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Abstract: Most models on the origins of tantrism have been either inattentive to or dismissive of non-literate, non-sectarian ritual systems. Groups of magicians, sorcerers or witches operated in India since before the advent of tantrism and continued to perform ritual, entertainment and curative functions down to the present. There is no evidence that they were tantric in any significant way, and it is not clear that they were concerned with any of the liberation ideologies that are a hallmark of the sectarian systems, even while they had their own separate identities and specific divinities. This paper provides evidence for the durability of these systems and their continuation as sources for some of the ritual and nomenclature of the sectarian tantric traditions, including the predisposition to ritual creativity and bricolage.

Keywords: tantra; mantra; ritual; magician; sorcerer; seeress; vidyādhara; māyākāra; aindrajālikā; non-literate

1. Introduction

In the emergence of alternative religious systems such as tantrism, a number of factors have historically been seen at play. Among these are elements that might be called ‘pre-existing’. That is, they themselves are not representative of the eventual emergent system, but they provide some of the raw material—ritual, ideological, terminological, functional, or other—for its development. Indology, and in particular the study of Indian ritual, has been less than adroit at discussing such phenomena, especially when it may be designated or classified as ‘magical’ in some sense. The social fact of several categories of individuals either referencing themselves or being referenced by others as magicians, sorcerers, witches or seers, and pursuing livelihoods by those means in ancient, medieval and modern India is a reality worthy of investigation, given the observable contribution of these groups to the eventual emergence of tantrism in the sixth or seventh century. They do not appear to have expressed ideologies of liberation or transcendent divinity but were concerned with magical crafts of various kinds. Such groups not only preceded the formation of sectarian, lineage-based tantrism by well over a millennium, but they also continued to function outside of formal tantric structures until the present—a poorly studied and under-recognized reality of Indian social and religious life.

This paper will argue that some of the dynamics and ritual practices of Indian magicians and sorcerers were appropriated by tantric groups, so that later forms still exhibit analogous attributes. Thus, various kinds of magicians and illusionists contribute some (out of many) source streams for social and ritual praxis, as well as magical nomenclature, both of which were appropriated by the tantric traditions on an as-need basis. The intermittent and idiosyncratic nature of the appropriation seems also to be a property of the earlier groups, and perhaps contributed to the tantric predisposition toward textual or ritual bricolage.

Some of this material I have presented previously in various venues, including the Tantra-Agama panel at the 14th World Sanskrit Conference in Kyoto, 2009, invited by Dominic Goodall and Einoo Shingo.
2. Problematic Historical Representations

Those having even a modest familiarity with scholarly literature on the contested origins of tantrism may see that there are several problematic positions that have skewed our understanding, and in some measure these positions are related. First, and most important, there is the supposition that the origins of tantrism are grounded in elite, intellectual formulae. In this model, the renowned hermeneutists and theologians within the various sectarian orders—Śaiva, Vaiṣṇava, Buddhist, Jain or other—represent the authentic voices and irrefutable sources of tantrism, and the roots of this movement is best understood by examining their archive. For some scholars, this includes the model that tantrism is an intellectual project formulated in diametric opposition to the dominant paradigm, inverting it, so that antinomian or alternative practices are but contradictions of the dharmasūtra dicta.

Second, because there is by definition no surviving literature attributable to non-literate traditions, such individuals cannot be reasonably postulated (Sanderson 1994, p. 92). Third, as authentic tantric sources must be grounded only in literate intellectualist textual traditions, any reports about alternative, non-literate groups must be considered fallacious or inconsequential (Wedemeyer 2013, p. 196). Fourth, such positions have been in some measure configured by questions of lineage and sectarian ideology, predominantly focused on literate traditions that survive to this day, in which one or another of them claim priority in order to depict all others as derivative. In this model, one of the modern sectarian systems of tantrism makes the claim of first invention, and the method of dissemination is diffusion, whether textually or by some other means.

While there certainly is a relationship between tantrism and the pre-existent intellectual, theological, legal and ritual literature of India, it still may appear to those informed on the history of alternative or emergent religious movements, that the unarguably later intellectual elites constitute a second-order phenomenon, in other contexts identified as “rationalized religion” by Weber. Such rationalized functions are extremely important for the development of hermeneutics and theology, but it is difficult to identify them as the principal sources of the differing traditions, which tend to be grounded in social disruption rather than in an act of intellectual imagination. Nor can much of tantrism be understood by a simple inversion of the “Vedic tradition” or the dharmasūtras (although both are actually manifold) for that would not yield the majority of tantric practices. Moreover,
as already pointed out by Blaut (1987) and others, unsophisticated diffusionist models similar to those proposed implicitly or explicitly encode a political position and covert hegemony, and certainly this seems apparent in many scholarly appeals to diffusion as the source of tantric textual similarity. Equally, it appears to me that a single source model, as exercised, is laden with multiple fallacies of historical reasoning, assumptions concerning authenticity and other questionable suppositions. So, if all secondary forms are derivative, with the implication that they thereby are inauthentic, then the intellectual traditions could also be considered derivative and inauthentic, a curious entailment of the proposal. As a result, in order to model the rise and efflorescence of tantrism in all its manifold diversity, models positing an elite intellectual project followed by a subsequent diffusion to the lower strata are perhaps less cogent than claimed.

In terms of our available archive, I would like to argue that such models take little account of the multi-nodal form of the matrix of tantrism, the discrete socio-cultural network systems, which in my estimation were developed in the highly distributed ritual world of India from a plethora of points and sources, not just from one. An alternative multi-nodal or multi-source model could assume that pre-existent forms—which may continue on independently—have persistently contributed to tantric ideas and rituals over time. The corollary to this would be that tantric systems continued to reinvent themselves on a decade-by-decade basis, one of the reasons that an omnibus definition of tantrism per se is so elusive. Elements appropriated may be either integrated as ritual or textual pericope, but that appropriation occurs with a robust dynamic, and is neither unidirectional nor unilateral. The process resists essentialist presumptions, for the elements selectively either diffused or appropriated both change and are reinterpreted in new social and ideological horizons in the process. A multi-nodal and simultaneously emergent, distributed network system fits Indian reality more clearly than the modern Euro-American ideology of single-source independent invention, which is not even true in the Euro-American world. Specialists in the origins of Mahāyāna Buddhism have arrived at similar multi-nodal models in understanding the different factors—intellectual, literary, performative, soteriological and so on—which contributed to the Mahāyāna form of Buddhism evolving in the first to sixth centuries of the common era in highly distributed networks (e.g., the essays in (Nyanatūsita himi 2013)). Analogous observations have been made about the purāṇas, the gṛhya-sūtras, the epics, and other genres of Indian religious literature. In general, these models are consonant with the text-critical methods of form and redaction theory as well.

In this paper, I would like to focus on one of the historiographical curiosities found in tantric studies, one that extends from the suppositions just mentioned: the desire for scholars to integrate prior religious outliers into forms known from literature of their specialization. Sometimes this is done with the relatively historical awareness that these previous outliers are not actually the later forms encapsulated in an earlier enterprise, anachronistically projected into the past. More frequently, however, we see a willingness to draw straight lines between one behavior, often of non-literate groups, and a later, generally literate, form of ritual or belief, neglecting the differences of social frame, operational function or symbolic formulation. Thus, the pattern established in a mature system is held as the standard, and the antecedent outlier system is shaped, sculpted, and sometimes forced

---

7. The extensive literature and quantitative model construction based on issues of nodality and network theory are beyond the scope of this paper, but its applicability to archaeology has been summarized in Collar et al. (2015) and its use in Indian agrarian governance is explored in Udayaadhithya and Gurtoo (2013).

8. Form-critical approaches are discussed in Sweeney and Zvi (2003), and historically assessed in Byrskog (2007); recent redaction-critical approaches are outlined in Tan (2001). Other text-critical approaches are emerging, but they generally presume a granulation of a text drawn from multiple sources.
into a comfortable acquaintance in scholarly literature. This is the teleological fallacy, that the end known to us is encoded in the earlier form, a fallacy often accompanied with the quasi-Marxist idea that the earlier form embodies the seeds of its own destruction. Thus, the model is most often provided an addendum, in which the pre-existent outlier is “absorbed” into tantrism, with the inchoate presumption that Indian tantrism acted as a kind of religious singularity, operating in a manner so that nothing could escape its gravity.

Instead I would propose that these pre-existing, alternative behaviors had their own dynamics, although much is unknown based on the data available. Among my arguments will be the observation that we are often misled by Indological attachment to the lineages of the written texts, which indeed have their historical gravity precisely because they are written and conserved. Yet, when we compare Indological emphasis on literacy with the earliest remotely comprehensive census of India, the 1881 census, we may surmise how slight literacy must have been in the world in which tantrism emerged. The census concluded that, among the adult Hindu subjects, literacy was 6% range (about 12% of males, negligible females; (Plowden 1883, vol. 1, pp. 227–38)), a figure almost exactly confirmed in the 1891 census (Baines 1893, pp. 214–16). The authors of the imperial census were well aware—as we are in our census statistics today—that the disadvantaged classes were undercounted. Perhaps the actual literacy figure was in the neighborhood of 5% overall, possibly less. I cannot imagine trying to frame a history of a religious movement and not acknowledge that, in all likelihood, approximately 94–95% of the population of the period were not literate, especially given the well-known privileging of the oral episteme in India. It therefore appears a questionable use of the available data to insist that we only consider those representing themselves in the literate record, and not acknowledge how the many others were represented by those few who could actually write.

3. Cue the Magicians

This is a somewhat loquacious introduction to the problem of sorcerers, witches and magicians in ancient and medieval India. Certainly, such figures are attested quite early, and their attestation continues on to the present. Yet they do not represent specific sectarian traditions associated with tantrism, even if the behaviors are similar to or overlap with them to a degree. In this regard, we may observe that there is a difference between the social life of the individual, the professional behavior of persons allied to groups or not, and the identity of the person as a member of a specific group. At the advent of an investigation, it is useful not to conflate these.

I am quite aware of the problems of definition associated with sorcerers, witches and the like. Virtually all who have written on this issue have commented on the fuzzy category structures involved (e.g., (Goudriaan 1978, pp. 1–2, 58–59; Kapferer 1997, pp. 8–12)), but most such discussions emphasize the categories of sorcery or magic as an ideology or behavior rather than sorcerers as a social form; they emphasize witchcraft rather than witches. Moreover, Indian literature is not impoverished in their cataloging of these behaviors. The Brahmajālasutta in the Dīghanikāya, for example, mentions 115 different skills—from reading of signs to mirror divination—that might qualify as sorcery or witchcraft (Dīghanikāya I.9.1-11.22; Sumāngalavilāsini I.92.9-97.19). Because we can expect that many such behaviors would have been aggregated in a single individual, we do not know from such lists how they were associated or how the aggregation would have occurred: Is prognostication via visions visited on boys and girls handled by the same individual? What about reading signs from mice or the attributes of elephants—were they related? Does one also both raise vetālas and speak with yakṣas or are these different specialities? These are not inconsequential questions, as we shall see.

In contrast, our problem is simultaneously simpler and more complex, as we are first and foremost concerned with the activities of social, lineal, clan or caste groups operating under selective indigenous identity designations: yittudhāna, ikṣaṇikā, mayākāra, aindrajālika, viḍyādhirā or so on. They should be differentiated, as much as possible, from the saints that acquire magical powers—ṣiddhi or rddhi—through religious actions, such as via ascetical tapas or by meditative practices like dhyāna. That is, there is a difference in kind between claims about a saint attaining psychic powers through
meditative success or spiritual purity and claims about powers that are transmitted through groups from one individual to another, often from the communication of spells or the performance of a ritual. Even then, the distinction blurs when we see spells obtained by tapas, meditation or other kinds of virtue. However, I would at the same time argue that there is a difference in sensibility between magical power that cannot be shared—as religious ability—in distinction to a spell that can be accidentally overheard or ceremonially transferred from one to another with no loss of efficacy. We are expected to understand that siddhi or the psychic powers of abhijñā cannot be accrued by overhearing spells at night, while the sorcerer is muttering in his sleep.

To comprehend the social and ritual world of these liminal figures, we could understand that a single individual plays multiple roles, effecting multiple ritual functions and systems, much as we see from other religious agents of the period. Moreover, we also see figures described in literature without specific titles, so such category structures should be suggestive guides rather than exhaustive and closed systems. In any event, the English language category structure is, for the moment, less compelling than the Sanskrit, Pali and Prakrit category structures. So I propose to look at some of these categories in their context and see what they have to tell us.

4. Yātudhānas

The history of the study of magic in India—through the work of Keith, Henry, Goudriaan, and Siegel among others—has only secondarily addressed the social issues with which I am concerned. Türsig and Grafe were the really the first to embrace fully a similar project, and Türsig’s classic article on abhīcāra identifies magical rituals of death—specifically kṛtya—as a focal point of the both Āṅgirasas (e.g., AVŚ 8.5.9) and, in particular, the yātudhānas, those enemies of Indra and of the rṣis mentioned as early as the Rgveda. The noun yātu in yātudhāna is sometimes identified with the other early term for magic or sorcery, kṛtya, although the term yātu appears sometimes to be employed as an abbreviation for the yātudhāna. (AVŚ 8.3.2c: ā jīhvaṁ mūradevaṁ rābhasaṁ kravyadā vṛṣṭāpi dhatvāsan ||2|| Whitney’s translation evokes the power of the expression, “Do thou, of iron tusks, O Jātavedas, kindled, touch the sorcerers with thy flame (arcis); take hold of the false-worshipers with thy tongue; cutting off (?) the flesh-eaters, shut them in thy mouth.” (Whitney 1905, vol. 1, p. 481). Here the yātudhānas are understood to invoke a specific class of gods, the mūrasevās, a group that was important at the time, even if its identity and extension are poorly understood today.

Yātudhāna sorcerers certainly were accorded exceptional powers, which perhaps validates the extraordinary fear of them expressed, especially in the RV X.87 and eighth kaṇḍa of the Atharvaveda Śaunakīya. Six categories of yātudhāna action are particularly suggestive:

1. They are there identified as descending in the air—RV 10.87.6: yad vāntarikṣe pathibhiḥ patantam; AVŚ 8.3.5c: anarikṣe patantam yātudhānam. We might also note the mention in Atharvaveda Saunakīya 4.20.9 that describes the things that fly in the sky, contiguous to asking to see yātudhānas and the demonic piśācas.

2. They seize with spears things obtained or acquired. (AVŚ 8.3.7: ālabdhānāṁ rṣīḥbir yātudhānam). We might also note the mention in Atharvaveda Saunakīya 4.20.9 that describes the things that fly in the sky, contiguous to asking to see yātudhānas and the demonic piśācas.

3. They conduct “root” magic associated with the “root-gods” (mūradevāḥ) who the Vedic rṣis believe ought to be destroyed (AVŚ 8.3.10, 8.4.24, 4.28.6: śṛṇvēḥ treadhā mūlaṁ yātudhānasya; AVŚ 4.28.6a: yah kṛtyakren mūlakṛd yātudhāna). It may be seen that Mānavadharmaśāstra 9.290 declares fines against anyone invoking the mūlakarmāṇi rites and pronounces that the performance of such rituals constitutes a cause for the loss of caste (Mānavadharmaśāstra 11.64), suggesting the perdurance of this class of malignant ritual (Bloomfield 1913; Sen 1968).

