

Article

‘Tataḥ Śrī-Gurus-Tasmai Sūrīmantram Dadyāt’, ‘Then the Venerable Guru Ought to Give Him the Sūrīmantra’: Early Modern Digambara Jaina Bhaṭṭāraka Consecrations

Tillo Detige

Independent Researcher, 9000 Ghent, Belgium; tillodetige@gmail.com

Received: 14 April 2019; Accepted: 17 May 2019; Published: 4 June 2019



Abstract: As recent research on the former *bhaṭṭāraka* lineages of Western and Central India has shown, the early modern Digambara tradition, rather than constituting a distinct, and defective, ‘*bhaṭṭāraka* era’, shows much similarity to contemporary Digambara Jainism. *Bhaṭṭārakas* were regarded and venerated as ideal renunciators. Many of their practices accorded to those of today’s Digambara *munis*, and the *bhaṭṭāraka saṅghas* also featured renunciators of the *muni* and *ācārya* ranks, long thought to have abruptly become obsolete in the late medieval period. This new understanding of early modern Digambara Jainism is corroborated by the present article, which deals with early modern *bhaṭṭāraka* consecration rituals (*paṭṭābhīṣeka*, *dīkṣā*). The study is mainly based on two genres of sources. Sanskrit *bhaṭṭāraka* consecration manuals (*dīkṣā-vidhi*, *pada-sthāpanā-vidhi*), firstly, outline the preparations, the ritual proceedings, and the festivities to be held. Some vernacular songs of praise (*gīta*, etc.) of individual *bhaṭṭārakas*, secondly, focus specifically on their consecrations. These song compositions confirm many of the manuals’ prescriptions, while also adding elements not attested in the latter. Read in conjunction, both sources allow a relatively detailed understanding of early modern *bhaṭṭāraka* consecrations, show they closely resembled contemporary Digambara initiations, and confirm the former venerability of early modern *bhaṭṭārakas* in their own times.

Keywords: Jainism; Digambara; *bhaṭṭārakas*; early modern Indian religious traditions; asceticism; mendicant initiation; consecration rituals; Sanskrit ritual manuals; vernacular songs of praise

1. Introduction

In Western and Central India, seats and lineages of male Digambara Jaina renunciators called *bhaṭṭārakas* were the stronghold of Digambara asceticism from the end of the late medieval period (1000–1350 CE) onwards and throughout the early modern period (1350–1800 CE).¹ It is often thought that the Western and Central Indian *bhaṭṭāraka* traditions declined and disappeared right after the 17th and 18th century CE rise and formalization of the Terāpantha, a reform movement which, next to its ritual reforms, also opposed the *bhaṭṭārakas*. However, a majority of *bhaṭṭāraka* lineages were continued up to the 19th and 20th century CE. While all *bhaṭṭāraka* lineages of Western and Central India have now been discontinued, in South India *bhaṭṭāraka* traditions continue to flourish, and new seats have been established in recent decades. For long, scholarship on Sultanate and Mughal era Digambara Jainism seems to have been strained under the influence of a limited understanding

¹ The standard work on the *bhaṭṭārakas* of Western and Central India remains Joharāpurakara (1958). See also (Deo 1956, pp. 545–48; Kāsalivāla 1967, 1979, 1981, 1982; Jain 1975, pp. 83–132; Sangave [1959] 1980, pp. 269–70, 317–22; 2001, pp. 133–43; Cort 2002c, pp. 40–42; Flügel 2006, pp. 344–47; Jaina 2010; De Clercq 2011).

of these contemporary, South Indian *bhaṭṭārakas*, who are clothed, sedentary, and oversee large monastic properties. Early modern *bhaṭṭārakas* have long been conceptualized as a type of ‘cleric’ or ‘administrator’, or as holding a position in between laypeople and renouncers. As such, *bhaṭṭārakas* present and past are unfavorably contrasted to the naked, itinerant Digambara *muni*, a figure who has reappeared in increasing numbers during the 20th century CE, a development often referred to as the ‘*muni* revival’. Negative assessments of early modern *bhaṭṭārakas*, and of early modern Digambara Jainism more broadly, were also informed by, and have in turn reinforced, contemporary perceptions of the period of ‘Muslim rule’ as an era of oppression and decline of indigenous traditions. These assumptions in turn derive from colonial depictions that served to contrast enlightened, colonial rule to preceding dark and despotic middle ages. Widely disseminated in popular Jaina and Hindu thinking, such understandings of the extended early modern period also spill over into scholarly analyses. In the case of the Digambara tradition, it takes the form of a tripartite historiography: the ancient and early medieval tradition; Sultanate and Mughal era Digambara Jainism as a distinct ‘*bhaṭṭāraka* era’; and contemporary Digambara Jainism since the *muni* revival.²

Recent research gainsays such periodization by bringing to light deep continuities running right across the ‘*bhaṭṭāraka* era’. In their own times, the Western and Central India *bhaṭṭārakas* were considered venerable, ideal renouncers by the castes connected to them (Detige 2019; forthcoming). Deceased, early modern *bhaṭṭārakas* were probably very commonly venerated with rituals like *pūjā* and *ārati* (Detige 2014, 2015, pp. 162–67), and the present study adduces evidence that ritual veneration was also practiced of living *bhaṭṭārakas*, as it is of today’s *munis* (Detige, in preparation b). At least some early modern *bhaṭṭārakas* seem to have followed practices associated with ideal Digambara *munis*, like itinerancy (*vihāra*), rain-retreats (*caturmāsa*), and, at least occasionally, nudity (Detige forthcoming). Far from an intermediary between renouncers and laypeople, the early modern *bhaṭṭārakas* stood at the very apex of the ascetic hierarchy, above the *munis* and *ācāryas*. And contrary to what is commonly thought, the latter ranks were still in usage well into the early modern period (Detige 2018, Detige, in preparation a). Studies of funerary monuments (Detige, in preparation a) and manuscript colophons (Detige 2018, esp. pp. 354–56) show that records of *munis* disappear after the early 17th century CE, while *ācāryas* continued to flourish up to the end of the 18th century CE. By then, the rank of the *ācārya*, and that of the *bhaṭṭāraka*, were possibly applied to figures we would now recognize rather as *paṇḍītas* or *brahmacārīs* (ibid.). Yet, well into the Mughal period *bhaṭṭārakas* as well as *ācāryas* were perceived, depicted, and venerated as ideal renouncers and as distinguished *munis*.

In sum, striking similarities exist between the late medieval and early modern *bhaṭṭāraka* traditions and today’s *muni saṅghas*. The case of *bhaṭṭāraka* consecration rituals (*paṭṭābhiṣeka*, *pada-sthāpanā*, *dīkṣā*)³ constitutes another aspect that clearly shows the former status of early modern, Western Indian *bhaṭṭārakas* as ideal renouncers and revered spiritual leaders, rather than mere clerics, and of the continuity of renunciant praxis, conduct, and ritual from the ‘*bhaṭṭāraka* era’ to contemporary Digambara Jainism. In order to make this case, the present article presents a study and translation of available texts related to early modern *bhaṭṭāraka* consecrations. Śāstrī (1992, p. 84) already proffered that the procedure of contemporary *muni dīkṣā* was based on *muni* initiations in the former *bhaṭṭāraka* lineages, and Gough (forthcoming) showed the similarity between the consecration rites used in the contemporary Digambara *muni saṅghas* and medieval and early modern Digambara renunciant initiation. Next to the ritual veneration of early modern *bhaṭṭārakas*, the case of initiation praxis might indeed constitute one of the best documented examples of the Digambara tradition’s continuity from the early modern to the contemporary era. Although beyond the scope of the present study, the importance of mantra within early modern Digambara consecration practice and other features of

² This section draws from (Detige forthcoming).

³ Technically, *dīkṣā* refers to renunciant initiation, *paṭṭābhiṣeka* means the consecration or anointment to a seat (*paṭṭa*), and *pada-sthāpanā* means the ‘establishment’ or conferment of a rank. As is the case more often, the sources employed for the present article use these terms more freely and interchangeably, and I follow them in this.

the rituals employed are also proof of the by then completed, and still preserved, ‘mantricization’ (Dundas 1998) or ‘tantrization’ (Gough 2017) of Jainism.

2. Sources

Notably two genres of texts are available attesting early modern *bhaṭṭāraka* consecration practice, both little-known, little-used in scholarship, or newly discovered. Undated Sanskrit manuals for *bhaṭṭāraka* consecrations (*Bhaṭṭāraka-pada-sthāpanā-vidhi*, *Bhaṭṭāraka-dīkṣā-vidhi*), firstly, offer prescriptions for the organization of consecration rites and festivals. A shorter and a longer recension are found, the former preserved in a single manuscript, the latter known in three versions (Section 2.1). *Bhaṭṭāraka gītas*, secondly, are vernacular songs of praise of individual early modern *bhaṭṭārakas*. Some of these compositions include references to their consecrations to the *bhaṭṭāraka* seat, and some even revolve around these events specifically (Section 2.2). In a combined reading, these two textual genres allow a relatively detailed understanding of early modern *bhaṭṭāraka* consecration practices. I first introduce both sources separately, and then proceed to draw from both to paint as complete a picture as possible of the consecration rituals, discussing its various, successive elements (Sections 3 and 4).

2.1. Consecration Manuals

I found copies of two different manuals for the consecration of a *bhaṭṭāraka* in the manuscript collections (*bhaṇḍāra*) of two former seats of the Mūlasaṅgha Balātkāraṅga *bhaṭṭāraka* tradition in Central India.⁴ The first manuscripts were discovered by chance while randomly browsing through manuscript bundles in the collection of the Sonagiriśākhā⁵ *bhaṭṭārakas* at the Bhaṭṭāraka Koṭhī in Sonagiri, Madhya Pradesh, which at the time of my visit in December 2013 was in a state of disarray. A manuscript with a shorter consecration outline (uncatalogued) has proven to be the thus far single existent version of this text, while other versions of a longer manual (no cat. no., cloth no. 806, ‘*Mantra saṅgraha*’) were also found subsequently. A second copy, featuring important and unique additions (see next), was discovered in the Chandranātha Digambara Mandira in Kārañjā, Maharashtra, the home of the Mūlasaṅgha Balātkāraṅga Kārañjāsākhā (cat. no. 517, cloth no. 99, ‘*Bhaṭṭārakapada sthāpanā vidhi*’) in January 2015. By this time I had also come across a third version of this longer text edited (pp. 116–17) and translated into Hindi (pp. 117–18) by Jaina (2009).⁶ His text stems from an edition by Āryikā Śītalmati, itself based, according to Jaina (2009, pp. 115–16), on a manuscript retrieved from a manuscript collection in Beḍiyā, Gujarat by Ācārya Sanmatisāgara.⁷ Premī (1913, p. 59) had obtained a manuscript of a *bhaṭṭāraka* consecration manual from Īḍara. Although Premī writes (ibid.) he only had a part of the text, from the contents he reports the copy seems to have been complete and clearly resembles the longer text, thus forming a fourth known copy of the latter. Although to date no further versions of either manual have been found in any of the other *bhaṭṭāraka* manuscript collections consulted in the course of my research, they can be anticipated to exist.

I follow the manuscripts in referring to the longer manual as the *Bhaṭṭāraka-pada-sthāpanā-vidhi* (‘Method for establishing the *bhaṭṭāraka* rank’, BPSV), occasionally using as a shorthand *Pada-sthāpanā-vidhi*, and to the shorter text as the *Bhaṭṭāraka-dīkṣā-vidhi* (‘Method for the initiation of a *bhaṭṭāraka*’, BDV), or *Dīkṣā-vidhi*. I also refer to the *Bhaṭṭāraka-pada-sthāpanā-vidhi* of the Sonagiri

⁴ On these and other *bhaṭṭāraka* manuscript collections from Western and Central India, see (Detige 2017).

⁵ Although nowadays commonly used in scholarship, the *sākhā* (branch) denominations of the various Mūlasaṅgha Balātkāraṅga lineages (Sonagiriśākhā, Kārañjāsākhā, Īḍarasākhā, etc.) derive from Joharāpurakara’s (1958) seminal *Bhaṭṭāraka Sampradāya*. They were however not used by the lineages themselves (see Detige forthcoming).

⁶ Jaina discusses and refutes the canonical authenticity (‘*āgamokta*’) of the *bhaṭṭāraka* consecration manual in a broader argument against the legitimacy of the rank of the clothed *bhaṭṭāraka* in general (see again Section 3.8). Questions about the legitimacy of *bhaṭṭārakas* are irrelevant to my concerns: the early modern *bhaṭṭārakas*’ venerability from the perspective of Digambara Jains contemporary to them.

⁷ I have not been able to consult the Āryikā Śītalmati book. Jaina (2009, pp. 115–16) gives only the following, further bibliographical information for the source of his *Bhaṭṭāraka-pada-sthāpanā* text: *Vividha Dīkṣā-saṁskāra Vidhi*, 2002, pp. 69–77.

manuscript as version S, that from Kārañjā as version K, and Jaina's text recovered from Beḍiyā as version B (v. S, v. K, v. B).

Barring minor differences, Jaina's *Bhaṭṭāraka-pada-sthāpanā-vidhi* is largely identical to that from Sonagiri. The Kārañjā manuscript stands out from these two, differing more substantially at some points. Judging from scribal errors⁸ as well as multiple additional phrasings which it alone carries,⁹ the text from Kārañjā seems to represent a later version based on, but diverging from, a text resembling the more closely related Sonagiri and Beḍiyā versions.

The shorter *Bhaṭṭāraka-dīkṣā-vidhi* largely overlaps with the latter part of the *Bhaṭṭāraka-pada-sthāpanā-vidhi*. The *Bhaṭṭāraka-pada-sthāpanā-vidhi* mostly adds prescriptions for preparations and preliminary rituals (Sections 3.1–3.3). The *Dīkṣā-vidhi* largely limits itself to outlining the actual consecration rituals, following the *Pada-sthāpanā-vidhi* also into its descriptions of the concluding celebrations, and differs from the parallel sections of the latter text only in its initial phrases (Section 3.4).

Importantly, in the manuscripts the *Bhaṭṭāraka-pada-sthāpanā-vidhis* occur within a set of outlines of initiation rites for various Digambara mendicant ranks. Also featured in the Sonagiri and Kārañjā manuscripts are a *Laghu-dīkṣā-vidhi*, an outline of the method for a *kṣullaka* ('junior monk') initiation;¹⁰ a manual for 'Mahāvratā-dīkṣā' or 'Bṛhad-dīkṣā', in effect the method for a *muni* initiation;¹¹ and *upādhyāya* and *ācārya* consecration manuals.¹² Jaina (2009, p. 121) also gives the text of the *Ācārya-* and *Upādhyāya-pada-sthāpanā-vidhis*, again from the Āryikā Śītalāmati booklet (referring to pp. 72–73 and p. 72 respectively), and it seems likely the Beḍiyā manuscript also contained the full set of initiation manuals. My discussion below refers to these methods for initiations into the other Digambara ascetic ranks whenever most pertinent, but I postpone a fuller analysis of these texts for another occasion. Obviously, a closer study of these texts and a consideration of their implications will be of much importance for our knowledge of the constitution of early modern *bhaṭṭāraka saṅghas*. For one thing, the order in which the various initiation rites are given, that for the *bhaṭṭāraka* following that for the *upādhyāya* and *ācārya*, confirms that the *bhaṭṭāraka* rank was at that time paramount.

In prescribing the recitation of a *Gurvāvalī* or lineage list as one of the concluding parts of the consecration (see below, Section 3.7), both the longer and the shorter manual refer to the Mūlasaṅgha Nandyāmnāya Sarasvatīgacha Balātkāragaṇa Kundākundācāryānvaya. Next to everything we know about early modern *bhaṭṭāraka* consecration hence applies to this tradition (in short, the Mūlasaṅgha Balātkāragaṇa), as a single song composition is our only source offering some indications of Kāṣṭhāsaṅgha Nanditātagaccha *bhaṭṭāraka* consecrations (Section 2.2). However, other close parallels between Kāṣṭhāsaṅgha and Mūlasaṅgha practices indicate that other traditions probably held similar consecration practices as the Mūlasaṅgha Balātkāragaṇa, excepting probably specific details or procedural differences. One source certainly confirms that Kāṣṭhāsaṅgha *bhaṭṭāraka*-rank renunciators were similarly distinguished from lower ranking Kāṣṭhāsaṅgha renunciators by possessing the *Sūrimantra*,

⁸ See footnotes 41, 45. See also footnotes 35, 36, and footnotes in the text editions for other differences between the different versions of the longer manual.

⁹ The most important addition consists of the mantras spelled out in the section of the *Sūrimantra*, not given in the other versions (Section 3.5). Also of interest is an additional specification of a worthy candidate-initiand (Section 3.1). And, of less consequence, there is a reference to the storage of the *Sūrimantra* manuscript in a treasure box (Section 3.5). See discussions below (Section 3), and footnotes to the text editions and translations in the appendices for other, minor additions and differences.

¹⁰ In the composition on Bhaṭṭāraka Śubhacandra's consecration in s. 1721 (1663 CE), however, his earlier 'laghu dīkṣā' made him a *brahmacārī*, not a *kṣullaka* (Kāsalivāla 1981, p. 227).

¹¹ The manuscripts refer to the text variously as *Bṛhad-dīkṣā-vidhi* and *Mahāvratā-dīkṣā-vidhi*, but towards the end the text refers to the newly initiated renouncer as a *muni*. The Kārañjā version also explicitly refers to the administration to the initiand of the Digambara *muni*'s five *mahāvratas* (see below, Sections 3.1 and 4.3), *samitis*, and 28 *mūlaguṇas*, the Sonagiri text referring only to unspecified vows (*vratas*).

¹² The manuals for the initiations into these other ranks found preceding the *Bhaṭṭāraka-pada-sthāpanā-vidhi* in the manuscripts are still reproduced (e.g., Padmanandi et al. 1982, pp. 231–41), and are still used during *dīkṣās* (Gough forthcoming).

and we can presume the mantra was also imparted to them during their consecrations, as it was to Balātkāragaṇa *bhaṭṭārakas* (see below, Section 3.5).

