

Transfer of Merit in Hindu Literature and Religion*

HARA, Minoru

Despite many important studies by eminent scholars on the concept of transfer of merit¹⁾ in Buddhism,²⁾ little has been done on the same subject in Hinduism.³⁾ This is due probably to the importance of the concept in Buddhism both in Mahāyāna and in Theravāda, which extend geographically from the Indian subcontinent to South east Asia as well as the Far East through Central Asia and China. In contrast to this, the Hindu idea of transfer of merit did not gain the same importance and popularity. Though in some respects the Hindu concept of transfer of merit is related to that in Buddhist tradition, both are not quite identical. The concept in Hinduism is distinctive and thus deserves careful analysis and investigation. In the pages which follow, we shall discuss the problem of transfer of merit as revealed in Hindu literature and religion.

The concept of transfer of merit in general, whether it be Buddhist or Hindu, is rooted in the ancient Indian mental tendency of the reification of abstract concepts. That is to say, according to this way of thinking, abstract concepts are often hypostasised. This peculiarity is also responsible for the appearance of a number of allegorical plays in classical Sanskrit literature, such as Śāriputra-prakaraṇa of Aśvaghoṣa, Prabodhacandrodaya of Kṛṣṇamiśra, Saṃkalpa-sūryodaya and others.

The concept of merit, denoted by such Sanskrit words as *sukṛta*, *punya*, *dharma* and even sometimes *tapas*, is not an exception to this way of thinking, for in the case of the transfer of merit, merit is first thought of as a substance divisible into several portions,⁴⁾ and is then transferred to other people.

* The gist of this article was originally prepared for the Radhakrishnan Memorial Lecture delivered at the University of Oxford in 1978–79. The lecture was entitled “Aspects of Ancient Indian Asceticism”, and consisted of four parts, of which this paper formed part three. I am grateful to the late Professor B. K. Matilal who invited me to Oxford and also to Professor R. N. Gombrich for his kind arrangements and for presiding over the lectures during the period of 15–22 June 1979. Since then, I have had several occasions to give lectures under the same title in Stockholm, Harvard, Los Angeles, Göttingen and other places. During the past fifteen years the original manuscript has been emended and enlarged, finally to take this shape.

Thanks are due to my friend Dr. J. Lipner in the University of Cambridge, who was kind enough to read this paper through and suggest corrections to my English in summer 1993.

However, prior to entering into the main discussion, we must not overlook an important problem connected with the concept of merit-transfer. That is to say, we must be aware of the fact that this theory of transfer of merit comes into conflict with the well-known Hindu doctrine of *karman*.⁵⁾ As is well-known, the doctrine of *karman* is the foundation of Hindu ethics, according to which every man is entirely and solely responsible for his own fate, creating his own future by the moral quality of his intentions. One who has done a good or evil deed in the past, whether in this or previous life, is expected to reap its fruits. This causal chain of *karman* binds each individual as long as he stays in the cycle of transmigration. Thus, even if he does not reap the fruit of his good deed in this life, the good deed (*sukṛta*) accompanies him after his death, and promises him good fruit (perhaps attainment of heaven), and conversely, the evil-doer may be tormented in hell because of his evil deeds (*duṣkṛta*). In order to illustrate this, we quote a few passages from the Manusmṛti.

eka eva suhṛd dharmo nidhane 'py anuyāti yaḥ
śarīreṇa samam sarvam anyad dhi gacchati (8.17)

"The only friend who accompanies a man even after death is a good deed (*dharma*), for everything else perishes with the body."⁶⁾

nāmutra hi sahāyārthaṃ pitā mātā ca tiṣṭhataḥ
na putra-dārā na jñātir dharmas tiṣṭhati kevalaḥ (239)
ekaḥ prajāyate jantur eka eva praliyate
eko 'nubhuñkte sukṛtam eka eva ca duṣkṛtam (MS.4.240)⁷⁾

"For there (in the next world) neither father, nor mother, nor wife, nor sons, nor relatives remain with one. The good deed alone remains. Each one is born alone, alone one dies, alone one enjoys (the reward of the) good deed and alone one suffers (the punishment of the) evil deed."⁸⁾

This rigorous and individualistic idea of *karman* is not limited to the legal and religious sphere, but extends to highly philosophical debate. In philosophical discussion any statement which involves *akṛtābhyāgama-prasaṅga*⁹⁾ (gaining a result without having worked for it) or *akṛtāgama-doṣa*¹⁰⁾ (the fault of experiencing the effects of acts not done) on the one hand, and *karma-vaiṣalya-prasaṅga*¹¹⁾ (the implication that one's action could be without results) or *kṛta-nāśa*, *kṛta-lopa*, *kṛta-hāni*¹²⁾ (interruption of the result of the action that has been done) on the other hand, is considered *ipso facto* erroneous.¹³⁾ According to this religious belief and philosophical conviction, one can never escape from the causal chain of the *karman*-mechanism.