4. They steal with speech (AVŚ 8.3.14: vāccā stenam).

5. They smear themselves with the flesh of humans, horses and cattle (AVŚ 8.3.15: yah pauruseyena kraviṣa samakte yo aśvyeṇa paśunā yātudhānah̄}).
6. They employ sorcery associated with small animals and birds—owls, owlets, dogs, cuckoos, eagles and vultures (AVŠ 8.4.22: ulākyātām, suśulākyātām, jahi śvayātām uta kokayātām | suparṇayātām uta grīhrayātām drṣṭādeva pra mṛṣa rakṣa indra ||).

Atharvaveda Śaunakiya 2.24, lists eight types of yātudhānas, or yātus, and I provide the list here: śerabhaka, śevṛdhaka, mroka, sarpa, jārṇi, upabde, arjunī, bharājī. These are somehow all types of Kimīdins, apparently another kind of sorcerer about which little is known. So far as I am able to tell, many of these eight designations have eluded successful linguistic analysis. The uncertain nature of these words leads me to wonder whether they might be proper familial or place names rather than a non-clan based typology as understood by others (cf. AVŠ I.28.1-4, I.7.1). In Sāyana’s commentary he treats these as personal names but apparently operating within a group following the leader, with whom I would presume the group members had some consanguine relation. Since both brahmans and sorcerers are otherwise known to establish themselves in familial lineages, we may presume that yātudhānas did as well, and by the time of the Vāyupurāṇa (II.5.114, II.8.123), they were mythologized as snakes, rākṣasas demons and descendants of Kāśyapa. Yet they were notably also described as following the cult of the sun, wandering with the solar deity, thus placing them in association somehow with the two primary priesthoods of the solar cult, the Magas and the Bhojakas (Bronkhorst 2014–2015); even then, the parameters of this statement remain unclear as it relies on the broad strokes of the Vāyupurāṇa.

The sense that we are speaking of familial magical cultures is buttressed by intermittent references to females of the species, the yātudhānī who are also mentioned both in the Atharvaveda and thereafter. Beseeching Indra, the 1000-eyed god,

darśaya mā yātudhānān darśaya yātudhānāḥ | piśācānt sarvān darśayeti tvā rabha
oṣadhe || AVŠ 4.20.6

Show me the sorcerers; show the sorceresses; show all the piśācas; with this intent I take hold of thee, O herb. (Whitney 1905, vol. 1, p. 185, trans.)

As late as the Bhāgavatapurāṇa, the female yātudhānī were described as in the retinue of the Asura Hiranyākṣa, “O sinless one, the mountains appeared with yātudhānīs observed residing in the directions, releasing weapons, having spears and wearing their hair loose” (Bhāgavatapurāṇa 3.19.20 girayah prayādyṛṣyanta nānāyudhamuco ‘nagha | digvāsaso yātudhānāḥ sālingo muktamārthajāh ||).

As with the yātudhānas’ relations to most of the Vedic divinities, Indra is their primary antagonist, with other gods like Soma, Agni, Mitra-Varuṇa, and Rudra (AVŠ 6.32.1-3) also charged to defeat them. However, in one hymn, AVŠ 6.13, they are paid homage as incorporated with death, and at the same time they are loosely associated with medicine, and with māla magic.

namas te yātudhānēbhyo namas te bhēsājebhyāḥ | namas te mṛtyo mulebhīyo
brāhmaṇēbhyā idaṁ namaḥ || AVŚ_6,13.3||

Homage to thy sorcerers; homage to thy remedies; homage to thy roots, O death; this homage to the brāhmans. (Whitney 1905, vol. 1, p. 290, trans.)

The specter of the yātudhānas was sufficiently dreaded that Rgveda 7.104.12-16 relates a hymn, interpreted to reflect the contest of Vasiṣṭha with Viśvāmitra. Vasiṣṭha, having had his hundred sons destroyed, is accused of being a yātudhāna, which he vehemently denies in an oath, cited in some Dharmāsttras as a method for proof (e.g., Mānavadharmaśāstra 8.110; Nāradasmrī I.221). A similar accusation was made in the Vālmiki Rāmāyaṇa that Yadu was demonic and his progeny were rākṣasas and yātudhānas (Rāmāyaṇa 7.59.14-20), part of a larger sphere of association between demons of various varieties and the sorcerers. In addition, the specter of conflict seems to shadow the demon-sorcerer relationship—the Anuśāsana-parvan of the Mahābhārata 13.3.4 portrays Viśvāmitra issuing forth countless yātudhāna sorcerers and rākṣasas because of his arrogance at destroying the hundred sons of Vasiṣṭha.
Despite these and related episodes, we may still acknowledge that the magical system of the yatudhāna remains something of an empty set. The depiction of Viśvāmitra in the Anuśasana-parvan is already hybrid. He creates a rākṣast demoness out of the homa fire, signifying the brahmanical ritual component, yet the rākṣast’s name was yatudhānti and was the scourge of his enemies, the seven rṣis. Ultimately, however, the rṣis defeat the yatudhānti rākṣast in a riddle contest. So, other than their use of malignant magic, stealing with speech, very close association with rākṣasas, piśācas, mūradevas, animal spirits, and occasional dabbling in medicine, the early texts tell us less than we would wish about the yatudhāna group identity and ritual systems.

Factors like these lead me to believe that the designation yatudhāna operates rather as a cypher for the non-brahmanical magical threat, a brahmanical category for magicians understood to have a social and ideological location distinct from brahmanical authority and the Vedic mantra corpus. Thus, the designation yatudhāna in ancient and medieval India invokes nomenclature presumably referencing individuals or groups, but it is unlikely to specify the name that they would have employed for themselves as a self-identification. Part of the evidence for this is the simple observation that the designation yatudhāna appears nowhere in the Pali Canon. Nor does it, so far as I have been able to discover, occur in any surviving Buddhist Sanskrit records, although the Mañjuśrīyaṃkulaśāstra includes yat as a kind of magic associated with disease (Mañjuśrīyaṃkulaśāstra 21.19ab nara yatudhāntiḥ hanyate tadda). Searches for a Prakrit or Apabhraṃśa equivalent to the term yatudhāna have equally been unsuccessful. Yet the term continues to surface in brahmanical literature like the ghṛtyasūtras, largely because their invocation of the Vedic texts as authoritative voices, and yatu survives in modern Indic languages in its cognate jāṭu as a term for both magic and magicians (jāṭu (Glucklich 2012)).

5. Ikṣaṇikā/Ikṣaṇikā, Their Yakṣas and Vetālas

In distinction, the other terms I hope to explore appear non-denominational, for we find variations on them in a variety of contexts, both secular and religious. For example, in part of its discussion of the means for conquering other states and creating sedition in them, the Arthaśāstra recommends that several classes of individuals should be employed as the fake news of the period—by propagandistically broadcasting the ‘king’s powers’ that he had displayed in a previous deceptive show of omniscience or by his agents deceptively playing the part of gods appearing in fire halls, only to announce the authority of the king.

\[
\text{tad asya svavisayē kārāṇtikānaśīnaṁ naimittikā kapaurāṇikēkṣaṇīkaśuddhapuruṣāḥ sācīvyakarās taddarśinaś ca prakāśayeyūḥ} \quad \text{Arthaśāstra 13.1.7}
\]

And secret agents acting as fortunetellers, interpreters of omens, astrologers, fabulists, seers, and those imperial assistants who have witnessed [the ruler’s deceptive displays], they should all broadcast these legends in his own territory.

While the difference between some of the terms—especially the kinds of fortune tellers (kārāṇtiṅka, naimittika)—is not entirely clear, the person of the ikṣaṇika or, alternatively, ikṣaṇikā would seem to indicate a seer, one who finds or sees objects or events distant in time and space.

Often we are informed they have assistance, and there is an old Jaina allusion to the similarity of sounds heard following the demise of a Jina to a secret request made by a female ikṣaṇikā. The early verse supplement to the Āvasyakanīryukti, the Mālabhāṣya, ties a plethora of skills to the mythic lives of the Jinas. Upon the Jina’s demise we are told in the Mālabhāṣya that the following extraordinary sounds are heard:

\[
\text{chelāvaṇam ukkitṭhāi bālakāvāṇam va senṭāi} \quad \text{1}
\]

\* In this they are similar to the Āṅgirasas, who were said to have had an Āṅgirasakalpa, containing their dark rituals. The contemporary texts under that name, however, appear later and invested with much tantric lore; see (Sanderson 2007) for the Oriya versions.
And it is true that these are sometimes grouped together, yet the range of behavior attributed to
Religions 2017
This is perhaps drawing a line in the sand, as 13
I would wonder if this practice is not the actual source of the 11
Despite its relatively early date, it can not be said that the 10
We may believe that the icksanikas were similar to the naimittikas, those soothsayers who made a living by reading signs of various kinds and who are a bit outside of the parameters of this essay. 15
And it is true that these are sometimes grouped together, yet the range of behavior attributed to these icksanikas is greater than finding lost items or answering obscure questions, as seen elsewhere in Buddhist literature, whether in the Sanskrit or Pali form. Perhaps our most dramatic portrayal

pracchantan praçchā sā inkhaniñkādirutalakṣanā inkhaniñkā hi karmamula graññikām cālayantī
tato yaksāh khalo āgata yāssam karnesu kimapi praśṭur vīvikṣitaṃ kathayanītī 1
(Āvaśyakaniṃtukty-avaçcārī 1.215 to Malabhaśya 28 on Āvaśyakanīṃtukty 2.207)10
That question [to the seeress or to the yaksā] is posed covertly, being characteristic of the sounds of the seeresses, etc. Actually, seeresses shake a little bell at the base of their ears, and then yaksas come and somehow express the answer desired by the questioners into the ears of the seeresses.

The image is delightful—a small bell is rung next to the seeress’s ear, and this apparently requires the yaksā familiars to come and answer questions. The sound of the bell is tantamount to the voice of the yaksas, who are otherwise invisible. Thus, the whisperings of the seeress’s questions, and probably the covert and invisible yaksā answers, are analogous to the soto voce of various sounds miraculously occurring upon the demise of the Jinas.11 A verse in the Brhatkalpabhaśya (v. 1312) again describes the ikṣanikā in this way; Kṣemakirti’s 13th century continuation of Malayagiri’s 12th century commentary adds that the yaksā is her kuladevatā, her family deity, and that the ikṣanikā is an outcaste dombī.12

We may believe that the ikṣanikas were similar to the naimittikas, those soothsayers who made a living by reading signs of various kinds and who are a bit outside of the parameters of this essay.15 And it is true that these are sometimes grouped together, yet the range of behavior attributed to these ikṣanikas is greater than finding lost items or answering obscure questions, as seen elsewhere in Buddhist literature, whether in the Sanskrit or Pali form. Perhaps our most dramatic portrayal

10 Despite its relatively early date, it can not be said that the Āvaśyakaniṃtukty and related literature has received the attention that it is due, possibly because of the difficulty of handling the Prakrit materials. See (Leumann 2010; Balbir and Oberlies 1993; Bruhn 1998).
11 I would wonder if this practice is not the actual source of the yaksā well known through Jaina and epigraphic sources, Ghanatakarna, generally interpreted as the yaksā with “bell-ears”; see (Cort 1997, 2000) on this figure. One problem for the idea that name may be based on a ritual is that we find, for example, the Tala image, a curious and highly disputed statue, where his testicles are carved in the image of bells; see (Nigam 2000) for disparate opinions on the nature of this image. It
12 Brhatkalpabhaśya 1312:pasināpāsīnaṃ suṇīṃ vijāśiṣṭham kahe annassa |ahavā āmikhiñṇyā ghaṃṭīṣyaśiṣṭham parikahe
| | Brhatkalpabhaśya-vṛtti: yat svape ‘vatiñayā vyidvayā vyidyādhiṣṭitrayā devatayā śiṣṭam kathitam sad ‘anyasmai’ prachchākāya kathayati | athavā ‘āmikhiñṇyā’ dombī tasyaḥ kuladaivataṃ ghaṃṭīṣya kṣa nama sa pṛṣṭhaḥ san karne kathayati
| sā ca tena śiṣṭam kathitam sad anyasmai prchchākāyā subhaśubhādi yat parikathayati eṣā praśnāpaseṇāḥ || On the summary history of the textual exegesis, Brhatkalpabhaśya, Bollée vol. 1, pp. 1–5.
13 This is perhaps drawing a line in the sand, as nemittika/naimittika are sometimes lumped with those who perform ritual enterprises; Dīghanikāya 1.8.30. However, I have yet to find a ritual system associated with the naimittika, and since prognostication of various varieties is so widely distributed, it appears to fall minimally on the margins of this paper. For references to the naimittika in several sutras, see Edgerton, Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit Dictionary, sv. The Brhatkalpabhaśya and Brhatkalpabhaśya-vṛtti 1313 discuss the term nimiṣṭāva as one making a living revealing information about the past, present and future, which seems to describe the revelation of knowledge rather than the exercise of prophylactic rituals.
of an ikṣanikā is in a section of the Saṅyuttanikāya, the Maṅgulīthissutta, where she is depicted in the fourteenth in a series of formulaic statements on the consequences of unwholesome action:

:idhāhāṃ āvuso, gijjhākātā pabbatā orohanto addasaṃ itthiṃ duggandhiṃ maṅgulīṃ vēhasaṃ gacchanti | Tam enam gijjhākī dharikāki kulākā anupatīvā anupatīvā vitacchenti, vibhajenti | Sā suḍaṃ atṭassaraṃ karoṭi | Tāsa mahāṃ āvuso, etad ahaosi | acchariyāṇa vata bho, abbhutaṃ vata bho | evaṟṟapo’pi nāma satto bhavissati evaṟṟapo’pi nāma yakkaḥ bhavissati evaṟṟapo’pi nāma attahatvapāṭalābhā bhavissati’ti | . . . Ēsa bhikkhave itthi imasmiṇī eva rājaghe ikkhanikā ahaosi | Saṅyuttanikāya II.260

Friend, now I was descending from Vulture Peak and saw a woman, foul smelling, of jaundiced complexion, traveling through the air, while vultures, crows and falcons were following her, pecking at her and driving her away. For her part, she was screaming. So it occurred to me, friends, that this is really strange, quite extraordinary, that there would be a person of this kind, or perhaps there would be a yakṣa of this variety, one who would be in this particular embodiment. (then follows a discussion of the karmic causes for her affliction) I understood, O monks, that I had seen the seeress of Rājagṛha.

In the Samyuktāgama (T.99.2.137a16-b3) in Chinese we find the equivalent text, but there distributed by gender, describing both the seer and seeress of Rājagṛha, with curious gender-specific additions: she has an iron pestle on her head (頂有鐵磨sirasi musalam abhava?) glowing with fire and revolving; he travels as if in a whirlwind. They both delude beings by trying to find valuable things for them. There is much of interest in this description, but we should be wary, as it is strikingly formulaic, both in language and in textual placement. In it, for example, we see echoes of the Atharvaveda image of the yatuddhānas descending through the intermediate space. Yet also, in both the Saṅyuttanikāya and the Samyuktāgama, virtually the same description is also applied to a variety of spirits: preta, yakṣa, etc., so that it is by no means unique to the seers/seeresses. However, both the scripture and the commentary (Stratthappakasini II.221) reinforce the consistently close association of these figures and their spirit familiars, as the same discourse structure can be applied by the Buddhists to both.