All manuscripts of the consecration manuals are undated. Jaina (2009, p. 122, see also Gough forthcoming) remarked that the manual's reference to the *Gurvāvalī* of the Balātkāragaṇa indicates that the texts were composed no sooner than the 12th century CE, when the epithet Nandyāmnāya is first attested. It is, however, also possible of course that the inclusion of this appellation is merely a feature of the preserved copy, added to an earlier version of the text. Based on material features, I estimate that all manuscripts to which I had access (the *Bhaṭṭāraka-pada-sthāpanā-vidhis*, from Kārañjā and Sonagiri, and the Sonagiri *Bhaṭṭāraka-dīkṣā-vidhi*) date from later than the 15th century CE and earlier than the 19th century CE (perhaps 17th or 18th century CE). Given the proliferation of Balātkāragaṇa branches in the 15th and 16th centuries, this might have been the time of formalization and recording of consecration practices, and the procedures prescribed by our sources perhaps best represent practices of the 16th to 17th and 18th centuries CE.

In appendices to this article I present an edition and English translation of both manuscripts from Sonagiri: the *Bhaṭṭāraka-pada-sthāpanā-vidhi* (Appendix A) and the shorter *Bhaṭṭāraka-dīkṣā-vidhi* (Appendix C). I also offer an edition and translation of those sections of the Kārañjā *Bhaṭṭāraka-pada-sthāpanā-vidhi* manuscript which differ most significantly from the other versions (Appendix B). In my discussion of the texts below, I refer to Jaina (2009, pp. 116–17) for the Beḍiyā version of the longer recension. Significant differences between the various versions of the *Bhaṭṭāraka-pada-sthāpanā-vidhi* are discussed in my analysis in the next section (Section 3), while minor variations are footnoted in my edition of the Sonagiri text in Appendix A. Notable differences between the *Pada-sthāpanā-vidhi* and the parallel *Dīkṣā-vidhi* sections are also analyzed below. Differences in orthography, grammatical variants, exchange of words for synonyms, etc., are not systematically noted. Probable scribal errors are not necessarily amended, but those of some consequence are discussed in footnotes to the text editions.¹³

2.2. *Bhaṭṭāraka* Song Compositions

Bhaṭṭāraka songs of praise are devotional and jubilant compositions singing the praises of individual *bhaṭṭārakas*' virtues (*guṇa-gāna*), describing their subjects as ideal Digambara renouncers observing all the normative ascetic rules of conduct.¹⁴ As such, they can be read as expressions of the venerability ascribed to the early modern *bhaṭṭārakas* by their contemporaries. Many of these song compositions also include biographical data like the renouncers' caste, place of birth, and parents' names, their beauty, learnedness, and dexterity, and their earlier lives both as laymen and as renouncers. References are found to their peregrinations (*vihāra*), the image consecrations (*pratiṣṭhā*) and pilgrimages they conducted, and the honors they received from rulers. Various titles *gīta*, *jakhadī*, *hamacī*, *lāvaṇī*, etc., such songs are found from the 15th to the 18th century CE. We know of several dozens of *bhaṭṭāraka gītas*, many edited, cited, or referred to in the work of Kastūracanda Kāsalīvāla and other Jain scholars, others newly retrieved from manuscript copies (Detige 2019, pp. 276–77).

Compositions are preserved relating to *bhaṭṭārakas* of various lineages of Western and Central India, though the majority relate to incumbents of the Mūlasaṅgha Balātkāragaṇa. The greater availability of sources deriving from the latter tradition is a mere reflection of its regional predominance. Yet, examples of *bhaṭṭāraka* song compositions are also found on incumbents of Mūlasaṅgha Senagaṇa and Kāṣṭhāsaṅgha Nandītaṭagaccha seats, and, again going from other close parallels between the practices of different *bhaṭṭāraka* traditions, we can surmise that their composition was a shared practice across traditions. *Chāpas* or colophons, whenever available, reveal that these songs were composed by

¹³ Wherever encountered, I do reverse the idiosyncratic, early modern manuscripts' swapping of 'va' and 'ba'.

¹⁴ In introducing the *bhaṭṭāraka gītas* here, I draw from an earlier discussion in (Detige 2019, esp. pp. 274–79).

pupils of *bhaṭṭārakas*, either lay *paṇḍitas* or celibate *brahmacārīs*, or by *bhaṭṭārakas* themselves, in praise of their predecessors.

The quantity of preserved texts shows that *bhaṭṭāraka* praise hymns were commonly composed and constituted a distinct genre of devotional literature. We also find evidence that they were performed. They served as benedictory verses (*maṅgalācarāṇa*) in welcoming visiting *bhaṭṭārakas* and were used during the performance of *āratī* (lamp offering ritual) of the *bhaṭṭārakas* (Detige 2019, pp. 278–79). We also have indications that such songs were used during *bhaṭṭāraka* consecrations. Thus, after the consecration of the Mūlasaṅgha Balātkāragaṇa Īḍarasākhā Bhaṭṭāraka Guṇakīrti in Dūṅgarapura in s. 1632 (1574–1575 CE), attractive women (*kāmanī*) reportedly sang *maṅgalagītas* (auspicious songs) about the newly minted *bhaṭṭāraka*, and dancers and musicians with various instruments also presented songs in his praise (Kāsalīvāla 1969, p. 454). The *bhaṭṭāraka* consecrations, and the festivities held in the margins thereof, might well have formed the inspiration for the composition of many of the *bhaṭṭāraka gītas*, notably of those songs which focused on the consecrations themselves.

A relatively substantial number of preserved *bhaṭṭāraka gītas* record their subjects' consecrations. Fifteen *bhaṭṭāraka gītas* at least refer to a *bhaṭṭāraka's* consecration, relating to in sum twelve individual *bhaṭṭāraka* consecrations, chronologically listed in Table 1.¹⁵ These compositions typically record the place and year of the consecration, sometimes also the precise date. Eight of these relate to 16th century CE *bhaṭṭāraka* consecrations, four 17th century CE, and three 18th century CE. Not surprising given the general predominance of *gītas* from the Mūlasaṅgha Balātkāragaṇa, *bhaṭṭāraka* song compositions attesting their subjects' consecrations are also predominantly found on incumbents from this tradition. Seven record the consecrations of four consecutive incumbents of the Sūrataśākhā sub-branch which I refer to as the Bāraḍolīśākhā (see Detige 2019, p. 276, fn. 27), three compositions deal with the consecrations of as many individual *bhaṭṭārakas* of Joharāpurakara's (1958) Dillī–Jayapuraśākhā, which I refer to as the Dḥūṅdhāḍaśākhā (see Detige 2018, p. 283), and one composition each relates to the Nāgauraśākhā, Īḍarasākhā, Jerahaṭaśākhā, and Kārañjāśākhā. One composition mentions the consecration of a Kāṣṭhāsaṅgha Nandītaṭagaccha *bhaṭṭāraka* (see further below in this section).

While in the present article the *gītas'* records of the rituals that took place as part of the *bhaṭṭāraka* consecrations are of central concern, and are called upon in subsequent sections, the texts are of further interest too. A few name *ācāryas*, *munis*, *brahmacārīs*, *āryikās*, and *brahmacāriṇīs* present at the consecration events. These references constitute one of the sources allowing us to establish the occurrence of renunciators of *muni* and *ācārya* ranks in the early modern period (Detige 2019), and they provide a sample of the composition of the *bhaṭṭāraka saṅghas* more broadly (see also Detige 2018). Names of attending *paṇḍitas* and lay donors are also recorded, both sometimes recorded as playing a role in the ritual proceedings (Section 4.1). While compositions with long lists of names of attendees and participants may have been commemorative, literary texts (as proffered in Detige 2019, p. 280), they might also have functioned as vehicles for praise of the present renunciators and lay sponsors, and as such they might also have been actually performed during consecration festivities.

¹⁵ To the fourteen attested compositions already listed in (Detige 2019, pp. 279–80), one can be added referring to the consecration of the Jerahaṭaśākhā Bhaṭṭāraka Narendrakīrti in Siroṅja in s. 1740 (1682–1683 CE), retrieved by Śāstrī (1992, pp. 88–89) from a *gūṭaka* found in Siroṅja (no further specifications). Śāstrī (1992, pp. 88–89) edits parts of the text and discusses others. As found in other *gītas* (Detige 2019, pp. 280–82), a series of *paṇḍitas* and renunciators listed in the composition probably refers to attendees at the consecration: Muni Udayasāgara and two unranked male renunciators, Śubhakīrti and Jayakīrti, judging from their names and the fact that they are mentioned before Udayasāgara probably at least *munis*; three female renunciators, among which one *āryikā* and one *bāī* (probably *brahmacāriṇī*), a third one remaining unranked in at least Śāstrī's account; and one *brahmacārī* (Śāstrī 1992, p. 89).

Table 1. Chronological list of *bhaṭṭāraka* consecrations attested in song compositions.

<i>Bhaṭṭāraka</i> Name	Lineage	Date of Consecration	Place of Consecration	Source
Prabhācandra	Ḍhūṇḍhāḍaśākhā	s. 1572 (1514–1515 CE)	Campāvati (=Chaksu)	manuscript, Āmera śāstrabhaṇḍāra, Jaipur, <i>guṭakā</i> no. 5, cloth no. 203, pp. 230B–31B
Viśvasena	Kāṣṭhāsaṅgha Nandītaṭagaccha	16th Century CE ¹⁶	Ḍūṅgarapura	(<i>Joharāpurakara</i> 1958, p. 270, <i>lekha</i> 672)
Ratnakīrti	Bāraḍolīśākhā	s. 1630 (1572–1573 CE)	Jālaṇapura (probably Jālanā, Maharashtra)	(<i>Kāsalīvāla</i> 1981, p. 104)
Guṇakīrti	Īḍarasākhā	s. 1632 (1574–1575 CE)	Ḍūṅgarapura	(<i>Kāsalīvāla</i> 1969; 1981, pp. 234–35)
Sahasrakīrti	Nāgaurasākhā	s. 1634 (1576–1577 CE)	?	manuscript, Barā Ḍarāji Mandira, <i>guṭakā</i> , cat. no. 148, pp. 52B–55B)
Kumudacandra	Bāraḍolīśākhā	s. 1656 (1598–1599 CE)	Bāraḍolī	three compositions: (<i>Kāsalīvāla</i> 1981, pp. 101–2, 233–34, 204–5)
Abhayacandra	Bāraḍolīśākhā	s. 1685 (1627–1628 CE)	Bāraḍolī	two compositions: (<i>Kāsalīvāla</i> 1981, pp. 105–6, 116–17)
Śubhacandra	Bāraḍolīśākhā	s. 1721 (1663–1664 CE)	Poravandara (Porbandar) ¹⁷	(<i>Kāsalīvāla</i> 1981, pp. 226–28)
Narendrakīrti	Jerahaṭasākhā	s. 1740 (1682–1683 CE)	Siroṅja	(<i>Śāstrī</i> 1992, pp. 88–89)
Devendrakīrti	Ḍhūṇḍhāḍaśākhā	s. 1770 (1712–1713 CE)	Āmera	(<i>Nyāyatīrtha</i> 1985b)
Mahendrakīrti	Ḍhūṇḍhāḍaśākhā	s. 1792 (1734–1735 CE)	Delhi	(<i>Nyāyatīrtha</i> 1985a)
Devendrakīrti	Kāraṅjāsākhā	second half of the 18th Century CE ¹⁸	?	(<i>Joharāpurakara</i> 1958, pp. 69–70, <i>lekha</i> 190)

Some *gītas* merely mention their subject's consecration, or describe it very summarily in their broader narratives of the *bhaṭṭāraka*'s life and career, or amongst their verses of praise. Others, however, revolve specifically around the consecration and were clearly composed to eulogize, or commemorate, the consecrations themselves. I refer to these as *paṭṭa-sthāpanā-gītas* ('songs on the consecration to the seat'). Among these are the three compositions from the Ḍhūṇḍhāḍaśākhā and that from the Nāgaurasākhā, and it is notably the two Ḍhūṇḍhāḍaśākhā compositions brought to light, edited, and discussed by Nyāyatīrtha (1985a, 1985b) that will add to our knowledge of early modern *bhaṭṭāraka* consecrations as gleaned from our reading of the ritual manuals (Section 4).¹⁹ The composition on the consecration of the Jerahaṭasākhā Bhaṭṭāraka Narendrakīrti, as reported by Śāstrī (1992, pp. 88–89), also revolves around the *bhaṭṭāraka*'s consecration, and also features some unique contents (Section 4.4).

With the exception of the latest, that on Bhaṭṭāraka Śubhacandra, the compositions on Bāraḍolīśākhā *bhaṭṭārakas* edited and discussed by Kāsalīvāla (1981) mention only a few of the rituals performed at the consecrations. Yet they are relatively consistent in recording the names of lay patrons (Section 4.1) and the recitation of the *Sūrimantra* (Section 3.5), some also mentioning a practice of anointment (Section 4.2). The compositions on the Īḍarasākhā Bhaṭṭāraka Guṇakīrti (Kāsalīvāla 1969, pp. 453–54; 1981, pp. 234–35) and the later Kāraṅjāsākhā Bhaṭṭāraka Devendrakīrti (Joharāpurakara 1958, pp. 69–70, *lekha* 190) deal with their subjects' entire lives. Yet, as already mentioned, the former, judging from Kāsalīvāla (1969, p. 454)'s account of it, seems to offer a lively picture of the festive atmosphere at the consecrations, including song and music. And the latter song touches upon similar

¹⁶ A single dated attestation of this *bhaṭṭāraka* stems from s. 1596 (Joharāpurakara 1958, p. 294).

¹⁷ (Kāsalīvāla 1981, p. 80).

¹⁸ Bhaṭṭāraka died s. 1850, other attestation s. 1840 (Joharāpurakara 1958, p. 76).

¹⁹ I thank John Cort for bringing my attention to and sharing both articles by Nyāyatīrtha.

elements as the Western Indian *paṭṭa-sthāpanā gītas* in its verses on Devendrakīrti's consecration, notably its scheduling under an auspicious constellation (*muhūrta*), the gathering of the fourfold community (*caturvidha saṅgha*) of laypeople and renunciators for the event, the organization of festivities (*utsava*), the pouring of a pitcher (*kalaśa*, Section 4.2), and the guru establishing his pupil on his own seat, giving him a new name (Section 3.5). The single known composition recording a Kāṣṭhāsaṅgha Nandītaṭagaccha consecration is, unfortunately, rather sparse with regards to details of the rituals performed. However, those few elements mentioned do accord to common Mūlasaṅgha Balātkāraṅgaṇa practice: the pouring of a pitcher, festivities held, and the incumbent *bhaṭṭāraka* Viśālakīrti himself establishing his successor Viśvasena on the seat. Interestingly, the composition also refers to the initiand 'taking Digambara *dīkṣā*' ('*grahī dīkṣā digambara*', Joharāpurakara 1958, p. 270, *lekha* 672, see also footnote 55).

Although the amount of detail of the ritual proceedings recorded thus varies greatly between individual song compositions, when read as a whole and in combination with the consecration manuals, the songs' descriptions help us develop a reasonably good idea of the overall procedure of early modern *bhaṭṭāraka* consecrations. The song compositions often confirm the prescriptions of the manuals, adding to the latter specificity as well as ambience and a certain graphic quality (Section 3). Sometimes song compositions also attest features *not* prescribed by the *vidhis*, among which a few seemingly important actions which, if presumed to have been practiced more commonly too, are oddly missing from the manuals (Section 4). Notable features are the initiand's taking of or reflecting on ascetic vows (Section 4.3); his performance of *keśaloñca*, the pulling out of the hair of the head (Section 4.4); the gifting of ascetic paraphernalia to him (Section 4.5); an anointment of possibly the initiand's head (Section 4.2); and a ritual called *āñjalī* performed by laypeople, next to more acknowledgement and detail of laypeople's roles in the rituals and celebrations more generally (Section 4.1).

3. Early Modern *Bhaṭṭāraka* Consecrations as Prescribed by Ritual Manuals and Confirmed by Songs of Praise

In my edition of the *Bhaṭṭāraka-pada-sthāpanā-vidhi* (Appendices A and B), I divide up the text in eight sections, roughly thematically delineated (A.1–8). The Kārañjā *Bhaṭṭāraka-pada-sthāpanā-vidhi* differs most notably from the Sonagiri text in Sections 1, 3 and 5, and only these are edited, translated, and numbered as such in Appendix B (B.1, B.3, B.5). The shorter *Bhaṭṭāraka-dīkṣā-vidhi* consists of close parallels to the *Bhaṭṭāraka-pada-sthāpanā-vidhis*' sections 4–8, and these are therefore numbered as such in Appendix C (C.4–8). The following sections of this article (Sections 3.1–3.8) largely overlap with the consecutive sections of the *bhaṭṭāraka* consecrations manuals: (Section 3.1) description and selection of a worthy candidate (A.1, B.1); (Section 3.2) preparations and preliminary rituals (A.2, B.2); (Section 3.3) recitation of *Bhaktis* (A.3, B.3, and A–C.7); (Section 3.4) ablution of the initiand's feet, praise of the *bhaṭṭāraka* (*bhaṭṭāraka-stavana*), and recitation of a *bhaṭṭāraka*'s virtues (*guṇāropana*) (A–C.4); (Section 3.5) transmission of the *Sūrimantra* (A–C.5); (Section 3.6) performance of *pūjā* and other devotions of the newly consecrated *bhaṭṭāraka*, including *āvāhana* (A–C.6, and A–C.8); (Section 3.7) recitation of the *bhaṭṭāraka* lineage (*Gurovālī*) (A–C.7); and (Section 3.8) concluding festivities (A–C.8).

In each of the following sections of this article, I discuss the contents of the corresponding sections of the manuals, adding considerations of the broader implications of their contents, and referring to findings from other sources wherever possible or relevant. Prime among these are the *bhaṭṭāraka gītas* and their confirmations of specific elements from the manuals. Features of individual *bhaṭṭāraka* consecrations attested in *gītas*, but not confirmed by the manuals, are discussed separately in a subsequent part of this article (Section 4).

3.1. Description and Selection of a Worthy Candidate

As noted, the *Bhaṭṭāraka-pada-sthāpanā-vidhi* adds prescriptions for preparations of the consecration not discussed in the shorter *Dīkṣā-vidhi*. Before naming the rituals due to be performed prior to the consecrations (Section 3.2), it firstly defines who is a suitable candidate for the *bhaṭṭāraka* rank and how he should be nominated. Importantly, all three versions of the text agree that a prospective *bhaṭṭāraka*

should be a *muni* already having the rank of ‘junior’ or ‘lower’ (*laghu*) *ācārya* (*‘laghvācārya-padaṃ [...] munim’*). The candidate should furthermore be loved by the whole *saṅgha*, well-versed in the *śruta* knowledge, steadfast in perpetuating the dharma of the *jina*, and adorned with the three jewels (*ratnatraya*) of right faith, knowledge, and conduct (*‘sakala-saṅghābhīrucitaṃ [...] śruta-jñāṃ jina-dharmmodharaṇa-dhīraṃ ratna-traya-bhūṣitaṃ’*, BPSV, v. S).