In spite of general Hindu belief in *karman*, a student of Hindu religion and literature cannot help having the impression that throughout the history of Indian civilization, there has been a constant effort to invent devices against the

rigorous causal mechanism of *karman*, or if not devices against it, then at least modification or compromise¹⁴⁾: this attempt has given fresh life to Indian religion and philosophy from time to time. Among the devices which are intended to interfere positively with the doctrine of *karman*, we may enumerate such concepts as *bhakti* (devotional love in one god), *prasāda* (divine grace), *jñāna* (knowledge) and sometimes *tapas* (ascetic merit).¹⁵⁾ According to this belief, one can destroy the last seed of evil actions one has committed in the past by the love of god, or one can burn the bondage of *karman* by means of the fire of knowledge (*jñānāgni*).¹⁶⁾

In this context, we are not altogether surprised when we meet the idea that merit, viz. good *karman* or *tapas* (ascetic merit or intensified good *karman*) is transferrable from one person to another. On the contrary, it is a sort of relief or emotional comfort that there exists some mitigation, some way out even from the rigour of the original *karman* doctrine.¹⁷⁾

More than twenty years ago, the present writer had an opportunity to write on the concept of transfer of merit in the context of Pāśupata Śaivism¹⁸⁾; since then he has tried to consider the same problem in wider perspective. In the pages which follow, we shall first consider several examples of abstract concepts, other than that of religious merit (*punya*, *sukṛta*, *dharma*), which are considered to be transferrable from one person to another, and then the problem of merit-transfer in classical Sanskrit literature and Pāśupata Śaivism.

I

(I-1) First, old age (*jarā*) is transferrable.¹⁹⁾ There is the famous story of king Yayāti, who had five sons, two by Devayāni the daughter of Uśanas and three by his second wife Śarmiṣṭhā the daughter of Vṛṣaparvan. Because of his secret union with Śarmiṣṭhā, Yayāti incurred a curse from his father-in-law, Uśanas, and suddenly became old. Yayāti still had a strong attachment to worldly affairs and a desire to enjoy the objects of the senses. He summoned his five sons, Yadu, Turvasu, Druhyu, Anu and Pūru and asked them to exchange his old age with their youth. The elder four sons refused, enumerating various defects attached to old age. Only the youngest son, Pūru, agreed with his father's proposal and took upon himself his father's old age and gave his youth to his father. After having banished the four elder sons, who were not obedient, and praised the filial love of Pūru, Yayāti became young again and enjoyed the objects of senses for another thousand years. The relevant portions in the Mahābhārata read as follows,

yayātīr abravīt taṃ vai *jarā me pratigṛhyatām*

yauvanena tvadīyena careyaṃ viṣayān aham (37)

"Yayāti said to him 'take my old age from me and with your youth I shall enjoy the objects of the senses.'"

Thereupon the youngest son, Pūru, answered as follows,

rājaṃś carābhinavayā tanvā yauvana-gocaraḥ
 ahaṃ jarāṃ samāsthāya rāje sthāsyāmi te 'jñayā (41)
 "O king, with youth at your command enjoy (objects of the senses) with a new
 body. I shall take your old age and rule over the kingdom by your command."

He then transferred his old age to Pūru (*samācarayām āsa*), having recourse to
 ascetic power (*tapo-vīrya-samāśrayāt*).

In the following passages the same dialogue occurs between father and son in
 a more concrete way.

pūro tvam *pratipadyasva pāpmānaṃ jarayā saha*
 kiṃcit kālāṃ careyaṃ vai viṣayān vayasā tava (25)
 pūrṇe varṣa-sahasre tu pratidāsyāmi yauvanam
 svaṃ vaiva pratipatsyāmi pāpmānaṃ jarayā saha (26)
 "(Yayāti said) O Pūru, take over my evil and old age. For some time to come I
 would like to enjoy the objects of senses with your youth.
 When a thousand years have passed, I shall return youth (to you) and take
 back again my own evil and old age."