Still, there remains the visionary ability of assisting others to find lost things or foretelling the future. This specific attribute is in accord with the description of a practice found among the group of six bhikkhuṇis in the Dharmaguptavinaya, translated by Buddhayaśas and Zhu Fonian between 410-412 CE.

_Dharmaguptaka-vinaya-vibhaṅga_ T. 1428.22.774c21-775a3

羅時婆伽婆。在舍國祇樹給孤獨園。時六群比丘尼。學術術以自活命。

術者。或支節利。或起尸鬼。或學知死相知轉禽獸論。

卜知鳥音聲。諸比丘尼聞。中有少欲知足行頭陀樂學戒知憐愧者。

嫌貴六群比丘尼言。汝等云何。乃學習如是諸術。乃至知鳥音聲。

即白諸比丘。諸比丘往世尊。

The lord was staying in Jetavana, at Anāthapiṇḍārāma in Śrāvastī. Then the group of six bhikkhuṇis studied mantras to earn a living. The mantras were those of prognostication through signs (aṅgavidyā), concerning warfare (ksatrayidya), raising the dead, knowing the signs of death, or the teaching on transformation by [rituals involving] small animals and birds, and prognostication using bird calls. All the bhikkhuṇis heard [about them], and among them was one with few needs and content (*ālpecchā samātusātā), practiced in the dhītāgūnas, who enjoyed studying the Vinaya, and knew modesty and decorum. Angrily she scolded the six bhikkhuṇis, “What do you say about your actions, that you have studied

---

14 _Saṅyutta_ II.260.4 reads dharikā, but dharikā is unattested; the refrain from the first section II.255.13 has kākāpi instead, and I have translated that.
these mantras, up to prognostication by bird calls?” She spoke to all the monks, who went to the Buddha.

The Lord for this reason called together the bhikkṣu samgha, and scolded the six bhikkṣunīs saying, “These are that which you should not do—this is not proper deportment, not the sramanadharmā, not brahmacarīya, not following that which is to be done. They are not to be accomplished! What do you say, bhikkṣunīs, that you studied these techniques, on up to prognostication by bird calls?”

Of course, the nuns agreed that they had studied these practices. And, despite their occurring in specifically Buddhist texts, it is certain that these are not Buddhist practices, for they would not have been so reprimanded. Indeed, some of them—like anīgavidyā and kṣatravidyā—seem straight out of the list detailed in the Brahmagālasutta, and find resonance in Jain scriptures as well. Rituals using small animals and birds had already mentioned in conjunction with the yātādānas and will be examined in later contexts. As in our other instances I wish to consider, there is also no sign that this was associated with any specifically sectarian enterprise at the time, and none of the designations associated with these mantras seem dedicated to a single divinity. At most, they drift toward the broad Śākta-based vidiham or parisaṇṭa rituals, and the conclusion of this episode in the same Vinaya indicates that if you read lāukikā texts for the purpose of healing or mitigating problems, then there is no difficulty (Dharmagupta-vinaya-vibhaṅga T. 1428.22.775a11-13). Both the Buddhist and Jain problem with such practices is the issue of right livelihood more than anything else—employing mantras for profit.

We note that the mantras mentioned are wider than simply understanding the prognostication from signs, and include the mantras controlling the dead, implicating yātudānas and yukṣas. The lore on the raising of the dead and conquering the creature has been described in various Buddhist Vinayas, from signs, and include the mantras controlling the dead, implicating yātudānas and yukṣas. At most, they drift toward the broad Śākta-based vidiham rituals, and the conclusion of this episode in the same Vinaya indicates that if you read lāukikā texts for the purpose of healing or mitigating problems, then there is no difficulty (Dharmagupta-vinaya-vibhaṅga T. 1428.22.775a11-13). Both the Buddhist and Jain problem with such practices is the issue of right livelihood more than anything else—employing mantras for profit.

In the Bhaisajyaguru-sūtra, the yvetāla rites are equally associated with rituals dedicated to the yaksas and rākṣasas:

Gilgit Manuscripts I.13-14; T.449.14.402c7-113 trans. Dharmagupta 616 CE.

To. 504, fol. 278a4-b1: punar aparəm manjusṛhi sativi ye paśunyabhīratāh sattavānam parasparəm kalahavigrahavīvārān kārāpayanti | te parasparəm vigrahacittāh sattavā nānādham aksuṣam abhisamskurvanti kāyena vācā manasā anyonyam ahitakāma nityam parasparəm anarthāya parakramanti | te ca vanadevatām āvihayanti vṛkṣadevatām giridevatām ca śmaśānāṃ prthak prthag bhūtān āvihayanti tiryagyoniṅgaṭāṁ ca prañino jīvetād vyavaropaṇyantti māṃsaraudhirahākṣān yuksarākṣāsan pājāyanti | tasya sātror nāma vā śārīrapratimāṃ vā

15 Cf. also Dharmaguptaka-vinaya-vibhaṅga 1428.22.754a17-b10, under pāyantika #117 and restated 745b11 in pāyantika #118. It is possible that the six bhikkṣunīs described in the Dharmaguptaka-vinaya-vibhaṅga were understood to be naimittikas, thus defeating my category restriction, but I have seen no verification of this.

16 Anīgavidyā is no. 16 and khattvātiyā no. 18 in the list of mīcchācīvīra in Brahmagālasutta at Dīghakaccāna 1.9.7; Sumantīgalavīśāni 1.93.10-18. I assume the Chinese translation as if kṣatīriya (利) really references kṣatra instead. A similar warning on livelihood is found in Udana 1.18.24: je lakkhaṇam suviṇa pañjāmaṇe nimittakōhihāsapagāḍhe | kheḍavijāśavadarājvī na gacchāt saranām tamnī kale || ‘One who practices a life of deceptive spells, employing himself by [interpretation of] dreams and qualities, devoted to fraudulent statements concerning signs, will be without refuge when karma come due.’
Moreover, Mañjuśrī, there are beings who are addicted to slander and cause mutual strife, fighting and discord among beings. They are beings with minds intent on mutual belligerence and perform unwholesome acts. By means of body, speech and mind they desire injury to each other and are intent on each other’s misfortune. They invoke a forest god, or a tree or mountain god, or invoke spirits in individual cremation grounds. They deprive beings born into the womb of animals of their lives and offer yakṣas and rākṣasas food of flesh and blood. Having made an image of the body of an enemy, they accomplish terrible spells, or desire to damage beings or the destruction of [beings’] bodies by the practices of kākhordas and vetālas.

Here we find the distinctive affirmation that, first, there are cultic associations with specific local divinities and, second, as in the case of the bhiksūṇis we find the aggregation of practices associated with apparently several different groups, appropriated on an as-need basis.

Indeed, various narratives suggest that few ritual practices were tradition specific: A spell with a distinct vetāla function—raising a corpse from the dead (matakutṭhāpanamantā)—is identified in the Saṅjīvājātaka (Jātaka I.510, no. 150), said to have been learned by the bodhisattva while residing in Takṣaśila. The idea of corpse revival to speak truth in response to a question is found in the story of the ascetic Korakkhattiya in the Dīghanikāya, indicating that the early Buddhists were familiar with the idea if not themselves practicing the ritual (Dīghanikāya III.8).

However, a specifically ikṣāṇikā association with a vetāla-like practice occurs in an interesting episode described by the Asilakkhaṇajātaka (no. 126) and demonstrates that these seers/seeresses were also expected to engage in charnel ground rituals. In the Jātaka story, a prince seeks to take his beloved princess away from her father, the king, who does not approve of the union. The princess is pining for her love in the melodramatic manner found in Indian amorous literature. The prince asks an ikṣāṇikā to assist him in spiriting the young lady away. She agrees and reveals how it will be accomplished.

Instead of a corpse, though, the seeress will hide the prince beneath the bed, ready to take the princess away. We are informed that the plan unfolds as desired, the king agrees, and the Great Seeress (mahā-ikkhaṇikā) gets the princess in the cart. As they proceed to the charnel ground, she warns the guards to be on their toes,

Instead of a corpse, though, the seeress will hide the prince beneath the bed, ready to take the princess away. We are informed that the plan unfolds as desired, the king agrees, and the Great Seeress (mahā-ikkhaṇikā) gets the princess in the cart. As they proceed to the charnel ground, she warns the guards to be on their toes,
The prince under the bed has been equipped with black pepper and he puts it up his nose, with the expected results—the gang of guards throw down their weapons when they hear the sneeze, the prince takes his love away to be married, and the king shrugs the whole episode off with a philosophical detachment worthy of the Stoics. For our purposes, however, it is evident that such liminal figures as this ikkhanika were invested in all kinds of witchcraft procedures. In addition, while the word vetala is not employed in the text (much as we saw with the bhiksunis above), the narrative requires that procedures for corpse reanimation were known to the audience in some manner. Jain and some magical literature similarly describe the animation of a corpse for various purposes without the vetala designation, so this use appears distributed in various ways across traditions.17

At a slightly later date—but approximately contemporaneous to the Bhaisajyaguru description above—and in an analogous vein, the Brhatsamhita of Varahamihira will describe a maandalaka figure, attendant on a specific kind of king.18

\[
\text{mandalakaksanamato rucakacarocaro 'bhicaravit ku\text{\textquoteright} salah} \]
\[
krti\text{\textacute{v}}\text{\textacute{tala}}\text{\textacute{d}i}su karmasu vidy\text{\textacute{a}}su \text{c\textquoteright}anuratah} \]
\[
vrdhakara\text{\textacute{a}} kharapurama\text{\textacute{n}utra\textacute{d}hajas ca satruna\text{\textacute{a}}sane ku\text{\textquoteright} salah} \]
\[
dvijadevayajiyaogapraakta\text{\textacute{d}h} strjito matim\text{\textacute{a}}n \]

The maandalaka is an opportunist, in the entourage of a rucaka king, skilled in killing magic (abhicicra), and fond of spells relating to the rituals of the krti and vetala spirits.

He looks old, hair rough and stiff, but skilled in the destruction of enemies. Intellectually attached to brahmans, gods, sacrifice and yoga, he is intelligent, but conquered by women.

As indicated in the verse, this unprepossing character is in the entourage of a specific kind of king, one who is himself not of the highest order, governed as he is by the planet Mars.

\[
\text{subhr\text{\textacute{a}}ke\text{\textacute{s}}o rakta\text{\textacute{a}}tama kambugr\text{\textacute{a}}vo vyadirgh\text{\textacute{a}}sya} \]
\[
\text{s\text{\textacute{u}}\text{\textacute{a}}} \text{kr\text{\textacute{a}}rah \text{\textacute{s}}re\text{\textacute{s}}\text{\textacute{h}}o mantri cauras\text{\textacute{a}}\text{\textacute{v}}\text{\textacute{a}}\text{\textacute{m}}i \text{vy\text{\textacute{a}}}\text{\textacute{a}}\text{\textacute{m}}i ca} \]

Attractive hair and eyebrows, [the Rucaka king] has a dark red visage, his neck marked with three lines, face very long in shape.

He is a warrior, cruel, a chieftain with secret counsel, the head of a band of thieves, and hard-charging.

Therefore, much as we saw the strong relationship between kings and magicians above, Varahamihira articulated the idea that there was a class of magicians who were associated with the needs of unsavory rulers, ones who themselves easily crossed the line between legitimate warfare (according to the dharmasutra understanding) and the naked exercise of power for personal gain. The aura of vetalas and krtyas (here interpreted as the raising of a female evil spirit) gave the magician both his power and his liminal status as a member of the thief-king’s court.

Moreover, perhaps a word of prudence is advisable concerning attempts at a systematic survey of vetala rites. My presentation does not even begin to touch on the manifold citations and descriptions of the vetala or half-vetala or corpse reanimation rites found in the Buddhist documents in Chinese and Tibetan, very few even identified and fewer critically evaluated.19 In aggregate, such evidence would suggest that vetala rites were recognized as equipment of various kinds of magicians, seers

---

17 Brhatkalpabhasya 5540-46 and Dattatreya 11.25 are examples.
18 These verses were noted by Dezs\text{\textacute{o}} (2010, pp. 398–99), for other purposes.
19 Huang (2009) and Skilling (2007) have explored some of the rich materials available in the Vinayas, but they have only scratched the surface, as this episode indicates. Dezs\text{\textacute{o}} (2010) explores two types of vetala\text{\textacute{d}harana}, one raising the deceased and the other based on a homa, but seems not to see that the employment of the homa fire rite must be an overlay or a hybrid system, compounded with the indigenous rite of corpse animation.
and sorcerers prior to the Gupta period and continued to exist down to the present as an optional ritual behavior widely distributed through Indian traditions outside of textual lineages or sectarian affiliation. Attempts to identify early statements of these practices as necessarily associated with the later sectarian tantric lineages should be treated with much caution.

6. All in the Family: Ḍākas, Ḍākīnīs, Vidyādharas and Vidyādarīs

The evidence available suggests that one facet of the role of magician or sorcerer entails familial relations, so that in a very familiar South Asian manner, there seems to have a hereditary component observable in some instances—families of sorcerers, handing the spells down over the generations. An example of this is in the story of miraculous powers (ākāśānubhāva) possessed by all the members of the family of a layman called Mṛgendaka, living in the town of Bhaddiya-nagara, related in Mahāvagga section of the Theravāda-vinaya (Vinaya I.240). The father could fill his granary with showers of grain; his wife had an inexhaustible pot; his son an inexhaustible bag of money; his daughter in law an inexhaustible basket; even the slave had the magical power to plow a field and leave seven furrows for each one plowed. The many, later versions in Buddhist literature (Ch’en 1953) tie these powers into a story of previous merit (pūrva-yoga) accrued by members of the family, generally by feeding a pratyekabuddha in a time of famine. However, the Mahāvagga makes no such allusions, and its commentary (Samantapāsādikā 5.1101) is silent on a karmic Buddhist rationalization of a family of magicians. It appears that, being a Buddhist partisan, the family was branded with the language of spiritual powers, so that claims about their magical assets were placed in a Buddhist moral cosmos, with the subsequent creation of a prior life of merit to validate the magical attributions as generated by virtue and not from some other source.

That was not the case for those not being part of the Buddhist patronage system, who were given less than honorable designations, merited or not. In addition, the extraordinary abilities attributed to them consequently placed these persons in a liminal sphere, on the social margins where figures of power are considered to have divine/demonic extensions. This is a familiar trope in Indian literature, how one or another category of magical beings—vidyādharas, ḍākīnīs, yakṣīs, etc.—will have both a human and non-human community, and were able to pass seamlessly between the two forms. In each dimension, they were often considered to have familial or geographical associations, especially notable in the female of the species. The earliest female magical persona, as we saw, was the case of the yuddhāñjīsī, the females occasionally identified along with their male counterparts, but other designations were employed at a later date, ones that invoked narratives of familial descent.

