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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 renouncers. Many of their practices accorded to those of today’s Digambara munis, and the bhaṭṭāraka saṅgha also featured renouncers 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 (pattabhiseka, dīkṣā). The study is mainly based on two genres of sources. Sanskrit bhaṭṭāraka consecration manuals (dīkṣā-viḍhī, 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.
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1. Introduction

In Western and Central India, seats and lineages of male Digambara Jaina renouncers 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). 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...
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 forthcoming). Deceased, early modern bhaṭṭārakas were probably very commonly venerated with rituals like pījā and ārātī (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 (vīhāra), 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 panditas 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 sanghās. The case of bhaṭṭāraka consecration rituals (paṭṭābhīṣekā, 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 renunciation 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. Sāstrī (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 sanghās 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, paṭṭābhīṣekā 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 bhattāraka consecration practice, both little-known, little-used in scholarship, or newly discovered. Undated Sanskrit manuals for bhattāraka 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 bhattārakas. 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 bhattāraka 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 (bhāndāra) of two former seats of the Mūlasaṅga Balātkāraṇa bhāṭṭāraka tradition in Central India.4 The first manuscripts were discovered by chance while randomly browsing through manuscript bundles in the collection of the Sonagiriśākha5 bhaṭṭārakas at the Bhaṭṭāraka Kotī 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, ‘Manaṭra saṅgraha’) were also found subsequently. A second copy, featuring important and unique additions (see next), was discovered in the Chandranātha Dīgambara Mandira in Kāraṇjā, Maharāshtra, the home of the Mūlasaṅga Balātkāraṇa Kāraṇjāśākha (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 Śālalmati, itself based, according to Jaina (2009, pp. 115–16), on a manuscript retrieved from a manuscript collection in Bediyā, Gujarāt by Ācārya Saṅmatisāgara.7 Premī (1913, p. 59) had obtained a manuscript of a bhaṭṭāraka consecration manual from Īdara. 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 my course of 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 Mūlasaṅga Balātkāraṇa lineages (Sonagiriśākha, Kāraṇjāśākha, Īdaraśākha, etc.) derive from Johārapurakara’s (1958) seminal Bhaṭṭāraka Saṃpradāya. They were however not used by the lineages themselves (see Detige forthcoming).
6 Jaina discusses and refutes the canonical authenticity (‘īgasmokta’) of the bhaṭṭāraka consecration manual in a broader argument against the legitimacy of the rank of the cloaked 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 Dīgambara Jains contemporary to them.
7 I have not been able to consult the Āryikā Śālalmati book. Jaina (2009, pp. 115–16) gives only the following, further bibliographical information for the source of his Bhaṭṭāraka-pada-sthāpanā text: Vividha Dīkṣā-saṃskāra Vidhi, 2002, pp. 69–77.

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

The shorter Bhāṭṭāraka-dīkṣā-vidhi largely overlaps with the latter part of the Bhāṭṭāraka-pada-sthāpanā-vidhi. The Bhāṭṭāraka-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 Bhāṭṭāraka-pada-sthāpanā-vidhis occur within a set of outlines of initiation rites for various Digambara mendicant ranks. Also featured in the Sonagiri and Kāraṇāja manuscripts are a Laghu-dīkṣā-vidhi, an outline of the method for a ksullaka (‘junior monk’) initiation; a manual for Mahātarata-dīkṣā or Bhṛhad-dīkṣā, in effect the method for a muni initiation; and upādhyāya andācārya consecration manuals. Jaina (2009, p. 121) also gives the text of the Ācārya- and Upādhyāya-pada-sthāpanā-vidhis, again from the Āryikā Śītalamati booklet (referring to pp. 72–73 and p. 72 respectively), and it seems likly the Bēdiyā 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 bhāṭṭāraka sāṅghas. For one thing, the order in which the various initiation rites are given, that for the bhāṭṭāraka following that for the upādhyāya and ācārya, confirms that the bhāṭṭāraka rank was at that time paramount.

In prescribing the recitation of a Gurvāvati 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 Mūlasāṅgha Nandyānāya Sarasватīgacha Balāktārāgaṇa Kundākundācāryānāvaya. Next to everything we know about early modern bhāṭṭāraka consecration hence applies to this tradition (in short, the Mūlasāṅgha Balāktārāgaṇa), as a single song composition is our only source offering some indications of Kāṭhāsāṅgha Nanditaṭagaccha bhāṭṭāraka consecrations (Section 2.2). However, other close parallels between Kāṭhāsāṅgha and Mūlasāṅgha practices indicate that other traditions probably held similar consecration practices as the Mūlasāṅgha Balāktārāgaṇa, excepting probably specific details or procedural differences. One source certainly confirms that Kāṭhāsāṅgha bhāṭṭāraka–rank renouncers were similarly distinguished from lower ranking Kāṭhāsāṅgha renouncers by possessing the Sūrīmantra,

---

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 Sūrīmantra, 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 Sūrīmantra 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 Bhāṭṭāraka Śūbhačandra’s consecration in s. 1721 (1663 CE), however, his earlier ‘laghu dīkṣā’ made him a brāhmaṇacārvī, not a ksullaka (Kāśāntvāla 1981, p. 227).

11 The manuscripts refer to the text variously as Bhṛhad-dīkṣā-vidhi and Mahātarata-dīkṣā-vidhi, but towards the end the text refers to the newly initiated renouncer as a muni. The Kāraṇāja version also explicitly refers to the administration to the initiate of the mahākārāvata (see below, Sections 3.1 and 4.3), samitīs, and 28 mūlavatās, the Sonagiri text referring only to unspecified vows (vratas).

12 The manuals for the initiations into these other ranks found preceding the Bhāṭṭāraka-pada-sthāpanā-vidhi in the manuscripts are still reproduced (e.g., Padmanandi et al. 1982, pp. 231–41), and are still used during dīkṣā (Gough forthcoming).
and we can presume the mantra was also imparted to them during their consecrations, as it was to Balātārakāna bhattārakas (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 Balātārakāna 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 Bhattāraka-pada-sthāpanā-vidhis, from Kāraṇā and Sonagiri, and the Sonagiri Bhattāraka-dīksā-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 Balātārakāna 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 Bhattāraka-pada-sthāpanā-vidhi (Appendix A) and the shorter Bhattāraka-dīksā-vidhi (Appendix C). I also offer an edition and translation of those sections of the Kāraṇā Bhattāraka-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 Bediyā version of the longer recension. Significant differences between the various versions of the Bhattāraka-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 Dīksā-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. Bhattāraka Song Compositions

Bhattāraka songs of praise are devotional and jubilant compositions singing the praises of individual bhattāraka’s virtues (guna-gīna), 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 bhattārakas 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 (pratisṭhā) and pilgrimages they conducted, and the honors they received from rulers. Variously titled gītā, jakhaḍī, hamaci, lāvaṇī, etc., such songs are found from the 15th to the 18th century CE. We know of several dozens of bhattāraka gītās, many edited, cited, or referred to in the work of Kastūracanda Kāsālīvāla and other Jain scholars, others newly retrieved from manuscript copies (Detige 2019, pp. 276–77).