The Kārañjā manuscript is unique among the three known versions in adding a further requirement for the initiand to be observing (to be ‘a storehouse of’) “vows, the *samitis* and *guptis*, self-restraint, mental restraint, concentration, and morality” (*‘vrata-samiti-gupti-yama-niyama-saṃyama-śīla-nidhānaṃ’* BPSV, v. K). It is not clear whether the terms *yama*, *niyama*, and *saṃyama* here carry any more specific, technical connotation. The three *guptis*—restraint of mind, speech, and body—and the five *samitis*—care in walking, speaking, accepting alms, picking up and putting down things, and excretory functions—are still stipulated for contemporary Digambara *munis*. The term *vrata* might well refer to the five *mahāvratas* or major vows of the Digambara *muni*—nonviolence (*ahiṃsā*), truthfulness (*satya*), not stealing (*asteya*), chastity (*brahmacharya*), and nonpossession (*aparigraha*).²⁰ Its occurrence in conjunction with the *gupti* vows and *samiti* rules of conduct also seems to indicate this much. Outside of the context of their consecrations as well, songs of praise quite commonly describe *bhaṭṭārakas* as observing this set of vows also referred to as the thirteen ways of (correct) conduct (*teraha cāritra*: five *mahāvratas*, five *samitis*, three *guptis*).²¹ The 18th century CE Dhūṇḍhāḍāśākhā Bhaṭṭāraka Devendrakīrti is recorded to have taken, or more probably recollected, observed, or renewed, the five *mahāvratas*, five *samitis*, and three *guptis* during his consecration (Nyāyatīrtha 1985b, p. 36; see further discussion below, Section 4.3).

The requirement of observance of these vows is one aspect (see also Sections 4.4 and 4.5) rendering the profile of an early modern *bhaṭṭāraka*-candidate recognizably close to that of an ideal Digambara renouncer as understood today. Yet a major question remains concerning the *bhaṭṭārakas’* and other early modern renunciators’ nudity, and here we need to take caution in our reading of the prescriptive manuals concerning the practical, early modern application of such vows. The *Mahāvratā-dīkṣā-vidhi* of the Sonagiri and Kārañjā manuscripts prescribes the *muni*-initiand to abandon his clothes during his initiation and to take the 28 *mūlaguṇas*, one of which is nudity. If we take this for granted, this would mean that a *bhaṭṭāraka*-initiand already was a naked renouncer. However, evidence concerning the nudity or clothedness of early modern *bhaṭṭārakas* is inconclusive, indications and attestations of both being found (Detige forthcoming), and less than that is known about early modern Digambara renunciators of other ranks. While it is often taken for granted that the change from naked to clothed renunciators occurred as a singular and decisive shift in the Sultanate period, it is much more likely that it was in reality far more gradual and not decisive, and that well into the Mughal era there existed a diversity of practices in different periods, regions, and perhaps traditions, less likely so between different branches of a single tradition.

As noted, we do not have a precise dating for any of the *Bhaṭṭāraka-pada-sthāpanā-vidhi* manuscripts. Yet, the reference to a suitable *bhaṭṭāraka*-initiand as already being a *muni* and an *ācārya*, observing the vows associated with these ranks as generally understood, is another confirmation of the preservation of these ranks in the early modern Digambara tradition, next to more ample proof from other sources (Detige 2018, in preparation a). The fact that the *Bhaṭṭāraka-pada-sthāpanā-vidhi* occurs together with similar outlines of the procedures for the initiation of an *ācārya*, *upādhyāya*, *muni*, and *ṣullaka* also shows that, at least in theory²², the early modern Digambara tradition had safeguarded its entire

²⁰ As noted (footnote 11), the Sonagiri *Mahāvratā-dīkṣā-vidhi’s* brief reference to the administration of ‘*vratas*’ to the *muni*-initiand is expanded in the Kārañjā manuscript’s listing of *mahāvratas* and other vows.

²¹ e.g., ‘*samiti gupati ādi e pāle cāritra tera prakāra’* (Kāsalivāla 1981, pp. 56, 204); ‘*pañca mahāvratā sudha lā dhārīpañca samiti dhare aṅga udārī|traṇya gupati guru cāritra pāle’* (ibid., pp. 228–29).

²² While sufficient sources attest early modern *munis* and *ācāryas* up to respectively the early 17th century CE and the late 18th century CE, references to early modern *upādhyāyas* are found far more rarely (Detige 2018, p. 279; forthcoming), and early modern *ṣullakas* are practically unattested (see Detige 2015, pp. 146–47 on a 19th century CE *ṣullaka*). One hypothesis, still

gamut of ascetic ranks, adding that of the *bhaṭṭāraka* on top of its hierarchy. This gainsays hitherto widespread conceptions of the absolute disappearance of the *muni* (*upādhyāya*) and *ācārya* ranks in the period, of the *bhaṭṭāraka saṅghas* solely being composed of celibate *brahmācārīs* and lay *paṇḍitas*, and of the *bhaṭṭārakas* themselves as being mere clerics or intermediaries between laypeople and renunciators (see also Detige 2018, 2019, in preparation a). Instead, in the early modern period, the *bhaṭṭāraka* rank was a higher promotion for a *muni* or *ācārya*. What distinguished the *bhaṭṭārakas* from the latter, as already remarked by Gough (2017, p. 296), or set them apart as “a special class of Digambara *ācāryas*” (ibid., p. 297) was their possession of the *Sūrimantra*, transmitted to the initiate and further in the consecration procedure as probably its single most empowering feature (see below, Section 3.5).

At the same time, while the manual demands a *muni*, or an *ācārya*, as an initiate, we also have some early modern sources attesting *brahmācārīs* or even lay *paṇḍitas* being initiated to the *bhaṭṭāraka* seat directly.²³ The latter certainly must have been a common practice by the 19th and 20th century CE,²⁴ when the Western and Central Indian *bhaṭṭāraka* lineages were themselves coming to an end and the *bhaṭṭārakas* no longer had pupillary circles of fully initiated renunciators as the ranks of *muni* and *ācārya* had by then effectively ceased to exist. In earlier centuries too, it was possible that specific seats or regions at times did not have a sufficient number of initiated renunciators of lower ranks to select from. On the other hand, new incumbents also seem to have been attracted from elsewhere if necessary,²⁵ and this certainly would have been possible given the transregional connections of early modern *bhaṭṭāraka* seats, as confirmed for example through the case of *bhaṭṭārakas* consecrating incumbents of sister lineages (see Section 3.5). Further studies of the composition of specific *bhaṭṭāraka saṅghas* might bring to light regional differences or certain patterns of historical development.

It is unclear what the *laghu-ācārya* rank (*laghvacārya-pada*) attested in the *Bhaṭṭāraka-pada-sthāpanā-vidhi*'s initial phrasing refers to precisely. It does not seem very likely that the term *laghu* would here refer to youth. Some *Paṭṭāvalīs* include the number of years each incumbent had spent prior to his consecration to the *bhaṭṭāraka* seat, both as a layperson and as a renouncer (e.g., Hoernle 1891, pp. 351–55; 1892, pp. 74–77, 79). If we take these data at face value, *bhaṭṭārakas* were on average consecrated between their early thirties and late forties, though some already in their twenties, and others as late as their sixties. We might expect that experienced renunciators, at least somewhat advanced in age, would have been preferred for this high-ranking position, but particularly charismatic or talented renunciators might indeed have been consecrated to the seat at a relatively young age. Yet again others only reached the *bhaṭṭāraka* rank at a much more mature age.

Though also building up to a rather weak hypothesis only, we could also try to understand the term *laghu-ācārya* in relation to the figure of the *maṇḍalācārya*.²⁶ The latter rank, or title, is attested quite commonly at the time of the proliferation of Balātkāragaṇa branches in the 15th and 16th century CE and in some Balātkāragaṇa lineages (Bhānapuraśākhā, Nāgaurāśākhā) still in the 17th and 18th century CE. A *maṇḍalācārya* originally, at least theoretically, seems to have been responsible for a certain region of his superior *bhaṭṭāraka*'s wider sphere of influence. At some point, successions of *maṇḍalācāryas* often claimed *bhaṭṭāraka*-status for themselves. It is noteworthy that there is no outline of the procedures for the consecration of a *maṇḍalācārya* among the various initiation manuals found in the manuscripts. This probably indicates that it was not considered a separate ascetic rank, but rather

to be verified through further research, is an early modern conflation of the *ksullaka* and *brahmācārī* ranks, or perhaps rather the suppression or substitution of the former by the latter. This much would certainly seem plausible if we conceive of early modern, fully-initiated renunciators (*munis*, and beyond) as generally clothed, in which case one of these lower steps of renunciation might have seemed redundant.

²³ As a later example, one Paṇḍita Maṅgalacanda was consecrated on the Kārañjā Balātkāragaṇa seat at the turn of the 20th century CE (Detige 2015, p. 152).

²⁴ See Premī (n.d.) [reprint without bibliographic information], who reports, and deplores, the preparations for the consecration of a *brahmācārī* to the empty Idara seat after it had been empty for fifteen years since the death of Bhaṭṭāraka Kanakakīrti.

²⁵ Again standing as a later example of this (cf. footnote 23), Paṇḍita Maṅgalacanda who was consecrated on the Kārañjā Balātkāragaṇa seat was a native of Nainavām, Rajasthan (Detige 2015, p. 152).

²⁶ I here draw from the discussion on *maṇḍalācāryas* in (Detige 2018, pp. 311–20).

a distinction for an *ācārya*. The *maṇḍalācārya* then stood in between the *ācārya* and the *bhaṭṭāraka* in the ascetic hierarchy, probably closer to the former, distinguished from the latter again because of the *bhaṭṭāraka*'s monopoly over the *Sūrimantra*, which granted him the privilege of icon consecrations (see Section 3.5). The term *laghu-ācārya* could then be taken to refer to an *ācārya* who was not (also) a *maṇḍalācārya*, although it might otherwise be exactly these *maṇḍalācāryas* who could be thought of as qualified to make the final promotion up to the highest ascetic rank of *bhaṭṭāraka*. Another, at least slightly more probable interpretation presents itself in the fact that *bhaṭṭārakas* were themselves also understood to be *ācāryas* and were regularly referred to such. A *laghu-ācārya* could then apply to an *ācārya* lower than the '*bhaṭṭāraka*-type *ācāryas*'. Either way, the lack of further attestations of the term *laghu-ācārya* also indicates that it was probably not a fully formalized rank.

What I distinguish as the first section of the *Bhaṭṭāraka-pada-sthāpanā-vidhi* concludes with short instructions for the selection procedure of a suitable candidate, the choosing of an auspicious moment for the consecration to take place, and the dispatching of invitations²⁷ for the event. The latter ought to be done by the leader of the lay congregation (*saṅghādhipa*, v. S & B; *saṅghādīpati*, v. K). While the text is slightly ambiguous, it also seems to present it as the latter's responsibility to look for a worthy candidate in the first place and to deliberate on his fitness with the whole fourfold *saṅgha* (*caturvidha-saṅgha*), lay men and women and male and female renunciators. The text thus points out the involvement of the lay community in the selection of a new *bhaṭṭāraka*. I have indeed sometimes heard accounts of the large extent of the lay community's say in the selection of a successor to a deceased *ācārya* in today's *muni saṅghas*. And yet it probably often was the former *bhaṭṭāraka*, when still alive or by some proclamation before passing, who held the prerogative of electing his successor. Typically, this could have been his favorite pupil or the most skilled or learned renouncer of his circle of pupils. This probably happened in the case of *bhaṭṭārakas* consecrating their own successors (see below, Section 3.5). According to Kāsalivāla's (1981, p. 235) account of the composition on Bhaṭṭāraka Guṇakīrti, the latter announced a pupil of his to become his successor at a festival seemingly especially organized for this purpose. It certainly seems to have been very common for the fourfold *saṅgha* to gather for *bhaṭṭāraka* consecrations, as it is explicitly recorded in several song compositions,²⁸ and *gītas* also offer more indications of the responsibilities and roles of laymen in the consecrations rituals and festivals (see Section 4.1).

The manual continues by indicating that, apparently once a candidate has been accepted by all, an astrologically auspicious moment (*lagna*)²⁹ needs to be determined for the consecration. Immediately after its *Bhaṭṭāraka-pada-sthāpanā-vidhi*, the Kārañjā manuscript indeed continues with a 'Description of the auspicious and inauspicious constellations for initiation and consecration' (*Dikṣā-paṭṭābhīṣeka-nakṣatra-phalāphala-varṇana*). The *Pada-sthāpanā-vidhi* texts themselves, in the next section, proceed with prescriptions for preparations of the consecration event and rituals to be performed by laypeople in the days leading up to the consecration.

3.2. Preparations and Prefatory Rituals

A colorful pavilion (*maṇḍapa*), stage or platform (*vedi*), and throne (*siṅhāsana*) are to be erected for the consecration. Laypeople should hold a festival (*mahotsava*) in a temple (*caityālaya*) performing

²⁷ '*āmantraṇapatraṇ*', v. S; '*āmantraṇapatrīm*', v. B; '*āmantraṇa-patrikāṇ*', v. K. Version K adds that the invitation letter ought to be colored with *kumkuma* ('*kumkumāṅkitāṇ*').

²⁸ Compositions on the Bāraḍolīśākhā Bhaṭṭāraka Śubhacandra, Poravandara, s. 1721 (1663 CE, '*caturvidha saṅgha*', (Kāsalivāla 1981, p. 80, n. 1); '*saṅgha caturvidha*', (Kāsalivāla 1981, p. 227)); Dhūṇḍhāśākhā Bhaṭṭāraka Mahendrakīrti, Delhi, s. 1792 (1734–1735 CE, '*dūri desa syaṃ ābīyā jī saṅgha caturavidhi sāra*', (Nyāyafīrtha 1985a, p. 423)); Kārañjāśākhā Bhaṭṭāraka Devendrakīrti, second half of the 18th century CE ('*caturvidha śrisaṅgha mīlavūna*', (Joharapurakara 1958, p. 69, *lekha* 190)). Other compositions' listings of attending renunciators can also be taken as confirmations of the gathering of the fourfold *saṅgha*, even when they don't explicitly use the term *caturvidha saṅgha*, e.g., the composition on the consecration of the Dhūṇḍhāśākhā Bhaṭṭāraka Devendrakīrti in Āmera in s. 1770 (1712–1713 CE, (Nyāyafīrtha 1985b, p. 36); (see also Detige 2019, pp. 279–82)).

²⁹ '*lagnaṃ grhītrvā*', V. B. V. S has '*lagnim*', and V. K omits, probably both due to scribal error.

the *Śāntikā*-, *Gaṇadharavalaya*-,³⁰ *Ratnatraya*-, and other *pūjās*.³¹ Like many contemporary *vidhānas* or *mahāpūjās* (collective *pūjās*), these rituals seem to have lasted for several days, for the manuscript repeats its prescription to perform the *Śāntikā* and *Gaṇadharavalaya* rituals (*arcana*) on the auspicious day selected for the consecration. After this, a procession with water pitchers (*jalayātrā-mahotsava*) ought to set out. The auspicious number of 108 pitchers (*kalaśa*) filled with (water suffused with) herbs are to be brought on and established on a *svāstika*. It is not explicated who the singular individual is who ought to establish the pitchers (*sthāpayet*), possibly the *pratiṣṭhācārya* referred to later (see Section 3.4). Happily married lay women (*saubhāgyavatī strī*) make another *svāstika* on the ground with lines of sandalwood paste and pearls. On top of it the throne (*siṅhāsana*) for the initiand should be erected, and he should be seated there facing east. It is here that the actual consecration and the rituals most closely surrounding it will begin, as prescribed in the next sections of the manual.

Individual *bhaṭṭāraka gītas* regularly confirm elements of the preparatory rituals and festivals prescribed by the *Pada-sthāpanā-vidhi*. An account of the *paṭṭābhiṣeka* of the Balātkāraḡaṇa Dhūṅḡhāḡaśākhā Bhaṭṭāraka Devendrakīrti in Āmera in s. 1770 (1712–1713 CE, Nyāyatīrtha 1985b, p. 36; see also below, Section 4) relates how the initiand, a *muni*, was seated on a throne (*siṅhāsani*), and above his head a parasol (*chatra*), a symbol of reverence, was spread. A composition on the consecration of Devendrakīrti's successor Mahendrakīrti in Delhi in s. 1792 (1734–1735 CE) shortly refers to the performance of further unspecified *pūjās* before the *dīkṣā*. Through these, the poem says, obstacles were removed (*vighana dūri vidāriyo*), Nyāyatīrtha 1985a, p. 423), which indicates that such rituals were understood to render the consecration auspicious and successful. In his *hamacī* on Bhaṭṭāraka Śubhacandra, the poet Śrīpāla records the performance of *jinapūjā*, *śāntika*, *homa* (a fire ritual), *vidhāna*, and a *jalayātra*, the latter also featuring coconuts (*śrīphala*), before the consecration of Śubhacandra on an auspicious date and time (*śubha muhūrata*) in s. 1721 (1663–1664 CE, Kāsalīvāla 1981, p. 227). According to Kāsalīvāla's (1969, p. 454) account of the composition on Bhaṭṭāraka Guṇakīrti, a procession (*jalūsa*) of ornamented elephants, palanquins, and other vehicles went out before his consecration, and the whole area was perfumed with flower garlands.³² Reminiscent of *jalayātras* as they are still performed today, women decked out with jewels and decorated clothes ('no less than goddesses') went out carrying pitchers (*kumbha*) on their head filled with fragrant water, which was subsequently used for Guṇakīrti's *paṭṭābhiṣeka*.

