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Abstract Some remarks on the possible methods of composing samhitās as hinted in chosen texts belonging to the Pāñcarātra school are presented in Sect. 1. In Sect. 2, the content and the structure of the Sātvatasamhitā and Īśvarasamhitā are compared. In fact, both texts are independent works even though in the light of some Pāñcarātrika texts they are considered to be mutually linked, the latter being considered a “commentary” of the former. In Sect. 3, the initiation (dīkṣā) as found in both texts is outlined. In Sect. 4, I focus on the re-use of the portions concerning dīkṣā: although the redactor of the Īśvarasamhitā borrowed almost all the Sātvatasamhitā’s chapters on initiation, he dealt in a very different way with the practice called vaibhāvīyanarasīṁhakalpa that in the context of the latter text plays the role of a unique preliminary purification. Strikingly, the Sātvatasamhitā’s redactor reused the initial verses describing the vaibhāvīyanarasīṁhakalpa, putting them into other contexts, not necessarily connected to the issue of initiation, whereas he totally omitted its impressive section concerning magical powers (siddhi).
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The constant re-using of texts seems to be one of the most characteristic features of the literature of Vaiṣṇava Pāñcarātra.

First traces of the Pāñcarātra doctrine can be found already in the Nārāyāṇiya section of Mahābhārata. However, in the opinion of Sanderson (2001, p. 38), the form in which its most important texts, called the “three gems” (ratnaratva), i.e. Jayākhyasamhitā (JayS), Sātvatasamhitā (SātS) and Pauskarasamhitā (PausS), were preserved is a result of the reformation of the Pāñcarātra ritual under the influence of
the Kashmirian Śaiva mantramārga. In such circumstances, these three texts must have been composed around the middle of the ninth century in Kashmir. On the contrary, the younger samhitās of Pāñcarātra were most probably composed in the South of India. Due to the coexistence with South Indian brahmanical circles, the teachings they contain took a more orthodox shape approved by teachers of the Śrīvaishnava tradition. These are also the texts which gave the basis for the order of worship in South-Indian Śrīvaishnava temples. Among them one can enumerate the texts believed by tradition to be specific commentaries (vyākhyā) of the oldest “three gems”, i.e. Pādmasamhitā (PādS), Īśvarasamhitā (ĪŚ) and Pārameśvarasamhitā (PārS), as well as other relatively important samhitās.

That the textual borrowings happened to a great extent within the boundaries of the Pāñcarātra tradition has already been shown in the research done by Rastelli (2006) on the basis of PārS, which, so far, seems to be the best example of a text being itself a kind of compilation of the passages taken over from other sources, usually the most respected samhitās of Pāñcarātra, the already mentioned “three gems”.

However, Sanderson (2001, pp. 1, 37–39) has shown that there are also extensive parallel passages linking the Tantric Śaiva and Pāñcarātrika sources, proving, therefore, that there was also a movement from Pāñcarātrika literature toward Śaiva. This is evident in the case of the Śaivasiddhānta text Bhṛhatkālottara, which in terms of the accounts of cremating initiates (antyeṣṭi) and śraddhā ceremonies draws richly from two chapters of JayŚ. The Śaiva redactor did not avoid some inconsistencies although he obviously attempted to eliminate the traces of the Vaiṣṇava material.

Another example, again examined by Rastelli (2007), comes from Agnipurāṇa. Among passages hailing from other sources, for example from the Śaivasiddhānta text entitled Somaśambhupaddhati (AP 72–90, 92–103), there are also those (AP 21–70) deriving, sometimes verbatim, sometimes with regard to the contents, from Pāñcarātra samhitās, mostly from Hayāśīraṁpañcarātra and Nārādyasamhitā.

The focus of the present paper will be to analyze, in turn, a particular portion of the ĪŚ which is perceived by the tradition as a specific commentary upon ŚaṭS. At least in regard to the initiatory prescriptions, the former draws richly from the latter; however, the process is quite selective. My attempt will be, therefore, to discuss the possible reasons behind such a selection. Many questions arise in this connection. Is it at all meaningful that the compiler of the ĪŚ avoided the coherent passage on vaibhaviyaṇarasimhakalpa, which, judging from its size (457 ślokas), was quite important for the ŚaṭS’s initiatory system? One might say that there is no need to look for further explanations since there are many other portions of ŚaṭS neglected by the compiler of the ĪŚ. Yet, despite the negligence of vaibhaviyaṇarasimhakalpa as a coherent section, there are single verses derived from it dispersed throughout many chapters of ĪŚ, which suggests that its compiler was familiar with it. Hence, the absence of the section as a consistent unit needs a specific explanation.

In order to give some arguments for the alleged purposefulness of the treatment (or rather: the lack of treatment) of ŚaṭS’s vaibhaviyaṇarasimhakalpa within the framework of ĪŚ, I will firstly discuss some passages suggesting that Pāñcarātrika authors were familiar with re-working and re-using the texts. Then I will proceed to the brief characteristic of the texts in question, i.e. both ŚaṭS and ĪŚ, followed by a short analysis of their concept of initiation (dīkṣā). After presenting their parallel
passages, I will conclude with some cautious observations regarding the reasons for the omission of the vaibhaviyanaarasimhakalpa section in the case of ĪŚ.

1 How the saṃhitās of Pāñcarātra might have been Composed

The Pāñcarātrika saṃhitās were regarded to be revealed by God himself and composed in the form of a dialogue, which was actually the divine revelation (Rastelli 2003, p. 1). Accordingly, their authors or compilers remain unknown to us: “they hide themselves completely behind the divine figures and sages whom they introduce as instructors and questioners” (Gonda 1977, p. 119). Therefore, “the catena of divine and prehistoric transmitters is the counterpart of the exact indications of the preceptors and ancestors of a commentator so often found in exegetical works: the guruparamparās guaranteeing the reliability of the tradition” (Gonda 1977, p. 119). Yet, as Gonda continues: “this does not however mean that the compilers are not committed to that which is taught in their books. They expound, as well as they can, the religious doctrines of their community, that is of the Pāñcarātra school of thought as handed down in a definite region and in definite milieus of which these authors are learned guides” (Gonda 1977, p. 119).