Compositions are preserved relating to bhattārakas of various lineages of Western and Central India, though the majority relate to incumbents of the Mūlasaṅgha Balātārakāna. The greater availability of sources deriving from the latter tradition is a mere reflection of its regional predominance. Yet, examples of bhattāraka song compositions are also found on incumbents of Mūlasaṅgha Senagaṇa and Kāsthāsaṅgha Nanditaṭaṅgaccha seats, and, again going from other close parallels between the practices of different bhattāraka 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 bhattāraka gītās here, I draw from an earlier discussion in (Detige 2019, esp. pp. 274–79).
pupils of bhaṭṭārakas, either lay pāṇḍitas or celibate brahmaṇarīs, 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 (maṅgalācarana) in welcoming visiting bhaṭṭārakas and were used during the performance of ārati (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 Balātākaraṇa Īḍarasākha Bhaṭṭāraka Gunākārtī in Dūṅgarapura in s. 1632 (1574–1575 CE), attractive women (kamaṇṭī) reportedly sang maṅgalagītas (auspicious songs) about the newly minted bhaṭṭāraka, and dancers and musicians with various instruments also presented songs in his praise (Kāsalivāla 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. 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 Balātākaraṇa, 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 Śrātaśākhā sub-branch which I refer to as the Bāradoḷisākha (see Detige 2019, p. 276, fn. 27), three compositions deal with the consecrations of as many individual bhaṭṭārakas of Johāraṝakaraṇa’s (1958) Dīḷī–Jayapuraśākhā, which I refer to as the Dhūndhaṇaśākhā (see Detige 2018, p. 283), and one composition each relates to the Nāgauraśākhā, Īḍaraśākhā, Jerahatāśākhā, and Kārāṇjāśākhā. One composition mentions the consecration of a Kāsthāsaṅgha Nanditaṭaṅgaṭaccha 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, munīs, brahmaṇarīs, āryikās, and brahmaṇacārinīs present at the consecration events. These references constitute one of the sources allowing us to establish the occurrence of renouncers of munī 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 pāṇḍitas 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 renouncers 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 Jerahataśākhā Bhaṭṭāraka Narendrakārtī in Sironja in s. 1740 (1682–1683 CE), retrieved by Śastrī (1992, pp. 88–89) from a gatāka found in Sironja (no further specifications). Śastrī (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 pāṇḍitas and renouncers listed in the composition probably refers to attendees at the consecration: Muni Udayaśāgara and two unranked male renouncers, Subhakārtī and Jayakārtī, judging from their names and the fact that they are mentioned before Udayaśāgara probably at least munīs; three female renouncers, among which one āryikā and one bīja (probably brahmaṇacārtī), a third one remaining unranked in at least Śastrī’s account; and one brahmaṇacārtī (Śastrī 1992, p. 89).
Table 1. Chronological list of bhaṭṭaṭaraka consecrations attested in song compositions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bhāṭṭāraka Name</th>
<th>Lineage</th>
<th>Date of Consecration</th>
<th>Place of Consecration</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prabhācandra</td>
<td>Dhuṇḍhārāsākha</td>
<td>s. 1572 (1514–1515 CE)</td>
<td>Campāvati (=Chaksu)</td>
<td>manuscript, śāstrabhanḍa, Jaipur, gutaṅga no. 5, cloth no. 203, pp. 230B–31B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viśvasena</td>
<td>Kāṣṭhāsananga</td>
<td>16th Century CE</td>
<td>Dūṅgarapura</td>
<td>(Joharāpurakara 1958, p. 270, lekha 672)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sahasrakirti</td>
<td>Nāgaurenāśākha</td>
<td>s. 1634 (1576–1577 CE)</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>manuscript, Barā Ḍarāji Mandira, gutaṅga, cat. no. 148, pp. 52B–55B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kumudacandra</td>
<td>Bāraḍolīśākha</td>
<td>s. 1656 (1598–1599 CE)</td>
<td>Bāraḍol</td>
<td>three compositions: (Kāsālivāla 1981, pp. 101–2, 233–34, 204–5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Šubhācandra</td>
<td>Bāraḍolīśākha</td>
<td>s. 1721 (1663–1664 CE)</td>
<td>Poravandara (Forbandar)12</td>
<td>(Kāsālivāla 1981, pp. 226–28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narendrakirti</td>
<td>Jerahatāśākha</td>
<td>s. 1740 (1682–1683 CE)</td>
<td>Śiroḍja</td>
<td>(Śastrī 1992, pp. 88–89)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Devendrakirti</td>
<td>Dhuṇḍhārāsākha</td>
<td>s. 1770 (1712–1713 CE)</td>
<td>Āmera</td>
<td>(Nyāyatirtha 1985b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahendrakirti</td>
<td>Dhuṇḍhārāsākha</td>
<td>s. 1792 (1734–1735 CE)</td>
<td>Delhi</td>
<td>(Nyāyatirtha 1985a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Devendrakirti</td>
<td>Kāraṇjāśākha</td>
<td>second half of the 18th Century CE</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>(Joharāpurakara 1958, pp. 69–70, lekha 190)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Some gītas merely mention their subject’s consecration, or describe it very summarily in their broader narratives of the bhaṭṭaṭaraka’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 paṭṭaṭa-sthāpanā-gītas (‘songs on the consecration to the seat’). Among these are the three compositions from the Dhuṇḍhārāsākha and that from the Nāgaurenāśākha, and it is notably the two Dhuṇḍhārāsākha compositions brought to light, edited, and discussed by Nyāyatirtha (1985a, 1985b) that will add to our knowledge of early modern bhaṭṭaṭaraka consecrations as gleaned from our reading of the ritual manuals (Section 4).19 The composition on the consecration of the Jerahatāśākha Bhaṭṭaṭaraka Narendrakirti, as reported by Śastrī (1992, pp. 88–89), also revolves around the bhaṭṭaṭaraka’s consecration, and also features some unique contents (Section 4.4). With the exception of the latest, that on Bhaṭṭaṭaraka Šubhācandra, the compositions on Bāraḍolīśākha bhaṭṭaṭarakas edited and discussed by Kāsālivāla (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 Sūrīmantra (Section 3.5), some also mentioning a practice of anointment (Section 4.2). The compositions on the Īḍarasākha Bhaṭṭaṭaraka Guṇākirti (Kāsālivāla 1969, pp. 453–54; 1981, pp. 234–35) and the later Kāraṇjāśākha Bhaṭṭaṭaraka Devendrakirti (Joharāpurakara 1958, pp. 69–70, lekha 190) deal with their subjects’ entire lives. Yet, as already mentioned, the former, judging from Kāsālivāla (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
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16 A single dated attestation of this bhaṭṭaṭaraka stems from s. 1596 (Joharāpurakara 1958, p. 294).
17 (Kāsālivāla 1981, p. 80).
18 Bhaṭṭaṭaraka 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 Nyāyatirtha.
elements as the Western Indian puṭṭa-sthāpanā gītas in its verses on Devendrakīrti’s consecration, notably its scheduling under an auspicious constellation (muhūrtta), the gathering of the fourfold community (caturvidha saṅgha) of laypeople and renouncers for the event, the organization of festivities (utsava), the pouring of a pitcher (kalāsā, 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 Kāśhāsāṅga Nandītalagaccha consecration is, unfortunately, rather sparse with regards to details of the rituals performed. However, those few elements mentioned do accord to common Mūlaśaṅga Balātkāragaṇa practice: the pouring of a pitcher, festivities held, and the incumbent bhāṭṭāraka Viśālakīrti himself establishing his successor Viśvasena on the seat. Interestingly, the composition also refers to the initiand ‘taking Digambara dikṣa’ (‘graḥi dikṣā 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 bhāṭṭāraka 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 kesalotica, 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 āṅjali 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 Bhāṭṭāraka Consecrations as Prescribed by Ritual Manuals and Confirmed by Songs of Praise

In my edition of the Bhāṭṭāraka-pada-sthāpanā-vidhi (Appendices A and B), I divide up the text in eight sections, roughly thematically delineated (A.1–8). The Kāraṇḍa Bhāṭṭāraka-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 Bhāṭṭāraka-dikṣā-vidhi consists of close parallels to the Bhāṭṭāraka-pada-sthāpanā-vidhi’s 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 bhāṭṭāraka 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 bhāṭṭāraka (bhāṭṭāraka-stavana), and recitation of a bhāṭṭāraka’s virtues (gurūtrapaya) (A–C.4); (Section 3.5) transmission of the Sūramantra (A–C.5); (Section 3.6) performance of pūjā and other devotions of the newly consecrated bhāṭṭāraka, including aṭavhana (A–C.6, and A–C.8); (Section 3.7) recitation of the bhāṭṭāraka lineage (Guruvāvata) (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 bhāṭṭāraka gītas and their confirmations of specific elements from the manuals. Features of individual bhāṭṭāraka 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 Bhāṭṭāraka-pada-sthāpanā-vidhi adds prescriptions for preparations of the consecration not discussed in the shorter Dikṣā-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 bhāṭṭāraka rank and how he should be nominated. Importantly, all three versions of the text agree that a prospective bhāṭṭāraka
should be a muni already having the rank of ‘junior’ or ‘lower’ (laghu) ācārya (‘laghovācārya-padam [ . . . ] munim’). The candidate should furthermore be loved by the whole saṅgha, well-versed in the śrūta knowledge, steadfast in perpetuating the dharma of the jīna, and adorned with the three jewels (ratnatraya) of right faith, knowledge, and conduct (‘sakala-saṅghābhīrucitam [ . . . ] śrūta-jīna jīna-dharmadhārana-dhīryam ratna-traya-bhūṣita’), BPSV, v. S).

The Kārāṇjā 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-saṅyama-sīla-mīdhāna’ BPSV, v. K). It is not clear whether the terms yama, niyama, and saṅyama 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 mahāvrata or major vows of the Digambara muni—nonviolence (ahimsā), truthfulness (satya), non 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 bhattārakas as observing this set of vows also referred to as the thirteen ways of (correct) conduct (teraha cātrita: five mahāvratas, five samitis, three guptis).21

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 bhattāraka-candidate recognizably close to that of an ideal Digambara renouncer as understood today. Yet a major question remains concerning the bhattārakas’ and other early modern renouncers’ 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 Mahāvrata-dīkṣā-vidhi of the Sonagiri and Kārāṇjā manuscripts prescribes the muni-initiand to abandon his clothes during his initiation and to take the 28 muniṃ gupati 20 samiti gupati adi e pāle cānta tera prakara’, BPSV, v. K).