Thereupon Pūru replied to the king as follows,

pratipatsyāmi te rājan pāpmānaṃ jarayā saha
grhāṇa yauvanam mattaś cara kāmān yathepsitān (28)
jarayāham praticchanno vayo-rūpa-dharas tava
yauvanam bhavate *dattvā* cariṣyāmi yathāttha mām (MBh. 1. 79.29)
 "O king, I shall take your evil and old age. Take youth from me and enjoy
 pleasures as you like. Covered with old age and wearing your age and form, I
 shall do as you say, while giving youth to you."²⁰⁾

(I-2) The motif of exchange does not appear only in rejuvenation, but also in
 revival (*āyus-exchange*). One could give a part of one's life-span to others in case of
 need. We introduce here a story of Ruru and Pramadvarā as related in the first
 book of the Mahābhārata. Ruru, a grandson of the sage Cyavana, fell in love with
 Pramadvarā, a daughter of Gandharvarāja Viśvāvasu and the Apsaras Menakā,
 who was fostered by the sage Sthūlakeśa. Just before the wedding, however, the
 girl was killed by the bite of a poisonous snake. Ruru went into the dense forest
 and cried out most grievously. Even the act of truth (*satya-kriyā*)²¹⁾ did not avail
 (1.9.4-5) for restoring her life. Now, a *deva-dūta*, an envoy of the gods, appeared
 in front of him and made the following suggestion:

āyuso 'rdhaṃ prayacchasva kanyāyai bhṛgu-nandana
 evam utthāsyati ruo tava bhāryā pramadvarā (9)
 "Bestow half your life on the girl, o scion of Bhṛgu, and she shall stand up,

Ruru, your bride Pramadvarā.”

Ruru immediately agreed with this suggestion and said,

*āyuso 'rdham prayacchāmi kanyāyai khecarottama
śṛṅgāra-rūpābharaṇā uttiṣṭhatu mama priyā* (11)
“I bestow half my life upon the girl, O excellent celestial. Let my beloved,
then, rise up with her love, beautiful form and adornment!”

Ruru's intention and his devoted love to his beloved were reported to Yama, who in turn said “let it be” (13–14). No sooner had he spoken thus, than the dead girl rose up. The text reads as follows,

*evam ukte tataḥ kanyā sodatiṣṭhat pramadvarā
ruros tasyāyuso 'rdhena supteva vara-varṇinī* (MBh. 1. 9. 15)
“No sooner had he spoken than the maiden Pramadvarā arose to life with
half the life of Ruru, as though the fair-skinned girl had merely been asleep.”

Here we notice that one's life span (or *Lebenkraft*)(*āyus*) is considered a tangible substance, which can be divided into half (*ardha*) and then transferred to somebody else.²²⁾ The story of Ruru and Pramadvarā is repeated in the Kathāsaritsāgara 14. 80–81²³⁾ and 28. 87–88.^{24,25)}

The same revival motif is met with in the Kathāsaritsāgara 112. But here it is a female who called her beloved back to life by giving him half her life-period (*āyuso 'rdha*). Suprahāra, the son of a fisherman, was the husband of the princess Māyavatī in a previous life so that when they saw each other they fell in love immediately. But the young man unfortunately died. When he died, she resolved to ascend the funeral pyre with him. Her father, the king Malayasiṃha, was annoyed by her decision and beseeched the god Śiva for help. Instantly a heavenly voice suggested that his daughter give half her life-span to her beloved so that he could be restored to life. The divine voice (*divyā vāc*) said as follows,

*tad etaṃ pūrva-bhartāraṃ rājann eṣā tvad-ātmajā
jīvatv āyuso 'rdhena gatāyusaṃ anindita* (KSS. 112. 142)
“O king, this daughter of yours must revive this dead youth, who was her
husband in a previous life, by (giving) half her life-span.”

When the youth was restored to life, the king gave his daughter to him.