A passage found in JayŚ sheds some light on the features of text compilers and, possibly, copyists. One finds there the definitions of both the knower of a treatise (śāstrajña) and its preserver (śāstradhāraka) suggesting that among the followers of the tradition there were people responsible for knowing the doctrine as well as people responsible for reconstructing and maintaining the texts/manuscripts. The JayŚ 22.51cd–56ab reads: “[Characteristic of the knower of a treatise: ] Know that he [who] knows purāṇas, dharmaśāstras and Vaiṣṇava itihāsas, [he who] would not only listen to the doctrine of Vedānta but also explains it, [he who] having discussed the reading of the lost words with their knowers, with effort and attentively keeps on refining the treatise (āgama), such [a person] is a knower of a treatise belonging to the Vaiṣṇava tradition. [Characteristic of the preserver of a treatise: ] Know that he [who] having collected all treatises (āgamas) wherever they were with faith, then maintains them carefully meditating on Brahman, [he who] worships the seat of the treatise with the arghya-offerings, flowers etc., [he who] transmits [the texts] of the Vaiṣṇavas and keeps away those of unprepared minds following other doctrines, such [a person] is a preserver of a treatise.” By saying that through the reconstruction of the lost words the knower of a śāstra arranges the treatise or, in other words, makes it perfect, refines it (saṃskaroti), the text points most probably to the fact that those treatises, even though treated with the highest esteem, were, with time, subjected to reworking, modifications and manipulations.2

One of the aspects of changes that happened within the boundaries of Pāñcarātrika literature in the course of time seems to be the concept that the

---

1 Also treated in Czerniak-Drożdżowicz (2003, p. 40; 2006/2007, pp. 228–229).
2 Among the reasons for such modifications one can enumerate not only religious factors but also changes in the social, political and economic situation of a given community. See Czerniak-Drożdżowicz (2006/2007, p. 9).
particular younger texts are linked to the most respected ones. The best known passage on both the concept of mutual relations between the older and younger \textit{samhitās} as well as the technique of composing the latter ones comes from the additional chapter of JayS called \textit{Adhikapāṭha} (JaySA). The JaySA is relatively young, since it must have been composed after the time all the texts it mentions had been composed, including ĪS, PārS and the text which is traditionally linked to JayS itself, i.e. PādS.\footnote{Architectural details of the Varadarāja Temple in Kāñcipuram mentioned therein allow us to date it, contrary to the corpus of JayS, to the fourteenth century. See Rajan (1967, p. 73) and Rastelli (1999, pp. 52–53).} Here, for the first time within the scope of the Pāñcarātra literature the idea of a “basic” (\textit{mūla}) text and its traditional commentary (\textit{vyākhyā}) is openly expressed. In accordance with JaySA, the latter one is composed through borrowing to a certain extent the content of the former. Thus JaySA 1–8ab says that the whole corpus of Pāñcarātra scriptures has been revealed by Nārāyaṇa himself. Out of these, the SātS, the PauṣS and the JayS are called the “three gems” (\textit{ratnatraya}). They are regarded to be the essence of the teaching of the Sāttvata [clan], to be secret, approved by learned men and to have emerged directly from the mouth of Bhagavān in their accomplished form. This means that they are neither defective nor too broad. The other scriptures, among them the so called commentaries (\textit{vyākhyā}), are said to be composed through filling them up with the essence coming out of the mouth of Bhagavān by adding, removing or keeping it. Their value depends, however, on the coexistence with the basic text (\textit{mūla}), i.e. one of the “three gems”. The texts are believed to function in pairs. JaySA 11cd–12ab\footnote{JaySA 11: \textit{mūlavākhyānarūtpatvād upajīvyam parasparam //11// tantratrayam idaṃ vidyād ekāśāstraṃ tathā buddhah /} reads: “The wise one should know that the three treatises present one doctrine which can be fruitfully used, since it has the form of, respectively, basic text and commentary”. The PārS is said to have descended in the form of \textit{vyākhyā} in order to explain the meaning (\textit{vivṛtyarthā}) of PauṣS, ĪS has been caused to descend in order to explain the meaning of SātS and PādS is said to be the commentary (\textit{vyākhyāna}) on JayS.

It has already been generally accepted that it was the particular idea of the author of JaySA to present the three \textit{vyākhyās/vyākhyānas} as commentaries, even though in terms of structure they are not proper commentaries.\footnote{See Rastelli (1999, pp. 54–55), where the same portions of the JaySA are treated, too. In the context of Indian philosophical terminology, the terms \textit{vyākhyāna}, \textit{vivṛti} consider usually the action of “commenting” by a commentator for the sake of establishing the proper meaning of a text commented upon by him.} Those \textit{vyākhyās} are in fact independent, self-sufficient texts arranged in the same way as the rest of Pāñcarātra \textit{samhitās}, including the aspect of the unknown authorship. Nevertheless, most probably for the sake of a greater authority, they borrow more or less richly from the elder \textit{samhitās}. Still, neither do the compilers of \textit{vyākhyās} limit themselves to borrow from the particular \textit{samhitā} ascribed to them by the author of
the additional chapter of JaySA, nor do the compilers of the rest of the known *saṃhitās* resign from that, which shows the conventionality of the concept presented in JaySA. The technique of re-using the older texts is not limited to the three so-called commentaries, but it is visible throughout almost the whole corpus of Pāñcarātra. One can also observe a change in respect to the subjects treated: in the course of time, there is an internal trend to depict the tradition as fitting the brahmanical environment of South India and, in consequence, to betray much fewer tantric features.

2 *Sātvatasaṃhitā* versus *Īśvarasaṃhitā*

Let us turn to the case of certain borrowings between *ĪS* and SātS. It was already mentioned that as for the latter one, the redaction available to us was most probably composed in Kashmir, in the ninth century AD. In the case of *ĪS*, there are still controversies regarding the time of its composition. However, all scholars agree that it must have been compiled in the South of India. Both Schrader (1995, p. 16) and Gonda (1977, pp. 54–55) propose to consider it the oldest *saṃhitā* among those of Southern Indian origin, but not earlier than the tenth century. According to Matsubara (1994, pp. 27–31), the text is much younger and should be dated at the fourteenth century, and its compiler must have been inspired by the older PārS. Nevertheless, as Matsubara continues, there must have been two variants of *ĪS*, the older and the younger one, out of which the latter one is now available, whereas the former one is known from quotations found in Yāmuna’s (tenth century) Āgamaaprāmānya.