The Kārāṇjā 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-saṅyama-sīla-mīdhāna’ BPSV, v. K). It is not clear whether the terms yama, niyama, and saṅyama 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 mahāvrata or major vows of the Digambara muni—nonviolence (ahimsā), truthfulness (satya), non 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 bhattārakas as observing this set of vows also referred to as the thirteen ways of (correct) conduct (teraha cātrita: five mahāvratas, five samitis, three guptis).21 The 18th century CE Dhūndhādāsākha Bhaṭṭāraka Devendrākṣī 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 bhattāraka-candidate recognizably close to that of an ideal Digambara renouncer as understood today. Yet a major question remains concerning the bhattārakas’ and other early modern renouncers’ 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 Mahāvrata-dīkṣā-vidhi of the Sonagiri and Kārāṇjā manuscripts prescribes the muni-initiand to abandon his clothes during his initiation and to take the 28 mula guṇas, one of which is nudity. If we take this for granted, this would mean that a bhattāraka-initiand already was a naked renouncer. However, evidence concerning the nudity or clothedness of early modern bhattārakas is inconclusive, indications and attestations of both being found (Detige forthcoming), and less than that is known about early modern Digambara renouncers of other ranks. While it is often taken for granted that the change from naked to clothed renouncers 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 bhattāraka-initiand as already being a muni and an acārya, 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 acārya, upādhyāya, muni, and ksullaka also shows that, at least in theory22, the early modern Digambara tradition had safeguarded its entire
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20 As noted (footnote 11), the Sonagiri Mahāvrata-dīkṣā-vidhi’s brief reference to the administration of ‘vrata’ to the muni-initiand is expanded in the Kārāṇjā manuscript’s listing of mahāvratasya and other vows.
21 e.g., ‘samiti guptita adi e palle cātira tera prakara’ (Kāsaliyā 1981, pp. 56, 204); ‘pānicya mahāvrata sudha lā dhāre pānicya samiti dhare aṅgga udārīritya guptita guru cātira palle’ (ibid., pp. 228–29).
22 While sufficient sources attest early modern muni’s and acāryas 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 ksullakas are practically unattested (see Detige 2015, pp. 146–47 on a 19th century CE ksullaka). 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 acārya ranks in the period, of the bhaṭṭāraka saṅghas solely being composed of celibate brahmacāris and lay paṇḍitas, and of the bhaṭṭārakas themselves as being mere clerics or intermediaries between laypeople and renouncers (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 acārya. 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 acāryas” (ibid., p. 297) was their possession of the Sūrimantra, transmitted to the initiand 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 acārya, as an initiand, we also have some early modern sources attesting brahmacāris or even lay paṇḍitas being initiated to the bhaṭṭāraka seat directly. 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 pupilary circles of fully initiated renouncers as the ranks of muni and acārya 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 renouncers of lower ranks to select from. On the other hand, new incumbents also seem to have been attracted from elsewhere if necessary, 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 (laghvācārya-pada) attested in the Bhaṭṭāraka-pada-sthāpana-viḍhi’s initial phrasing refers to precisely. It does not seem very likely that the term laghu would here refer to youth. Some Paṭṭāvalis 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 renouncers, at least somewhat advanced in age, would have been preferred for this high-ranking position, but particularly charismatic or talented renouncers 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 Balāṭkāraṇa branches in the 15th and 16th century CE and in some Balāṭkāraṇa lineages (Bhānāparaśākhā, 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
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23 As a later example, one Pandita Mangalalacanda was consecrated on the Karaṇṭā Balāṭkāraṇa 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 brahmacāri to the empty līḍa seat after it had been empty for fifteen years since the death of Bhaṭṭāraka Kanakakirti.
25 Again standing as a later example of this (cf. footnote 23), Pandita Mahagalarcanda who was consecrated on the Kāraṇṭā Balāṭkāraṇa seat was a native of Nainavāṃ, Rajasthan (Detige 2015, p. 152).
26 I here draw from the discussion on maṇḍalācāryas in (Detige 2018, pp. 311–20).
a distinction for an ṛṣī. The manḍalācārya then stood in between the ṛṣī and the bhattāraka in the ascetic hierarchy, probably closer to the former, distinguished from the latter again because of the bhattāraka’s monopoly over the Sūtraṇātra, which granted him the privilege of icon consecrations (see Section 3.5). The term laghu-ācārya could then be taken to refer to an ṛṣī who was not (also) a manḍalācārya, although it might otherwise be exactly these manḍalācāryas who could be thought of as qualified to make the final promotion up to the highest ascetic rank of bhattāraka. Another, at least slightly more probable interpretation presents itself in the fact that bhattārakas were themselves also understood to be ṛṣīs and were regularly referred to such. A laghu-ācārya could then apply to an ṛṣī lower than the ‘bhattāraka-type ṛṣīs’. 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 Bhāṭṭāraka-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 renouncers. The text thus points out the involvement of the lay community in the selection of a new bhattāraka. 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 ṛṣī in today’s muni saṅghas. And yet it probably often was the former bhattāraka, 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 bhattārakas consecrating their own successors (see below, Section 3.5). According to Kāśīvalā’s (1981, p. 235) account of the composition on Bhāṭṭāraka Gunakṛtī, 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 bhattāraka 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 Bhāṭṭāraka-pada-sthāpanā-vidhi, the Kāraṇā manuscript indeed continues with a ‘Description of the auspicious and inauspicious constellations for initiation and consecration’ (Dīkṣā-pattaiḥṣeṣaka-nāṣatra-phalaphala-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 (manḍapa), stage or platform (vedi), and throne (sinhāsana) are to be erected for the consecration. Laypeople should hold a festival (mahotsava) in a temple (caityālaya) performing

27 ‘-amantaṃpatraṇ’, v. S; ‘-amantaṃpatrīṇ’, v. B; ‘-amantaṃ-pattrīṇ’, v. K. Version K adds that the invitation letter ought to be colored with kunkana (‘kunkumāṅkitaṃ’).
28 Compositions on the Bāradolīsākhā Bhāṭṭāraka Śubhacandra, Poravandara, s. 1721 (1663 CE, ‘caturvidha saṅgha’, (Kāśīvalā 1981, p. 80, n. 1); ‘saṅgha caturvidha’, (Kāśīvalā 1981, p. 227)); Dvīndhādāsākhā Bhāṭṭāraka Mahendrakṛtī, Delhi, s. 1792 (1734–1735 CE, ‘dvarī deva sūrya abhā saṅgha caturvidha śrīt’, (Nyāyatirtha 1985a, p. 423)); Kāraṇāsākhā Bhāṭṭāraka Devendrakṛtī, second half of the 18th century CE (‘caturvidha śrīsaṅgha nilārtvā’, (Joharāpurakara 1956, p. 69, lekha 190)). Other compositions’ listings of attending renouncers 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 Dvīndhādāsākhā Bhāṭṭāraka Devendrakṛtī in Āmera in s. 1770 (1712–1713 CE, (Nyāyatirtha 1985b, p. 36); (see also Detige 2019, pp. 279–82)).
29 ‘lagnum ghrāvē’, V. B. V. S has ‘lagnum’, and V. K omits, probably both due to scribal error.
the Śaṅtikā-, Gaṇadhara-valuṣya-,30 Ratnātaraya-, and other pūjā.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 Śaṅtikā and Gaṇadhara-valuṣya rituals (arcana) on the auspicious day selected for the consecration. After this, a procession with water pitchers (jalayātra-mahotsava) ought to set out. The auspicious number of 108 pitchers (kalasā) 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 (śthāpaya), possibly the pratīṣṭhācārya referred to later (see Section 3.4). Happily married lay women (saubhāgyavati strī) make another svāstika on the ground with lines of sandalwood paste and pearls. On top of it the throne (siṅghāsana) for the initiated 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 ṇhāṭṭārakā gītas regularly confirm elements of the preparatory rituals and festivals prescribed by the Pada-sthāpanā-vidhi. An account of the paṭṭābhiseka of the Balākāragana Dhūndhādāsakha Bhaṭṭāraka Devendrakṛiti in Āmera in s. 1770 (1712–1713 CE, Nyāyatīrtha 1985b, p. 36; see also below, Section 4) relates how the initiate, a munī, was seated on a throne (śiṅghāsana), and above his head a parasol (chatra), a symbol of reverence, was spread. A composition on the consecration of Devendrakṛiti’s successor Mahendrakṛiti 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 (viṃghana dāri vidārya), Nyāyatīrtha 1985a, p. 423), which indicates that such rituals were understood to render the consecration auspicious and successful. In his haṃacca on Bhaṭṭāraka Śubhacandra, the poet Śrīpāla records the performance of jina-pūjā, Śaṅtikā, 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 muḥtrata) in s. 1721 (1663–1664 CE, Kāsālvāla 1981, p. 227). According to Kāsālvāla’s (1969, p. 454) account of the composition on Bhaṭṭāraka Guṇakṛiti, a procession (jaliṣa) 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 decorated 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 Guṇakṛiti’s paṭṭābhiseka.

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 jina 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 (Śiddha-, Śruta-, Acāraya-, Śaṅtī-, and Śaṃśadhi-bhakti) to be recited at three different moments during the consecration ritual. The different versions all agree that firstly the Śiddha-, Śruta-, and Acāraya-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 Gaṇadhara-valuṣya-muṇḍalā during Digambara dīkṣā.
31 Version K drops the term ‘mahotsa’, festival, speaking directly of the pūjā being held.
32 Elsewhere, Kāsālvāla (1981, p. 235) speaks of a jalayātra and jaliṣa (also?) mentioned in the composition as going out in celebration of the establishment of a stepwell.
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 *āvihana* (see below, Section 3.6), single *bhaktis* ought to be recited twice more: the *Śānti-bhakti* before, and the *Samādhi-bhakti* after the *Guruvālī* (see below, Section 3.7).

In the first occurrence of *Bhakti* recitation, the texts from Sonagiri and Bediyā hold that a singular individual ought to recite (*‘pathet’*) the first three *bhaktis*. The version from Kāranjā, however, has a plural optative form (*‘patheyul’*). All three versions use the singular optative *‘pathet’* for the third *bhakti* recitation (*samādhi-bhaktim. *pathet’*, ‘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 dīksās* both the initiand and the consecrating guru read out specific *Bhaktis* (Gough forthcoming), and the Kāranjā 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 *pratīṣṭhācārya* 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 expression of the *pratīṣṭhācārya*, the *ācārya* in charge of the consecration (*pratīṣṭhālā*), in this case not of an icon but of a *bhaṭṭāraka*. In contemporary dīksās, icon consecrations, and mahāpūjās, a lay ritual specialist sometimes referred to as *pratīṣṭhācārya* (Gough 2017, p. 286), a sort of *pandita-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 ‘‘*ādām yogin-‘* (v. K & B).36 Given that it is only the transmission of the *Śūrimantra* 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-vidhi*s 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 (‘‘*guru-bhaktim. dattvā*’) 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 ablation 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 ablation of both the initiand’s feet with water from the 108 pitchers (*‘iti pathitva kalasāsottarāśata-toyena pādau pariścayet’*).]