3.3. Recitation of Bhaktis

The *Bhaṭṭāraka-pada-sthāpanā-vidhi* next prescribes that an announcement be made of the commencement of the ritual for conferment of the *bhaṭṭāraka* rank.³³ Immediately after this, we find a first reference to the recitation of *Bhaktis*. The Digambara *Bhaktis* are ancient devotional texts, of which independent sets exist set in both Prakrit and Sanskrit. They are used by laypeople during the veneration of *jīna* icons or living renouncers, at fasts, and annual festivals.³⁴ The *Bhaktis* are already attested as forming part of renunciant initiations in medieval texts, and they are still used during contemporary Digambara initiations (Gough forthcoming). Although their usage is not mentioned in the *paṭṭā-sthāpanā-gītas*, the *Bhaṭṭāraka-pada-sthāpanā-vidhi* prescribes in sum five *Bhaktis* (*Siddha*-, *Śruta*-, *Ācārya*-, *Śānti*-, and *Sāmādhi-bhakti*) to be recited at three different moments during the consecration ritual. The different versions all agree that firstly the *Siddha*-, *Śruta*-, and *Ācārya-bhakti* ought to be recited immediately after the announcement of the ritual's commencement. The *Bhaṭṭāraka-dīkṣā-vidhi*

³⁰ See (Gough 2015) and (Gough forthcoming) on the usage of the *Gaṇadharavalaya-maṅḡala* during Digambara *dīkṣās*.

³¹ Version K drops the term '*mahotsava*', festival, speaking directly of the *pūjās* being held.

³² Elsewhere, Kāsalīvāla (1981, p. 235) speaks of a *jalayātra* and *jalūsa* (also?) mentioned in the composition as going out in celebration of the establishment of a stepwell.

³³ '*atha bhaṭṭārakapadapraṭiṣṭhāpanakriyāmityādi uccārya*', v. S. '*atha bhaṭṭārakapadapraṭiṣṭhāpanakriyāyām*' ityādi uccārya', v. B. '*atha bhaṭṭārakapadapraṭiṣṭhāpanakriyāyām pū*.' v. K.

³⁴ On the *bhaktis*, (see Cort 2002a, p. 733; Cort 2002b, pp. 79–80). On their usage during Digambara initiations, (see Gough forthcoming).

joins in on the *Pada-sthāpanā-vidhi*'s outline only in the subsequent steps, but both texts agree that further on during the consecration, after the *āvāhana* (see below, Section 3.6), single *bhaktis* ought to be recited twice more: the *Śānti-bhakti* before, and the *Samādhi-bhakti* after the *Gurvāvalī* (see below, Section 3.7).

In the first occurrence of *Bhakti* recitation, the texts from Sonagiri and Beḍiyā hold that a singular individual ought to recite (*paṭhet*) the first three *bhaktis*. The version from Kārañjā, however, has a plural optative form (*paṭheyuh*). All three versions use the singular optative '*paṭhet*' for the third *bhakti* recitation (*samādhi-bhaktim paṭhet*, 'he ought to read the *Samādhi-bhakti*') and use the, in regards to number, inconclusive absolutive form for the second (*śānti-bhaktim kṛtvā*, 'after having performed the *Śānti-bhakti*'). It is, thus, not always clear who ought to read out the various *Bhaktis*, but in contemporary Digambara *muni dīkṣās* both the initiand and the consecrating guru read out specific *Bhaktis* (Gough forthcoming), and the Kārañjā version presumably refers to these two participants, even if through a plural rather than a dual verbal form.

3.4. Ablution of the Initiand's Feet, *Bhaṭṭāraka-Stavana*, and *Guṇāropana*

After the recitation of the first three *Bhaktis*, the *Bhaṭṭāraka-pada-sthāpanā-vidhi* prescribes the *pratiṣṭhācārya* to wash the feet (of the initiand) with water from the 108 pitchers brought on before, spelling out a mantra to be recited at this time stating the purity of the water.³⁵ This is the text's single reference to the figure of the *pratiṣṭhācārya*, the *ācārya* in charge of the consecration (*pratiṣṭhā*), in this case not of an icon but of a *bhaṭṭāraka*. In contemporary *dīkṣās*, icon consecrations, and *mahāpūjās*, a lay ritual specialist sometimes referred to as *pratiṣṭhācārya* (Gough 2017, p. 286), a sort of *paṇḍita*-cum-MC, is typically in charge of at least the less esoteric aspects of the proceedings. Given that it would be odd for a guru to wash a pupil's feet, here too the term probably refers to a layperson rather than the consecrating *bhaṭṭāraka-guru*.

The initiand's feet are then to be touched 'from all sides', meaning probably by all those attending, and we can imagine a crowd thronging around the initiand. At this time some verses of praise of the *bhaṭṭāraka* (*bhaṭṭāraka-stavana*) are to be recited starting with '*aidam yugīn*' (v. K & B).³⁶ Given that it is only the transmission of the *Sūrimantra* in the next section (Section 3.5) which seems to turn the initiand into a *bhaṭṭāraka*, the hymn probably concerns praise of the figure of the *bhaṭṭāraka* more generally, rather than of the individual initiand. The *Pada-sthāpanā-vidhis* next prescribe the performance of *guṇāropana*, the attribution of virtues, possibly the recitation of the virtues, vows, rules of conducts, etc., which a *bhaṭṭāraka*-rank renouncer ought to observe, and their administration to him. This is the closest the manuals get in terms of referring to the initiand's taking of vows, attested more explicitly in *gītas* (see Section 4.3 and, already, Section 3.1).

It is around this point of the proceedings that the *Bhaṭṭāraka-dīkṣā-vidhi* commences. Though it closely follows the *Bhaṭṭāraka-pada-sthāpanā-vidhi* in its outlines of further rituals and actions (Sections 3.5–3.8), it differs from the latter text in its initial lines. It offers alternatives to some actions and, in doing so, is also a little more explicit about the interactions between initiand and guru. In its first phrase, the *Dīkṣā-vidhi* refers consecutively to the performance ('giving') of devotion to the teacher ('*guru-bhaktim dattvā*'), clearly by the initiand; the gift of a *tilaka* by the guru, to the initiand undoubtedly, this step more or less replacing the feet ablution of the *Bhaṭṭāraka-dīkṣā-vidhi*; the recitation, not clear by whom, of a hymn (*stavana*) starting with the words *or* dealing with detachment (*nirveda*) and skillfulness

³⁵ While versions S & B only give the mantra, which itself sufficiently clearly indicates what is to be done, Jaina's (2009, p. 116) version somewhat superfluously adds that 'he' ought to do precisely what is described in the mantra, making an ablution of both the initiand's feet with water from the 108 pitchers ('*iti paṭhitvā kalasāṣṭottaraśāta-toyena pādau pariśecayet*').

³⁶ Jaina (2009, p. 118) translates as 'Of this era' ('*isa yuga ke*'). Version S seems to read '*tata idam yogī nṛtyādi*', which seems to demand some dance of the yogi, the initiand. While it is not unusual for attending laypeople to dance during contemporary Digambara initiations (see Detige, in preparation b), it seems too late at this point for the initiand to engage in dance. The disagreement between the otherwise closely related versions S and B indicates this is probably an error of the Sonagiri manuscript's scribe.

(*sauṣṭava*), a closer parallel again to the *bhaṭṭāraka-stavana* referred to in the *Bhaṭṭāraka-pada-sthāpanā-vidhi*; recitation of the words ‘*śānti jinaṃ*’ (etc.?) while (?) touching the guru’s feet, clearly by the initiand; and finally the *guṇāropana*, which, as this text clarifies, ought to be performed by the guru.

3.5. Transmission of the *Sūrimantra*

Certainly an important part of early modern *bhaṭṭāraka* consecrations, and probably the most central, empowering act, seems to have been the transmission of the *Sūrimantra*. Multiple variants of the typically well-secured *Sūrimantra* are used to consecrate icons (*mūrti*) by both Digambaras and Śvetāmbaras (Gough 2017) and to initiate Śvetāmbara *ācāryas* (Gough forthcoming).³⁷ As a part of early modern *bhaṭṭāraka* consecrations, it is prescribed by both the *Bhaṭṭāraka-pada-sthāpanā-vidhis* and the *Bhaṭṭāraka-dīkṣā-vidhi*, confirmed in several song compositions,³⁸ and also attested by other sources.³⁹ Gough (2017, p. 296) already understood the imparting of the *Sūrimantra* to the *bhaṭṭāraka*-initiand as “the key ritual action in distinguishing between an *ācārya* and a *bhaṭṭāraka*”. In describing the ideal *bhaṭṭāraka* in his composition *Sanghāṣṭaka*, Brahmācārī Jñānasāgara also glosses a renouncer of this rank as possessing the *Sūrimantra* (Joharāpurakara 1964, p. 232). Interestingly, Jñānasāgara was affiliated to the late 16th/early 17th century CE Kāṣṭhāsāṅgha Nandītaṭagaccha Bhaṭṭāraka Śrībhūṣaṇa (Joharāpurakara 1958, p. 298). This forms a so far unique, though unsurprising, confirmation that the *Sūrimantra* was also used in the Kāṣṭhāsāṅgha, where it was probably similarly passed on to its *bhaṭṭārakas* during their consecrations, as in the Mūlasāṅgha Balātkāraṅgaṇa. The importance attached to the *Sūrimantra*, and the reason for its transmission to the highest-ranking renouncers, *bhaṭṭārakas*, probably lies in its usage within image consecrations (see Gough 2017). Dundas (1998, p. 45) however remarks that Śvetāmbara *Sūrimantras* were “more than a simple formula involved in the installing of a senior ascetic or an image”, and also need to be seen in relation to issues of authority in situations of sectarian strife, and as expressive of specific attitudes towards Jain teachings (ibid., pp. 45–46). Though we lack further information about the *Sūrimantra* of even the Balātkāraṅgaṇa, and especially that of other traditions, I take it however that the various Balātkāraṅgaṇa sister and daughter lineages, which were typically on good footing, used the same *Sūrimantra* (see below in this section).

In nearly identical formulations, the longer and the shorter consecration manuals both allow for two ways of transmitting the *Sūrimantra*. Either the *Sūrimantra* is passed on from guru to initiand directly, or it is transmitted through a paper copy. We have evidence that, in the case of the first procedure, the living guru could either be the direct teacher of the initiand or the *bhaṭṭāraka* of another lineage coming over to perform the consecration. In the former case, the incumbent *bhaṭṭāraka* apparently abdicated to personally anoint his successor.⁴⁰

Gītas certainly offer attestations of *bhaṭṭārakas* consecrating their own successors and, at that time, giving them a new name. Thus, in the 16th century CE, the Kāṣṭhāsāṅgha Nandītaṭagaccha Bhaṭṭāraka Viśvasena was consecrated by his guru Viśālākīrti in Dūṅgarapura (Joharāpurakara 1958, p. 270, *lekha* 672). A *paṭṭa-sthāpanā-gīta* on the seventeenth century CE Bāraḍolīśākhā Bhaṭṭāraka Kumudacandra explicitly asserts that he was consecrated and given the *Sūrimantra* by his guru Ratnakīrti in Bāraḍolī in s. 1656 (1598–1599 CE, Kāsalīvāla 1981, p. 56, and ibid., no. 1). Another composition adds that Kumudacandra was given his new name by the abdicating Bhaṭṭāraka Ratnakīrti during the consecration (Kāsalīvāla 1981, p. 233). In s. 1792 (1734–1735 CE), Bhaṭṭāraka Devendrakīrti consecrated his successor Mahendrakīrti on the Dhūṅḍhāḍaśākhā seat (Nyāyatīrtha 1985a, p. 423). And in the

³⁷ On the *Sūrimantra* in Śvetāmbara Jainism, (see also Dundas 1998).

³⁸ The *Sūrimantra* is mentioned in compositions on the consecration of the Dhūṅḍhāḍaśākhā Bhaṭṭāraka Mahendrakīrti, Delhi, s. 1792 (1734–1735 CE, (Nyāyatīrtha 1985a, p. 423), see below) and several Bāraḍolīśākhā *bhaṭṭārakas*: Kumudacandra, Bāraḍolī, s. 1656 (Kāsalīvāla 1981, pp. 101–102, 233–34, 205); Abhayacandra, Bāraḍolī, s. 1685 (ibid., p. 105); Śubhacandra, Poravandara, s. 1721 (ibid., p. 228).

³⁹ (See Gough 2017, pp. 296–97).

⁴⁰ In manuscript colophons and funerary monuments’ inscriptions, we find attestations of a title ‘*sthāvīrācārya*’ which seems to have been used precisely for retired *bhaṭṭārakas* (Detige 2018, p. 329).

second half of the 18th century CE, in yet another Balātkāragaṇa branch, Bhaṭṭāraka Devendrakīrti of Kārañjā was established on the seat and at that time given a new name by his guru Bhaṭṭāraka Dharmacandra (Joharāpurakara 1958, p. 69, *lekha* 190).

While the consecration manuals' reference to the guru might, thus, have referred to the abdicating *bhaṭṭāraka*, we also know of cases in which a seat's new incumbent was consecrated by the *bhaṭṭāraka* of a sister lineage—another branch, that is, of the same tradition. This second manner of transmitting the *Sūrimantra* would presumably have been practiced typically when an incumbent *bhaṭṭāraka* had passed away before anointing his successor. This might also have been a fairly usual procedure, given that *bhaṭṭārakas*, probably often senior renunciators, may well have regularly passed away unexpectedly. The consecration manuals' slight ambiguity of speaking of the 'guru', never explicitly referring to the incumbent *bhaṭṭāraka*, might in fact be taken as consciously allowing for this latter option, even if in this case the relation between the initiating *bhaṭṭāraka* and the initiand is not the same, close teacher–pupil (*guru-śiṣya*) relationship as in the case of a *bhaṭṭāraka* anointing his actual, probably often years-long, pupil. Both recensions of the consecration procedure refer to the transmission of the 'traditional *Sūrimantra*' or the '*Sūrimantra* of the tradition' ('*paramparagataṃ sūrimantram*').⁴¹ It is assumed that different seats of a single tradition, e.g., those of the various Balātkāragaṇa branches, by default used the same *Sūrimantra*, which precisely would have facilitated *bhaṭṭārakas* of one lineage to anoint new incumbents of other branches.⁴²

We have two probable attestations of this procedure from the Balātkāragaṇa, where *bhaṭṭārakas* of neighboring seats were called upon to install a new incumbent. In s. 1721 (1663–1664 CE) Śubhacandra was given the *Sūrimantra* and established on the Bāraḍolī seat not by his predecessor Abhayacandra but by one Gachapatī Dharmabhūṣaṇa from the South, probably Bhaṭṭāraka Dharmabhūṣaṇa who was then on the Kārañjā seat (Śubhacandra hamacī; Kāsālīvāla 1981, pp. 227–28). Half a century later, in s. 1770 (1712–1713 CE), the Dhūṇḍhāśākhā Bhaṭṭāraka Devendrakīrti was consecrated in Āmera by Candrakīrti, most probably the *bhaṭṭāraka* of that name then incumbent in the Nāgaurāśākhā (Nyāyatīrtha 1985b, pp. 34, 36). It indeed seems quite plausible that Devendrakīrti's own guru Jagatkīrti had died before anointing his successor, given that Jagatkīrti's *pādukā* (memorial stone with carvings of the commemorated renouncer's feet) at the Kīrtistambha Nasiyāṃ in Āmera was consecrated in s. 1771 (Detige 2014, p. 28), such monuments probably often finalized and consecrated only some time after their subject's death.

As mentioned, next to the direct transmission of the *Sūrimantra* from guru to initiand, the *Bhaṭṭāraka-pada-sthāpanā-vidhi* and *Bhaṭṭāraka-dīkṣā-vidhi* both offer a second method, or a third method when counting our distinction between transmission from either the previous *bhaṭṭāraka* of the seat or an incumbent of another seat. At the end of his life,⁴³ an incumbent *bhaṭṭāraka* can write down the *Sūrimantra* on a piece of paper, which is then sealed, properly stored, and, according to the version from Kārañjā, covered with stamped paper and deposited in a treasure box ('*rūpya-patrā-chādita-saṃpuṭikāyāṃ muktaṃ bhavati*').⁴⁴ The *Dīkṣā-vidhi* adds that this manuscript ought to be entrusted to the main devotees and (?) a good pupil (*śiṣya*), not clarifying whether lay or renunciant. While it could also be taken

⁴¹ BPSV Versions S & B, as well as the BDV, also speak of 'the *Sūrimantra* suitable for the post', which the guru ought to give to the initiand ('*śrīgurustasmai tatpadayogyāṃ paramparāgataṃ sūrimantram dadyāt*'). Version K, however, changes this form into a dative ('*śrīguruḥ tasmai padayogyāyāparāparāgataṃ sūrimantram dadyāt*'), thus applying the term 'suitable for the rank' to the initiand instead of to the *Sūrimantra*. Although the term was indeed used in this context earlier on in all BPSV versions, in the description of a suitable candidate-*muni*, it can probably be taken as a confusion in the Kārañjā manuscript at this point, confirming it is a copy, here defective, of a text closer to the other versions.

⁴² As noted, Dundas (1998, pp. 45–46) notices, vice-versa, the relation between speculations about the power of the *Sūrimantra* and Śvetāmbara sectarian strife.

⁴³ '*āyuhḥ prante*', v. S; '*āyuhḥ prānte*', v. B; '*āyuhḥ prānte*', v. K; '*soāyuhḥ prānte*', BDV.

⁴⁴ Jaina (2009, p. 118) interprets the *Pada-sthāpanā-vidhi*'s '*muktaṃ bhavati*' as 'he (the *bhaṭṭāraka*) dies', after having written down the *Sūrimantra*. The Kārañjā version's added locative 'in a treasure box' seems to confirm the interpretation that it is rather the manuscript being deposited ('*muktaṃ*'). I do give Jaina's reading a chance in my translation of the *Dīkṣā-vidhi*, which has '*muktaḥ syāt*'.

as a method to secure the continuity of the lineage when even inviting an initiating *bhaṭṭāraka* from another lineage proved impossible, the Balātkāraḡaṇa branches generally seem to have been sufficiently interconnected to always have had recourse to the latter option. Instead, the manuals in fact prescribe the transmission of the *Sūrimantra* via a paper copy in the absence of a sadhu worthy of the *bhaṭṭāraka* post, towards the end, it can be understood, of the incumbent *bhaṭṭāraka*'s life.