If we compare the colophons of SātS and *ĪS*, both comprising 25 chapters, it turns out that in accordance with the changes which took place in the course of time, the former one focuses mostly on two subjects: the prominent role of different facets of the worship on vyūha and vibhava modes of God (2–6, 9–13) and, further, on the issues related to the initiation (dīksā) (16–23), whereas the latter one presents mostly the prescriptions connected with various aspects of temple practice. Its first section (2–9) regards the daily routine of temple priests, the second (10–15) regards the occasional festivals taking place throughout the year, the third (16–19, 21–22) regards the optional activities such as those performed in the context of the temple, including its building, furnishing, consecration as well as the vows (vrata) and initiation (dīksā). The additional fourth part (23–25) contains in turn the answers to six questions regarding the interests of professional priests (Smith 1975–1980, pp. 66–67).

In accordance with convention, the first chapter of *ĪS* contains the mythical story of the text’s revelation (*śāstrāvatāra*). It is where the link with SātS is established and the

---

6 For example, as for the first case, there are parallel passages between all three “gems” and PārS (Rastelli 2006). As for the second case, there are parallel passages between *Śrīprāṇasaṃhitā* and SātS regardless of the fact that the former one is not believed to be a *vyākhya* of any older *saṃhitā*, see Padmanabhan (2006).

7 The thirteen lines of the text quoted under that title in Āgamaaprāmānya (to be found in Narasimhachary 1976, p. 163) do not appear in the published version (Matsubara 1994, p. 28).
Chart no. 1. Colophons of SātS and ĪŚ

| SātS                                                                 | ĪŚ                                                                 |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1. Questions and answers (praśnaprativacana)                         | 1. The revelation of the text (śāstrāvatāra)                         |
| 2. [no specific colophon]                                            | 2. The rules of internal worship (mānasayāgavidhi)                  |
| 3. The extraction of the mantra of a [deity] in vyāha [aspect] in suṣupti [state] (suṣuptivyāhāntroddhāra) | 3. The rules of the worship of the deities of the temple (vimānadevatārcanavidhi) |
| 4. [no specific colophon]                                            | 4. The rules of [the ceremony] ending with waving lights before an idol (nīrōjanāntavidhi) |
| 5. [no specific colophon]                                            | 5. The rules of kindling fire and preparing food (bhajyāsanāṅgikāravidhi) |
| 6. The worship of [a deity] of a fourfold nature (caturāmyārādhana)  | 6. The rules beginning with the distribution to the ancestors and ending with the festival of śayana (piṭṣaṃvibhāgādiśayanotsavāntavidhi) |
| 7. The rules of vows (vratavidhi)                                    | 7. The rules of worshipping Lākṣmī and Sudarśana (lakṣmīsudarśanārcanavidhi) |
| 8. The rules of annual vows (saṃvatsararvatavidhi)                   | 8. The rules of worshipping the deities of the retinue starting with Garuḍa (garuḍādiparivārārcanavidhi) |
| 9. The internal worship of vibhava deities (vibhavadevatāntaryāga)   | 9. The rules starting with the characteristic of the deities of the doors and the accompanying [deities] (dvārāvaraṇadevatālakṣanāndavidhi) |
| 10. The [external] worship of vibhava deities (vibhavadevatārcana)   | 10. The rules ending with the great festival of raising the flag (mahotsavādhvajārohaṇāntavidhi) |
| 11. The rules of the offering and a fire pit (yāgakunḍavidhi)        | 11. The rules of the great festival (mahotsavavidhi)                 |
| 12. The visualization of vibhava deities (vibhavadevatādhyaṇa)       | 12. The rules of the festival of half of a lunar month (pakṣotsavavidhi) |
| 13. The visualization of the deities with their weapons starting with ornaments (bhīṣaṇāḍyastradevatādhyaṇa) | 13. The rules starting with the festival of half of a lunar month (pakṣotsavādvidhi) |
| 14. The rules of wearing a pavitra (pavitraśropanavidhi)             | 14. The rules starting with the pavitra festival (pavitraśrovādvidhi) |
| 15. The rules of the [festival] of bathing a pavitra (pavitrānānavidhi) | 15. The rules of the act of causing a bath (snapanavidhi)            |
| 16. The procedure [of mastering the mantra for the sake of] pacifying evil (aghaśāntīkalpa) | 16. The rules starting with the consecration of the temple (prāśādidepratīṣṭhāvidhi) |
| 17. The procedure of [mastering the mantra of] Narasimha in vibhava form (vaibhavānāṁsiṃhakalpa) | 17. The characteristic of the idol etc. (pratimādilakaṇa) |
| 18. The rules starting with the preliminary ceremonies of initiation (adhiṣṭādīkṣāvidhi) | 18. The prescription for consecration [of an idol] (pratīṣṭhāvidhāna) |
| 19. The rules of initiation (dīkṣāvidhi)                             | 19. The rules of atonements (prāyaścittavidhi)                       |
| 20. The rules of consecration [of a person] (abhiṣekavidhi)           | 20. The greatness of Yādavācala (yādavācalamāhātmya)                  |
prominent role of being both the essence (sāra) of divine śāstras and the explanation of SāṭS (sātvatārthaprakāśika) is highlighted. However, since the compiler of ĪŚ was influenced by the PārŚ’s story, the way of expressing the relation between both texts is not his genuine idea. 8 The verses considering the relation with SāṭS are inspired by the relevant passage of the PārŚ speaking about the connection of the latter with PausŚ: PārŚ 1.90–92aḥ9 uses the formulation arthopapādaka in this context.

The sage Nārada says (ĪŚ 1.47–53)10: “Listen to what I am going to tell. Previously, Bhagavān Hari himself looked at those who desire the benefit for all people for the sake of favouring those who have abandoned the supreme dharma and wished to approach a mixed dharma, [and] even more (bhūyas) those who aspire at his abode [and] those who wish to reach faith and devotion. For the sake of showing favour towards [them] and for the sake of creating the ability for all varṇas