36 Jaina (2009, p. 118) translates as ‘*Of this era*’ (*‘isa yuga ke’*). Version S seems to read *‘tata idam. yogi nityādā’*, 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.
(saunṣṭava), a closer parallel again to the bhaṭṭāraka-stavana referred to in the Bhāṭṭāraka-pada-sthāpanā-vidhi; recitation of the words ‘śānti jinam’ (etc.) while (?) touching the guru’s feet, clearly by the initiand; and finally the guṇṭropana, which, as this text clarifies, ought to be performed by the guru.

3.5. Transmission of the Sūrīmantra

Certainly an important part of early modern bhaṭṭāraka consecrations, and probably the most central, empowering act, seems to have been the transmission of the Sūrīmantra. Multiple variants of the typically well-secreted Sūrīmantra are used to consecrate icons (mūrti) by both Digambaras and Śvetāmbaras (Gough 2017) and to initiate Śvetāmbara acāryas (Gough forthcoming).37 As a part of early modern bhaṭṭāraka consecrations, it is prescribed by both the Bhāṭṭāraka-pada-sthāpanā-vidhis and the Bhāṭṭāraka-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 Sūrīmantra to the bhaṭṭāraka-initiand as “the key ritual action in distinguishing between an acārya and a bhaṭṭāraka”. In describing the ideal bhaṭṭāraka in his composition Sanghaṅgaka, Brahmacārī Jñānasagara also glosses a renouncer of this rank as possessing the Sūrīmantra (Joharāpurakara 1964, p. 232). Interestingly, Jñānasagara was affiliated to the late 16th/early 17th century CE Kāśṭhāsangha Nanditatacacha Bhaṭṭāraka Śrībhūṣaṇa (Joharāpurakara 1958, p. 298). This forms a so far unique, though unsurprising, confirmation that the Sūrīmantra was also used in the Kāśṭhāsangha, where it was probably similarly passed on to its bhaṭṭārakas during their consecrations, as in the Mūlasaṅgha Balāṭkāragaṇa. The importance attached to the Sūrīmantra, and its consecration 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 Sūrīmantras 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 Sūrīmantra of even the Balāṭkāragaṇa, and especially that of other traditions, I take it however that the various Balāṭkāragaṇa sister and daughter lineages, which were typically on good footing, used the same Sūrīmantra (see below in this section).

In nearly identical formulations, the longer and the shorter consecration manuals both allow for two ways of transmitting the Sūrīmantra. Either the Sūrīmantra 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 Kāśṭhāsangha Nanditatacacha Bhaṭṭāraka Viśvasena was consecrated by his guru Viśalakīrti in Dūŋgarapura (Joharāpurakara 1958, p. 270, lekha 672). A paṭṭa-sthāpanā-gīta on the seventeenth century CE Bārādolīsākhā Bhaṭṭāraka Kumudacandra explicitly asserts that he was consecrated and given the Sūrīmantra by his guru Ratnakīrti in Bārādolī in s. 1656 (1598–1599 CE, Kāṣálivāla 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 (Kāṣālivāla 1981, p. 233). In s. 1792 (1734–1735 CE), Bhaṭṭāraka Devendrakīrti consecrated his successor Mahendrakīrti on the Dūṅghādāśakhā seat (Nyāyatīrtha 1985a, p. 423). And in the

37 On the Sūrīmantra in Śvetāmbara Jainism, (see also Dundas 1998).
38 The Sūrīmantra is mentioned in compositions on the consecration of the Dūṅghādāśakhā Bhaṭṭāraka Mahendrakīrti, Delhi, s. 1792 (1734–1735 CE, (Nyāyatīrtha 1985a, p. 423), see below) and several Bārādolīsākhā bhaṭṭārakas: Kumudacandra, Bārādolī, s. 1656 (Kāṣālivāla 1981, pp. 101–102, 233–34, 205); Abbhayacandra, Bārādolī, 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 ‘sthavīra-cārya’ 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 Kāraṇjā 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 renouncers, 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-śīṣya) 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’ (‘paramparagatāṃ sūrimantraṃ’). 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.\footnote{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 (‘śīruṣtrasnai tapadājagūpyam paramparagatāṃ sūrimantram dadyāt’). Version K, however, changes this form into a dative (‘śīruṣtra tasmai padājyajagūpyam paramparagatāṃ 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 Kāraṇjā manuscript at this point, confirming it is a copy, here defective, of a text closer to the other versions.}

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) Šubhacandra was given the Sūrimantra and established on the Bbaraḍoli seat not by his predecessor Abhayacandra but by one Gachapatī Dharmabhūṣana from the South, probably Bhaṭṭāraka Dharmabhūṣana who was then on the Kāraṇjā seat (Šubhacandra hamač; Kāśalīvāla 1981, pp. 227–28). Half a century later, in s. 1770 (1712–1713 CE), the Dhūndhādāśakhā Bhaṭṭāraka Devendrakīrti was consecrated in Āmera by Candrakīrti, most probably the bhaṭṭāraka of that name then incumbent in the Nāgaurāsakhā (Nyāyatīrthā 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 saṃputikāya (memorial stone with carvings of the commemorated renouncer’s feet) at the Kūrtistambha Nasiyām in Āmera was consecrated in s. 1771 (Detige 2014, p. 28), such manuscripts 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,\footnote{As noted, Dundas (1999, pp. 45–46) notices, vice-versa, the relation between speculations about the power of the Sūrimantra and Śvetāmbara sectarian strife.} 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 Kāraṇjā, covered with stamped paper and deposited in a treasure box (‘rūpya-patrā-chādita-samputikāyaṃ muktaṃ bhavati’).\footnote{‘-aṭā, v. S; ‘-āṭā, v. B; ‘-āṭā, v. K; ‘-aṭā, BDV.} The Dīkṣā-vidhi adds that this manuscript ought to be entrusted to the main devotees and (?) a good pupil (śīṣya), not clarifying whether lay or renunciant. While it could also be taken

\footnote{\textit{Jaina} (2009, p. 118) interprets the \textit{Pada-sthāpanā-vidhi’s} ‘muktaṃ bhavati’ as ‘he (the bhaṭṭāraka) dies’, after having written down the Sūrimantra. The Kāraṇjā 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 svāt’.}
as a method to secure the continuity of the lineage when even inviting an initiating bhattacharaka from another lineage proved impossible, the Balatkaragana 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 bhattacharaka post, towards the end, it can be understood, of the incumbent bhattacharaka’s life.

The Sonagiri and Bediyā Pada-sthāpanā-viḍhīs 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 Kāraṇjā Bhattacharaka-pada-sthāpanā-viḍhī omits this latter passage, the Diṅgā-viḍhī clarifies that this signifies ‘the one engaged in the bhattacharaka rank’ (‘bhattacharakapadasthāya’), which I take to be the initiator. A more straightforward interpretation would perhaps be ‘the one being in’, or already having the bhattacharaka rank, referring then to a bhattacharaka 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 Balatkaragana branches probably used the same Sūrimantra. Both Sonagiri manuscripts, the Pada-sthāpanā-viḍhī and the Diṅgā-viḍhī, also mention a rite of ‘establishing’ the manuscript, the former explicating that it is to be performed by the man handing it over.\footnote{\textsuperscript{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 pāṭṭabhīṣaka of the 18th century CE Bhattacharaka Mahendrakīrti. No consecrating bhattacharaka is mentioned in an otherwise relatively detailed composition, and Mahendrakīrti is said to have recited the mantra and himself performed keśalōka—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).\footnote{\textsuperscript{46}}

Although the Kāraṇjā Bhattacharaka-pada-sthāpanā-viḍhī often seems the faulty copy, as noted it also stands out from the more closely related versions from Sonagiri and Bediyā because of some additional phrasings not included in the latter versions. By far the most important among the latter is a long post, towards the end, it can be understood, of the incumbent bhat.taraka. The manuscript then turns to the procedure for transmission of the Sūrimantra via a paper copy, 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.

\footnote{\textsuperscript{45} ‘tatpratsthāpanākāvidhi’, BDV; ‘tatpratsthāpanākāvidhi’, v. S (a scribal error or a vernacular phrasing entering the manuscript?). The Bediyā version refers only to an unspecified establishing (‘sthāpanākādhi’, probably a syllable ‘vi’ missing due to a scribal or editorial error). The Kāraṇjā version refers to the rite of the establishment of the rank (pada) (‘tatpratsthāpanāvīḍhī’) rather than of the manuscript (pata). Although reference to the bhattacharaka consecration rite in general is not undiluting at this point, this is probably another point where the Kāraṇjā manuscript is flawed.

