text and English trans. Madras.

Burghart, R. 1978. "The Founding of the Ramanandi Sect," *Ethnohistory* 25: 121–39.

Caland, W. 1929. *Vaikhānasasmārtasūtram. The Domestic Rules and Sacred Laws of the Vaikhānasa School Belonging to the Black Yajurveda* [trans.]. Calcutta.

Cantlie, A. 1985. "Vaishnava Reform Sects in Assam," in R. Burghart and A. Cantlie, eds., *Indian Religion*. London and New York, pp. 134–57.

Carman, J. B. 1981. *The Theology of Rāmānuja. An Essay in Interreligious Understanding*. Bombay (reprint).

Clémentin-Ojha, C. 1990. "La renaissance du Nimbārka Sampradāya au XVIe siècle: Contributions à l'étude d'une secte kṛṣṇaïte," *JA* 278, pp. 327–76.

——. 1999. *Le trident sur le palais: une cabale anti-vishnouite dans un royaume hindou à l'époque coloniale*. Paris.

Cœdès, G. 1931. "Études cambodgiennes: XXV. – Deux inscriptions sanskrites du Fou-nan," *BEFEO* 31 (1931): 1–23.

Cœdès, G. 1932. "Études cambodgiennes: XXVIII–XXX," *BEFEO* 32: 71–112.

——. 1942. *Inscriptions du Cambodge*, vol. II. Hanoi.

——. 1953. *Inscriptions du Cambodge*, vol. V. Paris.
—— and Dupont, P. 1937 "Les inscriptions du Prasàt Kôk Pô," *BEFEO* 37: 379–411.
Colas, G. 1988. "Le yoga de l'officiant vaikhānasa," *JA* 276: 245–83.
——. 1995. "Cultes et courants du vishnuisme en Inde du Sud. Quelques observations à partir des textes," in M.-L. Reiniche and H. Stern, eds., *Les ruses du salut. Religion et politique dans le monde indien*. Paris, Collection Puruṣārtha 15, pp. 111–38.
——. 1996. *Viṣṇu, ses images et ses feux. Les métamorphoses du dieu chez les vaikhānasa*. Paris.
——. 1999. "The Reworking of 'Vedic' Paradigms in Medieval Liturgies," in J. Assayag, ed., *The Resources of History: Tradition, Narration and Nation in South Asia*. Paris/Pondichéry: École Française d'Extrême-Orient/Institut Français de Pondichéry, pp. 41–50.
Couture, A. 1986. "Akrūra et la tradition Bhāgavata selon le Harivaṃśa," *Studies in Religion/Sciences Religieuses* 15, pp. 221–32.
——. 1991. *L'enfance de Kṛṣṇa*. Paris.
Dasgupta, S. 1975. *A History of Indian Philosophy*, vol. IV. Delhi (reprint).
De, S. K. 1961. *Early History of the Vaiṣṇava Faith and Movement in Bengal from Sanskrit and Bengali Sources*. Calcutta (2nd ed.).
Dimock, E. C. 1966. *The Place of the Hidden Moon: Erotic Mysticism in the Vaiṣṇava-Sahajiyā Cult of Bengal*. Chicago & London.
Eschmann, A., H. Kulke, and G. C. Tripathi, eds. 1978. *The Cult of Jagannāth and the Regional Tradition of Orissa*. Delhi.
Esnoul, A.-M. 1956. "Le courant affectif à l'intérieur du brahmanisme ancien," *BEFEO* 48: 141–207.
Farquhar, J. N. 1967. *An Outline of the Religious Literature of India*. Delhi (1st ed. 1920).
Feldhaus, A. 1983. *The Religious System of the Mahānubhāva Sect: The Mahānubhāva Sūtrapāṭha*. Ed. and trans. with an intro. Delhi.
—— and S. G. Tulpule. 1992. *In the Absence of God: The Early Years of an Indian Sect. A Translation of Smṛtisthaḷ with an Introduction*. Honolulu.
Gonda, J. 1977. *Medieval Religious Literature in Sanskrit*. Wiesbaden.
Goudriaan, T. 1965. *Kāśyapa's Book of Wisdom (Kāśyapa-jñānakāṇḍaḥ). A ritual handbook of the Vaikhānasas*. London–The Hague–Paris.
——. 1981. "Hindu Tantric Literature in Sanskrit," in Goudriaan and Gupta 1981, pp. 1–172.
—— and S. Gupta. 1981. *Hindu Tantric and Śākta Literature*. Wiesbaden.
Gros, F. 1968. *Le Paripāṭal, texte tamoul, Introduction, traduction et notes*. Pondichéry.
Gupta, S. 1972. *Lakṣmī Tantra, A Pāñcarātra text, Translation and notes*. Leiden.
——. 1981. "Tantric Śākta Literature in Modern Indian Languages," in Goudriaan and Gupta 1981, pp. 173–213.
Hardy, F. 1974. "Mādhavêndra Purī: A Link between Bengal Vaiṣṇavism and South Indian Bhakti," *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland* 1974: 23–41.
——. 1983. *Viraha-bhakti: The Early History of Kṛṣṇa Devotion in South India*. Delhi/Oxford/New York.
——. 1998. "South Indian Viṣṇu Temples and the Performing Arts," *South Indian Research* 18: 99–114.
Hari Rao, V. N. 1961. *Kōil Oḻugu. The Chronicle of the Srirangam Temple with Historical Notes* [trans. of the Kōyil Oḻuku]. Madras.
——. 1964. "Vaishnavism in South India in the Modern Period," in O.P. Bhatnagar, ed., *Studies in Social History (Modern India)*, pp. 116–35.