8 For details regarding the inspiration by PārŚ visible in the case of revelation stories of both texts see Rastelli (1999, pp. 80–84) and Matsubara (1994, p. 29).
9 PārŚ 1.90–92ab: pārmeśvarasastraśrānāṁ sarvesāṁ munipuṅgava / sārabhūtaṁ viśeṣaṇa pauṣkarārtho-papādakam / 59/ mūlavādūnasāreṇa chandaśānusṭubhena ca / 1akṣagrathena sarvārthakriyānānopalabdhaye / 91/ sa me bravīṁ mahāśāstram pārmeśvarasamsājñayā / “O great sage! For the sake of teaching me all knowledge which has efficacy to be seized, he [Samkarsana] revealed to me the great śāstra called Pārmeśvara, which is the essence of all śāstras [communicated] by Pārmeśvara, which explains especially the meaning of Pauṣkarasaṁhitā, [composed] in accordance with the Root Veda in anuṣṭubh metre comprising one hundred thousands words.”
10 ĪŚ 1.47–53: śrīyātāṁ abhīdāśyāṁ sarvalokahitaśiṇāṁ / pravaṇīḥ bhagavān eva samālocya haris svayam / 47/ parītyayo param dharmaṁ mūradharmam upeyuṣāṁ / bhāyas tatpadakāṁkṣāṁ śrāddhāḥbhaktiḥ upeyuṣāṁ / 48/ anugraḥārtham varṇānāṁ yogyatāpādanāya ca / itāh jānānāṁ sarvesāṁ abhīṣṭapalasāddhayā / 49/ mūlavādūnasāreṇa chandaśānusṭubhena ca / sātvatāṁ pauṣkaram caiva jayākhyetyeyam ādikam / 50/ divaṁ sacchāstṛajālam tad uktā saṅkarāṇadībbhiḥ / pravartaye ayā bhuvī sarvalokahitäśiḥ / 51/ evaṁ diyaṁ śāstraṁ śaṅkṛīpyaḥ pī mahāmuniḥ / saṅkarāṇad bhagavatāḥ śrutvā adhyāpyayam muṇān / 52/ mahāyācālanīṣṭḥāḥ ca purā rāmasya cājñāyā / prathamaṁ sātvatāṁ śastraṁ samyag adhyāpyitā mayā / 53/
as well as for the sake of realizing the goals desired by all people, he communicated the net of the divine true śāstras, in anuṣṭubh metre and in accordance with the Root Veda (mūlaveda), starting with Sātvata-, Pauṣkara- and Jayākhya[saṁhitā]. Then, he activated Saṃkarṣaṇa and others who desire the benefit for all people, [to teach His words] on earth. In the same way, also the great sage Śāṅḍilya having heard those divine śāstras from Bhagavān Saṃkarṣaṇa taught them to [other] sages. [Those who] were staying in the Malaya mountains previously have been taught correctly by me, with the consent of God Rāma, at first the śāstra [called] Sātvata.” And then (ĪŚ 1.64–71ab) 11: “O divine sages! Therefore, there is no better śāstra then the divine Sātvata. Those beginning with Sātvata, Pauṣkara and Jayākhya are divine śāstras announced by Hari himself in accordance with the Root Veda for the sake of the benefit. These three śāstras, starting with Sātvata, are everywhere (vyāpaka), o best sages! Likewise, the three mantras starting with the eight-syllabled one (aṣṭākṣara), 12 o wise ones! Thus, according to the prescriptions of the three texts (tantra), Hari is worshipped in Yādavācala, Śrīrāṅga and Hastiśaila respectively. Among these divine śāstras, however, Sātvata is the greatest among the greatest. The God himself directly announced it and Lord Saṃkarṣaṇa listened to him: How to characterize the greatness of this Sātvata, o divine sages! Thus, o the best of twice born! I will tell you about the tantra called Īśvara, which is the essence of the śāstras communicated directly by Īśvara, which explains specifically the meaning of Sātvata[saṁhitā] (sāvatārthopapāddaka) and has been heard from Saṃkarṣaṇa himself. Listen, o sages, with attention.”

In addition, the mutual connection between Śī and SaṭS is similarly expressed in the last chapter of the former, where the text says that it elucidates the meaning of SaṭS (sāvatārthapraṇāśika) (ĪŚ 25.213). 13

Although one could expect that due to the traditional link between SaṭS and Śī, it was the compiler of Śī who was primarily interested in the content of SaṭS; according to the information mentioned above (that is the fact that the śāstrāvatāra of the ĪŚ has been influenced by that of the PārŚ), also the short summary of SaṭS found in ĪŚ 21.567cd–577ab appears to be borrowed from PārŚ 19.529–538. In both

---

11 ĪŚ 1.64–71ab: ato divyāt parataṇam nästi śāstraṃ muniśvaraḥ / sātvataṃ pauṣkaraṃ caiva jayākhyam ca tathaiva ca //64// evamādini divyānāṃ śāstraṃ haritaḥ svayam / mūlavedānusāreṇa prakṛtīni hitakāmyavā //65// sāvatādyam trikaṃ caitat vyāpakaṃ munisattamāḥ / yathā cāṣṭākṣaraṇāṁ mantramāṁ tīrthayaṃ budhāḥ //66// etat tantratrjayotena vīdhnā yādavācane / śrīrāṅge hastiśailand ca kramāt sampūjyaṃ hariḥ // 67// eteṣu divyaśāstroṣu sātvataṃ tūtāntottamam / vaktā sākṣād īṣvaro ‘syā srotā samkarṣaṇaḥ prabhuh // 68// kiṃ varamya ‘syā māhāmāyam sātvatasāya muniśvaraḥ / atas sākṣādīśavoktaśāstraṇāṃ dvī- japaṅgāvāḥ //69// sārabhūtam viśeṣaṇaṃ sāvatārthopapādakam / īṣvarākhyam idam tantram sākṣaśaṁkarṣaṇāc chruṭam //70// sampravakṣyāmi munayaḥ śṛṇudhvaṃ avadhānatāḥ //

12 The three mantras are the six-syllabled (ṣadākṣara), the eight-syllabled (aṣṭākṣara) and the twelve-syllabled (dvādaśākṣara) ones. Since Śī teaches the eight-syllabled mantra, it is said to be the first one.