Most Indologists are aware of the Gaṅgādhār inscription, that provides the earliest epigraphic evidence for the term ḍākīnī, and Bruce Sullivan’s discussion of this inscription treats it judiciously (Sullivan 2006). Yet other, approximately contemporary, information is available in textual sources, verified as to their date by their translations into Chinese.20 The most important is the Laṅkāvatārasūtra, translated by Gucchabhadra in 443 and again by Bodhiruci in 513, for this text provides a series of morality tales on the eating of meat. So the king Simhasaudāsa lost his kingdom because of his desire for flesh, and Indra experienced misfortune after chasing the pigeon in the Śivi-jātaka. However, it is one description that interests us:

\[
\text{anyesāṁ ca mahāmāte narendrabhūtānāṁ satāṁ aśveṇāpaḥtānāṁ atavāṁ paryātamanānāṁ}
\text{śīnahā saha maithunam gatavāṁ jīvitabhaṇḍāy apatyaṁ cintādīvantaṁ śīnaḥṣasanaṁvānayāt}
\text{kālāśapādabhabhitāy yo mṛpaṇapratihāy parvajjanamāṁvarsūddoṣaśrūtanātṛā umamuyendrabhūtā}
\text{api santo māṃśādā abhibhāvan ī haiva ca mahāmāte janmani saptakūṭṭrake ‘pi grāme}
\]

20 Adelheid Herrmann-Pfandt’s (Herrmann-Pfandt 1996) article was the first, in my estimation, to treat this section intelligently. Unfortunately, her article has been left out of the scholarly discussion, so I thought to treat the Laṅkāvatāra section again, in part because she does not verify the Chinese translations.
pracurāṃ̐ṣa-laulyād atiprasaṅgeṇa niṣevamānā mānuṣamāṃsādā ghorā dākā vā
dākiniṣṭaṃ saṃjñayante

And other kings, Mahāmati, carried away into the forest by their horse(s), wandered until, out of fear of their lives, had sex with a lioness, and progeny were born. The princes, beginning with Kālmāṣapāda, through the consequence of [their fathers’] cohabitation with the lioness, and because of the offending karmic outflow of eating meat in a previous life, they continued their carnivorous practices even once they had become kings. And thus in this birth, Mahāmati, in the village of Seven Huts (Saptakuṭṭiraka), [these princes] were born residing as ferocious cannibalistic warlocks and witches, because of an excessive attachment and greed for quantities of meat.

As is usual for Mahāyāna sutras, the verse summary—which is in this case older than the prose—restates the issue:

caṇḍalapukkasakule dombesu ca punah punaḥ | | Lāṅkāvatāra-sūtra 8.14 |
dakiniṭṭiyonyaśca māṃsade jāyate kule |

Again and again, he is born into a carnivorous family, of wombs in the category of witches, in a family of the caṇḍalas or pukkasas, or among the dombas.

Here it would seem most specifically, that dākas and dākins were understood to reside in specific villages and were human beings, or at least appear as such. The 513 CE translation of Bodhiruci simply glosses dākas and dākins as men and women who end up as rākasas. (T. 671.16.563a24-25: 生諸男女盡羅). Yet it is relatively clear that the author of this short story understands the rebirth of the princes as dākas and dākins in this village of Seven Huts, wherever that may have been.

The representation of female spirits in a family-modeled relationship to sorcerers is the subject of the yaksini-sādhana studied by Yamano (2013). Going back at least as early as the Amoghapāśaṃahākalparāja, the yaksini is controlled by various means, so that the vidyādhara will command her to perform functions, depending on the configuration of their familial relationship:21

vidyādhrena vaktavyam tṛthiḥ kāryasādhanaṁ me kuruṣva iti mātā bhūryā bhagini | | yadi mātā
puratat paripīṭhayati anapāṇāśayanavasāsthanadhānyaḥ | bhūryā sarvacakaraṇam aśvaraṇādhīpatiṁ
dadāti kṛdenāṃvivacarati | | yadi bhaginīya sarvacakāmikanañorathānī
aparipīṭhayati | sarvacakāryāṁ karisyati | sarvacartha dāhavati | punar āgacchati dine dine
ābharanavastra[va]lībharanālakṣaṇāṁ dadāti | | dine dine anyāṁ divyaśāstreiyaṁ ānayati kṛḍārthe | Amoghapāśaṃahākalparāja ms. 30a5-7.

Then the vidyādhara is to say, “You are to perform three kinds of actions for me!” These are, like a mother, a wife and a sister. If [the yaksini] is to be like a mother, then she is to treat the vidyādhara as a son, protecting him with food and drink, bed, clothing, money and grain. If like a wife, she is to render all services to her lord and master, and to follow his lead in sexual play (kṛḍenāṃvivacarati). If like a sister, then she is to fulfill all his desires as they occur. She will do everything that is to be done. She will run everywhere for him, and having returned, she will give him every day every variety of ornament and clothing. Each day, she will bring to him other heavenly women for the purpose of sexual play (kṛḍārthe).

Thus, the relationships between the sorcerer/witch and his/her familiar were in some sense configured through the understanding of Indian family structure, and it would be curious if this family structure were not continued in the sorcerers’ physical lives.22

---

21 This is part of a larger section: Amoghapāśaṃahākalparāja ms. 30a2-b1; To. 686, ma: 54a1-55a1; T. 1092.20.258c13-259b4.
22 Recent studies on the yoginis seem to suggest a similar phenomenon may have been at play; see (Serbaeva 2013; White 2013).
These fifth through seventh century descriptions were not exceptionally different from either the īkṣāntkās mentioned above or the tribal (matāṅga) witch (vidyādhārī) who is at the center of the early story of Ānanda’s attempted seduction by the witch’s daughter Prakṛti, who had fallen hopelessly in love with the Buddhist saint (Śārdālakārṇavādana pp. 1–12). Her mother, the vidyādhārī, prepares a homa of 108 arka (Calotropis gigantea) flowers and sends a spell that would fall squarely under the later tantric karma of magical attraction (ākāsa/fan) or control (nāśīkaraṇa). That such magical behaviors might have some familial base is suggested by the Dhanādaha copper-plate inscription of Kumāragupta I describing a familial lineage (sākhā) of a vidyādhārī or from a vidyādhārī, one that applies the curious Vedic metaphor of branch (sākhā) to the description.23

The old Brhatkathā story literature, like the Vasudevahimnī and the Brhatkathāslokaṃśaṅgara, mentions the hereditary nature of vidyādhara families and their spells. So in one episode, a young vidyādhārī named Vegavatī is humiliated by her playmates because she cannot simply fly up the mountain; she replies that she has yet to receive the spells of her family (Brhatkathāslokaṃśaṅgara 14:3: alabdhakulavidyā). Jamkhedkar (1984, pp. 225–33) has combed through the Vasudevahimnī stories of vidyādhara sorcerers, and described the way in which the lineage stretching back to mythic descendants of the Jina Rāsbha, descendants named Nami and Vinamṛti, eventually produced sufficient descendants of their own to populate cities of either eight, sixteen or sixty-four groups (nikāyas) of vidyādharas, depending on the description. Accomplishment of the spells entailed various kinds of temporary religious activities: fasting, recitation of the mantra, various painful penances, to name but the most important. However, receipt of the vidyā might simply be performed by securing marriage into the family of sorcerers.

7. The Illusionists: Māyākāra, Aindrājālika

Different from the seer or seeress in some ways was the illusionist, variously identified as a māyākāra, one who creates illusions, or aindrājālika, one involved with phantasms. Both Buddhist and Jain literature feature interesting vignettes of such figures, who are usually represented as creating trouble for people or encountering the respective founders of the religions under contentious circumstances. One Buddhist scripture, named after the illusionist Bhadra, describes his situation.

23 [Bhandarkar et al. 1981, p. 273]: Kṛṣṭīyā gana(nā)vidyādhārīlō sākhāto datilācāryya(prajñāpāṭīya)ye; “commanded by Datilācārya (=Dattilācārya) of the Kṛṣṭīya-gana and the Vidyādhārī-sākhā.” (trans. Bhandarkar).

24 sTog vol. ca (39), fols 74b5-75a2; the corresponding section in the Derge is To. 65, dkon-brtsegs ca, fols. 18b5-19a1; the older Chinese translation is attributed to Dharmarākṣa: the section here is found T. 324.12.31a7-b4. Compare Régemey’s 1938 edition and translation, pp. 20–21, 58, and his comments on the Dharmarākṣa translation, p. 13.

At this time in the city of Rājaṭra lived an illusionist. Skilled in mantras, skilled in the knowledge of crafts (*śilapiṇḍaḥ), he had completed tasks (*kṛtakarmāṇa), finished presentations and was famous. Among all the illusionists in Māgadhā, or among all their disciples, he was known as the finest, renowned as eminent. Having delighted, deluded and confused all the groups of people in all of Māgadhā, he performed wondrous feats.
Only those who saw the truth and had faith, those following the Dharma—the upāsakas and upāsikās—were exempt (from his deception). Yet he received extraordinary wealth, acclaim and verses of praise, all produced by the power of his deceptive spells of illusion.

Here the description is fleshed out: Our person is an illusionist, a tradition in India to this day, and studied in some depth by Siegel (1991) and Shah (1998). Illusionists—whether designated as māyākara or aindrajālika—have been a metaphor in Buddhist philosophical texts, like the Bodhicaryāvatāra 9.31, describing the idiocy of the illusionist falling in love with a woman conjured by his own illusion. Or the Ayoghara-jātaka, which in the canonical verses (XV.337) points out that the illusionist who is capable of deluding the crowd’s vision while on stage, even then cannot obtain release from death.

And it is true that Buddhist literature does not favor such figures generally. The Candraprabhahodhisattvavacara of the Divyāvadāna (pp. 314–28) features the narrative of the magician (indrājāliavidhiṇa) Raudrākṣa, who is a brahman living on the holy mountain Gandhamadaṇa. Raudrākṣa conspires to request the head of the king Candraprabha, who was a previous embodiment of Śākyamuni; Raudrākṣa, of course proved to be a previous embodiment of the Buddha’s evil cousin, Devadatta. In another Divyāvadāna section, the Prāthibhāyayātra, a similar conspiracy is launched in Śākyamuni’s own time by the paritorājaka Raktākṣa, also an illusionist. He is charged by the Buddha’s ascetical opponents to rally followers and disgrace the Buddha in Śrāvasti, where he is preparing his great miracle (Divyāvadāna, pp. 151–53). With substantial literary flair, the ruse does not work and the Buddha engages in a series of miracles (pp. 155–66), clearly posed to demonstrate his superiority over the false claims to magic from the ascetic teachers of the period.

Other descriptions of such illusionist figures are found, sometimes in Jain literature. One occurs in the sixteenth chapter of the Nāyādharmankalpāt, one of the twelve āṅgas of the Śvetāmbara Jain canon (Schubring 1978). Chapter sixteen is devoted to a Jain version of the previous existence and one episode in the life of the Pāṇḍavas, Draupadi and Kṛṣṇa Viṣṇu. Most interesting for our purposes is the figure of Kacchulla Nārada, who precipitates much of the action in this section. Kacchulla Nārada seems to be the Jain appropriation and reformulation of the persona of the old r.s.i Nārada of Vedic fame, and has been mentioned elsewhere in Jain literature as a magician of note (Balbir 1990, p. 54). He is described as an ascetic with both formulaic and distinctive language employed:

kacchullanārāra damāsenāṁ aibhaddae viṁte anto [anto]b ya kaluṣahiyae majjhattha-uvatthie ya allmuṣamapiyadamsane sûrtve amālasagalapariphe kālinayacuṃma-uttarangarāya vaccheb
damākakamandaluhattie jaṇamvidādittasre jāmvoṣajagāṇettiya-muṇjaṃmaḥalā-vagāladhare hattakayacakabhite pīyagandhavve dharamigyarappahāte samvarantuvara-cravanuppaṃiyani-
lesanṣe ya saṁkacanma-ābhoga- paṇṭatti-gāmac-ṣanbhāṇṣe ya bahūṣe viṇāḥaharṣe viyijṣe vissuyajase ittec
Nāyādharmankalpāt 16.127.

There was Kacchulla Nārada, very good to look at, educated, playful but internally concealing his corrupt intent (kalusa), unbiased between factions, displaying friendliness and determined pleasantness, well-built, his clothing stainless, his chest covered with an outer cloak of a black buck skin, staff and water pot in his hand, his head ablaze with a dreadlocked crest, wearing a sacrificial thread, a rosary, grass girdle and bark clothing, holding a lute in his hand (vināpāni, a name for the rṣi Nārada). He was loved [for his song] like the Gandharvas, avoiding [walking on] the domain of the earth [as he was

25 Schubring (1978, p.58), reproduces this description but does not translate it; he separates some of the lines in a manner inconsistent with the tīka. Dīpannakārāra’s Āgamasatāṇi, edition includes Abhayadevasūrī’s 11th century tīka, which understands a anta to be repeated; p. 221.5: ‘vinā pāṇi anto ya kalusahiyae’ antarāṇāra dūśacitthā kalpiṇyayāvād ity arthaḥ. For b Abhayadevasūrī takes vacche as vatsa, chest, although it could also be read as vatsa, which may also be understood as the chest; the reading vattive for vacche given in the Dīpannakārāra edition (p. 220.22) seems in error. Abhayadevasūrī provides a verse in his colophon that indicates he completed his commentary on viṇāṭasamāḥ, the tenth day of the month of Aśvin, in VS 1120, i.e., 1063, in the town of Anāhitapātaka: ekākṣaṇaśaśeṣa atha vimsatīadhikṣeṣ vikramasamāṇaṁ 1 anāhitapātakanagare viṇāṭaśaśeṣam ca siddheyaṁ 11
always flying]. He was understood to be famous for his spells of the *vidyādharas*: spells of concealment (*samvarana*), of cloaking (*āvarana*), descent (*avatarana*), ascent (*utpatana*), affixing someone to his seat (*ślesaṇa*), entering another’s body (*sankranana*), control over another (*abhiyoga*), making hidden things known (*prajñapti*), magical flight (*gamana*), and immobilization (*stambhana*).

And even though he was praised by Krishna, Baladeva and the other Yadava princes, his inner nefarious quality (*dus.ta.citta*) was manifest by his desire for conflict, 

```
kalabahujauddhakolhalappie bhamaṇaḥabhilast bhātisu ya samarasayasyaṁparatresu daṁsaṇarae sammatao kalaham sadakkhinaṇi anugavesamāne । Nayādhammakahāo 16.127
```

He loved conflict, war, verbal disputes, addicted to witnessing the many hundreds of clashes of armies, ardently sought out everywhere the conflicts with their remuneration [for his services].

As a consequence, Kacchulla Nārada enticed the ruler of Amarakaṇḍa, Padmanābha by name, to kidnap Draupadī from the Pāṇḍavas and create warfare between Hastināpura and Amarakaṇḍa. Curiously, for Jain texts, Kacchulla Nārada escaped from this conflict with no specified karmic consequence, even though the sixteenth chapter of the *Nāyādhammakahāo* is the perhaps the longest in the scripture.

Now this personality profile represents Kacchulla Nārada in the guise of a *tāpasa* or a *rsi*, and reflects the ideology of the Śmāta assumption that those in positions of authority are entitled to it, and not necessarily subordinate to other authority. It also again reflects the expectation that kings are to have strong association with a magical *siddhatāpasa*, as in the *Arthaśāstra*, which enjoins kings to secure the presence of illusionist ascetics in a kingdom for protective purposes (4.3.44ab: *māyāyogavidas tasmād viṣaye siddhatāpasaḥ*). The image is in line with the kind of coercive magic often witnessed in texts featuring the *vidyādharas*, apparently from whom Kacchulla Nārada obtained his spells. In addition, as we know, the designation *vidyādhara* represents a crossover human/divine kind of sorcerer, given several descriptions in the *Jātakas* and Jain literature.