The Sonagiri and Beḡiyā *Pada-sthāpanā-vidhis* indicate that, later on it appears, once a suitable candidate has been found, a man ought to hand over the *Sūrimantra* manuscript to 'him'. While the Kārañjā *Bhaṭṭāraka-pada-sthāpanā-vidhi* omits this latter passage, the *Dīkṣā-vidhi* clarifies that this signifies 'the one engaged in the *bhaṭṭāraka* rank' ('*bhaṭṭārakapadasthāya*'), which I take to be the initiand. A more straightforward interpretation would perhaps be 'the one being in', or already having the *bhaṭṭāraka* rank, referring then to a *bhaṭṭāraka* from another seat coming over to consecrate the candidate once the latter has been found. In that case, however, it seems there would be no need for the former to read the *Sūrimantra* from a paper, taking it, as proffered before, that different Balātkāraḡaṇa branches probably used the same *Sūrimantra*. Both Sonagiri manuscripts, the *Pada-sthāpanā-vidhi* and the *Dīkṣā-vidhi*, also mention a rite of 'establishing' the manuscript, the former explicating that it is to be performed by the man handing it over.⁴⁵

This procedure might have been applied in the case of many consecrations on which *gītas* remain silent about the manner of transmission of the *Sūrimantra*. It seems probable especially in the case of the *paṭṭābhīṣeka* of the 18th century CE Bhaṭṭāraka Mahendrakīrti. No consecrating *bhaṭṭāraka* is mentioned in an otherwise relatively detailed composition, and Mahendrakīrti is said to have recited the mantra and himself performed *keśaloñca*—the ritual pulling out of the hair from the head—an act otherwise typically performed at least partially by the initiating renouncer (Nyāyatīrtha 1985a, pp. 422–23, see below, Section 4).⁴⁶

Although the Kārañjā *Bhaṭṭāraka-pada-sthāpanā-vidhi* often seems the faulty copy, as noted it also stands out from the more closely related versions from Sonagiri and Beḡiyā because of some additional phrasings not included in the latter versions. By far the most important among the latter is a long section in which it supplies three mantras to be recited, seemingly, surrounding the transmission of the *Sūrimantra*. The first of these starts with the *Namokāraṇamantra* (*Pañcanamaskāraṇamantra*), the obeisance to the five *parameṣṭhins* or 'supreme lords', the well-known five Digambara figures worthy of veneration (*arihantas* or *jinas*, *siddhas*, *ācāryas*, *upādhyāyas*, and 'all *sādhus*', the latter mostly taken to mean *munis*);⁴⁷ adds salutations to the supreme renouncer (*paramahaṃsa*) and the *parameṣṭhin*; a series of seed syllables (*bīja-akṣara*) with vocalic variations on the syllable '*haṃ*'; and an invocation of the *jina*.⁴⁸ 'At the right moment for the *dīkṣā* to take place' ('*dīkṣāvelāyāṃ*'), this mantra should be imparted at the top of the head of the initiand, repeated 38 times. A second mantra, to be recited 37 times, largely repeats the latter parts of the first, now also using variations of '*hraṇi*' as *bīja-akṣaras*. The third, short mantra again offers obeisance to the renouncer (*haṃsa*) and is indicated to be repeated 17 times. This unique section of the Kārañjā manuscript concludes by stating that 'in between these three [mantras] one [more] mantra ought to be given', the latter presumably the actual *Sūrimantra* not disclosed here. The manuscript then turns to the procedure for transmission of the *Sūrimantra* through a paper copy, henceforth running parallel with the other versions again.

⁴⁵ '*tatpatrasthāpanikāvidhi*', BDV; '*tatpatrasthāpanākīvidhi*', v. S (a scribal error or a vernacular phrasing entering the manuscript?). The Beḡiyā version refers only to an unspecified establishing ('*sthāpanikādhi*', probably a syllable '*vi*' missing due to a scribal or editorial error). The Kārañjā version refers to the rite of the establishment of the rank (*pada*) ('*tatpadasthāpanavidhiḡ*') rather than of the manuscript (*patra*). Although reference to the *bhaṭṭāraka* consecration rite in general is not unfitting at this point, this is probably another point where the Kārañjā manuscript is flawed.

⁴⁶ In the composition on the sixteenth century CE Guṇakīrti, we read that his *bhaṭṭāraka dīkṣā* was carefully planned by his guru Sumatikīrti, but Kāsalīvāla's (1969; 1981, pp. 234–35) account of the composition does not make it clear whether Guṇakīrti was ultimately consecrated at the hands of Sumatikīrti as well.

⁴⁷ The five obeisances of the *Namokāraṇamantra* are similarly featured as part of many longer Jain mantras (Dundas 1998, p. 35).

⁴⁸ The same mantra is still used in contemporary *muni dīkṣās* (Gough forthcoming), which needs not by itself surprise us, given that these use editions of texts similar to those of our manuscripts (see footnote 12).

3.6. *Āvāhana and Bhaṭṭāraka Pūjā*

After describing the possibilities for the transmission of the *Sūrimantra*, both manuals announce the method for the performance of *āvāhana*. The manuscripts' term *āvāhana* functions here as a short-hand for the standardized, tripartite mantra-preamble which typically introduces a Digambara *pūjā*. *Āvāhana*, the invocation of the object of veneration, is itself only its first part, the second and third parts being *sthāpanā*, the establishment of the object of veneration, and *sannidhi-karaṇa*, its placing in the nearness of the devotee. While the shorter *Bhaṭṭāraka-dīkṣā-vidhi* only spells out the *āvāhana*, the *Bhaṭṭāraka-pada-sthāpanā-vidhis* also communicates the mantras for the *sthāpanā* and the *sannidhi-karaṇa*. In each, the object of veneration is the *bhaṭṭāraka*. The fact that the *āvāhana* follows immediately after the recitation of the *Sūrimantra* indicates it is precisely the latter that turns him into a subject suitable for veneration, or at least that which establishes him as a *bhaṭṭāraka* and renders him venerable in that capacity specifically. The latter is probably more accurate if we take it early modern *bhaṭṭārakas* had typically already had an earlier ascetic career as a *muni* (*upādhyāya*) and/or *ācārya*, at which point they would already have been suitable objects of veneration. In confirmation of this, in all known versions the *upādhyāya* and *ācārya* consecration manuals also give *āvāhana* verses for renunciators newly consecrated to these ranks, and in the latter case laypeople are also prescribed to perform eightfold *pūjā* (*'aṣṭatayim iṣṭim'*) of the newly minted *ācārya*.

After the *āvāhana*, the *bhaṭṭāraka* consecration manuals add another mantra, slightly different in both texts, but in both cases repeating some parts of the *āvāhana* verses. This latter mantra is said to be meant to be recited while applying a *tilaka* of camphor and sandal to the feet of the initiand, by now *bhaṭṭāraka*. Both manuals then proceed with prescribing the recitation of *Śānti-bhakti*, *Gurovāvalī* (see next), and *Samādhi-bhakti*. The texts in other words give the standard preliminary to *pūjā* (*āvāhana*), but do not, at this point, refer to the performance of an eightfold *pūjā* of the *bhaṭṭāraka*. *Bhaṭṭāraka pūjā* is, however, duly prescribed after the *Gurovāvalī* section, when both texts similarly instruct all renunciators (*yati*) to give *guru-bhakti* and to bow (*'guru-bhaktim datvā|sarve yatinaḥ praṇāmaṃ kuryuḥ|'*, BPSV v. S, section 8, variants in other BPSV versions and BDV) and all laypeople to also perform eightfold *pūjā* (*'tataśca sarve upāsakāḥ aṣṭatayim-iṣṭim kṛtvā guru-bhaktim datvā praṇāmaṃti'*, *ibid.*). Our sources on *bhaṭṭāraka* consecrations here offer important proof of the ritual veneration of living, early modern *bhaṭṭārakas*, adding to our prior knowledge of the performance of such rituals of deceased *bhaṭṭārakas* evident from other sources, notably the combination of *bhaṭṭāraka pūjā* and *ārati* texts and *bhaṭṭārakas'* funerary monuments (Detige 2014; 2015, pp. 162–67).

We again find some confirmations of this element from the manuals in the corpus of *bhaṭṭāraka gītas*. In his *jakhadī*, Paṇḍita Akairāma reports how *pūjā*, and praise, of Bhaṭṭāraka Mahendrakīrti were performed after his consecration in s. 1792 (1734–1735 CE, *'guru pūjana vaṃdana karai jī'*, Nyāyatīrtha 1985a, p. 423). And according to Kāsalivāla's (1969, p. 454) reading of Jayadāsa's account, a century and a half earlier in s. 1632 (1574–1575 CE), all the *sādhus* of the *saṅgha* accepted the newly consecrated Bhaṭṭāraka Guṇakīrti as a guru, and coconuts were gifted to him while shouts of *'jaya jaya'* (hail, hail!) were heard everywhere.

The manuals' triple *āvāhana* verses offer further indications of the extent to which early modern *bhaṭṭārakas* were regarded by their contemporaries as ideal, venerable renunciators, beyond their featuring as an object of veneration in the *āvāhana* and *pūjā*. Importantly, the mantras refer to the *bhaṭṭāraka* as a *parameṣṭhin* (*'paramabhāṭṭārakaparameṣṭhin-*', with orthographic variants in both manuals, all versions). Much unlike contemporary *bhaṭṭārakas* in the eyes of most of today's Western and Central Indian Jains, early modern *bhaṭṭārakas* were thus included among the *parameṣṭhins*, the five classes of venerable beings (*arihantas*, *siddhas*, *ācāryas*, *upādhyāyas*, and *sādhus*), probably more specifically as *ācāryas*. This understanding of the *bhaṭṭārakas* as a type of *ācāryas* is also confirmed by the reference to the *bhaṭṭāraka* as a 'leader and *ācārya* of dharma' (*dharmācāryādhipati*) in both the triple *āvāhana* mantras and the subsequent mantra meant to be recited while applying a *tilaka* to the *bhaṭṭāraka's* feet. This term is not attested elsewhere, and most certainly was not a formal ascetic rank. The latter mantra also includes the Prakrit phrasing *'ṇamo āyariyāṇam'*, 'salutations to the *ācāryas*', well-known

from the *Namokāra* mantra. This could be taken as linking the *bhaṭṭāraka*(s) to the *ācāryas* of ancient lore, although our historiographical understanding should probably be that of a natural, historical connection between both, rather than a discontinuity in need of rhetorical patchwork. *Gurovāvalī*s (also *Paṭṭāvalī*, *Virudāvalī*, see next) indeed depict the *bhaṭṭāraka* lineages as a continuation of earlier *ācārya* lineages. Early modern *ācāryas* on the other hand were clearly less highly authorized and of lesser standing than both the *bhaṭṭārakas* contemporary to them and the premodern *ācāryas*. The *bhaṭṭāraka* rank, once again, developed as an addition to the premodern Digambara ascetic hierarchy, superseding the *ācārya* rank at the apex.

3.7. *Gurovāvalī* Recitation

The consecration manuals next prescribe another element which is still featured as part of contemporary Digambara initiations: the recitation of a *Gurovāvalī* or lineage text.⁴⁹ *Gurovāvalī* recitation is also prescribed in the consecration manuals for *kṣullakas* (*Laghu-dīkṣā-vidhi*) and *munis* (*Mahāvratā-dīkṣā-vidhi*, *Brhad-dīkṣā-vidhi*). The manuscripts merely supply the standard, generic formula in which the names of the subsequent seat-holders of the lineage of the newly consecrated *bhaṭṭāraka* are still to be inserted: ‘on the seat of so and so, a *bhaṭṭāraka* of such and such a name’ (*‘amukasya paṭṭe amuka-nānavān bhaṭṭārakah’*, v. S, and variations). However, as mentioned before, both texts do refer to the incumbent *bhaṭṭārakas* as standing in the Mūlasaṅgha Nandisaṅgha/Nandyāmnāya Sarasvatīgaccha Balātkāraṅga Kundākundācāryānvaya.⁵⁰ Here, we are reminded that everything we believe we can derive from these prescriptive texts about early modern *bhaṭṭāraka* consecrations, and initiations of lower renunciators, applies to this tradition only. *Gurovāvalī*s are found in multiple copies in former *bhaṭṭāraka* seats’ manuscript libraries, especially in *guṭakas* — bound manuscripts or ‘notebooks’ often holding an anthology of a wide variety of different genres of texts. Verses of praise added for at least the more recent incumbents differentiate most manuscript *Gurovāvalī*s from the mere sequence of successive incumbents’ names needed for the initiand’s confirmation of his affiliation as part of his consecration. Yet the recitation of the lineage list at this time might have been an additional purpose for recording *Gurovāvalī*s in *guṭakas*, next to the far more numerous usage of bare-bones succession lists also in image inscriptions. *Bhaṭṭāraka gītas* themselves regularly feature verses about their lineage’s successions, giving the names of the successive incumbents interspersed with some praise of each. In doing so, one composition indicates that a lineage list was also performed in song at the Bāraḍolīśākhā Bhaṭṭāraka Śubhacandra’s consecration in s. 1721 in Poravandara (*‘birudāvalī bole’*, [Kāsālīvāla 1981](#), p. 228).

3.8. Concluding Festivities

After the lay community’s expression of devotion and formal *pūjā* veneration (Section 3.6), both manuals enjoin the newly consecrated *bhaṭṭāraka* to give his blessings, to the leader of the lay congregation (*saṅgha-nāyaka*) according to the *Dīkṣā-vidhi*, to the donor (*‘dātre’*, the patron of the consecration) and all lay Jains according to the *Pada-sthāpanā-vidhis* (*upāsaka*, v. B & S; *śrāvaka*, v. K). Both *vidhis* then instruct all lay folks to bring gifts from their own houses to congratulate the newly consecrated *bhaṭṭāraka* (*‘navīna bhaṭṭārakaṃ’*, BPSV v. K). The *Pada-sthāpanā-vidhi*’s Sonagiri and Beḍiyā copies add that this ought to be accompanied with great festivities (*‘mahā-mahotsavena’*). References to such concluding festivities, or at least to festivities more generally (*utsava*, *mahotsava*, etc.), can also be

⁴⁹ Technically a *Gurovāvalī* or lineage of teachers (*guru-śiṣya* lineage) differs from a *Paṭṭāvalī* or list of incumbents. In early modern Digambara tradition however this distinction is not made, different manuscripts regularly identifying one and the same text through either of both titles.

⁵⁰ The Kārañjā version of the BPSV drops the epithet *Nandyāmnāya*, like other textual as well as epigraphic sources also regularly do.

found in the *paṭṭa-sthāpanā-gītas*,⁵¹ including the performance of music and song after the consecration of Bhaṭṭāraka Guṇakīrti mentioned before (Kāsalīvāla 1969, p. 454).

The *Bhaṭṭāraka-dīkṣā-vidhi* concludes with mentioning a meal offered to the whole *saṅgha* ('*sarva-saṅgha-bhojanam*'). This can probably be taken to mean both renunciators and laypeople, appropriate provisions separately made for both as in contemporary praxis. The *Bhaṭṭāraka-pada-sthāpanā-vidhi* adds that the patron ought not only to feed the *saṅgha* but also make an offering of cloth(es) etc. to the *saṅgha* ('*vastrādīnā saṅghārcanam*'), which in this case must refer to the renunciators' congregation. Jaina (2009, p. 120) argues on the basis of this fragment that early modern *bhaṭṭārakas* were clothed, while *ācāryas* and *upādhyāyas* contemporaneous to them were not, given that the consecration manuals for the latter ranks contain no such mention of cloth gifted to them upon their promotions. However, as noted, we don't have conclusive evidence concerning the nudity or clothedness of early modern Digambara renunciators, be it *bhaṭṭārakas* or of other ranks (see Section 3.1). But in light of the plentiful evidence of a clear ascetic hierarchy with the *bhaṭṭārakas* at the top, the implication of Jaina's interpretation that naked *ācāryas* and *upādhyāyas* (and *munis*) were subordinated to clothed *bhaṭṭārakas* seems very unlikely. The *Bhaṭṭāraka-pada-sthāpanā-vidhis* conclude in ordering that beggars, poor people, and orphans should also be satisfied.

4. Further Glimpses from Songs of Praise

Although most *bhaṭṭāraka gītas* offer only very partial, unsystematic, or ad hoc accounts of specific *bhaṭṭāraka* consecrations, they largely confirm the rites prescribed by the manuals, at the same time presenting us a more vivid account of the rituals, preparations, and festivities. Some songs also add elements not included in the manuals' outlines, including a few seemingly important ones. This is the case, most notably, for the compositions on the *paṭṭābhiṣekas* of two consecutive Mūlasaṅgha Balātkāraṅga Ḍhūṇḍhāḍasākḥā *bhaṭṭārakas*, Bhaṭṭāraka Devendrakīrti in Āmera in s. 1770 (1712–1713 CE), and Bhaṭṭāraka Mahendrakīrti in Delhi in s. 1792 (1734–1735 CE). Notable additional elements attested in either or in both texts concern the role played by laypeople in the festivities and rituals, amongst other in the performance of a ritual referred to as *āñjalī* (Section 4.1); the anointment of the initiand with *kalaśa* pitchers (Section 4.2); the initiand's taking or probably rather recollection of the five *mahāvratas* vows, five *samiti* regulations, and three *gupti* restraints (Section 4.3); his performance of *keśaloñca*, the pulling out of the hair (Section 4.4); and the gifting of ascetic paraphernalia to the initiand: a water pitcher (*kamaṇḍalu*), whisk (*picchī*), and lotus (Section 4.5).

Here is the relevant section from Nemaacanda's account of the consecration of Bhaṭṭāraka Devendrakīrti, as edited by Nyāyatīrtha (1985b, p. 36):

Eka yatī paṇḍita pañca saba mili kalasa kañcaṅga ḍhāliyā|
Āñjalī sāha ghāsīrāma jhelī sāṅga jyo sujasa kīyā||6||
Sīnghāsani baidā śrī munirājai sira para chatra dharāyaji|
Kavalī kamaṇḍala pīchikā dayā upakaraṅga livāyaji||teka|
Livāi upakaraṅga saṅjama līdho pañca mahāvratas mani dharyā|
Pāñca samiti triya gupati pālai pāñca indrī basi karyā|

One *yati* [and] five *paṇḍitas*⁵² together poured the golden pitcher.

⁵¹ Compositions referring to the consecrations of Kāṣṭhāsaṅgha Nandītaṭagaccha Bhaṭṭāraka Viśvasena, Dūṅgarapura, 16th century CE ('*utsava*', Joharāpurakara 1958, p. 270, *lekha* 672); Bāraḍolīśākḥā *bhaṭṭārakas* Kumudacandra, Bāraḍolī, s. 1656, ('*pratiṣṭhā pāṭa mahotsava*', *ibid.*, p. 101); Abhayacandra, Bāraḍolī, s. 1685 ('*uchava*', '*mahochava*', *ibid.*, p. 105); Śubhacandra, Poravandara, s. 1721 ('*mahochava*', *ibid.*, p. 80, n. 1); and Kārañjāsākḥā Bhaṭṭāraka Devendrakīrti, second half of the 18th century CE (*utsava*, Joharāpurakara 1958, p. 69, *lekha* 190).