\footnote{\textsuperscript{46} In the composition on the sixteenth century CE Guṇakīrti, we read that his bhattacharaka dikṣā was carefully planned by his guru Sumatiśīkha, but Kasāñīvāla’s (1969; 1981, pp. 234–35) account of the composition does not make it clear whether Guṇakīrti was ultimately consecrated at the hands of Sumatiśīkha as well.

\footnote{\textsuperscript{47} The five obeisances of the Namokāramantra are similarly featured as part of many longer Jain mantras (Dundas 1998, p. 35). The same mantra is still used in contemporary muni dikṣās (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 sthāpana, the establishment of the object of veneration, and sannidhi-karana, its placing in the nearness of the devotee. While the shorter Bhaṭṭāraka-dīkṣā-vidhi only spells out the āvāhana, the Bhaṭṭāraka-pāda-sthāpanā-vidhī also communicates the mantras for the sthāpana and the sannidhi-karana. 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 renouncers newly consecrated to these ranks, and in the latter case laypeople are also prescribed to perform eightfold pūjā (‘aśṭatayim īśtim’) 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 initiate, by now bhaṭṭāraka. Both manuals then proceed with prescribing the recitation of Śānti-bhakti, Gurvāvali (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 Gurvāvali section, when both texts similarly instruct all renouncers (yati) to give guru-bhakti and to bow (‘guru-bhaktiṁ datvā sarve yatinaḥ prāṇānam kuryduḥ’), BPSV v. S, section 8, variants in other BPSV versions and BDV) and all laypeople to also perform eightfold pūjā (‘tataśa sarve upasakaḥ aśatyim-īśthim kṛtvā guru-bhaktiṁ datvā prāṇāmanthu’, 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 jakhadi, Panḍita Akairāma reports how pūjā, and praise, of Bhaṭṭāraka Mahendrakīrti were performed after his consecration in s. 1792 (1734–1735 CE, ‘guru pīṭhāna vandana karai jī’, Nyāyatīrtha 1985a, p. 423). And according to Kāsalīvala’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 renouncers, beyond their featuring as an object of veneration in the āvāhana and pūjā. Importantly, the mantras refer to the bhaṭṭāraka as a paramesṭhin (‘paramabhaṭṭārakaparamesṭhin-’), 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 paramesṭhinus, 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’ (dharma-ācāryādhipati) 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 ‘nāmo āgariyānam’, ‘salutations to the ācāryas’, well-known
from the Namokāramantra. This could be taken as linking the bhaṭṭārakas 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. Gurvāvalīs (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. Gurvāvalī Recitation

The consecration manuals next prescribe another element which is still featured as part of contemporary Digambara initiations: the recitation of a Gurvāvalī or lineage text.49 Gurvāvalī recitation is also prescribed in the consecration manuals for kṣullakas (Laghu-dīkṣā-vidhi) and munis (Mahāvratā-dīkṣā-vidhi, Bṛhad-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’ (‘āmukasya paṭṭe amuka-nāmaṁ bhaṭṭārakaḥ’, v. S, and variations). However, as mentioned before, both texts do refer to the incumbent bhaṭṭārakas as standing in the Mūlasaṅgha Nandisaṅgha/Nandyāṃnaya Sarasvatigaccha Balātkāragaṇa Kundākundedācāryāṇvaya.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 renouncers, applies to this tradition only. Gurvāvalīs 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 Gurvāvalīs 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 Gurvāvalīs 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 Bārādolīśākhā Bhaṭṭāraka Subhacandra’s consecration in s. 1721 in Poravandara (‘birudāvalī bole’, Kāsalīvāla 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 bhaṭṭārakaṁ’, BPSV v. K). The Pada-sthāpanā-vidhi’s Sonagiri and Beḍīyā copies add that this ought to be accompanied with great festivities (‘mahā-mahotsavaṁ’). References to such concluding festivities, or at least to festivities more generally (utsava, mahotsava, etc.), can also be

49 Technically a Gurvāvalī 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 Kāranāj version of the BPSV drops the epithet Nandyāṃnaya, like other textual as well as epigraphic sources also regularly do.
found in the *paṭṭa-sīhāpanā-gītas*, including the performance of music and song after the consecration of Bhatṭāraka Gunakirti mentioned before (Kāsālīvala 1969, p. 454).

The *Bhatṭāraka-dikṣā-vidhi* concludes with mentioning a meal offered to the whole *saṅgha* (*sarva-saṅgha-bhojanam*). This can probably be taken to mean both renouncers and laypeople, appropriate provisions separately made for both as in contemporary praxis. The *Bhatṭāraka-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* (*vastrādīna samghārcanām*), which in this case must refer to the renouncers’ congregation. Jaina (2009, p. 120) argues on the basis of this fragment that early modern *bhatṭārakas* were clothed, while *acāryas* 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 Dīgambara renouncers, be it *bhatṭārakas* or other ranks (see Section 3.1). But in light of the plentiful evidence of a clear ascetic hierarchy with the *bhatṭārakas* at the top, the implication of Jaina’s interpretation that naked *acāryas* and *upādhyāyas* (and *muni*s) were subordinated to clothed *bhatṭārakas* seems very unlikely. The *Bhatṭāraka-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 *bhatṭāraka gītas* offer only very partial, unsystematic, or ad hoc accounts of specific *bhatṭāraka* 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 Balākāragaṇa Dhumḍhadaśākāḥ *bhatṭārakas*, Bhatṭāraka Devendrakīrti in Āmera in s. 1770 (1712–1713 CE), and Bhatṭāraka 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 *kalahastha* pitchers (Section 4.2); the initiand’s taking or probably rather recollection of the five *mahāvrata* vows, five *samiti* regulations, and three *gupti* restraints (Section 4.3); his performance of *keśalōṭa*, the pulling out of the hair (Section 4.4); and the gifting of ascetic paraphernalia to the initiand: a water pitcher (*kamanḍalā*), whisk (*pīchchī*), and lotus (Section 4.5).

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

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Eka jāti pan. dīta pañca saba mili kalasa kañcanā dāhīya[6]} \\
\text{Aṇjaltā sāla ghatstrāma jheli sānga jyo sujasa kya[6]} \\
\text{Siṅghāsani baidā śri munirājī sīra para chaṭtra dhārāyajī} \\
\text{Kavalī kaṃandaḷa pichīkā dayā upakaraṇa livāyajī[eka]} \\
\text{Livī upakaraṇa samjama lidho paṇca maṭārata mani dhārya[6]} \\
\text{Paṇca samiti triya gupti pālai paṇca ināri basi karyā[6]} \\
\end{align*}
\]

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

---

51 Compositions referring to the consecrations of Kāṣṭhāsaṅgha Nandīṭātagacchha Bhaṭṭāraka Viṣvāsena, Dūṅgorapura, 16th century CE (*utsavā*, Johārāpurakāra 1958, p. 270, lekha 672); Bārādoliśākāḥ bhaṭṭārakas Kumudacandra, Bārādoli, s. 1656, (*pratisthā pāta mahotsavā*, ibid., p. 101); Abhayacandra, Bārādoli, s. 1685 (*ucaḷuva*, *maḷoḷaṛava*, ibid., p. 105); Subhacandra, Poravandara, s. 1721 (*maḷoḷaṛava*, ibid., p. 80, n. 1); and Kāraṇjāśākāḥ Bhaṭṭāraka Devendrakīrti, second half of the 18th century CE (*utsava*, Johārāpurakāra 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 *paṇca*’, compare next composition.
As he poured the āñjalī, Sāha Ghāsirāma brought fame to the saṅgha (?, sāṅga = ?).
The king-like muni was seated on a throne, above his head a parasol spread.
Taking lotus, kamanḍalu, and pīcchī 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 (guptī), bringing his five senses under control.

In his composition on the paṭṭābhiṣeka of Devendraṅkṛī’s successor Bhaṭṭāraka Mahendrakṛī a little over two decades later, Panḍita Akairāma touches upon similar elements as Nemacanda, while again adding a few more features unrecorded in the manuals (Nyāyaṭīrttha 1985a, p. 423):

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Kari pūja mahimā śṛṅ jineśvara vighana dāri biḍāriyo} & \\
\text{Taba sāri mantra ucāri mukhasyoṃ loṭca niya karasyoṃ liyo} & \\
\text{Satavaṃṭa sūra sadhīra samarasa bhāva niramala tharapiyo} & \\
\text{Jayakāra sabada ucāra karatāṃ kalasa masataka dhāliyā} & \\
\text{Śrī ṭava kiraṇāmaṇaji niya sujasa jaga visātāryā} & [3] \\
\text{Dīksā vidhi saba jugati syoṃ jī kinhim subudhi vicārī} & \\
\text{Kauli kaṃṇḍala pīcchī jī dayā upakarana sudhārī} & \\
\text{Purava vidhi jaba āṇjuli jī jhelī sāhāṃ tibārī} & \\
\text{Tīhiṃ bāra chājūrāmaṇaji paradhāna paṅca mīya dhaṇā} & \\
\text{Gachapati gurupada diyo mili kari sakala paṅca mahājanā} &
\end{align*}
\]

Performing pūjā and praise of the jina, he removed all obstacles, then pronounced the Śrīrmantra, 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 Kirapārāmaṇaji spread his glory through the world.[3]
Wisely and considerately he organized the consecration rite according to all [correct] methods.
He took hold of [?, sudhārī] lotus, kamanḍalu, and pīcchī, insignia of compassion.
When Sāha Tibari poured the āñjalī according to the manners of old, at that time Chājúrāmaṇaji [and the] foremost, virtuous paṅca united, together the paṅca of mahājanas gave the rank of leader of the gaccha [and guru].