13 ĪŚ 25.213: saṃruttamā saṁhitā eṣā sāvatārthapraṇāśikā / nākhīyavā dusṭabuddhāhāṃ abhattānām janārđane //213// “O Janārdana! This saṁhitā, which is the best one among all and elucidates the meaning of Sātvata[saṁhitā], should not be told to the bad-minded people who are not devoted to Viṣṇu.”
cases the passage appears in the context of presenting the features of the *mantrasiddhānta* (one of the four doctrines into which the Pañcarātra is traditionally divided), to which SātS belongs. It includes the outline of several subjects dealt with (in the same order) in SātS, among them the section on different forms of *prādurbhāva* deities; the section on the worship both in the heart-lotus and the lotus-throne, along with the worship of śaktis such as Lākṣmī, Puṣṭi etc. as well as the worship of divine attributes such as conch and discus; the section on the initiation of Narasimha; the section on three initiations called *vibhava, vyūha* and *sūkṣma*; the section on the four ranks of *samayī, putraka* and others; the section on consecration; the section on the rules of religious and social behaviour (*samaya*); and the section on the order of the installation of idols, characteristics of *mantras, maṇḍalas, mudrās*, a fire pit and others. Additionally, the same passage is partly re-used in another chapter of ĪS, i.e. ĪS 20, which praises the greatness of Yādavācala (*yādavacalāmāhātmya*), the holy Vaiṣṇava site linked to the tradition of SātS and ĪS. In that case, the verses presenting SātS as belonging to *mantrasiddhānta* are abandoned (ĪS 20.196–207ab). As a result, there might be two streams of borrowings: the re-use of the passage of PārS by the compiler of ĪS 21 (PārS 19.529–538 = ĪS 21.567cd–577ab) and the shortened version of the same passage re-used again within ĪS 20 with the same variants present in ĪS 21 (PārS 19.532cd–537 = ĪS 21.571–575cd = ĪS 20.198cd–203).

| Chart no. 2. PārS 19.529–538 = ĪS 21.567cd–577ab |
|-----------------------------------------------|
| PārS 19 | ĪS 21 | ĪS 20 |
| mantrasiddhāntasamjñām | mantrasiddhāntasamjñām | |
| tajjāgradvyūhādīmūrtinaḥ | tajjāgradvyūhādīmūrtinaḥ | /567/ |
| samutkāṛṇaṁ dvīṭiyāsya | samutkāṛṇaṁ dvīṭiyāsya | |
| sātvatasya mahātmanāḥ | sātvatasya mahātmanāḥ | /529/ |
| tena pradyumnasamjñāsya | tena pradyumnasamjñāsya | |
| turyātmano vibhoḥ | turyātmano vibhoḥ | /568/ |
| tena vāgīśvarākhyāsya tasmād | tena vāgīśvarākhyāsya tasmād | |
| vidvākhyāvigrāha //530// | vidvākhyāvigrāha //530// | |
| samkrāntaṁ ca tataḥ paścād rudendraḍītyendravahnuṣu | samkrāntaṁ ca tataḥ paścād rudendraḍītyendravahnuṣu | |
| tathaiva nāradādyeṣu devaṁśiṇām gaṇesv api //531// | tathaiva nāradādyeṣu devaṁśiṇām gaṇesv api //531// | |
| mantrasiddhāntam | mantrasiddhāntam | |
| bhedabhinnam anekadhā | bhedabhinnam anekadhā | /570/ |
3 Borrowings in the Case of Chapters on Initiation (dikṣā)

Despite the conventionality of the idea proposed by the author of JaySA, there are in fact many parallel passages between IŚ and SātS. An interesting example of textual borrowings between them is the case of initiatory chapters. The compiler of IŚ reused the relevant portions of the latter to a great extent, however, as was already mentioned, this happened quite selectively. Whereas he rewrote many substantive passages from the consecutive chapters of SātS, others have been excluded by him. What is more, to provide his own chapters with an expected, logical structure, some new, original portions have been added by him. Therefore, at least in regard to the initiatory prescriptions, the account of IŚ makes the impression of being a kind of an essence (sāra) of SātS, though at the same time it reflects the changes which took place within the tradition due to the historical circumstances.

In short, the SātS teaches the system of three initiatory paths. Each one of them is supposed to bear a particular result. In general, the highest dikṣā (paradikṣā) provides liberation (kaivalya), the middle one (vyūhadikṣā) provides worldly pleasures (bhoga) together with liberation and finally, the lowest among them, namely vibhavadikṣā, provides first and foremost worldly pleasures (bhoga) (SātS 19.3–7). The three initiations of SātS differ in the type of initiatory mantra in the
sense that a candidate, depending on his predisposition, might be initiated with the mantra belonging to the vibhava, vyūha or para aspect of Viṣṇu. Nevertheless, there is only one initiatory pattern presented within the text, focusing on the initiation with the usage of vibhava-mantras. Therefore, we can presume that the procedures are similar in the case of all three dīkṣās. In this connection each of them comprises the hierarchical entitlements of samayin, putraka, sādhaka and ācārya. However, before the initiation one should undertake the specific purification, or, if there is a need, cut off his previous religious affiliations by the means of an initiation with the help of the mantra of Narasimha. Then, as is explained in SātŚ 16, in order to check the readiness of the candidate to be initiated, the teacher observes him when he worships the mantra of Narasimha. As we could see from chart no 1, seven chapters of SātŚ deal with various initiatory prescriptions. These are: SātŚ 16 on the procedure [of mastering the mantra for the sake of] pacifying evil (aghaśāntikalpa), SātŚ 17 on the procedure of [mastering the mantra of] Narasimha in the vibhava form (vaibhavīyanarasimhakalpa), SātŚ 18 on the rules of the preliminary ceremonies of initiation (adhiḥvāsadiṅkṣāvidhi), SātŚ 19 on the rules of initiation (dīkṣāvidhi), SātŚ 20 on the rules of consecration (abhiṣekavidhi), SātŚ 21 on the rules of the prescriptions of proper religious behaviour (samayavidhi), SātŚ 22 on the rules of various signs relevant to the one possessing the authority (adhiḥkārimudrābhedavidhi), and SātŚ 23 on the rules of the preliminary ceremonies of initiation (adhiḥvāsadiṅkṣāvidhi) (but in fact on different kinds of mantras applicable during an initiation).

The dīkṣā-related portions of ĪŚ are, in turn, enclosed within two chapters: the 21st chapter, entitled “The prescriptions about initiation” (dīkṣāvidhi), and the 22nd chapter, entitled “The prescriptions about the restrictions [for proper religious behaviour]” (niyamavidhāna). The former comprises many parallels with SātŚ 16 and SātŚ 18–20: three fourths of SātŚ 16 and almost the complete SātŚ 18, 19 and 20. The latter almost entirely (without introductory statements) corresponds to SātŚ 21. The borrowed passages are taken systematically from the subsequent chapters of SātŚ (with the exception of SātŚ 17) and put in the order following the structure of SātŚ’s exposition. Nevertheless, there is no reference to the source of borrowing. Most often, the re-used portions are joined together by means of short passages authored, possibly, by the compiler of ĪŚ. As for significant interferences in the structure of transmission of SātŚ (apart from occasional small modifications of, usually, single words or corruptions) one can enumerate the omission of SātŚ 17 containing the elaborate description of the procedure of worshipping the mantra of Narasimha in his vibhava form (vaibhavīyanarasimhakalpa) and the addition of the pañcaśaṃskāra rite.