However, it is germane to observe that obtaining spells via *tapas* or other means, most generally from the *vidyādharas*, is a theme as far back as the Vālmiki *Rāmāyana* (Grafe 2001, p. 75, referencing Rāmāyana 1.21.10-19). And long before any evidence for the emergence of tantric rites, we find various mentions of *vidyādharas* in literature and inscriptions, occasionally transmitting their spells to others, as is seen in the Jain story of Vasudeva’s study of spells from an illusionist (*indajāliya* *vidyādha*ra (*Vasudevaviṇḍī 1.195; Jain 1977, p. 338), from whom he obtained the spells *Sumbha* and *Nisumbha*, and who are otherwise known as demonic figures in the *purāṇas*. Grafe (2001), pp. 339–50), building on the studies of Van Buiten (1958), Lüders and others, has given this terminology the most extensive study, and has argued that the *vidyādharas* were initially humans practicing various spell rituals for magical purposes, particularly evident in Theravāda sources. One canonical *Jātaka* verse seems to validate this perspective:

```
vijjādhāra ghoram adhiyamānā adassanaṁ osadhehi vajanti
na maccurājassa vajantadassanam tam me māti hoti carāmi dharmam । Jātaka XV.341
```

Vidyādharas study ferociously, so that they can move invisibly by means of medicines.

Yet they cannot travel while invisible to the King of Death;
So it occurs to me that I will travel with the Dharma.

This *Jātaka* verse represents the *vidyādharas* engaged in techniques of invisibility, which becomes one of the *siddhis* at a later period, as well as a means for thieves and others of nefarious purposes, and we see that it is among the most important qualities listed for Kacchulla Nārada. The nefarious potential for invisibility spells is already noted in the descriptions of the *māṇavas*, the thieves of the *Arthaśāstra*, who are noted as having employed them in service of a ruler:
Let the [secret agents] have the mānava criminals walk right through the wide-awake security personnel by means of the invisibility mantra.

Little wonder that the invisibility spell is an enterprise featured in the thieves’ manual, the Śaṅkukhalapa §2.

However, it may be noted that our focus strays a bit in this regard. We should understand there to be a distinction between those who employ spells exclusively for the goals of violating the social compact, and those whose employment of spells is for personal support. This latter may entail a drift to behaviors outside of polite society but is not inherent in their goals, which are more frequently opportunistic but not necessarily nefarious. Magicians, I would argue, are represented in the available literature as dedicated to opportunistic gain, even if they are sometimes framed as pathological predators. Nonetheless, it is germane to observe that the roles may be reversed, and the stories about the duplicitous magician or evil ascetic should be one reference point for all those concerning themselves with Indian religion, as White has persuasively argued (White 2009).

8. Śaṅvara, Indra and Prakrit Sociolinguistic Evidence

Some at least of the notices concerning such magicians in the classical or medieval period appear to me to be found in Buddhist or Jain literature, as we have already seen. Brahmanical religious literature tends to occlude these figures for reasons that are not entirely clear, although much speculation is possible. Indeed, we will see later that the Mālasarvāstivāda-vinaya provides one answer even if it is probably not the only position possible. In any event, the reality is that some of the earliest descriptions of magicians outside of the Vedas are located in a Prakrit register, and an avadāna in a collection from Gandhāra, dated to the first half of the first century C.E. is of especial interest.

Lenz (2010): Avadāna 6

evo śuyadi nagare pa(*laḍī)-
putre mayagare maya vidarśayad[e]
dupragara co maya śabarī co ///
mayo idra co ta so puruṣo śa[i]ba[rma]
ya vīḍaśayadi a[vare co] mayagaro to pradeśe
anuprato idromaya (∗vidarśayadi) + + ???
iśa mo so matri[di kici ictu ∗]to [bh]∗av[ro]//∗adi)
mayo paśīdo suṭho teno sumeru ///(∗parvado)
sadarśido vistarāso sarvo [matrādaro]
yavi sa tamo suriγo pradibhudo
mayabaleno sarvo vistarō yasayu[pa]/∗mano)

Lenz translates this (p. 74)

Thus, it was heard. In the city of Pataliputra, a magician displayed magic. There were two kinds of magic: the magic of Śambara and the magic of Indra. Then, that person displayed the magic of Śambara. And another magician arrived in that place. He (∗displayed) the magic of Indra . . . He said: “Do you have a desire (∗to see a magic display)?” Magic was seen: (∗it was) excellent. Mount Sumeru was bought into view by him. In detail, all (∗should be said) up to “the darkness overshadowed the sun by the power of magic.” The complete expansion should be according to the model.

Lenz notes, both in his discussion of this text (Lenz 2010, pp. 3–14) and analogous ones in the Gāndhāri corpus, that the specialists in the Avadāna literature employed abbreviated notes to preach from, so that the text available to us references a well-known narrative that would probably have been memorized. The notes appear to have been mnemonic devices to prompt the preacher, whose audience would have been familiar with the story, or minimally the types of characters involved.
Even given its brevity, it is an important early statement about a magical contest in Pātaliputra, where two magicians (G: mayagara Skt: māyākara) engaged in a test of wits, one employing magic derived from Indra, the king of the gods, and the other invested in magic from Śambara, Indra’s nemesis in the Vedas, who was noted with his skill in magic (Parpola 1988, pp. 227, 259–64). Such stories of magical ability versus the ability of the spiritual adepts is not unusual, and frames the Buddhist Prāthīhāryasūtra in the Divyāvadāna collection as has already been mentioned (Divyāvadāna, pp. 89–103). And, as in the Gāndhārī story, we may observe that such figures, if they are given a quotation, are sometimes depicted as speaking in a Middle Indic language. This is either because the text is written in such a language, as in the instance of Jain texts in Ardhamāgadhī or Mahārāṣṭrī Prakrit, or in the case of dramatic texts they are provided with that linguistic register as their level of discourse, on a par with women, Buddhists and other second-class citizens.

The Ratnāvalī—one of the three surviving dramas attributed to the Puṣyabhūti emperor Harsha Vardhana—is a case in point, and provides a later moment in the image of magicians dedicated to Indra and Śamvara. The plot of the drama, and its resolution, requires the activity of an illusionist, an aindrajalika, named Śamvarasiddhi, one who obtains his accomplishment from the god Śamvara. As with other lower caste actors, Śamvarasiddhi speaks in the Prakrit of the dramas. He is from Ujjain, and introduces himself to the king by giving a hommage to his divinities:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{panamaha calana indrassa indajala-apinaddhanamassa} & | \\
taha jjeva sambarassa madpsuparthithidajasassa & | 4.7
\end{align*}
\]

We bow down to the feet of Indra, whose identity is bound up into his illusionary powers, And as well to Śamvara, whose fame is established by his phantasm.

King Udayana is intrigued by the magician, and the Queen Viśavadattā is supportive, as she is also from Ujjain, so Udayana asks the peripatetic magician what illusions he can perform. Śamvarasiddhi replies,

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{kim dharanie miño ko aase mahiharo jale jalo} & | \\
\text{majhahanhami paaso dabijai dehi anatti} & | 4.8
\end{align*}
\]

Do you wish to see the moon on earth, or a mountain in the sky, or fire in the water or twilight at noon—whatever you command!

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{kim jappiden a bahun a jam jam hiene sam datthum} & | \\
\text{tam tam damsemi aham guruno mantappasadena} & | 4.9
\end{align*}
\]

Well, enough of this blathering on. Whatever god you wish in your heart to see, that god I will show to you, by the grace of my guru’s mantras.

Thus, notwithstanding the agonistic relationship between Indra and Śamvara described in the Vedas that carried over into the Gāndhārī Avadāna, by the time of the Ratnāvalī, their lineages of
magic had come together into a single person. Whether this was because Indra had been moved from the center to the periphery with the rise of the new gods of Hinduism, or for some other reason it is difficult to say.

Yet we note that the protagonist Śamvarasiddhi, both in his homage and his name, indicates his devotion to the magical deity Śamvara, the devatā who will be prominent in the Buddhist yogini tantras a hundred years hence, and that he claims to belong to some kind of lineage, exercising his art by the grace of his guru. As with the māyākāras of the Gāndhārī story, he is an illusionist, and in the Rātnāvali, his activity is required by the plot—he must kindle an illusionary fire so that the members of court believe the domestic apartments to be ablaze and release the imprisoned princess Rātnāvalī, for whom the drama is named. In some sense Śamvarasiddhi is a key to a conundrum I could not solve previously (Davidson 2002, p. 214), how Śamvara, the old illusion-related divinity of the Vedas and Brahmanas should end up in the Buddhist canon. Indeed, the evidence from the Gāndhārī Avadāna leading up to the Rātnāvali suggests that a vernacular language based tradition of magical practice thrived around this god, to be appropriated by the Buddhists at a later date.

9. Caste Again

One cannot explore such topics without continually bumping into the issue of caste and class—even Śamvarasiddhi is referred to as the [illegitimate] son of a slave girl in Rātnāvali (Carpeller p. 362.23: dāsī putta indraśāla); and we saw that various figures like the īkṣaṇikās have been described in outcaste or lower caste terms. But one episode brings together many of these elements and is, because of its entertaining nature, worthy of relating in extensio. The Mālasarvāstivāda Saṅghabhedavastu, in its narrative of the great schism precipitated by Devadatta, relates how the schismatic monk subsequently lost the psychic power (rddhi) that he had previously gained when he studied under the eminent Daśabalaśycsa and had attained the first contemplation (dhyāna):

Previously, O monks, Brahmadatta reigned in Vārāṇasī, and the town was filled with prosperity, the many people scattered about the city. There, resided one outcaste (candāla), possessed of vidyāmantras, skilled in vidyāmantras, and by invoking the Gāndhārī spell, through his magic power he would bring from Mt. Gandhamadana each day flowers and fruit out of season, and present them to King Brahmadatta. King Brahmadatta, pleased with the outcaste magician, [each day] bestows on him a present.

Now one [brahman] boy (mānava) [Somasarma] among many desired mantras, was in search of mantras. He heard by word of mouth [about the candāla] and leaving his country

---

27 This story has been translated by Von Schiefner (1906, pp. 288–91) from the Tibetan Mālasarvāstivādinavag.
made his way to Vārāṇasī. Having recovered from the toils of the road, he proceeded into the company of the caṇḍāla who possessed the spells. Having come before him, he said, “I would like, O Master, to perform service for you?” “For what reason?” “For the spell.” He [the caṇḍāla] then recited this verse:

The spell is not to be given to anyone; one should die with the spell.

Or one would exchange the spell for [another] spell, or service or wealth.

sa kathayati: upādhiyāya yady evam aham āsā śūraśām karomi; kiyantam kālaṃ kartavyaḥ? sa kathayati: dvādaśabhir varṣaḥ śūraśāya ditya vā na vā; so ‘tyarthaṃ vidyāpratipannaḥ anujñātaḥ; tata ārādhana-parāmah satkṛta guruḥ śūraśām kartum ārabbhauḥ;

The brahman inquired, “Master, if thus I am to render service [for the spell], for how long does it need to be done?”

The outcaste responded, “With twelve years of service, I will see if the spell is to be given, or not!”

Thus, because the brahman was excessively dedicated to obtaining the spell, he agreed to these terms. From then on, he was dedicated to service, and having paid homage to the outcaste, he began to provide service to the guru.

yāvo dāpāreṇa samayena sa caṇḍāla madyamadākṣipto grham āgataḥ; sa māna-caaṃ samākṣayati; ayam upādhiyāya atto madyamadākṣiptah; pārśvasya asya śaṅkṛt kalpita-taccaḥ iti; yāvo āsau caṇḍālaḥ samparivartitum ārabbauḥ; tasya samparivartamānasya khaṭvāya anganikā bhagauḥ; māna-caaṃ śrutvā pratibuddhaḥ; sa samākṣayati: upādhiyāya dūkhaṃ śāayiṣyaḥ; yanno aham anganikāyaṃ prṣṭhaṃ datvā avasthitauḥ;

This went along until, on another occasion, the outcaste came home dead drunk on spirits, and the brahman thought to himself, “The teacher is totally drunk, so I should set his bed at my side.” [in case he could overhear the spell spoken in his sleep] So then the outcaste began to turn over in his sleep, and while he was doing so, the leg on his bed shattered [so the teacher started to fall off]. The brahman boy heard it and woke up. Then he thought, “The teacher will be sleeping with discomfort. So I should set it so that the legs of the bed are on my back.”

dharmatā hy eṣā saṃjñānāṃ yo balavāṃs tasya vāntīr bhavati; tasya prathame yāme madyaṃ vigacchati; tena tīkṣṇaṃ madyamadākṣiptāṃ māna-caaṃ prṣṭhe vāntauḥ; so saṃkṣayati: yady aham kāyaṃ cālaṇēyaṃ vācaṃ vā niścālaṇēyaṃ sthānauṃ etad vidyate yad upādhiyāyaṃ sābdauṃ śrutvā pratibuddho na pūṇauṃ śaṅkṛtaṃ kalpayaḥ; sa pratisaṃkhyānena avasthitauḥ;

Naturally, anyone who has drunk a lot of spirits will vomit, and so in the first watch of the night that booze came back up. And because of the intensity of the spirits, [the caṇḍāla] vomited onto the back of the brahman boy. And the boy thought, “If I move my body or utter a sound, then it will be the basis for the teacher, having heard the sound, to wake up. Moreover, if he wakes that way, he won’t let me have my bed by him anymore.” So he just sat there and ruminated on his situation.

yāvo ca caṇḍālaḥ saṣṭo eva pratibuddhaḥ paśyati taṃ tathā viprākṛtaḥ; tataḥ prccatati, ko ‘yam; sa kathayati: upādhiyāya aham somaśārmaḥ; vatsa (88) kim asy evaṃṣhītaḥ? tena yāthāyorṇaṃ samākhyātāṃ; so bhuprasannāṃ kathayati: vatsa paritūṣo ‘ham; gatvā snātvā āgaccha; vidyāṃ tuḥḥyām anupraṣṭaccāmī iti; somaśārmā āgataḥ; tena laśmai vidyā ṛṣitaḥ;

In the meanwhile, the outcaste woke up just on his own and saw the brahman there contaminated in that way. “Who are you?” he asked. “Master, it is I, Somaśārma.” “Boy, what are you doing there?” So the brahman recounted the story, just as it had happened. The teacher was very pleased and exclaimed, “Boy, I am very pleased with you! Go take a bath,
and then return. I will bestow on you the spell you desire.” Somaśarma did as instructed and returned, and the spell was conferred on him.

Yet, we know that brahmans are fickle. Unable to contain himself, he quickly thought, “I have to try out this spell that I have just here received! I will travel elsewhere.” So he cast the spell and ascended from the surface of the earth. Having gone to Mt. Gandhamādana, he seized some flowers that were out of season (back in Vārānasī) and then returned (to the palace) and gave them to the King’s chief priest (purohita), who in turn gave them to King Brahmadatta. The king exclaimed, “From where did these come?”

The Purohita replied, “A boy came from a distant place, and he gave these to me. Moreover, he is an extraordinary possessor of vidyamantras, and a brahman who will not be disappointing. Why do we put up with this can. dāla, who is despised by the world? Withdraw this position from him, and give it to this boy!” The king replied, “Let it be so!” Then the chief priest withdrew the position from the outcaste and gave it to the brahman youth. However, because of his ingratitude to the outcaste magician, his magical spell ceased to function.”