4.1. Participation and Role of the Laity, Āñjali

A first point recorded in more detail in the song compositions than in the manuals is the participation of laypeople, both patrons and panḍitas—scholars or ritual specialists. A list of some of the attending panḍitas is included in both Dhūṇḍhāḍaśākhā paṭṭābhiṣeka compositions, both also referring to the presence of 51 panḍitas (Detige 2019, pp. 281–82). The compositions also name other laymen, probably prominent members of the Digambara communities. At least one of the Dhūṇḍhāḍaśākhā texts also gives a role to the paṅca, the committee of elders (compare footnote 52), and references to mahājanas, members of the merchant gild, are found elsewhere too. Particularly common are records of saṅghapatitas, principal patrons known to have sponsored icon consecrations, pilgrimages, and—we can add here—renouncer’s consecrations. The Bhaṭṭāraka-pada-sthapanā-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 Bāradoliśākha Bhaṭṭāraka Kumudacandra in Bāradoli in s. 1656 (1598–1599 CE) all record the name of Saṅghapati Kahānaji (Kāsalīvāla 1981, pp. 101, 204, 233), the former song most explicitly confirming Kahānaji was the main patron of the consecration festival (‘kare pratiṣṭhā pāta mahotsava’, ibid., p. 101). Śrīpāla’s hanacī on the Bāradoliśākha 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 Bāradoli in s. 1685 (1627–1628 CE, ibid., p. 105) and Bhaṭṭāraka Ratnakīrti in Jālanapura in s. 1630 (1572–1573 CE, ibid., p. 104) respectively list several saṅghavis and one saṅghapati and two saṅghavīs.

In the composition on Devendrākīrti’s consecration, Šāha Ghastrāma reaps fame by pouring the ‘ añjali’ (añjali). In the composition on Mahendrākīrti, this action was performed by Šāha Tibari, while Rāva Kiripārāma (Kr.pārāma) took the honor of pouring the pitcher (see next section), and Chājūrāmaṇi and the paṭica are said to have recognized (?) the newly consecrated bhaṭṭāraka as guru. The precise meaning of the añjali 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 Devendrākīrti poured a kalaśa together with the paṇḍitas. In the modern period, there sometimes occurs a specific Diṇḍambara 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 paṇḍitas 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 Mahendrākīrti, it is clear that Rāva Kiripārāma poured a pitcher over his head instead, performing a mastakabhisēka (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 atha kumbha re dhātāya nirmala jala atisāṣā’, Kāsalīvāla 1981, p. 205). According to Śastrī (1992, p. 89), the composition on the consecration of the Jerāhaṭaśākha Bhaṭṭāraka Narendrākīrti in s. 1740 (1682–1683 CE) also mentions an abhisēka (lustration) with 108 pitchers. A layman also poured a kalaśa during the 16th century CE Kāṣṭhāsāṅgha Nandītātacaccha Bhaṭṭāraka Viśvasena in Dūṅgarapura (‘tīnaī avasāri śrīpālā sāhi kula kalaśa caḍāvya’, Joharāpurakara 1958, p. 270, lekha 672). With reference to the Kāraṇjāśākha Bhaṭṭāraka Devendrākīrti in the second half of the 18th century CE, a song seems to indicate that the guru poured the kalaśa (‘kalaśa dhāluni nīja 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 Bāradoliśākha Bhaṭṭāraka Śubhacandra in s. 1721 (‘dhāle kalaśa uttanga’, Kāsalīvāla 1981, p. 227).

4.3. Mahāvrātas

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 mahāvrātas, five samittis, and three guptis in the composition on Devendrākīrti, also found in another section of the related composition on Mahendrākīrti (Nyāyatīrthī 1985a, p. 423). As noted (Section 3.1), the reference to this set of ascetic rules, also summed up as the tera(ha) cārtīra (thirteen ways of conduct), is very common in bhaṭṭāraka gītas as part of the observances ascribed
to them more generally. The Bhattacharaka-pada-sthāpanā-vidhi profiled a suitable candidate for the bhattāraka rank as a muni, as a ‘junior acarya’, and, according to the Kāranājā version’s addition, as one observing the (maha)vrata, samiti, and gupti (Section 3.1). And from Kāsaliwāla’s (1969, p. 454; 1981, p. 234–35, see also Detige 2019, pp. 282–83) account of the composition on Bhattacharaka Gunakirti, we learn that he had first taken the five maha vrata at a function in Dungarapura organized by Sanghapati Lakharaja. While Kāsaliwāla does not report an attestation of the muni rank from the composition, a muni is presumably what Gunakirti became at that time. As noted, the Kāranājā Mahāvrata-dīkṣā-vidhi, the outline for the initiation of a muni, also included the administration of the five maha vrata 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 Sultānate and early Mughal period, as a standard practice bhattāraka-initiands were muni already. The fact that the bhattāraka consecration manuals do not explicitly prescribe the taking of specific vows but only feature a reference to guṇaropana (Section 3.4) might also be taken as a confirmation that bhattāraka-initiands already observed the muni vows. Devendrakirti’s ‘taking’ of the five maha vrata, five samitis, and three guptis during his bhattāraka consecration would then constitute a mere renewal of vows, or an act of contemplation thereof, rather than his first taking of these precepts. Nemacanda’s phrasing also seems to indicate that rather than newly adopting them, Devendrakirti 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 vrata, the composition on Mahendrakirti’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 bhattāraka consecrations attested by the Dūndhādaśākha compositions is also Mahendrakirti’s pulling out his hair (keśaloñca). Although this act, a central feature of contemporary Digambara muni dīkṣās, is not referred to in the bhattāraka consecration manuals, it is noteworthy that both Sonagiri manuals (BDV, BPSV) proceed with a mantra meant to accompany keśaloñca (‘keśotpātanamantra’, BPSV manuscript). Keśaloñca is furthermore also prescribed as part of the initiation of a ksullaka and a muni in the respective vidhis of both the Sonagiri and Kāranājā manuscripts. Keśaloñca, the previous case of the taking of the maha vrata, 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 bhattāraka as well as acarya 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 Mahendrakirti pulled out his hair himself might be an indication that no consecrating bhattāraka 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 Sāstrī’s (1992, p. 89) reading of the composition on the Mūlasangha Jerahataśākha bhattāraka, Narendraṅka before his consecration in Sironji (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 Bāraḍolāśākha bhattārakas Kumudacandra (Kāsaliwāla 1981, p. 204), Ratnakirti (ibid., p. 104), and Abhayacandra (ibid., p. 116), the Kāsthasangha Nandītattagachha Bhattacharaka Vijayakirti (Kāsaliwāla 1982, pp. 194–95), and the Dūndhādaśākha Bhattacharaka Mahendrakirti, the latter also referring to the twelve recollections (‘dvadasha bhāavana’, Nyāyātīrtha 1985a, p. 423).

54 As I observed it at a ksullaka-dīkṣā in Jaipur on 7 December 2014 (see also Detige, in preparation b).
outfit and performed *kesaloñca*. Remarkable because of its singularity in early modern sources, such accoutrement 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 bhāṭṭāraka-hood as a layman or at most *brahmañcāri*, since fully-initiated renouncers would not typically be expected—or allowed—to take on civil clothes, let alone jewelry.

### 4.5. Renunciant Paraphernalia

Finally, both Dhundhādāsākhā *patṭa-sthāpana-gītas* also record the gifting of a water pitcher (*kamandalu*), whisk (*picchī*), and lotus (*kavalī, kaulī*) to the initiand. This differs from contemporary Dīgambara initiations, in which instead of a lotus, a scripture (*śāstra*) is sometimes gifted as a third item next to the common ascetic paraphernalia of *kamandalu* 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 Nāgaurāsākhā Bhaṭṭāraka Sahasrākīrti in s. 1634 (1576–1577 CE) (*‘pinchī-kamandalu-sahita-kaulī’, Ajmer Gūḍaka, cat. no. 148, pp. 42a–55a*).