*ity ukto divyayā vācā suprahārāya tām sutām
dattāyur-ardhām ca dadau tasmai labdhāsava nṛpaḥ*
(KSS. 112. 144)
“Thus addressed by the heavenly voice, the king gave his daughter in

marriage who gave half her life-span to that Suprahāra, who thus regained his life.”²⁶⁾

In the following story recounted in the Pañcatantra, this half life-span (*jīvitārdha*) becomes a substance not only to be given, but also to be taken back again. A Brahmin who is devoted to his wife gave half his life-period to his wife in order to revive her. The story reads as follows,

ativallabhatayā viṣādaṃ kurvan yāvad vilapati tāvad ākāse vācaṃ śṛṇoti/
yadi bho brāhmaṇa tvaṃ *sva-jīvitasyārdhaṃ dadāsi* tat te jīvati brāhmaṇī/tad
brāhmaṇena śucībhūya tiṣṭhīr vācābhiḥ *sva-jīvitārdhaṃ dattam/vākya-*
samam eva jīvitā sā brāhmaṇī (Pañcatantra 4, p. 31 lines 11–14)

“While crying out in grief because of his supreme love (for her), he heard a voice in heaven, saying ‘O Brahmin, if you give (her) half your own life-period, your wife will come back to life.’ Then the Brahmin cleansed himself and gave half his life-period (to her), repeating solemnly three times²⁷⁾ (what he desired). No sooner had he spoken the words than the Brahmin’s wife came back to life.”

Later, however, this frivolous woman was enamoured of another man and threw her husband into a well. But the husband escaped and eventually found her. He brought the matter to the royal court and in front of the king he said to her as follows,

yan mayā trivācikaṃ *sva-jīvitārdhaṃ tava dattam* tad *dehi* me (p. 32, lines 19–20)

“Give me back that half life-period that was given to you with the thrice repeated words.”

Being afraid of the king, she confessed the truth and returned that portion of life.

atha sā rāja-bhayāt tatraiva trivācikaṃ eva *jīvitam* mayā *dattam* iti jalpanti
prāṇair vimuktā (p. 32, lines 20–21)

“Then, being afraid of the king, she said in that very place for the third time: ‘I give back the life (to you).’ While speaking thus, she was bereft of life.”

The Brahmin in despair speaks to himself as follows,

yad-arthaṃ svakulaṃ tyaktaṃ *jīvitārdhaṃ* ca hāritam
sā mām tyajati niḥsnehā kaḥ strīṇām viśvasen narah
(p. 32, lines 24–25)

“She, for whose sake I abandoned my family and sacrificed half my life-span, that cold-hearted woman abandoned me. Which man can trust a woman?”²⁸⁾

(1–3) Beside *jarā*, *āyus* and *jīvita*, *tejas* can also be transferred. Since the present writer had an opportunity to deal with this problem of the transfer of *tejas* in detail,²⁹⁾ here a few examples suffice to illustrate the point. The Sanskrit word *tejas* means valour, vital energy or even fighting spirit according to context. In the mythological sphere a god being given *tejas* by a more powerful god becomes stronger. In the battle between the gods and demons, Indra, the leader of the gods, became faint of heart, seeing his party flee in fear and his enemy Vṛtra invigorated. The god Viṣṇu placed his own *tejas* within him (*svatejo vyādadhac chakre*). When the hosts of gods saw Indra swollen (*āpyāyita*) by Viṣṇu, they all placed (*samādadhyaḥ*) their own *tejas* within him, and so did the immaculate Brahmin seers. Swollen mightily (*sam-āpyāyita*) with the help of Viṣṇu and others, Indra waxed strong and finally was able to defeat his enemy (MBh. 3. 99. 9ff.). In single combat it was believed that the *tejas* of the killed warrior entered into the one who has killed.³⁰⁾ When Śiśupāla was killed by Kṛṣṇa, *tejas* came out of Śiśupāla's body and after bowing down before Kṛṣṇa entered into him (*kṛṣṇam . . . tejo viveśa*) (MBh. 2. 42. 22–23).

The concept of “invigoration” or “encouragement” suggests itself as a sort of transfer of valour. People encourage the generalissimo, who is about to depart for the front, by blessing and by praising his virtues and by beating of drums. Sātyaki is described, when departing for the front, as follows.

tataḥ snātaḥ śucir bhūtvā kṛta-kautuka-maṅgalaḥ
 snātakānāṃ sahasrasya svarṇa-niṣkāṇ adāpayat
 āsīrvādaḥ pariṣvaktāḥ sātyakiḥ śrīmatāṃ varaḥ (60)
 ālabhya vīra-kāṃsyaṃ ca harṣeṇa mahatānvitaḥ
 dvigunī-kṛta-tejā hi prajvalann iva pāvakaḥ
 utsaṅge dhanur ādāya saśaraṃ rathināṃ varaḥ (62)
 kṛta-svastyayano vipraiḥ kavacī samalaṃkṛtaḥ
 lājair gandhais tathā mālyaiḥ kanyābhiś cābhinanditaḥ
 (MBh. 7. 87. 63)