---

14 See SātŚ 19.169–177, where according to the account of vibhavadiṅkṣā it says that in the case of vyūhadīkṣā bijas of four vyūhas should be applied in each rite, whereas in the case of brahmadiṅkṣā (paradiṅkṣā) it should be the first mantra (ādyamantra) divided into six parts.
As we can see, the passages taken over from SātS do not cover the whole content of ĪS 21. There are also visible additions reflecting the innovations which took place during the development of the Pāñcarātra tradition. In these terms, the significant portion appears just at the beginning of the instructions regarding the course of the proper initiation (corresponding to SātS 19). It discusses tāpa (branding) and
urdhva-parṇa (painting the mark) rites (īśa 21.283cd–318), supplemented with the nāman (naming) element. The passage regarding the latter one is again rewritten from SātS (īśa 21.319–325= SātS 19.39cd–46ab) but placed in a new context. Those three rites, after adding two additional ones, i.e. mantra (conferring mantra) and yāga (interpreted usually as offering an idol or teaching), together form an initiatory practice of five sacraments (pañcasamskāra). It is not attested in such a form in the oldest samhitās of Pāṇcarātra.15 The ceremony, optionally called saṃśrayaṇa, is still performed nowadays in the South of India. As Raman claims,16 the pañcasamskāra rite, or at least some aspects of it, has been a marker of Vaiṣṇava identity in the Tamil country at least since the ninth century AD. With time passing it took over a role of a basic initiatory rite endowing Śrīvaiṣṇavas with the competence to participate in the religious life of the community.

In comparison to SātS, the new element is also the portion at the end of ĪS 21 expressing again the different historical background. It discusses the features of the worship for oneself (svārtha) and for others (parārtha) (īśa 21.504–512ab), continues with the greatness of Śāṅdilya and other sages important for the ĪS tradition (īśa 21.512cd–558) and ends with the division into four Pāṇcarātrika doctrines, so-called siddhāntas (īśa 21.559–587).

4 Why has the vaibhaviyanarasimhapalaka Section been Omitted?

As we could see in charts no. 2 and no. 3, while preparing his own description of the dīksā practice, the compiler of ĪS omitted the 17th chapter of SātS. This happened

---

15 As Young summarizes, branding (tāpa) with a conch and discus was not specific for Pāṇcarātra but associated with Vaiṣṇavas in general. The earlier samhitās neither mention pañcasamskāra nor branding, although there is one exception. SātS 22.9 describes a samayin as having the body branded with cakra (cakrataptatanu), but as explained by Rastelli, “this could be a later modification of the text” (aber dies könnte eine spätere Modifikation des Textes sein, TĀK 3, s.v. tāpa). See Young (2006, p. 207).

16 On different aspects of this ceremony see Raman (2005, 2006).
regardless of the fact that he re-used the other chapters of SātS on different aspects of initiation very extensively.

SātS 17 contains the account of a fully-fledged practice devoted to the mantra of Narasimha in his vaibhava form (according to colophon: vaibhavīyanarasimha-kalpa). It might be divided into two broad but closely related sections: the former considers the practice of an ācārya preparing to confer the narasimhādikṣā (SātS 17.3–148), and the latter considers the practice of an adept already initiated by the means of the mantra of Narasimha, including the account of magical powers (siddhi) he acquires (SātS 17.148–150cd, 153ab–456).

The contemporary interpreters of the procedure devoted to Narasimha as described in SātS (Smith 1975–1980; Gupta 1983; Hikita 1990, 1991, 1993; Hudson 2002, 2006; Carman 2006) follow to some extent the strategy of the compiler of ĪŚ in the sense of focusing mostly upon the information given in SātS 16 and SātS 18–20 so that the narasimhādikṣā seems like a kind of preliminary rite. If we consider its function exclusively from the perspective of SātS 16, Hudson’s proposal to interpret narasimhādikṣā as a unique converting ceremony/purification seems the most convincing. Based on the Śaiva accounts of converting ceremonies,17 one can say that in the context of Hindu tantric traditions only after the converting rite comprising purifying ceremonies is accomplished, the proper initiation can be undertaken. Structurally it recalls the schema outlined in SātS 16, where after completing expiations in the form of prāyaścītta along with brahmakūrca, one is, if there is such a need, supposed to undertake narasimhādikṣā to remove previously gathered serious sins or even religious affiliations. Being new-born, the adept is finally allowed to be regularly initiated into the tradition of SātS.18

However, in contradistinction to the content of SātS 16 as well as prevailing interpretations, the SātS 17 presents narasimhādikṣā as entitling the advanced adept to worship the mantra of Narasimha for the sake of realization of worldly aims (bhoga). In this connection, since the logical discrepancy between the 16th and 17th chapters of SātS is obvious, it makes us consider the content of the previous one as a kind of purposeful manipulation aiming at reformulation of the original meaning of the kalpa-type19 ceremony devoted to Narasimha for the sake of establishing the unique cleansing ritual introducing even strangers, like nāstikas, into the tradition of Pāṇcarātra.

Strikingly, it was the SātS 17 as a coherent, meaningful unit which has been neglected by the redactor of ĪŚ. That he must have been familiar with its content is suggested by the fact that many verses of SātS 17, most of them verbatim, can be found within the limits of ĪŚ’s corpus. The size of these borrowings, adjusted to different contexts without any reference to the original source, ranges from half a śloka to nearly ten. All of them, however, come from the first section of SātS 17 presenting the activities of an ācārya preparing to perform narasimhādikṣā so that,