⁵² I follow Nyāyatīrtha (1985b, p. 36) in his reading of 'one *yati* and five *paṇḍitas*' rather than, another possibility, 'one *yati*, a *paṇḍita*, and the *pañca*'; compare next composition.

As he poured the *āñjalī*, Sāha Ghāsīrāma brought fame to the saṅgha (? , *sāṅga* = ?).

The king-like *muni* was seated on a throne, above his head a parasol spread.

Taking lotus, *kamaṇḍalu*, and *picchī* as insignia of compassion.

Taking the paraphernalia, he took renunciation, keeping the five *mahāvratas* in mind.

He observed the five regulations (*samiti*) and the three restraints (*gupti*), bringing his five senses under control.

In his composition on the *paṭṭābhiṣeka* of Devendrakīrti's successor Bhaṭṭāraka Mahendrakīrti a little over two decades later, Paṇḍita Akairāma touches upon similar elements as Nemaçanda, while again adding a few more features unrecorded in the manuals (Nyāyatīrtha 1985a, p. 423):

Kari pūja mahimā śrī jineśvara vighana dūri bidāriyo||
Taba sūri mantra ucāri mukhasyom loṅca nija karasyom liyo|
Satavaṃta sūra sadhīra samarasa bhāva niramala tharapiyo||
Jayakāra sabada ucāra karatām kalasa masataka dhāliya|
Śrī rāva kirapārāmajī nija sujasa jaga visatāriya||3||
Dikṣā vidhi saba jugati syom jī kīnhīm subudhi vicāri|
Kaulī kamaḍala pīchikā jī dayā upakaraṇa sudhāri||
Purava vidhi jaba āñjulī jī jhelī sāhām tibāri||
Tihim bāra chājūrāmajī paradhāna pañca milyā dhaṇā|
Gachapati gurupada dāyo mili kari sakala pañca mahājanā|

Performing *pūjā* and praise of the *jina*, he removed all obstacles,

then pronounced the *Sūrimantra*, with his own hands pulled out the hair from his head.

The virtuous wise man, steadfast and equanimous, fixed his pure mind.

Shouting 'Hail!', he poured the pitcher over the top of the head,

Śrī Rāva Kirapārāmajī spread his glory through the world.[3]

Wisely and considerately he organized the consecration rite according to all [correct] methods.

He took hold of [?, *sudhāri*] lotus, *kamaṇḍalu*, and *picchī*, insignia of compassion.

When Sāha Tibari poured the *āñjalī* according to the manners of old,

at that time Chājūrāmajī [and the] foremost, virtuous *pañca* united,

together the *pañca* of *mahājanas* gave the rank of leader of the *gaccha* [and] guru.

4.1. Participation and Role of the Laity, *Āñjalī*

A first point recorded in more detail in the song compositions than in the manuals is the participation of laypeople, both patrons and *paṇḍitas*—scholars or ritual specialists. A list of some of the attending *paṇḍitas* is included in both *Ḍhūṇḍhāḍaśākhā paṭṭābhiṣeka* compositions, both also referring to the presence of 51 *paṇḍitas* (Detige 2019, pp. 281–82). The compositions also name other laymen, probably prominent members of the Digambara communities. At least one of the *Ḍhūṇḍhāḍaśākhā* texts also gives a role to the *pañca*, the committee of elders (compare footnote 52), and references to *mahājanas*, members of the merchant guild, are found elsewhere too. Particularly common are records of *saṅghapatis*, principal patrons known to have sponsored icon consecrations, pilgrimages, and—we can add here—renouncer's consecrations. The *Bhaṭṭāraka-pada-sthāpanā-vidhi* indeed identified the latter as main actors in the selection procedure of the *bhaṭṭāraka* candidate and the preparations for the consecrations, and here we see them taking part in the rituals and reaping fame for their service and donations.

The three compositions reporting the consecration of the Bāraḍolīśākhā Bhaṭṭāraka Kumudacandra in Bāraḍolī in s. 1656 (1598–1599 CE) all record the name of Saṅghapati Kahānājī (Kāsalīvāla 1981, pp. 101, 204, 233), the former song most explicitly confirming Kahānājī was the main patron of the consecration festival (*'kare pratiṣṭhā pāṭa mahotsava'*, *ibid.*, p. 101). Śrīpāla's *hamacī* on the Bāraḍolīśākhā Bhaṭṭāraka Śubhacandra's consecration in Poravandara in s. 1721 (1663–1664 CE) records a list of *saṅghapatis* who apparently came to the consecration from elsewhere (*ibid.*, p. 227). Compositions on other consecrations in the same lineage, of Bhaṭṭāraka Abhayacandra in Bāraḍolī in s. 1685 (1627–1628 CE, *ibid.*, p. 105) and Bhaṭṭāraka Ratnakīrti in Jālaṅapura in s. 1630 (1572–1573 CE, *ibid.*, p. 104) respectively list several *saṅghavīs*, and one *saṅghapati* and two *saṅghavīs*.

In the composition on Devendrakīrti's consecration, Sāha Ghāsīrāma reaps fame by pouring the *'āñjalī'* (*añjalī*). In the composition on Mahendrakīrti, this action was performed by Sāha Tibari, while Rāva Kiripārāma (Kṛpārāma) took the honor of pouring the pitcher (see next section), and Chājūrāmājī and the *pañca* are said to have recognized (?) the newly consecrated *bhaṭṭāraka* as guru. The precise meaning of the *āñjalī* ritual remains somewhat obscure, but probably involves a pouring of water or other liquids with cupped hands. Although not dictated by the manuals, its attestation in both compositions indicates it might have been another common part of the consecration festivals.

We can also pause to consider the signification of the *'jati'* who at the consecration of Bhaṭṭāraka Devendrakīrti poured a *kalaśa* together with the *pañḍitas*. In the modern period, there sometimes occurs a specific Digambara ascetic rank called *yati*, used to designate a celibate close to but below a *bhaṭṭāraka* (Detige 2018, pp. 310–11). In the early modern period, however, the term is used for renouncers of any rank. I, therefore, assume the *'jati'* who assisted the *pañḍitas* in pouring the golden pitcher was a full renouncer.

4.2. Anointment

The *Bhaṭṭāraka-pada-sthāpanā-vidhi*'s instructions as we saw included a procession with pitchers and their subsequent use for the ablution of the initiand's feet. In the case of Mahendrakīrti, it is clear that Rāva Kiripārāma poured a pitcher over his head instead, performing a *mastakābhīṣeka* (head anointment) of sorts. Other songs attesting anointments however fail to indicate whether it was the initiand's head or feet being anointed. A composition on the consecration of Bhaṭṭāraka Kumudacandra in s. 1656 (1598–1599 CE) refers to the 108 pitchers of pure water we encountered in the *vidhis*' prescriptions (*'eka śata āṭha kuṃbha re dhālyā nirmala jala atisāra'*, Kāsalīvāla 1981, p. 205). According to Śāstrī (1992, p. 89), the composition on the consecration of the Jerahaṭaśākhā Bhaṭṭāraka Narendrakīrti in s. 1740 (1682–1683 CE) also mentions an *abhīṣeka* (lustration) with 108 pitchers. A layman also poured a *kalaśa* during the consecration of the 16th century CE Kāṣṭhāsāṅgha Nandītaṭagaccha Bhaṭṭāraka Viśvasena in Dūṅgarapura (*'tīnai avasari śrīpāla sāhi kula kalaśa caḍāvoyo'*, Joharāpurakara 1958, p. 270, *lekha* 672). With reference to the Kārañjāsākhā Bhaṭṭāraka Devendrakīrti in the second half of the 18th century CE, a song seems to indicate that the guru poured the *kalaśa* (*'kalaśa dhāḷunī nija padi sadguruna'*, *ibid.*, p. 69, *lekha* 190). A reference to the pouring of a *kalaśa*, unspecified by whom, is also found in the composition on the consecration of the Bāraḍolīśākhā Bhaṭṭāraka Śubhacandra in s. 1721 (*'dhāle kalaśa uttamga'*, Kāsalīvāla 1981, p. 227).

4.3. Mahāvratas

Three further additions to our knowledge of early modern *bhaṭṭāraka* consecrations as reconstructed from the manuals also concern the initiand, and are major parts of today's *muni* initiations. A first of these is the reference to the five *mahāvratas*, five *samitis*, and three *guptis* in the composition on Devendrakīrti, also found in another section of the related composition on Mahendrakīrti (Nyāyatīrtha 1985a, p. 423). As noted (Section 3.1), the reference to this set of ascetic rules, also summed up as the *tera(ha) cāritra* (thirteen ways of conduct), is very common in *bhaṭṭāraka gītas* as part of the observances ascribed

to them more generally.⁵³ The *Bhaṭṭāraka-pada-sthāpanā-vidhi* profiled a suitable candidate for the *bhaṭṭāraka* rank as a *muni*, as a ‘junior *ācārya*’, and, according to the Kārañjā version’s addition, as one observing the (*mahā*)*vratas*, *samitis*, and *guptis* (Section 3.1). And from Kāsalivāla’s (1969, p. 454; 1981, p. 234–35, see also Detige 2019, pp. 282–83) account of the composition on Bhaṭṭāraka Guṇakīrti, we learn that he had first taken the five *mahāvratas* at a function in Ḍūṅgarapura organized by Saṅghapati Lakharāja. While Kāsalivāla does not report an attestation of the *muni* rank from the composition, a *muni* is presumably what Guṇakīrti became at that time. As noted, the Kārañjā *Mahāvratā-dīkṣā-vidhi*, the outline for the initiation of a *muni*, also included the administration of the five *mahāvratas* to the initiand, the Sonagiri version remaining imprecise about which vows (*vrata*) ought to be taken (see footnote 11).

Despite some examples to the counter (see above, Section 3.1), I take it that, at least in the Sultanate and early Mughal period, as a standard practice *bhaṭṭāraka*-initiands were *munis* already. The fact that the *bhaṭṭāraka* consecration manuals do not explicitly prescribe the taking of specific vows but only feature a reference to *guṇāropana* (Section 3.4) might also be taken as a confirmation that *bhaṭṭāraka*-initiands already observed the *muni* vows. Devendrakīrti’s ‘taking’ of the five *mahāvratas*, five *samitis*, and three *guptis* during his *bhaṭṭāraka* consecration would then constitute a mere renewal of vows, or an act of contemplation thereof, rather than his first taking of these precepts. Namacanda’s phrasing also seems to indicate that rather than newly adopting them, Devendrakīrti concentrated on the five major vows and observed the five *samitis* and three *guptis* while controlling his senses. Albeit not in explicit connection to the *vratas*, the composition on Mahendrakīrti’s consecration also depicts the initiand as steadfastly and equanimously focusing his mind. Today, such a state of concentration also seems to be an expectation, or a good practice for Digambara initiands.⁵⁴

4.4. Keśaloñca

Prime among the additional features of the *bhaṭṭāraka* consecrations attested by the Ḍhūṅḍhāḍaśākhā compositions is also Mahendrakīrti’s pulling out his hair (*keśaloñca*). Although this act, a central feature of contemporary Digambara *muni dīkṣās*, is not referred to in the *bhaṭṭāraka* consecration manuals, it is noteworthy that both Sonagiri manuals (BDV, BPSV) proceed with a mantra meant to accompany *keśaloñca* (*‘keśotpātanamantram’*, BPSV manuscript). *Keśaloñca* is furthermore also prescribed as part of the initiation of a *kṣullaka* and a *muni* in the respective *vidhis* of both the Sonagiri and Kārañjā manuscripts. *Keśaloñca*, the previous case of the taking of the *mahāvratas*, and the receiving of ascetic paraphernalia discussed next, might all have been actions already performed by the initiand in his prior ascetic career. Or, in as far as they were repeated during the initiation to these higher ranks, the *bhaṭṭāraka* as well as *ācārya* and *upādhyāya* consecration manuals’ silence about them might be understood as indicating that this much seemed self-evident to the manuals’ authors or users.

While the fact that Mahendrakīrti pulled out his hair himself might be an indication that no consecrating *bhaṭṭāraka* was present, as proffered above (Section 3.5), today initiands commonly pull out their own hair before their *dīkṣā*, leaving only a few strands of hair to be pulled out by the initiating renouncer, and for this would be praised for their endurance. Interestingly, and uniquely, according to Śāstri’s (1992, p. 89) reading of the composition on the Mūlasaṅgha Jerahaṭaśākhā *bhaṭṭāraka*, Narendrakīrti before his consecration in Siroñja (Madhya Pradesh) in s. 1740 (1682–1683 CE) was first decked out with clothes and jewels and was taken to a temple where he took off his whole

⁵³ Compositions on the Bāraḍolīśākhā *bhaṭṭārakas* Kumudacandra (Kāsalivāla 1981, p. 204), Ratnakīrti (ibid., p. 104), and Abhayacandra (ibid., p. 116), the Kāṣṭhāsaṅgha Nandītagaccha Bhaṭṭāraka Vijayakīrti (Kāsalivāla 1982, pp. 194–95), and the Ḍhūṅḍhāḍaśākhā Bhaṭṭāraka Mahendrakīrti, the latter also referring to the twelve recollections (*‘dvādaśa bhāvanā’*, Nyāyatīrtha 1985a, p. 423).

⁵⁴ As I observed it at a *kṣullaka-dīkṣā* in Jaipur on 7 December 2014 (see also Detige, in preparation b).

outfit and performed *keśaloñca*.⁵⁵ Remarkable because of its singularity in early modern sources, such as accountment and parading of the initiand is again fully recognizable from contemporary Jain praxis. Here, it certainly seems to indicate that Narendrakīrti was not yet a *muni* or *ācārya*, but instead directly initiated into *bhaṭṭāraka*-hood as a layman or at most *brahmacārī*, since fully-initiated renunciators would not typically be expected—or allowed—to take on civil clothes, let alone jewelry.

4.5. Renunciant Paraphernalia

Finally, both *Dhūṇḍhāḍaśākhā paṭṭa-sthāpanā-gītas* also record the gifting of a water pitcher (*kamaṇḍalu*), whisk (*picchī*), and lotus (*kavalī*, *kaulī*) to the initiand. This differs from contemporary Digambara initiations, in which instead of a lotus, a scripture (*śāstra*) is sometimes gifted as a third item next to the common ascetic paraphernalia of *kamaṇḍalu* and *picchī*. Yet a third, independent attestation indicates that the gifting of a lotus was probably a common practice, the lotus also mentioned in connection to the other two in a composition on the consecration of the Nāgaurāśākhā Bhaṭṭāraka Sahasrakīrti in s. 1634 (1576–1577 CE) (*‘pimchī-kamaṇḍalu-sahita-kaulī’*, Ajmer Guṭaka, cat. no. 148, pp. 42a–55a).

While the *bhaṭṭāraka* consecration manuals make no mention of ascetic props, the gifting of *kamaṇḍalu* and *picchī* are mentioned as part of the initiation of a *kṣullaka* and a *muni* in, respectively, the *Laghu-dīkṣā-vidhi* and *Brhad-* or *Mahāvratā-dīkṣā-vidhi* of both the Sonagiri and Kārañjā manuscripts. This confirms that not only *bhaṭṭārakas*, but other early modern renunciators too, resembled contemporary Digambara renunciators in wielding these ascetic insignia. The donation of *kamaṇḍalu* and *picchī* to the newly minted *bhaṭṭārakas* would then again have been a mere gift-giving practice in which a new set of these items was offered to a renouncer who already carried them from earlier on in his ascetic career. Nowadays, *munis*' whisks indeed seem to be annually and ceremoniously renewed, new *picchīs* being offered by laypeople at specifically organized functions (*picchī-parivartana-samāroha*, see, shortly, in [Detige](#), in preparation b).

5. Conclusions

Most of the elements prescribed by the *bhaṭṭāraka* consecration manuals are sufficiently confirmed by song compositions or other sources to take it for granted that they commonly featured in actual consecration practice. This is also the case for what seems to have been the central act of the consecration: the transmission of the *Sūrimantra*. In further studies we will, however, need to exercise caution in our reading of elements like the *Mahāvratā-dīkṣā-vidhi*'s prescriptions for the *muni*-initiand to dispense with his clothes during his initiation, or when considering the possible early modern application of vows like nudity. We have little reason to structurally doubt the contents of the song compositions, yet it is not certain whether those elements not prescribed by the *vidhis*, but attested in songs, sometimes in single compositions only, formed part of early modern *bhaṭṭāraka* consecrations more generally, across Western and Central India, and throughout the centuries. If so, it remains a question why the manuals failed to include these seemingly important acts in their outlines. As a partial explanation, it is possible that the procedures for some parts of the proceedings were preserved as nontextualized knowledge.

Today, *ācāryas* nor *munis* receive the *Sūrimantra* as part of their initiation, although contemporary Digambara *muni*-initiands do receive the *Varddhamānamantra* ([Padmanandi et al. 1982](#), p. 233). Other probable elements of early modern *bhaṭṭāraka* consecrations, however, like the contemplation of the five *mahāvratas*, five *samītis*, and three *guptis*, and the pulling out the hair (*keśaloñca*), are crucial parts of contemporary *muni* initiations. Ablution of the initiand, recitation of *Bhaktis*, *Gurvāvali*, and recitation of the desired qualities and virtues for the specific rank into which he is being initiated

⁵⁵ In the words of Śāstrī (ibid., p. 89, or of the composition itself?) Narendrakīrti thus took '*muni dīkṣā*'. As noted, the composition on the consecration of the Kāṣṭhāsaṅgha Nandītaṅgaṅga Bhaṭṭāraka Viśvasena in 16th century CE Dūṅgarapura also states that the initiand 'took Digambara initiation (*'grahī dīkṣā dīgambara'*, [Joharapurakara 1958](#), p. 270, *lekha* 672).

(*guṇāropana*) are also still practiced. The performance of *pūjā* veneration of early modern *bhaṭṭārakas* is now sufficiently well-known for us not to be surprised by the veneration similarly of living *bhaṭṭārakas*. It is also performed of today's South Indian *bhaṭṭārakas*, and although little-known, *pūjā* veneration of contemporary Digambara *munis* and especially *ācāryas* is a fairly common practice, especially on mass events like image consecrations and, indeed, renunciators' initiations (Detige, in preparation b). The performance of rituals by laypeople in the days leading up to the consecration (Gough forthcoming), the grand and festive setting, and the view that laypeople accrue much honor and merit through patronizing and participating in consecrations are also recognizable dimensions of contemporary Digambara initiations. These all form part of the continuity of Digambara initiation praxis from the early modern period, and perhaps beyond, to the present times.