Yijing’s Chinese translation is even more explicit in the Somaśarma’s denial of the relationship with his can. dāla teacher:

In response [to his being fired], the can. dāla went to the king of the county and said, “This brahman boy is my disciple—how could his mantra ritual be considered superior to my own?” Then the king asked the brahman boy, “Now your mantra ritual, is that one you studied with the can. dāla or not?” However, the brahman boy replied, “I myself practiced furiously night and day for a year without a break, sought out and obtained this ritual. Now, this can. dāla falsely claims me [as his disciple]?"

The engaging narrative rings a bit dissonant in some ways, as it tries to identify Somaśarma’s loss of the power of a spell with Devadatta’s loss of power from his initial obtaining success in the first contemplation (dhyāna). Thus, it sets in analogy two different systems: the one narrative involves a spell that could be overheard by accident and bestows power immediately, while the other story investigates a psychic power gained through assiduous meditative effort over a lengthy period of practice. In some sense, the episode appears to echo the hermeneutic tension found within the Menḍaka family story, mentioned above. Moreover, the peculiar structure of the Saṅghabhedavastu narrative is clearly artificial, as the text depicts Devadatta as having already lost his power once before, explained in an entirely different manner (Saṅghabhedavastu 2.72). As the second story on his loss of

---

28 Reading bhuvanatalāṭ instead of bhavanatalam, but neither is attested in the Chinese or Tibetan, both of which eliminate the phrase: nam mkha’ la ‘phangs nas; T1450.24.173a19: 空騰已即.
power is both redundant and discordant, so we may assume that this candāla pericope as an editorial intrusion into the earlier narrative of Devadatta’s grievous missteps. It appears to be an attempt to identify inter-caste rivalry and brahmanical hubris, with the corruption of spirituality in Devadatta’s association with Ajātaśatru and his usurpation of authority over the members of the Samgha, in order to divide the Samgha and displace the Buddha himself.

Yet the engaging narrative certainly has some truth to it, part of the reason it resonates so strongly and is expanded within Yijing’s translation. There can be little doubt that we see in Buddhist and Jain literature various outcaste or tribal peoples attributed the possession of spells at different times and places. Yet we seldom find such a distinctive display of caste prerogative as in this instance, a bald-faced subversion of his teacher by Somaśarma to deny the source of his spells and displace his master as the king’s own sorcerer. Moreover, the collusion of the royal purohita is emblematic of the community scope of Somaśarma’s subversion, for the brahman boy’s ability to secure the coveted government sinecure is entirely dependent on the active complicity of his fellow brahman, one who would much rather deal with the high-status personality of Somaśarma than having regular involvement with a polluting outcaste. The king’s agreement is a function of the royal-religious/kṣatriya-brahman relationship, and the king’s only qualms emerge when received systems of authority (guru-disciple) might appear to have been subverted by Somaśarma.

I would submit that much of this kind of behavior actually occurred, perhaps as episodes in the courts of classical and medieval India, but also within the public consciousness, both in the early medieval period and now, with the current defense of received traditions over critical historical inquiry. As Glucklich observed in the modern period, “They [magicians] may imitate the elite traditions, and they may contest elite power, but the reverse is often true as well. Priests in major temples (e.g., Viśvanāth Mandir in Banaras) often utilize magical practices . . . ” (Gluchlich 814). Once the well-placed brahmans—or Buddhist elites—obtained mantras employed by the mātanās or the candālas, in collusion with purohitas and other agents of caste Hindu practice, they then sometimes would perform what we now recognize as historical erasure: they would simply eliminate their sources from public consciousness by writing them out of their Sanskritic texts. Others might appropriate the spell at the expense of living representatives, even while acknowledging the tribal origins to establish an aura of authenticity. Consequently, we find texts ostensibly with a tribal/outcaste connection represented in the title, yet entirely under the aegis of brahmans, sadhus or Buddhist monks.

10. Ancient to the Modern

That there is some measure of continuity in magicians’ conduct—whether simply within ritual or exhibited in a larger behavioral vein—extending from the ancient into the modern period is both evident and interesting. Some of the nomenclature reaches back to that reported in the early Buddhist and Jain textual traditions, and the designation of magicians as “tricksters” (kautuka, kulaka, kotiya) is an enduring theme. Cognate with and—in Sanskrit at least—derived from the word for curiosity or amazement (kutuka), things that are kautuka are big displays that incite wonder, and this use is found throughout Sanskrit literature. However, kautuka and related words also signify those who put on a deceptive show, and this use is mentioned as an unacceptable lifeway in the Brahmajālasutta (Dīghanikāya 1.8.29; Sumanāgalavilāsinī 1.91.28-29), but neither it nor the commentary provide much information. Obscure but better in many regards is the Brhatkālubhāṣya (1309), which defines those earning a living by kautuka methods as:

29 Bollée (1998, vol. 3 s.v.) deals with the peculiar vocabulary of this list, explanations drawn in some measure from the Brhatkālubhāṣya, vol. 2, p. 403bālaṇḍinām raksādinnitam striyā vai saubhāgyādimaṇḍānāya yad viśeṣeṇa snapanaṃ tad viśnapanaṃ | homaḥ sāntiṣakhiyotānānāṇaḥ havanam | śivaḥ parīrāyāh karabhramanābhimanimanam ādīśabādha svagataṣekhahedusūcakāh kṣāraśādāhānāni tathvābhāṣyaḥ dhūpāyājyādīśamānāyānaḥ lavanapraṣeṣaṇāḥ dhūve a tī tathāvābhāṣyaḥ yāyogةbhīṣmaḥ dhūpasya sāmaṇāṇaḥ | asadṛśaśeṣagranāṇaṃ nāma svayam āryah sann ānārāyaṇaṃ karoṭi puruṣo vai svām rūpam antārāśiṣaḥ śrīrveṣaḥ vidadhātṛīyādi | avayāṣaṇaṃ vṛkṣāṇāṃ śāntiṣakhyāṃ śāntayaḥ śāntayaḥ bandhūḥ kaṇḍākākādībandhanam etad sarvam api kautukam ucyate ||
Sprinkling, fire sacrifice, [santification by] the circulation of the hand around the head, etc., burning caustic salt and so on, applying incense,

Adopting an inappropriate appearance [e.g., appearing low class/different gender when not], embracing [trees, etc.], spitting [to ward off evil], binding [protective items on the body]: [these are ‘tricky’ forms of livelihood].

The disparate nature of these behaviors seemed to have led to the term kautuka being applied in two ritual ways. One is found in some of the late grhyastras and vihāna literature and extends from the “binding” (bandha) application mentioned in this verse. There, kautuka identifies a thread bound on the wrist, either in the case of marriage (Agniśayagrhyasūtra 2.3.5) or in the case of a protection ritual for a king involving a thread of gold (Śaunakīya 2.11.5: sauvorāṇam brahmāsūtrakam). This was perhaps understood as a ‘amazing/miraculous thread’ and the binding of the kautuka becomes a trope in some dramatic literature, so that the Raghuvamsa 9.1 mentions the viśāłakautuka, and Śaṇnaviśālakautuka at the end of act two employs it as a sign for the completion of the marriage rite (p. 68: kodumāgalam kādvam). In the Mānavagṛhyasūtra 1.9.30 and elsewhere kautuka is understood to designate some kind of room or building, wherein the thread ceremony is to take place (Dresden 1941).

More significant for our purposes is the magical-ritual semantic value, so that in several tantric or sectarian sources, the term is united with “illusion” to form a compound: illusion-magic (indrajālakautuka). Given the conduct of illusionists we have seen, we would expect that the compound would indicate sleight of hand, or the creation of illusions by suggestion. However, that is not what the texts do, by and large. The corpus of illusion-magic consists of innumerable small rituals with immediate outcomes: protection from animals or humans, the ability to be invisible, control of all kinds of people, the use of plants and animal parts for these purposes, the expulsion of enemies and generally the manipulation of the nature of things. Their structure strongly differentiates them from the later Vedic optional ritual literature, the vihāna texts. In this latter category, for each specific ritual action, there is generally a different mantra invoked, and often a different god. In distinction, here there is most often a single mantra identified, and the ritual applications of this mantra are extraordinary, with a plethora of additions depending on the text, and few specific gods invoked at all.

Moreover, they operate in a coercive universe, in which the sādhaka is supreme. He does not propitiate gods or spirits in advance of the rite or make offerings or beseech the divinities to hear his petition. There is no panegyric to the god or lauditory hymn that was in an earlier generation termed peti

In the Kaksaputajit edition is understood to designate some kind of room or building, wherein the thread ceremony is to take place (Dresden 1941).

More significant for our purposes is the magical-ritual semantic value, so that in several tantric or sectarian sources, the term is united with “illusion” to form a compound: illusion-magic (indrajālakautuka). Given the conduct of illusionists we have seen, we would expect that the compound would indicate sleight of hand, or the creation of illusions by suggestion. However, that is not what the texts do, by and large. The corpus of illusion-magic consists of innumerable small rituals with immediate outcomes: protection from animals or humans, the ability to be invisible, control of all kinds of people, the use of plants and animal parts for these purposes, the expulsion of enemies and generally the manipulation of the nature of things. Their structure strongly differentiates them from the later Vedic optional ritual literature, the vihāna texts. In this latter category, for each specific ritual action, there is generally a different mantra invoked, and often a different god. In distinction, here there is most often a single mantra identified, and the ritual applications of this mantra are extraordinary, with a plethora of additions depending on the text, and few specific gods invoked at all.

Moreover, they operate in a coercive universe, in which the sādhaka is supreme. He does not propitiate gods or spirits in advance of the rite or make offerings or beseech the divinities to hear his petition. There is no panegyric to the god or lauditory hymn that was in an earlier generation termed henotheism, so that each god is said to be special. Here, the magician simply performs the ritual, makes the offending element/spirit/person change course and then is done with it. There is a hard core engineering element to the rite: Squeaky wheel? Grease. Mechanism out of kilter? Mantras to the rescue. Patron needing victory? Perform the rite so that he gets victory and at the same time is brought under the magician’s sway (vaśikaranà). Occasionally, in the aftermath, the sorcerer may offer to the

---

30 Sections devoted to this topic are found in Udāṃnareśvaratāntra, pp. 165–72 (apparently an appendix to the text), Bhūṣhat-indrajāla, pp. 63–64 (the introduction to Dattatreya ch. 11 and mantra), Uddāntatāntra, pp. 97–123 (chapter 10). In the Kaksaputa attributed to the siddha Nāgarjuna, the terms are unbound, so that chapter 13 (pp. 338–48) in the printed edition is the indrajāla chapter, whereas two chapters of the vulgate edition are entitled as devoted to kautuka—chapter 12 (pp. 335–38) and chapter 20 (pp. 384–90) but this last is actually listed in its chapter colophon as sarvasāmykhysādāna; for the manuscript chapters see (Yamano 2013, pp. 63–64; Wujastyk 1984).

32 Davidson (2017) studies the sorcerers and coercive magic in the context of an early pre-tantric Buddhist text propitiating the nāgas for the purpose of rain.
spirit in question, but this is a reward at the conclusion rather than a request at the beginning. We get little sense of the theology of the sādhaka’s relationship with divinity (tattva, kalā, vyuha, etc.), the yoga of identity, the emotional or yogic or meditative relationships that lead into bhakti at a later date. Here, it is sorcerer to the rescue, with the proper tools at his disposal, which is why the ritual literature is so specific concerning the materials to be employed, much as a physician is specific in medical practice: this herb/animal-part/element, not some other item, is to be used.

These later texts are in need of extensive study, and vary widely one from the other but a small sample from the Illusion-magic chapter (chapter 11) of the Dattātreyatantra will suffice. For the mantra at the head of the chapter—OM NAMO NĀRĀYAṆĀYA VIṢVAMBHĀṆĀYA INDRAJĀLAKAUTUKĀṆĪ DARŚAYA DARŚAYA SIDDHIṂ KURU KURU SVĀHĀ—several dozen rituals are provided, depending on the textual recension. One ritual is simple:

ulākasya kapatena gṛhenāḥṛtakajajalam
tena netrāṇjanam kṛtvā ratri rathati pustakam

Having made a salve for the eyes with lampblack mixed with ghee in the skull of an owl, he can read texts at night.

If reading texts at night is not required, and the sādhaka does not actually wish to recite the mantra, then another source of accomplishment is available.

sarpadantam gṛhitvā tu kṛṣṇavṛćcikakantakam
krkalāsarakṣayuktam sūṣmacārṇam tu kārayet

Having taken a snake’s tooth, and the stinger of a black scorpion together with blood of a chameleon, make a fine powder.

If you put this powder on someone’s limbs, then he will immediately go to the abode of Yama (i.e., he will die).

Let this be siddhi without the mantra, and let it be designated ‘siddhayoga’. As is clear, the mantra is derived from Nārāyaṇa, even though the Dattātreyatantra is nominally Śaiva, as most of the later texts are. However, there is actually precious little Śaivism in many of them, and in reading them we are reminded of the multi-faceted personality of Dattatreya in Indian history overall (Rigopoulos 1998). In the tantra sporting his name, he seems to have become a ritual category for the aggregation of magical rites. What is notable in these works is that they reflect much of the early descriptions of the substance of the sorcerers: the use of birds—especially crows, peacocks and owls—the emphasis on small images

33 The numbering is from the Indrajālavidyāsangraha edition, (pp. 132–65); the organization and most of the readings from this edition are verified in Dattātreyapātalalī. 26b–39b3. The Tripāṭhī edition and Hindi translation is from an entirely different recension, and it is not clear to me whether this is bowdlerized or a simple series of eye-skips. The sense that this chapter might not be entirely acceptable in some circles is supported by the Dattātreyatantra, Dharmarth Trust ms. 4913, fol. 8b concludes chapter 10, whereas fol. 9a begins chapter 12, thus dropping out the entire chapter.

34 Lest the use of the term Kautuka is considered anomalous in this chapter, the tantra concludes its first chapter with a mantra that is to stand as the basic one: oṁ. param. brahma paramātmane oṁ. namah. utpattisthitipralayakārṇa brahmaharihariya trigunāntam sarvakaṭukāṇi darśaya dattātreyo namah tantrāṇi siddhiṃ kuru kuru svāhā. Moreover, statements about the applicability of Kautuka are repeated throughout parts of the text, starting with the outline of the text, chapter 1.14-17, to which this mantra is to be applied.

35 Tripāṭhī (1995, p. 152) reads: ulākasya kapāle tu gṛhdātpena kajjam | pāyvatvāmAjar netre rātrau pathati pustakam | | Dattātreyapātalalī fol. 28a4-5: ulākasya kapālaṇa jetaṇa ha kajalam āndrāṇjanam kṛtvā rātrau puthati pustakam.