While the bhāṭṭāraka consecration manuals make no mention of ascetic props, the gifting of *kamandalu* and *picchī* are mentioned as part of the initiation of a *kṣullaka* and a *muni* in, respectively, the *Laghu-dīkṣā-vidhi* and *Brhad- or Mahāvratadīkṣā-vidhi* of both the Sonagiri and Kārañjā manuscripts. This confirms that not only bhāṭṭārakas, but other early modern renouncers too, resembled contemporary Dīgambara renouncers in wielding these ascetic insignia. The donation of *kamandalu* and *picchī* to the newly minted bhāṭṭārakas 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 bhāṭṭāraka 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 *Śūrimantra*. In further studies we will, however, need to exercise caution in our reading of elements like the *Mahāvratadīkṣā-vidhi*’s prescriptions for the *muni*-initiant 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 *vidhi*s, but attested in songs, sometimes in single compositions only, formed part of early modern bhāṭṭāraka 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 *Śūrimantra* as part of their initiation, although contemporary Dīgambara *muni*-initiants do receive the *Vardhamānanamaṇtra* (Padmanandi et al. 1982, p. 233). Other probable elements of early modern bhāṭṭāraka consecrations, however, like the contemplation of the five *mahāvratas*, five *sāṃitis*, and three *guptīs*, and the pulling out the hair (*kesaloñca*), are crucial parts of contemporary *muni* initiations. Ablution of the initiand, recitation of *Bhakti*, *Guruñvali*, and recitation of the desired qualities and virtues for the specific rank into which he is being initiated

---

55 In the words of Śāstri (ibid., p. 89, or of the composition itself?) Narendrakīrti thus took ‘*muni dīkṣā*’. As noted, the composition on the consecration of the Kāśṭhāsaṅgha Nandītaṭagaccha Bhaṭṭāraka Viśvasena in 16th century CE Ćūṅgarapura also states that the initiand ‘took Dīgambara initiation (*grahī dīkṣā digaṃbara*’, *Joharapurakara 1958*, p. 270, lekha 672).
(gunāropana) 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, renouncers’ 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-shtubāpana-vidhi 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 paraṃśṭhīnas, 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 renouncers. Both understood as venerable ascetics in their own milieu, 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 renunciant 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 Jain 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.
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Appendix A. Bhaṭṭāraka-Pada-Sthāpanā-Vidhi, Sonagiri Manuscript, Text, and Translation

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

atha bhaṭṭārakapadaṃsthāpanāvidhirlīkhyate||laghācāryapadaṃ sakalasanghābhirucitaṃjīdaṃ yogi56 śrutajñam jinadharmmodharaṃ|ratnatreṣābhivyaktiṃ bhaṭṭārakapadap vyāgyaṃ munim drṣṭvā caturvidhasanghaṅghāḥ sahālocya lagnim57 grhitvopāsakamukhyāḥ sanghādhipāḥ sarvatrāmantrāntrapatram preṣayet||

Now the rite for establishing the bhaṭṭāraka rank is written. Upon finding [seeing] a yogi with the rank of junior acārya, 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 vicitraśobhāvitaṃ maṇḍapaṃ|maṇḍapaṃ58 vedikā simhāsanaṃ cakārayet| Sarve upāsakāṃ cetyalaye59|sāntikagānadharavalaya|ratnatreṣā bhivyaktiṃ pāṭjāmahotsavaṃ ca kuraṃtī|laghācāryaṃ| ganadharavala56|yārcanaṃ vidhāya jalaḷāramahotsavaṃ ca vidhāya kalaśān||108 ēntyasa sarvaśaṅghadhipaṃ|janmadhaye ksiṃpta tāṃ|svaṭikopari sthāpayet||Tataḥ saubhāgyavatī sīt bhūmaṃ ca maṇḍanaṃ chaṭā dāpaitvā mauktikaiḥ svastikaiḥ kāraṇītva tasyopari|simhāsanatī|sthāpayā tataḥ pūraṇābhimukhāṃ tāṃ bhaṭṭārakapadap vyāgyaṃ munimaśayet||atha bhaṭṭārakapadap vyāgyaṃ munimaśayet||

Then a colorful and beautiful pavilion (maṇḍapa), a platform (vedikā), and a throne (simhāsana) should be constructed. And in a temple all the laypeople (upāsaka) should perform a great festival with the Śaṅkta, Gaṇadharavalaya, Ratnatreṣā, and such pāṭjās. On the auspicious day, having performed the Śaṅkta and Gaṇadharavalaya veneration (arcana), and having held a great festival with a procession of water pitchers (‘jalaḷāramahotsavaṃ’, 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 (simhāsana) 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 bhaṭṭārakapadaṃpratisāthāpanakriyāṃtyādimaṇṭacārya śiddhāśrutacāryabhakti pathet|

Having pronounced “Now the ritual for the establishment of the bhaṭṭāraka rank”, etc., he ought to recite the Śiddha-, Śrut-, and Acārya-bhakti.

[Section A.4: ablution of the initiate’s feet, bhaṭṭāraka-stavana, and guṇāropana]

56 Compare v. K (Appendix B).
57 Probably scribal error for ‘laghām’, as in version B.
58 This repetition, not present in the Kāraṇṭa and B. versions, probably a scribal error.
59 ‘cetyalaye’ in versions B & K.
60 The manuscript here has a crossed out ‘yārcanaṃ pāṭjājāmahotsavaṃ’, a corrected scribal error.
61 This repetition probably a scribal error, only ‘atha’ belonging to the next line already. See also next footnote.
tataḥ panditācārya siddhastraucaryāḥ⁶² | aum hṛum⁶³ paramasurabhī⁶⁴ dravyasaṃdarbha parimalagarbhartīhambhpūrṇasuvarnakalasaṣṭātattarātataḥ tathā toyena pāduḥ parisecayāmti svāhā||⁶⁵
tata idam yogyo nṛtyād⁶⁶ [bhaṭṭārakastavanaṃ] pataḥ pādu Śrī pānātāt parāmṛtyaṃ guṇoropaṇaṃ kuryāt

Then the panditācārya [utters]: “Aum hṛum, 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) “idam yoginīrtya”⁶⁷ etc., the attribution of the virtues (guṇoropaṇa) ought to be performed.

[Section A.5: transmission of the Sūrimantra]

tataḥ śrigurutsmai tatpadayogyaṃ parampara-gataṃ sūrimantraṃ dadyāt athavā tatpadayogaṃunanerabhbhautcchrit bhāṭṭārakacchavyābhāṣyante tatpadayogasaṃritam paramabhat.t. bharaka⁶⁸ likhitvā tatpatram manadāṇidrayaivarśayitvā muktāṃ bhavati⁶⁹ [tadā tatpatraśṭānāṇkivisetrītyaḥ 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 establishment of that paper ought to give him that paper.

[Section A.6: āvāhana]

athavāhanadividiḥ⁷⁰ | aum hṛum nāmo āyariyānāṃ | dharmācāryādhisatyaye⁷¹ paramabhaṭṭārakaparamesṭhitinnaṃ tatra hi ²⁷² sarvavāsanānaṃ tatraḥ aum hṛum nāmo āyariyānāṃ | dharmācāryādhisatyaye paramabhaṭṭārakaparamesṭhinnaṃ ²⁷³ tisṭha ² [aum hṛum nāmo āyariyānāṃ] dharmācāryādhisatyaye paramabhaṭṭārakaparamesṭhitinnaṃ mama samnīhit[ō]²⁷⁴ bhava ² vasāt sannidhiśasanāṇāṃ [jītyāvānādaśī kṛtvā] tatasa aum hṛum nāmo āyariyānāṃ | dharmācārya²⁷⁵ yadhisatyaye²⁷⁶ sakalājñātum bhūdhārāprāptāyaḥ paramabhaṭṭārakāya namah|| aum aḥena karpuracandanena pāyodostilakaṃ dadyāt]

Now the method of invocation (āvāhana): “Aum hṛum, nāmo āyariyānāṃ (salutations to the ācāryas)!⁷⁷ O, leader, ācārya of dharma! O, most excellent bhaṭṭāraka-supreme lord (paramesṭhitin),

---

⁶² Again, the repetition of ‘siddhastraucaryā’ 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 ‘... uccīṣṭa’ of the preceding phrase, resembling the ‘panditācārya’ after which he goes at fault.

⁶³ Version K omits this seed syllable hṛum. Correcting a scribal error ‘suḥbhūhi’.

⁶⁴ Jaina’s (2009, p. 116) version adds “iti pathitvā kalasāśṭottarasaṣṭa-tyena pāduḥ parisecayet”, “having recited thus [the aforementioned mantra], he ought to anoint both feet with water from 108 pitchers.”

⁶⁵ Versions B and K have ‘tataḥ idam yanugṛṇyātāya’. Given that it is typically version K which offers forms differing from versions B and S, its agreement with version B here probably means ‘idam yo’gṛṇyād’ is an error of version S; see discussion in Section 3.4.

⁶⁶ See previous footnote.

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

⁶⁸ Jaina (2009, p. 118) interprets ‘muktaṃ bhavati’ as ‘he (the bhaṭṭāraka) dies’; see discussion in Section 3.5.

⁶⁹ To be corrected to ‘aṭṭhaṭṭoḥanadividiḥ’. Jaina (2009, p. 117) reads ‘aṭṭhaṭṭoḥanadividiḥ’, version K has ‘aṭṭhaṭṭoḥanadividiḥ’.

⁷⁰ Here and in the next case, version B has three times the vocative ‘dharmācāryaḥdhisatyaye’, as in the third repetition in this section, which seems to fit better here, next to the vocative ‘paramabhaṭṭārakaparamesṭhitinnaṃ’, than the dative ‘dharmācāryaḥdhisatyaye’, so I translate all as vocative ‘O, Dharmācāryaḥdhisatyaye’.

⁷¹ Jaina’s (2009, p. 117) version as well as the Kāraṇḍa manuscript have ‘(…) aṭṭha ṣṭi ṣṭi’.

⁷² Versions B and K have the dative, which seems the best fit here.

⁷³ From here on, I leave Prakrit passages in the mantras untranslated, because of, arguably, their more formulaic nature.

⁷⁴ Illegible on my documentation of the manuscript.

⁷⁵ Scribal error.

⁷⁶ Probably scribal error, doubting between both forms used before, dative ‘dharmācāryaḥdhisatyaye’ and vocative ‘dharmācāryaḥdhisatyaye’. 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, sanàvauṣat,78 ālvānana! Aum hrūm, salutations to the acāryas! O, leader, acārya of dharma! O, most excellent bhajṭāraka-supreme lord, be established, established (tiṣṭha tiṣṭha), ṭhāḥ ṭhāḥ, sthāpana! Aum hrūṃ, namo acāryānam! O, leader, acārya of dharma! O, most excellent bhajṭāraka-supreme lord, be near me, near me, vasaṭ, sāṁmīdhī-karaṇa! And then, having performed the āvāhana etc. as such, with camphor and sandal with tilaka Aum. hrūm.