I have not been able to observe *bhaṭṭāraka* consecrations among the still flourishing lineages in Southern India, which would of course form an interesting ground for comparison. Another field of further inquiry, beyond the scope of the present paper and my linguistic competences, is researching (the availability of) analogous textual sources from South India contemporary to the Western and Central Indian texts discussed here. As mentioned, a more in depth discussion of the *pada-sthāpanā-vidhis* for other ranks included in the manuscripts of the longer *bhaṭṭāraka* consecration outline is also postponed for another occasion.

Meanwhile, apart from showing the considerable similarity of early modern *bhaṭṭāraka* consecration rituals to contemporary Digambara praxis, and perhaps more importantly, our study of *bhaṭṭāraka* consecration manuals confirms a few crucial insights concerning early modern Digambara Jainism more broadly. The sources and the ritual procedures attested offer proof of the former venerability of early modern *bhaṭṭārakas*. They appear as *parameṣṭhins*, as standing in line with the ancient and medieval *ācāryas*, and as a special, higher class of *ācāryas* in the *saṅghas* of their own times. The late medieval origins and the continued early modern usage of the *bhaṭṭāraka* rank as a superimposition at the very apex of the prior Digambara ascetic hierarchy, rather than an inferior substitute after the latter's breakdown, is now beyond doubt. Our sources also confirm the preservation and usage in the early modern period of the ascetic ranks of *ācārya* and *muni*, that of the *upādhyāya* less plentifully attested, and the manuals' theoretical confirmation of the *kṣullaka* rank not yet borne out by records of early modern individuals, this rank perhaps having been conflated with that of the *brahmacārī*.

While early modern *bhaṭṭārakas* are nowadays often denounced for, supposedly, having been overly concerned with tantric practices ('*yantra-tantra-mantra*'), the similarity between the tantric initiation praxis in the West and Central Indian *bhaṭṭāraka saṅghas* and those of contemporary *munis* stands as one example of the likeness, rather than disparity, of early modern and contemporary Digambara renunciators. Both understood as venerable ascetics in their own milieus, both equally engaged in tantric practices. In contrast to the contemporary historiography of the early modern period, our sources and their Digambara authors' voices show no sign of any self-conception as belonging to an oppressed and declining tradition. Instead, a picture appears of a flourishing ascetic culture with diverse renunciator communities and dynamic practices, well-organized, transregionally connected, well-supported by lay communities and wealthy sponsors, and eager, able, and apparently allowed to flaunt itself to the broader society. The present study, then, confirms that in many ways the Digambara Jaina tradition in the Sultanates and Mughal Empire prospered, stood in continuity with earlier eras, and in turn also resembled ours much closer than generally thought.

Funding: Research partly facilitated by a grant of the FWO, Research Foundation Flanders (2012–2016).

Acknowledgments: Of taxpayers' financing of my hometown's public library, a wonderful place to work. Salutes to those Jains from throughout the centuries whose traditions are represented here, hopefully not misrepresented.

Conflicts of Interest: The author declares no conflict of interest.

Appendix A. *Bhaṭṭāraka-Pada-Sthāpanā-Vidhi*, Sonagiri Manuscript, Text, and Translation

[Section A.1: description and selection of a worthy candidate]

atha bhaṭṭārapadasthāpanāvidhirlikhyate|||laghvācāryapadaṃ sakalasaṃghābhirucitaṃ|idaṃ yogi⁵⁶ śrutajñāṃ jinadharmmodharaṇadhīraṃ|ratnatrayabhūṣitaṃ bhaṭṭārapadayogyaṃ muninṃ dr̥ṣṭvā caturvidhasaṃghaiḥ sahālocya lagninṃ⁵⁷ gr̥hītvopāsakamukhyaḥ saṃghādhipaḥ sarvatrāmantraṇapatraṃ preṣayet|

Now the rite for establishing the *bhaṭṭāraka* rank is written. Upon finding [seeing] a yogi with the rank of junior *ācārya*, beloved by the whole *saṅgha*, a *muni* well-versed in the *śruta* knowledge, skilled in uplifting the *jina* dharma, endowed with the three jewels, worthy of the rank of *bhaṭṭāraka*, after deliberating with the fourfold *saṅgha*, having determined an auspicious date, the *saṅghādhipa*, the chief of the laypeople (*upāsaka*), should send around an invitation letter.

[Section A.2: preparations and preliminary rituals]

tato vicitraśobhānvaitaṃ maṇḍapaṃ|maṇḍapaṃ⁵⁸ vedikā siṃhāsanaṃ cakārayet|Sarve upāsakāṃ cetyālaye⁵⁹|śāntikagaṇadharaṇavalayaratnatrayādī|pūjāmahotsavaṃ ca kurvaṃti|lagnādine śāntikaṃ|gaṇadharaṇavala⁶⁰yārcanaṃ vidhāya jalajātrāmahotsavaṃ ca vidhāya kalaśān||108 ānīyasasarvauśadhī|tanmadhye kṣiptvā tān|svastikopari sthāpayet||Tataḥ saubhāgyavatī strī bhūmau caṃdanena chaṭā dāpayitvā mauktikaiḥ svastikaṃ kārayitvā tasyopari|siṃhāsanaṃ sthāpya tatra pūrvoābhimukhaṃ taṃ bhaṭṭārapadayogyaṃ munimāsāyetaḥ|atha bhaṭṭārapadayogyaṃ munimāsāyetaḥ⁶¹||

Then a colorful and beautiful pavilion (*maṇḍapa*), a platform (*vedikā*), and a throne (*siṃhāsana*) should be constructed. And in a temple all the laypeople (*upāsaka*) should perform a great festival with the Śāntika, Gaṇadharaṇavālaya, Ratnatraya, and such *pūjās*. On the auspicious day, having performed the Śāntika and Gaṇadharaṇavālaya veneration (*arcana*), and having held a great festival with a procession of water pitchers ('*jalajātrāmahotsavaṃ*', *jala-yātra*), having brought 108 pitchers, having mixed in all herbs, he ought to establish them on top of a *svastika*. Then, after happily married women (*saubhāgyavatī strī*) have drawn lines on the ground with sandal [and] have made a *svastika* with pearls, [and] after setting up a throne (*siṃhāsana*) on top of it, that *muni* worthy of the rank of *bhaṭṭāraka* out to be seated there facing East. Now that *muni* worthy of the rank of *bhaṭṭāraka* out to be seated.

[Section A.3: recitation of *Bhaktis*]

atha bhaṭṭārapadapratīṣṭhāpanakriyāmityādīmuccārya siddhaśrutācāryabhakti paṭhet|

Having pronounced "Now the ritual for the establishment of the *bhaṭṭāraka* rank", etc., he ought to recite the *Siddha-*, *Śruta-*, and *Ācārya-bhakti*.

[Section A.4: ablution of the initiand's feet, *bhaṭṭāraka-stavana*, and *guṇāropana*]

⁵⁶ Compare v. K (Appendix B).

⁵⁷ Probably scribal error for '*lagnaṃ*', as in version B.

⁵⁸ This repetition, not present in the Kārañjā and B. versions, probably a scribal error.

⁵⁹ '*caityālaye*' in versions B & K.

⁶⁰ The manuscript here has a crossed out '*yaratnatrayādī|pūjāmahotsavaṃ*', a corrected scribal error.

⁶¹ This repetition probably a scribal error, only '*atha*' belonging to the next line already. See also next footnote.

tataḥ paṇḍitācārya siddhaśrutācārya⁶²||auṃ hrūṃ⁶³ paramasurabhi⁶⁴dravyasaṃdarbha
parimalagarbhatīrthāmbupūrṇasuvārnakalāśāṣṭauttaraśata tathā toyena pāḍau pariṣecayāmiti svāhā⁶⁵||
tata idaṃ yogī nr̥tyādi⁶⁶||bhaṭṭārakastavanaṃ||paṭhan pāḍau samaṃtāt parāmr̥śya guṇāropanaṃ kuryāt|

Then the paṇḍitācārya [utters]: “Auṃ hrūṃ, I make an ablution of both feet with the water [from] 108 golden pitchers filled with water from a sacred place suffused with the fragrance of the most pure substances, svāhā!” Then, after touching both feet from all sides reciting the praise of the bhaṭṭāraka (bhaṭṭāraka-stavana) “idaṃ yogīnr̥tya”⁶⁷ etc., the attribution of the virtues (guṇāropana) ought to be performed.

[Section A.5: transmission of the Sūrimantra]

tataḥ śrīgurustasmai tatpadayogyam paramparāgataṃ sūrimantram dadyāt athavā
tatpadayogyamunerabhāvācchrī bhaṭṭārakenāyuh|praṃte tatpadayogyasūrimantram patre ²⁶⁸ likhitvā
tatpatram madanādīdravyairveṣṭayitvā muktaṃ bhavati⁶⁹||tadā tatpatrasthāpanākīvidhikṛtaḥ pumān tatpatram
tasmai dadyāt|

Then the honorable guru ought to give him the traditional Sūrimantra fit for that rank, or, in the absence of a muni worthy of that rank, the Sūrimantra suitable for that rank having been written on a piece of paper by the honorable bhaṭṭāraka at the end of his life, that paper is deposited enveloped with bees’ wax and such substances. Then the man performing the procedure of the establishing of that paper ought to give him that paper.

[Section A.6: āvāhana]

athavāhanādividhi⁷⁰||auṃ hrūṃ ṇamo āyariyāṇaṃ||dharmmacāryādhipataye⁷¹
paramabhaṭṭārakaparamaṣṭhinatre hi ²⁷² saṃvausaṣṭ āhvānanaṃ|| 1||auṃ hrūṃ ṇamo āyariyāṇaṃ
|dharmmacāryādhipataye paramabhaṭṭārakaparamaṣṭhinna⁷³ tiṣṭha 2 ṭhaḥ ṭhaḥ sthāpanaṃ||2||auṃ hrūṃ
ṇamo āyariyāṇaṃ|dharmmacāryādhipate paramabhaṭṭārakaparamaṣṭhinatra mama sannihit[o]⁷⁴ bhava 2 vaṣaṣṭ
sannidhikaraṇaṃ||3||ityāhvānādikam kṛtvā||tataśca auṃ hrūṃ ṇamo āyariyāṇaṃ||dharmmacā⁷⁵ryādhipataye⁷⁶
sakalaśrutāṃbudhipārāprāptāya|paramabhaṭṭārakāya namaḥ||auṃ ā anena karpūracamdanena pādayostilakaṃ
dadyāt|

Now the method of invocation (āvāhana): “Auṃ hrūṃ, ṇamo āyariyāṇaṃ (salutations to the ācāryas)!⁷⁷ O, leader, ācārya of dharma! O, most excellent bhaṭṭāraka-supreme lord (paramaṣṭhin),

⁶² Again, the repetition of ‘siddhaśrutācārya’ from the previous phrase, missing from versions B and K, is probably a scribal error. We get a feeling the scribe was copying from another manuscript (rather than being dictated the text), his eye here having caught onto the ‘... uccārya’ of the preceding phrase, resembling the ‘paṇḍitācārya’ after which he goes at fault.

⁶³ Version K omits this seed syllable hrūṃ.

⁶⁴ Correcting a scribal error ‘subhabhi’.

⁶⁵ Jaina’s (2009, p. 116) version adds “iti paṭhitvā kalāśāṣṭottaraśata-toyena pāḍau pariṣecayet|”, “having recited thus [the aforementioned mantra], he ought to anoint both feet with water from 108 pitchers.”

⁶⁶ Versions B and K have ‘tataḥ aidaṃ yugīnetyādi’. Given that it is typically version K which offers forms differing from versions B and S, its agreement with version B here probably means ‘idaṃ yogī nr̥tyādi’ is an error of version S; see discussion in Section 3.4.

⁶⁷ See previous footnote.

⁶⁸ ‘2’ indicates a repetition of the preceding word, thus ‘patre patre’. Similar in further cases.

⁶⁹ Jaina (2009, p. 118) interprets ‘muktaṃ bhavati’ as ‘he (the bhaṭṭāraka) dies’; see discussion in Section 3.5.

⁷⁰ To be corrected to ‘athavāhanādividhi’. Jaina (2009, p. 117) reads ‘atha āvāhanādividhiḥ’, version K has ‘athavāhanādividhiḥ’.

⁷¹ Here and in the next case, version B has three times the vocative ‘dharmmacāryādhipate’, as in the third repetition in this section, which seems to fit better here, next to the vocative ‘paramabhaṭṭārakaparamaṣṭhin-’, than the dative ‘dharmmacāryādhipataye’, so I translate all as vocative ‘O, Dharmmacāryādhipati!’.

⁷² Jaina’s (2009, p. 117) version as well as the Kārañjā manuscript have ‘(. . .) atra ehi ehi’.

⁷³ Version B and K here add ‘atra’, typically included in this standardized ritual phrase, probably omitted here by scribal oversight.

⁷⁴ Illegible on my documentation of the manuscript.

⁷⁵ Scribal error.

⁷⁶ Probably scribal error, doubting between both forms used before, dative ‘dharmmacāryādhipataye’ and vocative ‘dharmmacāryādhipate’. Versions B and K have the dative, which seems the best fit here.

⁷⁷ From here on, I leave Prakrit passages in the mantras untranslated, because of, arguably, their more formulaic nature.

here here, *saṃvauṣaṭ*,⁷⁸ *āhvānana!* *Auṃ hrūṃ*, salutations to the *ācāryas!* O, leader, *ācārya* of dharma! O, most excellent *bhaṭṭāraka*-supreme lord, be established, established (*tiṣṭha tiṣṭha*), *ṭhaḥ ṭhaḥ*, *sthāpana!* *Auṃ hrūṃ*, *namo āyārīyānaṃ!* O, leader, *ācārya* of dharma! O, most excellent *bhaṭṭāraka*-supreme lord, be near me, near me, *vaṣaṭ*, *sānnidhī-karaṇa!* And then, having performed the *āvāhana* etc. as such, with camphor and sandal a *tilaka* ought to be applied to both feet with [the recitation of] this [mantra] (*anena*)⁷⁹: “*Auṃ hrūṃ*, *namo āyārīyānaṃ!* Salutations to the *Dharmācāryādhipati*, the highest *bhaṭṭāraka*, who has reached the other bank of (=mastered) the whole ocean of *śruta* knowledge, *auṃ ā!*”

[Section A.7: recitation of *Gurvāvalī* and *Bhaktis*]

tataḥ śāntibhaktiṃ kṛtvā||gurvāvalī paṭhitvā||śrī mūlasaṅghe naṃdisaṅghe ta⁸⁰ sarasvatīgacche balātkāragāṇa⁸¹ śrī kuṃḍakuṃḍācāryānvaye amukasya paṭṭe amukanāmaṅvān||bhaṭṭārakaḥ iti kathayitvā||samādhībhaktiṃ paṭhet||

Then after performing the *Śānti-bhakti* [and] reciting the *gurvāvalī* (succession list of the *bhaṭṭāraka* lineage) [as follows:] “In the revered Mūlasaṅgha Nandisaṅgha Sarasvatīgaccha Balātkāragāṇa Kundakundācāryānvaya, on the seat of so and so, a *bhaṭṭāraka* with such and such a name.” Having declared thus, he ought to recite the *Samādhī-bhakti*.

[Section A.8: *bhaṭṭāraka pūjā*, concluding festivities]

tataśca gurubhaktiṃ datvā||sarve yatinaḥ praṇāmaṃ kuryuḥ||tataśca sarve upāsakāḥ aṣṭayīm⁸²iṣṭhiṃ kṛtvā gurubhaktiṃ datvā praṇamaṃti||tataḥ sopi bhaṭṭārako dātre sarvebhyaścāśiṣaṃ datvā||tataḥ sarvā upāsikāḥ⁸³ nijanijagrāhān||mahāmahotsavena vārdhāpanamānīya⁸⁴||taṃ vārdhāpayanti dātā sarve||saṅgha bhōjayitvā||vastrādīnā saṅghārcanaṃ kuryāt||yācakān||dīnānāthāśca tarppayet⁸⁵||iti bhaṭṭārakapadavidhiḥ||

And then, after having performed devotion to the teacher (*guru-bhakti*), all the renouncers (*yati*) ought to bow. And then all the laypeople bow after making eightfold offerings (*‘aṣṭa||talyīmīṣṭhiṃ’*) and giving *guru-bhakti*. Then, after he, the *bhaṭṭāraka*, has given blessings to the [consecration’s] patron and to all, then with great festivities all the lay women present congratulatory gifts to him, having each brought [these] from their own houses. After feeding the whole *saṅgha*, the patron ought to make an offer of cloth etc. to the *saṅgha* (*saṅghārcana*). Beggars, the afflicted ones, and orphans ought to be satisfied. Thus, the method for the *bhaṭṭāraka* rank.

Appendix B. *Bhaṭṭāraka-Pada-Sthāpanā-Vidhi*, Kārañjā Manuscript, Text, and Translation of Selected Sections

[Section B.1: description and selection of a worthy candidate]

atha bhaṭṭārakapadasthāpanāvidhiḥ||evaṃ vidhi||muniṃ laghvācāryapadaṃ sakalasaṅghābhūcītaṃ⁸⁶||aidaṃ yugīna śrutajñāṃ jinadharmmodharaṇadhīraṃ||ratnatrayabhūṣitaṃ vratasamītigupti||yamaniyamasamyamaśīlanidhānaṃ|| bhaṭṭārakapadayogyam muniṃ drṣṭvā||caturvidhasaṅghaiḥ saha||ālocya saṅgrhitvā||sakalopāsakamukhyaḥ saṅghādhipatiḥ sarvatrā mantranapatrikāṃ kuṃkumāmkitāṃ preṣayet||

Now the rite for establishing the *bhaṭṭāraka* rank. The procedure is such: Upon finding (seeing) a *muni*, with the rank of junior *ācārya*, beloved by the whole *saṅgha*, versed in the *śruta* knowledge of

⁷⁸ *Bīja-akṣaras* (seed syllables) like ‘*saṃvauṣaṭ*’ are untranslatable.

⁷⁹ V. K reads ‘*auṃ āṃ||anena maṃtreṇa saheṃḍunā camānena*’.

⁸⁰ Superfluous *akṣara*.