17 There are at least two such examples: one is mentioned in the 27th verse of cārīpaḍa section of Mrgendrāgama (eighth century AD) and the other in Somaśambhupaddhati dated from the eleventh century AD. For the latter one, called liṅgoddhāra, see Gengnagel (2010).
18 On the structure of converting ceremonies see Gengnagel (2010, p. 294).
19 In the context of Tantric Śaiva literature, the term kalpa refers to a text devoted to the worship of a single deity for the sake of realizing one’s objectives by magical means, see Goudriaan (1981, p. 115) and Sanderson (2001, pp. 11–13).
| Page | Text Content |
|------|--------------|
| 17.43cd–44ab | daksinottarahastabhyaṃ hrdbijena vicintya ca/suryasomau tataḥ kuryād dravyadāhasamudbhavau // |
| 17.74–76ab | niṣṭapatanakābham ca sampūrṇāṅgam mahāṇutanam / ghoraśārdūlavadanaṃ caṇḍamārtandaḥalocanaṃ/ saudāminicayapakhyaṃ lomabhī pariṇūtīm / arunām bhojapatrabhaṃ vajrādhikakarouham / calatpanīśvarasaṇāṃ candraṇījñatadhyutīm |
| 17.77 | pralayāmbudanirghoṣaṃ udagirantaṃ svavācakaṃ / yugāntahutabhugjñālāṃdandalāntarvyavasthitam // |
| 17.78cd–79ab | divyagandhaṃulīptāṅgama divyāṃbaradharām tathā / divyasragvedaṇopetam divyālaṅkāramanditaṃ/ |
| 17.80 | ratnakaṇācanasanmukṭayaṃ vanamālayaḥ / sabrahmasūtryāḥ caiva śobhitam paramēsvaram // |
| 17.84cd–88ab | evam eva hi hṛṣṇantraṃ dhīyayet kumudapāṇḍaram // padmarāgacalākārāmāraṃsca śīraḥ smaret/ aṃjanāṃjniprakāśaṃ śīkhamantraṃ tathākṛtīm / pritaḥ sūryasantaptāṃ yathā kanakaparvatam / tathā kavacantraṃ ca dhīyānakaḥ vicintya ca / vṛte jñālāsahasraṃ tu ayaskāntasamadyutī/ sarvāśtraśaktisampūrṇaḥ cāstraṇantraḥ prakṛtītaḥ / nirdhūmāṅgāraśikharasarādṛśo netramantrarāt // |
| 3.30cd–31ab | daksinottarahastabhyaṃ hrdbijena vicintya ca / suryasomau tataḥ kuryād dravyadāhasamudbhavau // |
| 20.250cd–252 | niṣṭapatanakābham ca sampūrṇāṅgam mahātanum // ghoraśārdūlavadanaṃ caṇḍamārtandaḥalocanaṃ/ saudāminicayapakhyaṃ lomabhī pariṇūtīm / arunām bhojapatrabhaṃ vajrādhikakarouham / calatpanīśvarasaṇāṃ candraṇījñatadhyutīm // |
| 20.253 | pralayāmbudanirghoṣaṃ udagirantaṃ svavācakaṃ / yugāntahutabhugjñālāṃdandalāntarvyavasthitam // |
| 4.92 = 20.257 | divyagandhānulīptāṅgam divyāṃbaradharām tathā / divyasragvedaṇopetam divyālaṅkāramanditaṃ/ |
| 4.94 = 20.256 | ratnakaṇācanasanmukṭayaṃ vanamālayaḥ / sabrahmasūtryāḥ caiva śobhitam paramēsvaram // |
| 4.103–106 | evam eva hi hṛṣṇantraṃ dhīyayet kumudapāṇḍaram/ padmarāgacalākārāmāraṃsca śīraḥ smaret/ aṃjanāṃjniprakāśaṃ śīkhamantraṃ tathākṛtīm / paritas sūryasantaptāṃ yathā kanakaparvatam / tathā kavacantraṃ ca dhīyānakaḥ vicintya ca / vṛte jñālāsahasraṃ tu ayaskāntasamadyutī/ sarvāśtraśaktisampūrṇaḥ cāstraṇantraḥ prakṛtītaḥ / nirdhūmāṅgāraśikharasarādṛśo netramantrarāt // |
for example, they do not deal with the procedures of the initiation itself or the issue of acquiring the magical powers (*siddhi*). What is more, they are scattered throughout the whole *ĪS* and re-used, again mostly verbatim, sometimes even twice, in its different chapters discussing various topics. Most of the minor modifications that appear in *ĪS* are not very significant or they are simply corruptions, but in some cases, as for example in the parallel passage of *SaṭS* 17.27cd (*atha hastadvaye nyased diptimad dvādaśākṣaram*) and *ĪS* 5.21cd (*hastadvaye ’pi vinyasyed diptam aśtākṣaram param*), the compiler had to adjust the type of *mantra* in use: whereas in

| 17.98–100ab | 24.16cd–18 |
|--------------|------------|
| dhāyātvā tretāgnirūpam tu daksīṇād āṅgulitrayam/ | dhāyātvā tretāgnirūpam tu daksīṇād āṅgulitrayam // |
| spaṣṭam ārdhvaśīkham saiva jyeṣṭhākrāntā kanīyasya // | spaṣṭam ārdhvaṃkham saiva jyeṣṭhākrāntā kanīyasya / |
| atho ’khlavasvarūpaḥ ca dhvāntātīto ’gnirūpadhrk // | athākhlavādhvarūpā cāḥ adhvātīto ’gnirūpadhrk // |
| devo gunatrayātītas tathā mārgatrayātīgah/ | devo guṇatrayātītas tathā mārgatrayātīgah / |
| dharmāh sthūlatarair mukto yo ’yaṃ vyakto dhiyārcitah/ | dharmāh sthūlatarair mukto yo ’yaṃ vyakto dhiyārcitah // |

| 17.100cd–102 | 24.21–23ab |
|--------------|------------|
| sampuṭam hrdayoddēse baddhvā hastadvayena tu/ | sampuṭam hrdayoddēse baddhvā hastadvayena tu/ |
| nirantarābhīyāṃ śākhābhīyāṃ mudraisā ārdīdgī smṛtā/ | nirantarābhīyāṃ śākhābhīyāṃ mudraisā ārdīdgīḥ smṛtā // |
| āṅgusṭhādikaniśṭhāntam śākhāyugmam prthak prthak // | āṅgusṭhādī kaniśṭhāntam śākhāyugmam prthak prthak / |
| sāntaraṃ sampuṭād astmāt kaniśṭhādau tathā bhavet/ | sāntaraṃsampuṭādastmāt kaniśṭhādau tathā bhavet / |
| śīrāsśīkhātānustrāstranetramudrā yathākramam// | śīrāsśīkhātānustrāstranetramudrā yathākramam |

| 17.104 | 24.63 |
|---------|-------|
| svamantrayuktā cāṇyesām arcitānām yathākramam/ | svamantrayuktā cāṇyesām arcitānām yathākramam |
| punah punah prayoktavyā hārdeyam śirasa saha// | punah punah prayoktavyā hārdradhiś śirasa saha // |