“Sātyaki, then, having taken a bath and purified himself and undergone every auspicious ceremony, gave gold unto thousands of Snātaka Brahmins, who uttered benedictions upon him . . .³¹⁾

Having touched a brass-vessel and filled with a great joy, his energy became doubled³²⁾ and this foremost of chariot-warriors looked like a blazing fire while placing his bow and arrows upon his lap. Cased in armour and decked in ornaments, he was given by the Brahmins (the words) of successful progress,³³⁾ and applauded by virgins, who covered him with a shower of parched grain, perfume and garlands.”

II

As in the case of such abstract realities as *jarā*, *āyus*, *jīvita* and *tejas*, religious merit is also thought to be transferable. Here merit is expressed by the word *sukṛta*, good deed,³⁴⁾ which is contrasted with *duṣkṛta*, evil deed. Sometimes *sukṛta* is replaced by *dharma*, the counterpart of which is *adharma*. More often, merit is expressed by the word *punya*³⁵⁾ and occasionally also by the word *tapas*. All these—*sukṛta*, *dharma*, *punya* and *tapas* though with significant differences in nuance³⁶⁾—have a more concrete meaning as designating a power-substance inherent in them than that of the abstract concept.³⁷⁾ Below we shall quote some examples in which merit is transferred from one person to the other.

(II-1) Merit transferred from one's daughter and grand-sons was considered to be capable of restoring a sire to heaven, after he had fallen therefrom because of the exhaustion of his own merit. There is a functionary in heaven who is in charge of letting people fall down to earth when their merit is exhausted (*kṣiṇa-punya-nipātaka*, MBh. 5. 119. 6). Yayāti, the afore-mentioned king, after having enjoyed the objects of the senses, ascended to heaven, but had to leave it eventually by the order of this functionary. He fell to the Naimiṣa forest, where his pious daughter's sons, Pratardana, Vasumanas, Śibi and Aṣṭaka were performing the Vājapeya sacrifice. His grand-sons proposed to give him their religious merit (*dharma*) and the fruit of the sacrificial performance (*kratu-phala*), so that he might be restored to heaven. The relevant passages read as follows,

satyam etad bhavatu te kākṣitaṃ puruṣarṣabha
sarveṣāṃ naḥ kratu-phalaṃ dharmas ca pratigṛhyatām (18)

"Bull among men, let this desire of yours come true. Accept the fruit of sacrifice and the religious merit of us all."

But their grand-father, Yayāti, said in refusal:

nāhaṃ pratigraha-dhano brāhmaṇaḥ kṣatriyo hy aham
na ca me pravaṇā buddhiḥ para-punya-vināśane (19)

"I am not a Brahmin whose wealth comes from accepting (something from others), but a Kṣatriya.³⁸⁾ Nor does my mind incline to destroying the religious merit of other (by accepting it)."

At this moment, his daughter Mādhavī appeared. She introduced her four sons to her father and offered him half of her religious merit (*dharma*). She said,

ahaṃ te duhitā rājan mādhavī mṛga-cāriṇī
mayāpy upacito dharmas tato 'rdhaṃ pratigṛhyatām (24)

"I am your daughter Mādhavī, o king, who wanders around (in the forest)

like a doe. I, too, have accumulated religious merit. Would you please accept half of it.”

Gālava, too, arrived there and said to the king as follows,

tapaso me 'ṣṭa-bhāgena svargam ārohatām bhavān
(MBh. 5. 119. 28cd)

“Ascend to heaven with an eighth portion of my ascetic merit, sire.”

In the above passage, the religious merit which is to be transferred to the king Yayāti is expressed by such words as *dharma*, *punya*, *tapas* and *kratu-phala*, which is divided by its possessors into half (*ardha*) or one eighth (*aṣṭa-bhāga*) before it is transferred to the king.³⁹⁾