36 Tripāṭhī omits this verse, jumping from Indrajālavidyāsangraha p. 155, vv. 35 to 40, omitting vv. 36–39. Dattātreyapātalalī fol. 33a4-b1: sarpadāntam gṛhitvā tu kṛṣṇavṛćcikakantakam krkalārakṣasanyuktam sūṣmacārṇam tu kārayet yasvāngṛ videk ca rṇam sadyo yānti yamaḷayam ||

37 This line about this or that ritual being siddhayoga is often encountered in the Dattātreyatantra; e.g., pp. 138, 139, 141, etc., so that this one verse should not be considered definitive of that category in this text.
of demons and planets, the use of rural ingredients, all are in accord with the suggestions about the \textit{yātu}dhānas in the Vedic corpus and their ritual afterlife. The fact, demonstrated long ago, that the term \textit{yātu} survives in the modern North Indian \textit{jātī} would seem to indicate some kind of tradition that survived outside of the literate sphere \textit{per se}, even if it was included in ostensibly sectarian literature at some date.

Perhaps just as important as substance, is the issue of style, which I would argue is one of the magicians’ contributions to the tantric ritual and literary practice. Because so many of these rituals are without any specific moral imperative, they may be employed for all kinds of purposes. And because they are tools to various ends without a theological architecture, they may glide into a variety of sectarian frameworks: changing the mantra, visualizing the deity, dedicating the merit, requiring \textit{dīkṣa} (which most do not even mention let alone describe), invoking vows, etc. Yet they also may be vehicles to allow aggregation from other sources—folk traditions, new inventions, rumors of power elsewhere. In the most extensive study of a South Asian sorcerer tradition, Kapferer emphasizes its simultaneously creative and appropriative style among the sorcerers he knew.

There is a widespread view that innovative or foreign sorcery practice is more likely to achieve desired results. This is because antidotes to its poison (\textit{vasī}) are not developed. There is a great tension to innovation and borrowing in sorcery practice: it is the space of the bricoleur par excellence . . . The culture of sorcery is alive to borrowing and invention, and the more foreign or strange the practice, the greater its potency for death and destruction. (Kapferer 1997, p. 46)

I believe we see all of these activities in medieval Indian tantrism, with its cross-tradition borrowing, its emphasis on power, its desire for the foreign, tribal or extra-terrestrial aura and so on. The references to \textit{nāta}ng or \textit{sābara} tribal peoples in the tantras are analogous to the modern appropriation of tribal charisma by non-tribal sorcerers, most evident in the designation ‘\textit{baiga}’ in Chhattisgarh and Madhya Pradesh.\footnote{On tribal sorcerers, representative are Fuchs (1973), Sinha (2006) and Rahmann (1959), but the bibliography is quite lengthy; on the Baiga magicians in particular, Elwin (Elwin 2007, pp. 305–407) and Babb (1975, pp. 197–208), demonstrates that, in the communities he studied, \textit{baiga} is no longer a tribal designation but a form of employment, exclusively engaged in by non-twice born castes.} Some of these elements, to be sure, become rationalized in selective texts and traditions, and in many instances we find a strong moderation of the magical element merging into the religious element, with its distinctive emphasis on the dynamic relationship between deity and devotee. Yet this is most often accomplished via an elaborate, elite hermeneutic that is not encoded in the basic ritual action but operates as a symbolic frame of reference, one that can be modified even while retaining the ritual event. That is not to say that the symbolic frame is insignificant, nor is the community supporting it an afterthought. Rather, it is to acknowledge that rituals of power tend to operate in a value-neutral moral ground, and those adopting that ground must furnish it with a system of value predicated on their own traditions.

11. Conclusions: Sorcerers as Continuing Sources for Tantric Systems

If the above treatment is somewhat superficial—and in the face of the very sophisticated discussions of Kapferer, Tarabout, Nabokov and others, I certainly acknowledge that it is—this is in part because the volume of evidence is enormous and the intellectual challenges in unpacking and interpreting that evidence are daunting. Unlike anthropologists, textual scholars do not have the luxury of interrogating our informants about their intentions or other aspects of their performances. Here, I do not presume to have done more than bring to the attention of my colleagues some of the materials available.

Yet the evidence suggests—both from the examples given and from the many others for which space prohibits discussion—that there existed in India from the ancient to the modern period various
groups and individuals operating under a variety of designations; these people pursued avocations we would recognize as sorcery, magic or other ritual forms of the manipulation of reality for personal or professional reasons. The categories we find—y¯atudh¯ana, ikṣanika, vidy¯adhara, āṅkin, atdarij¯alika, m¯ay¯ak¯ara—cannot be expected to reflect precisely the fluid categories and reality on the ground while the texts were in the process of formation. Instead these designations most likely represent the literary reification of a bewildering variety of pursuits, often outside of our received lineal or ritual categories. That is because these individuals were not necessarily based in a lineage or literature themselves, and most of them are depicted as operating outside of the aura of polite society or of received linguistic norms, even if some were patronized by king and court. Like their modern successors—j¯ad¯ugar, ojha, d¯aïn, baiga, mantrav¯adi, c¯amis, etc.—they did not hold themselves aloof from the gritty necessities of making a living. Instead they pursued their claim to the manipulation of the cosmos in service of either personal promotion or their patron’s goals. We may suspect that their employment of various kinds of lethal rituals in the ancient and medieval period was accompanied with other forms of lethality less metaphorical and more physical, but this is a suspicion that requires further investigation, as do virtually all aspects of their activity. Certainly, sorcerers are occasionally depicted as creating and enjoying conflict, whether between friends or enemies, so we may assume that they were part of the predisposition to interpersonal drama in Indian social life.

Some of them evidently saw themselves as operating in a lineage, obtaining some kind of initiation from a teacher, even if we suspect (as the modern evidence supports) this may have been secondary or tertiary to their motives for the pursuit of their vocations. It is also entirely possible that “initiation” or guru-disciple relationship may have been the stuff of visions, dreams, or just fabricated out of the thin air of the mountain regions said to be inhabited by the vidy¯adharas in Jain narratives. Some, to be sure, felt called through some kind of personal crisis or psychological event (Nabokov 2000, pp. 149–51). However, just as likely, others simply understood a possibility and pursued a livelihood where none was otherwise available, relying on their social skills, understanding of patronage and motivation, and verbal wit to pull them out of uncomfortable situations. Moreover, because this is a function of human behavior, we may surmise that others came to their calling at a time of social dislocation and economic uncertainty, when no other form of economic support was available. Irrespective of cause, the documents invariably speak of the search for control, of the need for sustenance, of the understandable desire for the basic elements of human life.

It is also clear from the available evidence that identifying any of these as necessarily “Buddhist,” “Śaiva,” “Vaishnava,” “Jaina” or “S¯akta” is to misrepresent our sources, for the many instances of the lifeways delineated in the literate record seldom identify these magicians with any sectarian system of allegiance that is the sine qua non of modern Indological narrative. We may reflect on the fact that the literate archive is not so transparent, not immediately evident, not uncritically accessible as it has been occasionally treated in scholarly literature. This appears perhaps a weakness of some Indological understanding, based on a limited vision of what constitutes admissible categories. However, it is not a misrepresentation within the sources themselves, which consistently maintain a complex understanding of their own periods.

At no time for which we have evidence in India do we see magicians or sorcerers as relinquishing the field, nor are they ever under the domination of any single sectarian lineage. Indeed, in the modern period, they cross religions as well as traditions, with some coming from Islamic disenfranchised social groups, employing the opportunities available (Shah 1998; Tarabout 2000). Thus, we must take into account that these figures were invested with spells that were claimed to allow them supernormal powers, raise the dead, heal the sick, cast spells of benefit and destruction and counter other sorcerer’s spells for own patrons. They left us only tantalizing clues of their existence, they generally came from a vernacular background, and were dedicated to their own welfare as much as their promulgation of alternative rituals.

And yet these clues equally raise the specter of historical erasure: the intentional or unintentional occlusion of non-elite or non-brahmanical elements, all in service of the dominant paradigm. The
hostility of some brahmanical representatives to even discussing the religious traditions of those on the margins of society has been expressed to anthropologists. As Sax was told when he tried to present some outcaste data on ritual healing in Delhi, “How dare you conduct research on such a topic? . . . You should be spending your time stamping out this sort of thing, not conducting research on it!” ((Sax 2009, p. 232); see also (Nabokov 2000, p. 149)) So non-literate magical rituals among marginalized communities continue to be eliminated from discussion right into the present, much as they have been within India’s past. If there is a critical imperative, we might acknowledge that the forces of elite privilege did not only arise as a result of capitalist commercial or post-colonial forces, but equally stem from deeply seated symbol and social systems that have been reiterated throughout Indian history.
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To. De-đê canon numbers from Ui, Hakuju, et al., eds. 1934. A Complete Catalogue of the Tibetan Buddhist Canons (BKah-ḥgyur and Bstan-ḥgyur). Sendai: Tōhoku Imperial University.

Bibliography

Primary Sources

ĀgniṆeṣyagyasūtra. Ravi Varma, L. A., ed. 1940. ĀgniṆeṣyagyasūtra. Trivandrum Sanskrit Sries No. 144. Trivandrum: Bhaskara Press.
Amoghapāśamahākalparāja. Kimura, Takayasu, et al., eds. 1998–2011. Transcribed Sanskrit Text of the Amoghapāśakalparāja. Taishō Daigaku Sēgō Bukkyō Kenkyūjo Nenpō (大正大學総合佛教研究所年報) vol. 20 (1998), pp. 1–58; vol. 21 (1999), pp. 81–128; vol. 22 (2000), pp. 1–64; vol. 26 (2004), pp. 120–183; vol. 32 (2010), pp. 170–207; vol. 33 (2011), pp. 32–64. T. 1092, To. 686. Trans. Bodhiruci II 707 CE.
Aṅgāvijā. Punyāvijaya, Muni Shri, ed. 1957. Aṅgāvijā (Science of Divination through Physical Signs and Symbols). Prakrit Text Society Series No. 1. Banaras: Prakrit Text Society.
Arthaśāstra. Kangle, R. P. 1965. The Kautilīya Arthaśāstra. 3 parts. Bombay: Bombay University.
Aṭṭhāravoveda śaunakīya. Bandhu, Vishva, ed. 1960–1962. Aṭṭhāravavedah śaunakīyaiḥ. Vishveshananand Indological Series 13–16. Hoshiarpur: Vishveshvaranand Vedic Research Institute.
Āvasāyakāṅtrimukāvaścārya. Pramodāgāra, Paṇam Probodhasāgara Śiśyamuni. 1974. Śrīmātt Āvasāyakāṅtrimukāvaścārya. 2 vols. Śreṣṭhdevacandraḷalābhāi-Jainapustakoddhāre Granthākāhy vol. 123. Surat: Śreṣṭhdevacandraḷalābhāi-Jainapustakoddhāre.
Bhadramāyākāravyākaraṇa. Régmey, Konstanty. 1938. The Bhadramāyākāravyākaraṇa: Introduction, Tibetan Text, Translation and Notes. Warsaw: Warsaw Society of Sciences and Letters. Rpt. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1990.
Bhāgavatapurāṇa. Shastri, H. G., ed. 1996–2002. The Bhāgavata [Śrīmad Bhāgavata Mahāpurāṇa] Critical Edition. 4 vols. Ahmedabad: B. J. Institute of Learning and Research.
Bhāṣajyaguruvāscārya. Dutt, Nanakshā, ed. 1939. Gilgit Manuscripts. vol. 1, pp. 1–32. T. 449. To. 504.
Bodhicaryāvatāra. La Vallée Poussin, Louis de. 1901–1914. Prajñākaramati’s Commentary to the Bodhicaryāvatāra of Ĉāntideva. Bibliotheca Indica vol. 150. Calcutta: Asiatic Society of Bengal.
Bṛhat-indrajāla. Tripathi, Harihar Prasad, ed. 2015. Vṛhat Indrajāla with ‘Hari’ Hindi Commentary. Krishnas Sanskrit Series 191. Varanasi: Chowkhamba Krishnas Academy.
Rgveda. Van Nooten, Barend A., and Gary B. Holland, eds. *Rig Veda: A Metrically Restored Text with Introduction and Notes*. Harvard Oriental Series vol. 50. Cambridge: Department of Sanskrit and Indian Studies, Harvard University.

Samanatapiśādikā. Takakusu, J., and M. Ngai, eds. 1924–1947. 6 vols. London: Oxford University Press for the Pali Text Society.

Sannyuktāgama. T. 99.

Saṅghabheda-vastra. Gnoli, Raniero, ed. 1977–1978. *The Gilgit Manuscript of the Saṅghabheda-vastra: Being the 17th and Last Section of the Vinaya of the Mulasarvāstivādin*, 2 parts. Serie Orientale Roma vol. 49, pp. 1–2. Rome: Istituto Italiano per il Medio ed Estremo Oriente. To. 1, vols. ga, 25b-ba, 302a. T. 1450.24.99a–206a.

Saṃnukha-kalpa. George, Dieter. 1991. *Saṃnukha-kalpa: Ein Lehrbuch der Zauberei und Diebeskunst aus dem Indischen Mittelalter*. Monographien zur Indischen Archäologie, Kunst und Philologie, Band 7. Berlin: Dietrich Reimer Verlag.

Saṅguttani-kaṭāya. Feer, M. Leon. 1884–1896. *Saṃgutta-Nikāya*. 5 vols. London: Henry Frowde for the Pali Text Society.

Sāratthapakasini. Woodward, F.L. ed. 1929–1937. *Sārattha-Ppakasini*, Buddhaghosa’s Commentary on the *Saṃgutta-Nikāya*. 3 vols. London: Pali Text Society.

Śārdulakarn. Āvadāna. Mukhopadhyaya, Sujitkumar, ed. 1954. *Śārdulakarnāvadāna*. Santiniketan: Viśvabharati.

Śaunakīya. Śāstri, K. Śambaśiva, ed. 1935. *Śaunakīya*. Trivandrum Sanskrit Series No. 120. Trivandrum: Superintendent, Government Press.

Sumangalavilāsinī. Rhys Davids, T.W., and J. Estlin Carpenter, eds. 1886–1932. *Sumangala-Vilāsinī*, Buddhaghosa’s Commentary on the *Diṭṭha Nikāya*. 3 vols. London: Henry Frowde for the Pali Text Society.

Svāpnavāsavadatta. Rai, Ganga Sagar. 2003. *Svāpatnavāsavadattam* of Bhāsa. Kashi Sanskrit Series 296. Varanasi: Chaukhambha Sanskrit Sansthan.

Uddāmaresvaratratra. 2015. Shukla, Brijesh Kumar, ed. 1996. *Uddamareshvar Tantra with ‘Shantishwari’ Hindi Commentary*. Krishnadas Sanskrit Series 149. Varanasi: Krishnadas Academy.

Uddīṣṭatatra. Mishra, Giri Ratna, ed. and trans. *Lankesa Rāvanas Uddīṣṭa Tantra, With Sarveshwari English Commentary & Introduction*. Varanasi: Chaukhamba Surbharti Prakashan.

Uttarādhyaṇa. Mahārāj, Bhuvanabhānusūrīvarajī, ed. n.d. Śrī Uttarādhyaṇyanasūtra. Mumbai: Divyadarśan Ṭrūṣṭ.

Vāgupurāṇa. Āpte, Hari Nārāyaṇ, ed. 1905. *Mahāmuniśīrma-vyāsapraniṣṭam Vāgupurāṇam*. Ānandāsramasūkratragrāntahāvālī 49. Punyākhyapattana [Pune]: Ānandāsramamudrānāyala.