Religions 2019, 86

Probably scribal mistake for ‘Aum hrūṃ, namo acāryānam! Salutations to the Dharmaçāryādhīpatai, the highest bhajṭāraka, who has reached the bank of (=mastered) the whole ocean of śruta knowledge, aum ō!’

[Section A.7: recitation of Guruvālī and Bhaktis]

tatakā satīṭbhaktim kṛtvā[ghuru]vālī paṭhitvā[Śri mūlasamgre ṃ namisanghe ta sarasvatīgacche balātvāraya]81 Śri kundakundācāryānvaya amukasya pāṭe amukanāmavāñ[ḥbhajṭāraḥ iti kathayitvā]śamādhībhaktim pāṭhet]

Then after performing the Śanti-bhakti [and] reciting the guruvālī (succession list of the bhajṭāraka lineage) [as follows] “In the revered Mūlasanghe Nandīsanghe Sarasvatīgacche Balātvāraya Kundakundācāryānvaya, on the seat of so and so, a bhajṭāraka with such and such a name.” Having declared thus, he ought to recite the Śamādhī-bhakti.

[Section A.8: bhajṭāraka pājā, concluding festivities]

tatakā gurubhaktim datva sarve yatināḥ prāṇānaṁ kuryāṁ[tatakā sarve upāsakaḥ aṣṭāṁśīṁ]īśthānaṁ kṛtvā gurubhaktim datva pranamaṁtattalāḥ sopi bhajṭārako dātre sarvebhayaścāsīsim datvaṁtālaḥ sarvā upāsakāḥ83 nījanīyagrāñjanāhahātoṣavāṃ vārdhāpanamānāyā84[ḥtaṃ vārdhāpayaṇaṁ dāta sarveśaṃgha bhojayitvā]sastraṁdīnaṃ saṃghārcaṇaḥ kuryāṁyaścākāṁḍinaṁnāthāśca tarppayet85[ḥti bhajṭārakapadadvādhīh]]

And then, after having performed devotion to the teacher (guru-bhakti), all the renouncers (yatī) ought to bow. And then all the laypeople bow after making eightfold offerings (‘aṣṭālakṣyimīśthānaṁ’) and giving guru-bhakti. Then, after he, the bhajṭāraka, 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 (saṅghārcaṇa). Beggars, the afflicted ones, and orphans ought to be satisfied. Thus, the method for the bhajṭāraka rank.

Appendix B. Bhajṭāraka-Pada-Sthāpāna-Vidhi, Kāraṇjā Manuscript, Text, and Translation of Selected Sections

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

atha bhajṭārakapadadvādhīpanādīvitāya vidhī[ḥ] munīṇaḥ layāveśacaryapadān sakalasamgrāhābhycitaṁ86[ādām yugīṇa śrutiṇaṁ jinadharmmodhardhāriṁ][rattatrayabhisamtiṁ vrtasamitiguptiṁyāhahātoṣavāṃ bhajṭārakapadadvādhīḥ munīṇaḥ dṛṣṭaḥ] catuvrīdhasamgrāḥ sahaḥ[lokaḥ samgrhītya saha[lokapākṣaṁkumukhyāḥ saṃghādhipatiḥ sarvatra mantrাভaḥprārthikām kumāmśīkāṃtāḥ pṛṣajeyat]

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

78 Bija-aksaras (seed syllables) like ‘sanvauṣat’ are untranslatable.
79 V. K reads ‘aum ṛanjeena nāntreṇa sahrendunā candanaṇa’.
80 Superfluous aksara.
81 Scribal error, should be vocative ‘balātvāraya’.
82 Scribal error, ‘aṣṭāṁśīṁ’.
83 V. K & B have ‘aṣṭāmsāḥpamāṇāyā’. I follow Jaina’s (2009, p. 120, n. 117) interpretation of ‘aṣṭāmsaḥpamāṇa as ‘congratulatory gift’ (actually nārāyanaṇa).
84 Jaina (2009, p. 117) has ‘santarpayecca’.
85 Probably scribal mistake for ‘sakalasamgrhābhycitaṁ’ of version K & B.
[available in] this age, skilled in uplifted the jina dharma, endowed with the three jewels, a storehouse of vows (vrata), the samiti vows, gupti vows, forbearance (yama), self-control (niyama), mental restraint (samyama), and morality, a munī worthy of the rank of the 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 bhaṭṭārakapadapratishṭhāpanakriyāyāṃ pū. Siddhabhaktim Śrutabhakti acāryabhaktim ca patheyyuh]

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]

tatah śīruṃghur tasmāi padayogāyaparamaparāgatam sūrimantram dadyāt|ladyathā|aum nāmo arahamyātman nāmo Siddhasām|nāmo ariyātman nāmo uciṣṭha-yātman nāmo loe saṣāvā sāhāmām|aum nāmo arahāmām|nāmo ariyāmām|nāmo uciṣṭha-yāmām|nāmo loe saṣāvā sāhāmām|aum nāmo arahāmām|nāmo ariyāmām|nāmo uciṣṭha-yāmām|nāmo loe saṣāvā sāhāmām|aum nāmo arahāmām|nāmo ariyāmām|nāmo uciṣṭha-yāmām|nāmo loe saṣāvā sāhāmām|aum nāmo arahāmām|nāmo ariyāmām|nāmo uciṣṭha-yāmām|nāmo loe saṣāvā sāhāmām|aum nāmo arahāmām|nāmo ariyāmām|nāmo uciṣṭha-yāmām|nāmo loe saṣāvā sāhāmām|aum nāmo arahāmām|nāmo ariyāmām|nāmo uciṣṭha-yāmām|nāmo loe saṣāvā sāhāmām|aum nāmo arahāmām|nāmo ariyāmām|nāmo uciṣṭha-yāmām|nāmo loe saṣāvā sāhāmām|aum nāmo arahāmām|nāmo ariyāmām|nāmo uciṣṭha-yāmām|nāmo loe saṣāvā sāhāmām. |aum. namo arahamam namo siddhasam namo ariyamam namo ucishthamam namo loe savrama samvistam|aum nāmo arahāmām|nāmo ariyāmām|nāmo uciṣṭha-yāmām|nāmo loe saṣāvā sāhāmām|aum nāmo arahāmām|nāmo ariyāmām|nāmo uciṣṭha-yāmām|nāmo loe saṣāvā sāhāmām|aum nāmo arahāmām|nāmo ariyāmām|nāmo uciṣṭha-yāmām|nāmo loe saṣāvā sāhāmām|aum nāmo arahāmām|nāmo ariyāmām|nāmo uciṣṭha-yāmām|nāmo loe saṣāvā sāhāmām|aum nāmo arahāmām|nāmo ariyāmām|nāmo uciṣṭha-yāmām|nāmo loe saṣāvā sāhāmām|aum nāmo arahāmām|nāmo ariyāmām|nāmo uciṣṭha-yāmām|nāmo loe saṣāvā sāhāmām|aum nāmo arahāmām|nāmo ariyāmām|nāmo uciṣṭha-yāmām|nāmo loe saṣāvā sāhāmām. |aum. namo arahamam namo siddhasam namo ariyamam namo ucishthamam namo loe savrama samvistam]!

Then the honorable guru ought to give that one who is fit for the rank the traditional Śūrimantra. As follows: “Aum, nāmo arahāmām, nāmo Siddhasām, nāmo ariyāmām, nāmo uciṣṭha-yāmām, nāmo loe savrama. Aum. [Salutations] to the supreme renouncer (parama-hamsa), to the supreme lord (paramēṣṭhi)! Hamsah hamsah ham ham ham ham ham ham ham ham. Salutations to the jina! I make the jina abide nearby, sanvausat!” And at the right moment (velāyam) 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-hamsa), to the supreme lord (paramēṣṭhi)! Hamsah hamsah ham ham ham ham ham ham. Salutations to the jina! I make the jina abide nearby, sanvausat!” [And,] 17 times: “Aum hrīṃ arham śī namo hamsa namo hamsa.” In between these three [mantras] one mantra ought to be given. Or, in the absence of a munī worthy of that rank, the Śūrimantra 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 (chadhita) with a stamped (ṛupya) leaf of paper, that manuscript is deposited (muktam bhavati) in a treasure box (sampuṣṭikāyāṃ). Then, the rite of the establishment (sthāpana) of that rank89 is done.

Appendix C. Bhaṭṭāraka-Dikṣā-VIDHI, Sonagiri Manuscript, Text, and Translation

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

bhaṭṭārakadikṣāvidhi|guruhbhaktim daśāv paścādgurostilakadāman namo nirvedasasvavetistavanam śāntijinanimiyacārya guruḥ satpadau parāṃśṛṣya gururgunāropanam karṣyate

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

87 ‘lagnam’ as in v. B missing, scribal error.
88 Compare versions S & B, which indicate this much ought to be recited as an announcement (‘ītyādi ucārya’, v. B; ‘ītyāmucārṣa’, 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.
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 bhattāraka rank, at the end of his life, the guru may die after having written down on a piece of paper the Sūrimantra appropriate for that post 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 bhattāraka rank.
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