Haynes, R. D. 1974. "Svāmī Haridās and the Haridāsī Sampradāy." Ph.D. thesis, University of Pennsylvania.

Hopkins, T. J. 1984. "Hindu Sects in America: the Kṛṣṇa Consciousness Example," in P. Gaeffke and D. A. Utz, eds., *Identity and Divisions in Cults and Sects in South Asia*. Philadelphia, pp. 174–88.

JA = Journal Asiatique.

Jagadeesan, N. 1977. *History of Sri Vaishnavism in the Tamil Country (Post-Ramanuja)*. Madurai.

Jaiswal, S. 1967. *The Origin and Development of Vaiṣṇavism (Vaiṣṇavism from 200 BC to AD 500)*. Delhi.

Jones, K. W. 1989. *Socio-religious Reform Movements in British India*. Cambridge.

Joshi, R. V. 1959. *Le rituel de la dévotion kṛṣṇaïte*. Pondichéry.

Lester, R. C. 1992. "The Practice of Renunciation in Śrīvaiṣṇavism," *Journal of Oriental Research, Madras* 56–62: 77–95.

——. 1994. "The Sāttāda Śrīvaiṣṇavas," *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 114: 39–53.

Lipski, A. 1971. "Bipincandra Pāl and Reformed Hinduism," *History of Religions* 11: 220–35.

Majumdar, A. K. 1969. *Caitanya. His Life and Doctrine. A Study in Vaiṣṇavism*. Bombay.

Matsubara, M. 1994. *Pāñcarātra Saṃhitās & Early Vaiṣṇava Theology with a Translation and Critical Notes from Chapters on Theology in the Ahirbudhnya Saṃhitā*. Delhi.

Mesquita, R. 1979. "Zur Vedānta- und Pāñcarātra-Tradition Nāthamunis," *Wiener Zeischrift für die Kunde Süd-Asiens* 23: 163–93.

Meth Srinivasan, D. 1997. *Many Heads, Arms and Eyes: Origin, Meaning and Form of Multiplicity in Indian Art*. Leiden.

Mukherjee, P. 1978. "Caitanya in Orissa," in A. Eschmann, H. Kulke, and G. C. Tripathi 1978, pp. 309–19.

Mumme, P. Y. 1988. *The Śrīvaiṣṇava Theological Dispute: Maṇavāḷamāmuni and Vedānta Deśika*. Madras.

Nābhājī (=Nābhādāsa). *Śrībhaktamāla, with the commentary Bhaktirasabodhinī of Priyādāsa and a (modern) commentary Bhaktisudhāsvāda of Sītārāmaśaraṇa Bhagavānprasāda Rūpakalā*. Lakhnaü (Lucknow): Tejakumāra Book Depot, 1977.

Neevel, W. G. 1977. *Yāmuna's Vedānta and Pāñcarātra: Integrating the Classical and the Popular*. Missoula.

Nārāyaṇīya Parvan in *Śāntiparvan (=12,321–39)* of the *Mahābhārata, Part III: Mokṣadharma B*, ed. S. P. Belvalkar. Poona: Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, 1954.

Neog, M. 1965. *Śaṅkaradeva and His Times*. Gauhati.

NP = Nārāyaṇīyaparvan.

Oberlies, T. 1997. "Die Textgeschichte der Śvetadvīpa-Episode des Nārāyaṇīya (Mbh 12,321–326)," in Schreiner 1997, pp. 75–118.

Olivelle, P. 1986. *Renunciation in Hinduism, Volume 1: The Debate and the Advaita Argument*. Vienna.

Paripāṭal: see Gros 1968.

Pauṣkarasaṃhitā, ed. Sree Yatiraja Sampathkumara Ramanuja Muni. Bangalore, 1934.

Pollet, G. 1980. "The Old Braj hagiography of Nābhādās," in W. M. Callewaert, ed., *Early Hindi Devotional Literature in Current Research*. Leuven, pp. 142–9.

Renou, L. 1985a. "Les sectes," in L. Renou, J. Filliozat et al., *L'Inde classique. Manuel des Études indiennes, Tome I*. Paris (1st ed. 1947–9), pp. 620–61.