Vāsudeva-viśvaṇī. Muni Catuvriṇīja, and Muni Punyaviṇīja, eds. 1930–1931. *Vāsudeva-viśvaṇī*: Śrī Atmānanda-Jainagratratnamalā, nos. 80 & 81. Bhavnagar: Shri Jain Atmanand Sabha.

Vinaya. Oldenberg, Hermann. 1879–1883. *The Vinaya Pitakam: One of the Principal Buddhist Holy Scriptures in the Pāli Language*. 6 vols. London: Williams and Norgate.

Viṣṇusmeṭi. Olivelle, Patrick. 2009. *The Law Code of Viṣṇu: A Critical Edition and Annotated Translation of the Viśnava-Dharmaśāstra*. Harvard Oriental Series 73. Cambridge: Department of Sanskrit and Indian Studies, Harvard University.

Secondary Sources

Babb, Lawrence A. 1975. *The Divine Hierarchy: Popular Hinduism in Central India*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Baines, J. A. 1893. *Census of India, 1891: General Report*. London: Eyre and Spottiswoode.

Balbir, Nalini. 1990. Stories from the *Āvāṣyaka* commentaries. In *The Clever Adulteress and Other Stories: A Treasury of Jain Literature*. Edited by Phyllis Grannoff. Oakville, New York and London: Mosaic Press, pp. 17–74.

Balbir, Nalini, and Thomas Oberlies. 1993. *Āvāṣyaka-Studien*. Alt- and Neu-Indische Studien herausgegeben vom Institut für Kultur und Geschichte Indiens und Tibetens an der Universität Hamburg, 45, 1 & 2; Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag.

Bhandarkar, Devadatta Ramakrishna, Bahadurchand Chhabra, and Govind Swamirao Gai. 1981. *Inscriptions of the Early Gupta Kings*. Corpus Inscriptionum Indicarum III; New Delhi: Archaeological Survey of India.

Blaustein, James M. 1987. *Diffusionism: A Uniformitarian Critique*. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 77: 30–47. [CrossRef]
Bloomfield, Maurice. 1913. The Character and Adventures of Muladeva. *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society* 52: 616–50.

Bronkhorst, Johannes. 2014–2015. The Magas. *Brahmavidyā: The Adyar Library Bulletin* 78–79: 459–86.

Bruhn, Klaus. 1998. Bibliography of Studies Connected with Āvaśyaka-Commentaries. In *Catalogue of the Papers of Ernst Leumann in the Institute for the Culture and History of India and Tibet, University of Hamburg*. Edited by Birte Plutat. Alt- und Neu-Indische Studien herausgegeben von Institut für Kultur und Geschichte Indiens und Tibet an der Universität Hamburg, 49; Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, pp. 119–36.

Byrskog, Samuel. 2007. A Century with the Sitz im Leben: From Form-Critical Setting to Gospel Community and beyond. *Zeitschrift für die neuesten Wissenschaften und die Kunde der Alteren Kirche* 98: 1–27. [CrossRef]

Ch’en, Kenneth. 1953. *Apropos the Mendhaka Story*. *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies* 16: 374–403. [CrossRef]

Collar, Anna, Fiona Coward, Tom Brughmans, and Barbara J. Mills. 2015. Networks in Archaeology: Phenomena, Abstraction, Representation. *Journal of Archaeological Method and Theory* 22: 1–32. [CrossRef]

Cort, John E. 1997. Tantra in Jainism: The Cult of Ghanṭākārṇ Mahāvīr, the Great Hero Bell-Ears. *Bulletin d’Études Indiennes* 15: 115–33.

Cort, John E. 2000. Worship of Bell-Ears the Great Hero, a Jain Tantric Deity. In *Tintra in Practice*. Edited by David Gordon White. Princeton: Princeton University Press, pp. 417–33.

Davidson, Ronald. 2002. *Indian Esoteric Buddhism: A Social History of the Tantric Movement*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Davidson, Ronald. 2017. Studies in Dhāranī Literature IV: A Nāga Altar in 5th Century India. In *Consecration Rituals in South Asia*. Edited by István Keu. Leiden and Boston: Brill, pp. 123–70.

Davis, Donald R. 2004. *The Boundaries of Hindu Law: Tradition, Custom and Politics in Medieval Kerala*. Torino: Comitato ‘Corpus Iuris Sanscriticum et Fontes Iuris Asiae Meridianaet Centralis’.

Dezső, Csaba. 2010. Encounters with Vetālas: Studies on Fabulous Creatures. *Acta Orientalia Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae* 63: 391–426. [CrossRef]

Dresden, Mark. 1941. *Mānavagṛhyasūtra: A Vedic Manual of Domestic Rites—Translation, Commentary and Preface*. Groningen and Batavia: Bij J. B. Wolters’ Uitgevers-Matschappij.

Edgerton, Franklin. 1953. *Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit Grammar and Dictionary*, vol. II: Dictionary. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Elwin, Verrier. 2007. *The Baiga*. New Delhi: Gyan Publishing, First published 1939.

Elisa Freschi, and Philipp A. Maas, eds. 2017. *Adaptive Reuse: Aspects of Creativity in South Asian Cultural History*. Abhandlungen für die Kund des Morgenlandes, Band 101; Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag.

Fuchs, Stephen. 1973. Priests and Magicians in Aboriginal India. *Studia Missionalhia* 22: 201–36.

Glucklich, Ariel. 2012. Jādūgars. In *Brill’s Encyclopedia of Hinduism*. Leiden and Boston: Brill, vol. IV, pp. 806–14.

Goudriaan, Teun. 1978. *Māyā Divine and Human*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.

Grafe, Jörg. 2001. *Vidyādharas—Früheste Zeit bis zur Kaschmirischen Bṛhatkathā*. Europäische Hochschulschriften Reihe XXVIII Asiatische und Afrikanische Studien; Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, vol. 82.

Griffiths, Arlo. 2004–2005. *Tumburu: A Deified Tree*. *Bulletin d’Études Indiennes* 22–23: 249–64.

Herrmann-Pfandt, Adelheid. 1996. The Good Woman’s Shadow. Some Aspects of the Dark Nature of Dākinīs and Śākīnīs in Hinduism. In *Wild Goddesses in India and Nepal: Proceedings of an International Symposium, Berne and Zurich, November 1994*. Edited by Axel Michaels, Cornelia Vogelsanger and Annette Wilke. Studia Religiosa Helvetica Jahrbuch; vol. 2, Bern: Peter Lang, pp. 39–70.

Huang, Po-chi. 2009. The Cult of Vetāla and Tantric Fantasy. In *Rethinking Ghosts in World Religions*. Edited by Mu-chou Poo. Numen Book Series: Studies in the History of Religions; Leiden & Boston: Brill, vol. 123, pp. 211–35.

Jain, Jagdishchandra. 1977. *The Vasudevahinḍī: An Authentic Jain Version of the Bṛhatkathā*. L. D. Series 59; Ahmedabad: L. D. Institute of Indology.

Jamkhedkar, Aravinda Prabhakar. 1984. *Vasudevahinḍī: A Cultural Study*. Delhi: Agam Kala Prakashan.

Kale, M. R. 1921. *The Rasāntālī of Śrī Hariś-Deva*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass Publishers.

Kapferer, Bruce. 1997. *The Feast of the Sorcerer: Practices of Consciousness and Power*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Lenz, Timothy. 2010. *Gandhāran Avadānas: British Library Kharoṣṭhī Fragments 1–3 and 21 and Supplementary Fragments A-C*. Seattle and London: University of Washington Press.
Leumann, Ernst. 2010. *An Outline of the Áváśyaka Literature: Translated from the German by George Baumann with an Introductory Essay by Nalini Balbir*. Ahmedabad: L. D. Institute of Indology.

Lingat, Robert. 1973. *The Classical Law of India*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.

Lüders, Heinrich. 1939. *Die Vidyādhāras in der buddhistischen Literatur und Kunst*. Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft 93: 89–104.

Mitchell, Nathan. 2009. *The Mystery of the Rosary: Marian Devotion and the Reinvention of Catholicism*. New York: New York University Press.

Nabokov, Isabelle. 2000. *Deadly Power: A Funeral to Counter Sorcery in South India*. American Ethnologist 27: 147–68. [CrossRef]

Nigam, L. S. 2000. *Riddle of Indian Iconography: Zetetic on Rare Icon from Talav*. Delhi: Sharada Publ. House.

Bhikkhu Nyanatutsita himi, ed. 2013. *The Bodhisattva Ideal: Essays on the Emergence of Mahāyāna*. Kandi: Buddhist Publication Society.

Parpola, Asko. 1988. *The Coming of the Aryans to Iran and India and the Cultural and Ethnic Identity of the Dāsas*. Studia Orientalia (Helsinki) 64: 194–302.

Plowden, W. Chichele. 1883. *Report on the Census of British India taken on the 17th February 1881*. 3 vols. London: Printed by Eyre and Spottiswoode for H. M. Stationery Off.

Rahmann, Rudolf. 1959. *Shamanisti and Related Phenomenon in Northern and Middle India*. Anthropos 54: 681–760.

Rigopoulos, Antonio. 1998. *Dattātreya: The Immortal Guru, Yogin, and Avatāra—A Study of the Transformative and Inclusive Character of a Multi-Faced Hindu Deity*. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Ruegg, David Seyfort. 2007. *The Symbiosis of Buddhism with Brahmanism/Hinduism in South Asia and of Buddhism with “Local Cults” in Tibet and the Himalayan Region*. Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philosophisch-Historische Klasse, Sitzgungsberichte; Vienna: Österreichische Akademie Der Wissenschaften, vol. 774.

Sanderson, Alexis. 1994. *Vajrayāna: Origin and Function*. In *Buddhism into the Year 2000*. Edited by Dhammakaya Foundation. Bangkok and Los Angeles: Dhammakaya Foundation, pp. 87–102.

Sanderson, Alexis. 2007. *Atharvavedins in Tantric Territory: The Viṁśatīkā Texts of the Oriya Paippalādins and their Connection with the Trika and Kālīkula*. With critical editions of the Parījāpavīdhi, the Parāmantravīdhi, and the *Bhadraußāravīdhiprakaraṇa*. In *The Atharvaśāda and Its Paippalādśākḥa: Historical and Philological Papers on a Vedic Tradition*. Edited by Arlo Griffiths and Annette Schmiedchen. Indologica Halensis 11; Aachen: Shaker, pp. 195–312.

Sanderson, Alexis. 2009. “The Śaiva Age—The Rise and Dominance of Śaivism during the Early Medieval Period”. In *Genesis and Development of Tantrism*. Edited by Shingo Einoo. Tokyo: Institute of Oriental Culture, University of Tokyo, pp. 41–350.

Sax, William S. 2009. *God of Justice: Ritual Healing and Social Justice in the Central Himalayas*. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press.

Scholem, Gershom Gerhard. 1991. *Origins of the Kabbalah*. Edited by R. J. Zwi Werblowsky. Translated by Allan Arkush. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Schubring, Walter. 1978. *Naṣadhammukhaḥ: Das Sechste Ange des Jaina-Siddhanta: Einführung, kritische Nacherzählung mit Ausgabe der wichtigten Textpartien, Kommentar und Glossar*. Wiesbaden: In Kommission bei F. Steiner.

Sen, Sukumar. 1968. *On Muradeva, Muladeva and Šisnađeveda*. In *Mélanges d’Indoislamisme a la Mémoire de Louis Renou*. Publications de l’Institut de Civilisation Indienne, fasc. 28; Paris: Éditions E. de Boccard, pp. 677–81.

Serbaeva, Olga. 2013. Can Encounters with Yoginīs in the Jayarathayāmala Be Described as Possession? In *“Yoginī” in South Asia: Interdisciplinary Approaches*. Edited by István Keul. London: Routledge, pp. 198–212.

Shah, Tahir. 1998. *Sorcerer’s Apprentice*. London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson.

Sica, Alan. 2000. Rationalization and culture. In *The Cambridge Companion to Weber*. Edited by Stephen Turner. New York: Cambridge University Press, pp. 42–58.

Siegel, Lee. 1991. *Net of Magic: Wonders and Deceptions in India*. Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press.

Sinha, Shashank S. 2006. *Adivasis, Gender and the ‘Evil Eye’: The Construction(s) of Witches in Colonial Chotanagpur*. The Indian Historical Review 23: 127–49. [CrossRef]

Skilling, Peter. 2007. *Zombies and Half-Zombies: Mahāsūtras and Other Protective Measures*. Journal of the Pali Text Society 29: 313–30.

Stark, Rodney. 2015. *Sociology of Religion: a Rodney Stark Reader*. Waco: Baylor University Press.
Sullivan, Bruce M. 2006. Tantroid Phenomena in Early Indic Literature: An Essay in Honor of Jim Sanford. *Pacific World: Journal of the Institute of Buddhist Studies* 8: 9–20.

Sweeney, Marvin A., and Ehud Ben Zvi. 2003. *The Changing Face of Form Criticism for the Twenty-First Century*. Grand Rapids: W. B. Eerdmans.

Tan, Randall K. J. 2001. Recent Developments in Redaction Criticism: From Investigation of Textual Prehistory Back to Historical-Grammatical Exegesis? *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 44: 599–614.

Tarabout, Gilles. 2000. ‘Passions’ in the Discourses on Witchcraft in Kerala. *Journal of Indian Philosophy* 28: 651–64. [CrossRef]

Udayaadithya, A., and Angula Gurtoo. 2013. Governing the local networks in Indian agrarian societies—An MAS perspective. *Computational and Mathematical Organization Theory* 19: 204–31. [CrossRef]

Van Buitenen, Hans. 1958. The Indian Hero as Vidyādhara. *The Journal of American Folklore* 71: 305–11. [CrossRef]

Von Schiefner, F. Anton. 1906. *Tibetan Tales Derived from Indian Sources—Translated from the Tibetan of the Kah-Gyur*. Edited and translated by W. R. S Ralston; London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner & Co.

Weber, Max. 2001. *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism*. Translated by Talcott Parsons. London and New York: Routledge Classics. First published 1930.

Weber. 1965. *Sociology of Religion*. Translated by Ephraim Fischoff. London: Methuen & Co., Ltd. First published 1956.

Wedemeyer, Christian K. 2013. *Making Sense of Tantric Buddhism: History, Semiology, & Transgression in the Indian Traditions*. New York: Columbia University Press.

White, David Gordon. 2009. *Sinister Yogis*. Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press.

White, David Gordon. 2013. śākta, Yogini, Pairika, Strix: Adventures in Comparative Demonology. *Southeast Review of Asian Studies* 35: 7–31.

Whitney, William Dwight. 1905. *Atharva-Veda Sanhitā: Translated with a Critical and Exegetical Commentary*. Harvard Oriental Series; Vols 7–8, Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press.

Wujastyk, Dominik. 1984. An Alchemical Ghost: The Rasaratnakāra by Nāgārjuna. *Ambix* 31: 70–83. [CrossRef] [PubMed]

Yamano, Chieko. 2013. The Yaksāni-sādhanā in the *Kākṣapaṭa-tantra*: Introduction, Critical Edition and Translation. *Journal of the International College for Postgraduate Studies* 17: 61–99.

Yisraeli, Oded. 2016. Jewish Medieval Traditions concerning the Origins of the Kabbalah. *The Jewish Quarterly Review* 106: 21–41. [CrossRef]

© 2017 by the author. Licensee MDPI, Basel, Switzerland. This article is an open access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).