| 17.107 | 5.40 |
|---------|-------|
| yathāśākta japām kuryāc chatam aṣṭādhikam tu vai/ | yathasākta japām kuryāc chatam aṣṭādhikam tu vai |
| ekaikam hrdayādināṃ sarvesāṃ vihitāṃ tv atha/ | ekaikam hrdayādināṃ sarvesāṃ vihitāṃ tv atha / |

| 17.110cd | 5.41ab |
|----------|-------|
| kriyāṅgatvāna doṣo ’sti anyathā tajjapāṃ vinā// | kriyāṅgatvāna doṣo ’sti anyathā tajjapāṃ vinā / |

| 17.111cd–112 ab | 5.86cd–87ab |
|-----------------|-------------|
| vyāsto gunanāṅgaḥ śaṣṭhas tejo nāma guṇo hi yah/ | vyāsto gunanāṅgaḥ śaṣṭhas tejo nāma guṇo hi yah / |
| parasya brahmaṇaḥ so ’yaṃ sāmānyam sarvatejasām/ | parasya brahmaṇaḥ so ’yaṃ sāmānyam sarvatejasām / |

The text is reproduced from the editions given in References
SātŚ’s context it is the twelve-syllabled mantra of Narasimha, in the context of ĪŚ it has been changed into the eight-syllabled mantra of Bhagavân.

This particular case of re-using the 17th chapter of SātŚ by the compiler of ĪŚ shows, on the one hand, to what almost unimaginable extent the notion of intertextuality was common for Pāñcarātrīka authors, and, on the other, makes it tempting to consider the omission of SātŚ 17 as a meaningful section intentional for some reasons.

Are there any reasons for such lack of treatment of the procedure related to the Narasimha-mantra within ĪŚ?

In chart no. 3 we could see that in the case of SātŚ 16 the compiler of the ĪŚ restricts himself to quoting, word for word, only up to SātŚ 16.29ab. Significantly, that particular verse conferring three regular initiations called vibhava, vyūha and sūkṣma (SātŚ 16.29ab: vibhavyayuḥśākṣmāḥ dīkṣāḥ kuryād anantaram; ĪŚ 21.28cd: vibhavyuḥśākṣmāḥ dīkṣāḥ kuryāt tattvāt) immediately after performing narasimhādikṣā which removes past sins (SātŚ 16.26ab = ĪŚ 21.25cd: kalmaṣasya vighātārtham nārasimhin mahāmāte). Then, the exposition of ĪŚ smoothly continues with the portion taken from SātŚ 18 dealing with preliminary ceremonies of regular dīkṣā. In such circumstances it seems that the idea of the redactor of ĪŚ 21 was most likely to present the initiation with the help of Narasimha-mantra simply in terms of purification to be taken before the proper initiation, quite similarly as it is implied by SātŚ 16.

Yet, within the passages borrowed from SātŚ 16 (SātŚ 16.4–29ab = ĪŚ 21.3cd–28), a reference is made there to nāstikas etc., who by the means of the cleansing power of narasimhādikṣā may join the regular initiation of the vibhava, vyūha or para type. Afterwards, there are passages taken over from SātŚ 18 considering preliminaries to the dīkṣā proper (adhivāsa) and the beginning of SātŚ 19 regarding the dīkṣā itself but supplemented in its initial part with an account of the pañcasaṃskāra rite unknown to SātŚ (ĪŚ 21.283cd–325). According to Raman (Raman 2005, pp. 91–114), it was the pañcasaṃskāra rite which in certain Śrīvaisṇava contexts “enabled a person to cross over from Śaivism to Vaishnavism”. In such circumstances, it might not be coincidental that at the beginning of the description of the regular initiation, borrowed in fact mostly from SātŚ instead of narasimhādikṣā, the compiler of ĪŚ provided an account of the pañcasaṃskāra rite. If we accept the interpretation of Raman, then both narasimhādikṣā and pañcasaṃskāra rites occur to have the similar function, i.e. the function of introducing strangers into the tradition.

However, it might also have happened that due to the general tendency, the compiler of ĪŚ being aware of the actual content of SātŚ 17,20 aimed at invalidating of

---

20 It seems that at least the compiler of AhŚ was familiar with the actual function of narasimhākalpa, i.e. the function of providing a sādhaka with magical powers arising out of mastering the mantra of Narasimha. He does not quote from SātŚ but refers to it. The meaningful passage appears in the context of a teaching regarding magical amulets (yantra) meant for kings and the like to secure the kingship. AhŚ 27.31–33ab: sātvatādiśu tantraśa vihitenaiva cādhvānā / sūdāraṣaṇasa mantraśa nārasimhāsya vā mune //27.31// kalpa-prayuktā vidhayaḥ sarve caitasya sāṃdhihau / bhavantī sakalāḥ caitra-prabhadhāveṇa pravojitāḥ //27.32// tasmād yathoktā-saraṃsya pratiṣṭhāpitaḥ arcaya / “O sage! The prescriptions related to the worship (kalpa) of the mantra of Sūdāraṇā or Narasimha [should be performed] with the method [given] in Sātvata and other tantras. In its [yantra’s?] presence all of them become complete [if] performed with its power. Therefore, he should worship it having placed it according to the aforesaid way”. On the viibhavidyanarasiṃhākalpa in SātŚ see Dębicka-Borek (2013).
the role of a sādhaka described therein. Such purposeful removal of the passages on sādhaka’s practice would not be surprising if we take into account, on the one hand, the observations of Brunner regarding the general devaluation of sādhakas within Indian society (Brunner 1975), and on the other, the visible incoherence of the function of vaibhavīyanarasimhakalpa as presented in SātS 16 and SātS 17 respectively, which might have appeared problematic also to the compiler of ĪŚ when he decided to re-use SātS’s passages on initiation. By neglecting the content of SātS 17, which discusses the particular methods of worshipping the mantra of Narasimha applied by a sādhaka striving for particular siddhis, the compiler of ĪŚ 21 aptly omitted the logical ambiguity between the two chapters and therefore emphasized even more clearly the view presented by SātS 16. By doing so, he successfully led to the actual exclusion of the awkward results of narasimḥīdīkṣā in the form of creating a sādhaka aiming at the realization of bhoga with the help of magical powers. Yet, we cannot exclude the possibility that the omission of vaibhavīyanarasimhakalpa happened simply because such a procedure was well-known and, therefore, presenting it was redundant.
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