——. 1985b. "Le Vedānta," in L. Renou, J. Filliozat et al., *L'Inde classique. Manuel des Études indiennes, Tome II*, Paris (1st ed. 1953), pp. 16–33.
Rosenstein, L. L. 1997. *The Devotional Poetry of Svāmī Haridās*. Groningen.
Salomon, R. 1998. *Indian Epigraphy*. New York–Oxford.
Sankaranarayanan, S. 1993. "Sanskrit education in ancient Tamil country (An Epigraphical Survey)," *Adyar Library Bulletin* 57: 7–33.
Sastry, V. V. 1991. "Ancient Classical Telugu Theatre," *The Samskrita Ranga Annual* 9 (1988–90), Madras, pp. 62–7.
Schomer, K. 1987. "Introduction," in K. Schomer and W. H. McLeod 1987, pp. 1–19.
—— and W. H. McLeod, eds. 1987. *The Sants: Studies in a Devotional Tradition of India*. Delhi.
Schreiner, P., ed. 1997. *Nārāyaṇīya-Studien*. Wiesbaden.
——. 1997a. "Introduction," in Schreiner, ed., 1997, pp. 1–29.
——. 1997b. "'Schau Gottes' – ein Leitmotiv indischer Religionsgeschichte?," in Schreiner, ed., 1997, pp. 159–96.
Sharma, B. N. K. 1960. *A History of the Dvaita School of Vedanta and its Literature*, vol. I: *From the Earliest Beginnings to the Age of Jayatīrtha (c. 1400 AD)*. Bombay.
——. 1961. *A History of the Dvaita School of Vedanta and its Literature, vol. II: From the 15th Century to Our Own Time*. Bombay.
Shukla, N. S. 1971. *Le Karṇānanda de Kṛṣṇadāsa*. Pondichéry.
Siauve, S. 1968. *La doctrine de Madhva: dvaita-vedānta*. Pondichéry.
——. 1978. *Aṣṭādaśabhedanirṇaya [. . .] de Śrī Vātsya Raṅganātha*. Pondichéry.
Singh, S. 1958. *Vedānta Deśika: His Life, Works and Philosophy: A Study*. Varanasi.
Sircar, D. C. 1942. *Select Inscriptions bearing on Indian History and Civilization*, vol. I: *From the Sixth Century BC to the Sixth Century AD*. Calcutta.
Sivaramamurti, C. 1966. *Indian Epigraphy and South Indian Scripts*. Madras (repr.).
Smith, H. D. 1968 "Relevance of Epigraphic Evidence for the Pancaratra Studies," in R. Nagaswamy, ed., *Seminar on Inscriptions 1966*. Madras, pp. 15–18.
Snell, R. 1991. *The Eighty-four Hymns of Hita Harivamśa: An Edition of the Caurāsī Pada*. Delhi.
Srinivasachari, P. N. 1970. *The Philosophy of Viśiṣṭādvaita*. Madras.
Stietencron, H. von. 1978. "The advent of Viṣṇuism in Orissa: An Outline of its History according to Archaeological and Epigraphical Sources from the Gupta period up to 1135 AD," in Eschmann, Kulke, and Tripathi 1978, pp. 1–30.
Thiel-Horstmann, M. 1983. *Crossing the Ocean of Existence: Braj Bhāṣā Religious Poetry from Rajasthan. A Reader*. Wiesbaden.
——. 1991. "On the Dual Identity of the Nāgās," in D. L. Eck and Fr. Mallison, eds., *Devotion Divine: Bhakti traditions from the Regions of India. Studies in Honour of Charlotte Vaudeville*. Groningen–Paris, pp. 255–71.
Varadachari, V. 1983. *Two Great Acharyas: Vedānta Desika and Manavala Mamuni*. Madras.
Varāhamihira, *Bṛhatsaṃhitā = The Bṛhad Saṃhitā of Varāha-Mihira*, ed. H. Kern. Calcutta, 1865.
Vaudeville, C. 1969. *L'Invocation. Le Haripāṭh de Dñyāndev*. Paris.
——. 1987a. "Sant Mat: Santism as the Universal Path to Sanctity," in Schomer and McLeod 1987, pp. 21–40.
——. 1987b. "The Saiva–Vaishnava Synthesis in Maharashtrian Santism," in Schomer and McLeod 1987, pp. 215–28.
Vēṅkaṭarāmaṉ, Cu. 1985. *Araiyar cēvai*, Ceṉṉai. [=Madras]: Tamiḻpputtakālayam.
White, C. 1977. *The Caurāsī Pad of Śrī Hit Harivamś.* Hawaii.
[Yāmunācārya]. *Āgamaprāmāṇya of Yāmunācārya*, ed. M. Narasimhachary. Baroda, 1976.