⁸¹ Scribal error, should be vocative ‘*balātkāragāṇe*’.

⁸² Scribal error, ‘*aṣṭatayīm*’.

⁸³ V. B places this responsibility with all the laypeople, not only the women, ‘*upāsakā*’ (Jaina 2009, p. 117).

⁸⁴ V. K & B have ‘*vārdhāpanamānīya*’. I follow Jaina’s (2009, p. 120, n. 117) interpretation of *vārdhāpana* as ‘congratulatory gift’ (actually *vārdhāpanaka*).

⁸⁵ Jaina (2009, p. 117) has ‘*santarpayecca*’.

⁸⁶ Probably scribal mistake for ‘*sakalasaṅghābhūcītaṃ*’ of version K & B.

[available in] this age, skilled in uplifting the *jina* dharma, endowed with the three jewels, a storehouse of vows (*vrata*), the *samiti* vows, *guṭti* vows, forbearance (*yama*), self-control (*niyama*), mental restraint (*saṃnyama*), and morality, a *muni* worthy of the rank of *bhaṭṭāraka*, [and] after deliberating with the fourfold *saṅgha* [and] having determined [an auspicious date],⁸⁷ the *saṅghādhipati*, chief of all the laypeople (*upāsaka*), should send around an invitation letter marked with *kumkuma*.

[Section B.3: recitation of *Bhaktis*]

atha bhaṭṭārapadapratiṣṭhāpanakriyāyāṃ pū. siddhabhaktiṃ śrutabhakti ācāryabhaktiṃ ca paṭheyuh|

Now in the ritual of the establishment of the *bhaṭṭāraka* rank, *pū [=?]*.⁸⁸ They ought to recite the *Siddha-bhakti*, *Śruta-bhakti*, and *Ācārya-bhakti*.

[Section B.5: transmission of the *Sūrimantra*]

tataḥ śrīguruḥ tasmai padayogyāya|paraṃparāgataṃ sūrimantraṃ dadyāt||tadyathā||aum̐ ṇamo arahaṃtānaṃ ṇamo siddhānaṃ|ṇamo āriyānaṃ ṇamo uvajjhāyānaṃ ṇamo loḥ savva sāhūnaṃ|aum̐ paramahaṃsāya parameṣṭhine|haṃsaḥ haṃsaḥ haṃ haṃ hāṃ huṃ hūṃ hoṃ hauṃ jināya namaḥ jinaṃ samsthāpayāmi saṃvauṣaṭ a 38 dīkṣāvelāyāṃ|tathā [Śira?]ṣimastake|etanmanṭreṇopacaranīyaṃ|tathā aum̐ paramahaṃsāya parameṣṭhine|haṃsaḥ haṃsaḥ haṃ hāṃ hram̐ hraum̐ hrīm̐ hrem̐ hraḥ jināya namaḥ jinaṃ sthāpayāmi saṃvauṣaṭ|a 37|aum̐ hrīm̐ arhaṃ śrī namo haṃsaḥ namo haṃsaḥ||a 17|eteṣāṃ trayānāṃ madhye ekam̐ manṭraṃ dātavyam̐|Athavā tatpadayogyamunerabhāvāt|śrī guruṇā bhaṭṭārakeṇa|āyuh̐ prāṃte|tatpadayogyam̐ sūrimantraṃ patre likhitoḥ tatpatraṃ madanādīdravyai veṣṭayitvā rūpyapatrāchādita samputīkāyāṃ muktam̐ bhavati|tadā tatpadasthāpanavidhiḥ kṛtaḥ||

Then the honorable guru ought to give that one who is fit for the rank the traditional *Sūrimantra*. As follows: “*Aum̐, ṇamo arahaṃtānaṃ, ṇamo siddhānaṃ, ṇamo āriyānaṃ, ṇamo uvajjhāyānaṃ, ṇamo loḥ savva sāhūnaṃ. Aum̐. [Salutations] to the supreme renouncer (parama-haṃsa), to the supreme lord (parameṣṭhin)! Haṃsaḥ haṃsaḥ haṃ haṃ hāṃ huṃ hūṃ hoṃ hauṃ. Salutations to the jina! I make the jina abide nearby, saṃvauṣaṭ!*” And at the right moment (*velāyāṃ*) for the *dīkṣā*, on top of the head, that mantra is to be imparted 38 times. As well as, 37 times: “[Salutations] to the supreme renouncer (*parama-haṃsa*), to the supreme lord (*parameṣṭhin*)! *Haṃsaḥ haṃsaḥ haṃ hāṃ hram̐ hraum̐ hrīm̐ hrem̐ hraḥ. Salutations to the jina! I make the jina abide nearby, saṃvauṣaṭ!*” [And,] 17 times: “*Aum̐ hrīm̐ arhaṃ śrī namo haṃsaḥ namo haṃsaḥ.*” In between these three [mantras] one mantra ought to be given. Or, in the absence of a *muni* worthy of that rank, the *Sūrimantra* suitable for that rank having been written by the honorable *bhaṭṭāraka* guru on a piece of paper at the end of his life, that paper having been enveloped with beeswax and such substances, [and] covered (*chādita*) with a stamped (*rūpya*) leaf of paper, that manuscript is deposited (*‘muktam̐ bhavati’*) in a treasure box (*‘samputīkāyāṃ’*). Then, the rite of the establishment (*sthāpana*) of that rank⁸⁹ is done.

Appendix C. *Bhaṭṭāraka-Dīkṣā-Vidhi*, Sonagiri Manuscript, Text, and Translation

[Section C.4: ablution of the initiand’s feet, *bhaṭṭāraka-stavana*, and *guṇāropana*]

bhaṭṭāradīkṣāvidhiḥ||gurubhaktiṃ dattvā paścādgurostilakadānaṃ tato nirvedasauṣṭavetistavanaṃ śāntijinamityuccārya guroḥ satpādau parāṃṣya gururguṇāropanaṃ kuryāt

The method for the consecration of a *bhaṭṭāraka*: After having performed *guru-bhakti*, the application of a *tilaka* from the guru, then a hymn [on?] ‘otherworldliness and skillfulness’. After pronouncing thus: “*Śānti jinaṃ*”, after rubbing both venerable feet of the guru, the guru ought to perform *guṇāropana*.

⁸⁷ ‘*lagnaṃ*’ as in v. B missing, scribal error.

⁸⁸ Compare versions S & B, which indicate this much ought to be recited as an announcement (*‘ityādi uccārya’*, v. B; *‘ityādimuccārya’*, v. S). Perhaps the manuscript’s abbreviation ‘*pū*’, of which signification I am unclear, is an indication of the latter.

⁸⁹ Probably scribal error for ‘*patra*’ of other versions, see discussion in Section 3.5, footnote 45.

[Section C.5: transmission of the *Sūrimantra*]

śrī gurustasmai tatpadayogyam paraṃparāgataṃ sūrimantram dadyāt athavā tatpadayogyasādhorabhāvādguruḥ svāyuh prāṃte tatpadocitaṃ sūrimantram patre likhitoṃ tatpatram madanādidravyaivāṣṭayitvā muktaḥ syāttadā tatpatram mukhyaśrāddhebhystathā suśiṣyāya samarppayet tatpatrasthāpanikāvidhi kṛbharastatpatram bhāṭṭārakapadasthāya dadyāt

The honorable guru ought to impart the traditional *Sūrimantra* proper for the post to him. Or, in the absence of a *sādhu* worthy of that [*bhāṭṭāraka*] rank, at the end of his life, the guru may die after having the *Sūrimantra* appropriate for that post written down on a piece of paper [and] having enveloped that leaf with beeswax and other substances. In that case, it may be so that this leaf ought to be given to the principal, faithful people and to a good pupil. Performing the method (*vidhi*) of the *sthāpana* of that leaf, he ought to give that paper to the one engaged in [obtaining] the *bhāṭṭāraka* rank.

[Section C.6: *āvāhana*]

athāvāhanādividhiḥ auṃ hrīm arhaṃ ṇamo āiriyāṇaṃ dharmācāryādhipate paramasūre bhāṭṭārakaparameṣṭinnatra ehi 2 saṃvausaḍityā.⁹⁰ auṃ ṇamo āiriyāṇaṃ dharmācāryādhipataye śrutābdhipāragāya namaḥ anena pādāyostilakam dadyāt

Now the procedure of the invocation etc. “*Auṃ hrīm arhaṃ ṇamo āiriyāṇaṃ*. O, Dharmācāryādhipati! O, *parama-sūri*! O, *bhāṭṭāraka-parameṣṭhin*, here here, *saṃvausaḍ!* Thus, the *ā[hvānana]*. *Auṃ ṇamo āiriyāṇaṃ*. Salutations to the *dharmācāryādhipati*, who has crossed (=mastered) the ocean of *śruta* knowledge!” With this, a *tilaka* ought to be given on both feet.

[Section C.7: recitation of *Gurvāvalī* and *Bhaktis*]

tataḥ śāntibhaktiṃ kṛtvā guruvāvalīm paṭhitvā śrī mūlasaṃghe naṃdyāmnāye sa[ra]⁹¹svatīgacche balātkāragāṇe śrī kuṃḍākuṃḍācāryānvāye ‘mukapaṭṭe’ mukanānavān bhāṭṭāraka iti samudīryya

Then after performing the *Śānti-bhakti*, after reciting the *Gurvāvalī* as such: “In the venerable Mūlasaṃgha Nandyāmnāya Sarasvatīgacha Balātkāragāṇa Kundākundācāryānvāya, on a given seat, a *bhāṭṭāraka* with such and such a name,” having recited this, [continued in next section]

[Section C.8: *bhāṭṭāraka pūjā*, concluding festivities]

samādhibhaktiṃ paṭhet tataśca gurubhaktiṃ datvā sarve yatayaḥ praṇāmaṃ kuryyuh tataḥ sarve upāsakā aṣṭatayimīṣṭiṃ vidhāya praṇameyuh bhāṭṭārakaḥ saṃghanāyakāyāśiṣaṃ dadyāt śrāvakā nijanijagehādvarddhāpanamānīya bhāṭṭārakaṃ vaddhapiyeyuh sarvasaṃghabhōjanaṃ visarj[?]anamiti||

he should recite the *samādhī-bhakti*. And then, having performed *guru-bhakti*, all the renunciators (*yati*) ought to bow, and all the laypeople ought to bow after making eightfold offerings. The *bhāṭṭāraka* ought to bless the leader of the lay congregation (*saṃghanāyaka*). The laypeople ought to present festive gifts to the *bhāṭṭāraka*, having brought [these] each from their own house. [Then there is] an offering of a meal to the whole *saṃgha*. Thus [the *vidhi*].

References

- Cort, John E. 2002a. Singing the Glory of Asceticism: Devotion of Asceticism in Jainism. *Journal of the American Academy of Religion* 70: 719–42. [CrossRef]
- Cort, John E. 2002b. Bhakti in the Early Jain Tradition: Understanding Devotional Religion in South Asia. *History of Religions* 42: 59–86. [CrossRef]
- Cort, John E. 2002c. A Tale of Two Cities: On the Origins of Digambara Sectarianism in North India. In *Multiple Histories: Culture and Society in the Study of Rajasthan*. Edited by Lawrence A. Babb, Varsha Joshi and Michael W. Meister. Jaipur and New Delhi: Rawat Publications, pp. 39–83.

⁹⁰ = ‘*saṃvausaḍityāvāhana*’.

⁹¹ Scribal error, missing syllable.

- De Clercq, Eva. 2011. Bhaṭṭārakas and Digambara Monastic Lineages of Fifteenth Century Gwalior: Glimpses from Raīdhū's Writings. *Journal of Asian History* 45: 63–83.
- Deo, Shantaram B. 1956. *History of Jaina Monasticism from Inscriptions and Literature*. Poona: Deccan College.
- Detige, Tillo. 2014. Worshipping Bhaṭṭārakas. *Jaina Studies: Newsletter of the Centre of Jaina Studies* 9: 27–30.
- Detige, Tillo. 2015. The Bhaṭṭārakas of Kārañjā (Lāḍa): Trivenī Saṅgama at Jaina Kāśī. In *Sanmati, Essays Felicitating Professor Hampa Naḡarajaiah on the Occasion of His 80th Birthday*. Edited by Luitgard Soni and Jay Soni. Bengaluru: Sapna Book House, pp. 143–76.
- Detige, Tillo. 2017. Manuscript Collections of the Western and Central Indian Bhaṭṭārakas. *Jaina Studies: Newsletter of the Centre of Jaina Studies* 12: 36–39.
- Detige, Tillo. 2018. Satpātrāya samarpitaṃ: Manuscript Copies and the Early Modern Digambara Saṅgha. In *Gift of Knowledge: Patterns of Patronage in Jainism*. Edited by Christine Chojnacki and Basile Leclère. Bengaluru: Sapna Book House, pp. 274–370.
- Detige, Tillo. 2019. "Guṇa kahūṃ śrī guru": Bhaṭṭāraka Gītas and the Early Modern Digambara Jaina Saṅgha. In *Early Modern India: Literature and Images, Texts and Languages*. Edited by Maya Burger and Nadia Cattoni. Heidelberg and Berlin: CrossAsia-eBooks, pp. 271–85.
- Detige, Tillo. Forthcoming. Digambara Renouncers in Western and Central India, c. 1100–800. In *Brill's Encyclopedia of Jainism*. Edited by Knut Jacobsen, John E. Cort, Paul Dundas and Kristi Wiley. Leiden: Brill.
- Detige, Tillo. In preparation a. 'Nityaṃ praṇamanti': Funerary monuments of Digambara ācāryas, munis, and female renouncers from Western India (16th to 18th century CE).
- Detige, Tillo. In preparation b. The Ritual Veneration of Living Digambara Jaina Renouncers.
- Dundas, Paul. 1998. *Open Boundaries: Jain Communities and Cultures in Indian History*. Edited by John C. Cort. Albany: State University of New York Press, pp. 31–52.
- Flügel, Peter. 2006. Demographic Trends in Jaina Monasticism. In *Studies in Jaina History and Culture: Disputes and Dialogues*. Edited by Peter Flügel. London and New York: Routledge, pp. 312–98.
- Gough, Ellen. 2015. The Ṇamokār Mantra's Forgotten Brother. *Jaina Studies: Newsletter of the Centre of Jaina Studies* 10: 32–34.
- Gough, Ellen. 2017. The Sūrimantra and the Tantricization of Jain Image Consecration. In *Consecration Rituals in South Asia*. Edited by István Keul. Leiden and Boston: Brill, pp. 265–308.
- Gough, Ellen. Forthcoming. The Tantric Initiation of a Jain Monk. In *Tantric Communities in Context*. Vienna: Institute for the Cultural and Intellectual History of Asia.
- Hoernle, A. F. Rudolf. 1891. Two Pattavalis of the Sarasvati Gachchha of the Digambara Jains. *Indian Antiquary* 20: 341–61.
- Hoernle, A. F. Rudolf. 1892. Three Further Pattavalis of the Digambaras. *Indian Antiquary* 21: 57–84.
- Jain, Muni Uttam Kamal. 1975. *Jaina Sects and Schools*. New Delhi: Concept Publishing Company.
- Jaina, Ratanacandra. 2009. *Jainaparamparā Aura Yāpanīya Saṅgha (Dvītiya Khaṇḍa)*. Āgarā: Sarvodaya Jaina Vidyāpīṭha.
- Jaina, Pī Sī, ed. 2010. *Bhaṭṭāraka Paramparā*. Jayapura: Jaina Anuśīlana Kendra, Rājasthāna Viśvavidyālaya.
- Joharāpurakara, Vidyādhara. 1958. *Bhaṭṭāraka Sampradāya*. Solāpura: Jaina Saṃskṛiti Saṃrakṣaka Saṅgha.
- Joharāpurakara, Vidyādhara. 1964. Jaina Saṅgha ke chaḥ aṃga. *Anekānta* 17: 231–32.
- Kāsalīvāla, Kastūracanda. 1967. *Rājasthāna ke Jaina Saṃta: Vyaktitva Evaṃ Kṛtitva*. Jayapura: Śrī Di. Jaina A. Kṣetra Śrī Mahāvīrajī.
- Kāsalīvāla, Kastūracanda. 1969. Bhaṭṭāraka Guṇakīrti kā paṭṭābhīṣeka. *Vīra-Vāṇī* 21: 453–54.
- Kāsalīvāla, Kastūracanda. 1979. *Kavivara Būcarāja Evaṃ Unake Samakālīna Kavi*. Jayapura: Śrī Mahāvīra Grantha Akādamī.
- Kāsalīvāla, Kastūracanda. 1981. *Bhaṭṭāraka Ratnakīrti Evaṃ Kumudacandra, Vyaktitva Evaṃ Kṛtitva*. Jayapura: Śrī Mahāvīra Grantha Akādamī.
- Kāsalīvāla, Kastūracanda. 1982. *Ācārya Somakīrti Evaṃ Brahma Yaśodhara*. Jayapura: Śrī Mahāvīra Grantha Akādamī.
- Nyāyatīrtha, Anupacanda. 1985a. Āmera gaddī ke Bhaṭṭāraka Mahendrakīrti kā Dillī meṃ paṭṭābhīṣeka. *Vīra-Vāṇī* 37: 421–23.
- Nyāyatīrtha, Anupacanda. 1985b. Āmera meṃ paṭṭastha antima Bhaṭṭāraka Devendrakīrti. *Vīra-Vāṇī* 37: 34–36.

- Padmanandi, Muni, Muni Devanandi, and Āryikā Kulabhūṣaṇamatī. 1982. *Humbuja-Śramaṇa-Siddhānta Pāṭhāvali*. Jayapura: Śrī Digambara Jaina Kunthu Vijaya Granthamālā Samiti.
- Premī, Nāthūrāma. 1913. Bhaṭṭāraka (4). *Jaina Hitaiṣī* 8: 57–70.
- Premī, Nāthūrāma. n.d. Īḍar kī Gaddī. *Jain Hitaiṣī*, 459–64.
- Sangave, Vilas A. 1980. *Jaina Community—A Social Survey*, rev. ed. Bombay: Popular Prakashan. First published 1959.
- Sangave, Vilas A. 2001. *Facets of Jainology. Selected Research Papers on Jain Society, Religion and Culture*. Mumbai: Popular Prakashan.
- Śāstrī, Phūlacandra. 1992. *Parvāra Jaina Samāja kā Itihāsa*. Jabalapura: Śrī Bhāratavarṣīya Digambara Jaina Paravāra Sabhā.



© 2019 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/>).