(II-2) A similar textual example, in which the merit transferred from one person is believed to be effective in rescuing others from calamity (*āpad*), is met with in the story of Jaratkāru. The ascetic Jaratkāru who is devoted to *tapas*-practice with no regard for family life, happened to meet his ancestors, the Yāyāvaras, hanging upside down, and wanted to rescue them by means of his ascetic merit (*tapas*). He then proposed to give them his *tapas*, so that they might escape from this difficult situation. Jaratkāru addresses his ancestors as follows,

tato me duḥkham utpannam dṛṣtvā yuṣmān adhomukhān
kṛccchrām āpadam āpannān priyaṃ kiṃ karavāṇi vaḥ (9)
tapaso 'sya *caturthena* *trīṇyēnāpi* vā punaḥ
ardhena vāpi nistartum āpadam brūta māciram (10)
atha vāpi *samagreṇa* tarantu *tapasā* mama
bhavantāḥ sarva evāsmāt kāmam eva vidhīyatām
(MBh. 1. 41. 11)

“Seeing you upside down, fallen into extreme calamity, I am seized with grief. What pleasing thing can I do for you? Cross over this calamity with a quarter of my ascetic merit or with one third, or even half. Tell me at once (what I can do for you). Or would you rather overcome this with all of my ascetic merit? Let it be done as you like.”

The ancestors, however, are reluctant to accept his proposal. Instead they recommend that he marry a girl, so that he might have offspring who are able to rescue them from this calamity.⁴⁰⁾

(II-3) A similar story which praises the married life while condemning the ascetic way of life is met with in the story of an old virgin (*vṛddhā kanyā*), the mind-born daughter of the sage Kuṇi Gārgya. The sage Nārada told her that heaven is closed to those women who are not purified (*samskrta*) by marriage, even though they are furnished with an abundance of ascetic merit (*tapas*). On hearing the words of Nārada, the old virgin proposed to give half of her ascetic merit

(*tapaso 'rdha*) to any one who would marry her. The relevant passage reads as follows,

tan-nārada-vacaḥ śrutvā sābravīd ṛṣi-saṃsadi
tapaso 'rdham prayacchāmi pānigrahasya sattamāḥ (13)

“Hearing these words of Nārada, she went to a concourse of sages and said: ‘I shall give him half my ascetic merit, who will accept my hand in marriage, O excellent ones.’”

The son of Gālava, called Prākṣīṅgavat, accepted her proposal and married her. In one night she became a young lady of the fairest complexion, but next morning she ascended to heaven. Her husband distressed, thinking ever of her beauty.

ṛṣir apy abhavad dīnas tasyā rūpaṃ vicintayan
 samayena *tapo-'rdham* ca kṛcchrāt *pratigṛhītavān*
 (MBh. 9. 51. 22)

“The sage, on the other hand, became cheerless, thinking of her beauty, though he had somehow taken half her ascetic merit in consequence of the compact.”

Overcome by grief, the sage soon followed her to heaven.

In the above stories of Jaratkāru and the old maiden, we notice that ascetic merit (*tapas*) being a sort of substance which can be divided into a quarter (*caturtha*), one third (*trītiya*) or half (*ardha*), is transferred to others. One can also give all (*samagra*) one's *tapas*, if one wishes to do so.⁴¹⁾

(II-4) In Kālidāsa's Kumārasaṃbhava, we meet the god Śiva making in disguise a proposal of the similar sort to Pārvatī.

kiyac-ciraṃ śrāmyasi gauri vidyate
 mamāpi pūrvāśrama-saṃcitaṃ *tapah*
 tad-*ardha-bhāgena* labhasva kāṅkṣitaṃ
 varam tam icchāmi ca sādhu veditum (Kumārasaṃbhava 5.50)

“O Gaurī, how long do you mortify yourself? I also have ascetic merit (*tapas*) accumulated in my previous stage of life. By a half of it obtain the desired bridegroom! I also wish to know him well.”⁴²⁾

(II-5) In the 13th story of the Vikramacarita, we read,

ataḥ prāṇa-dānān mahopakāriṇas tava kim api pratyupakāraṃ na kariṣy-
 āmi cet, mama jīvitaṃ vyartham eva. tasmād godāvāry-udaka-madhye
 mayā dvādaśa-varṣa-paryantaṃ nāma-traya-japaḥ kṛtaḥ. tat *punyaṃ*
 tubhyaṃ *dīyate*. anyac ca: yat kṛcchra-cāndrāyaṇādinā kim api *sukṛtam*
 upārjitaṃ asti tat *samagraṃ* tvam *gṛhṇēti* bhaṇitvā rājñe tat sarvaṃ *punyaṃ*

samarpyāśiṣaṃ dattvā patnyā saha nija-sthānaṃ jagāma (HOS. 27, p. 116, lines 13–19)

“If I do not do you some favour in return for this great favour, the gift of my life, then my life will be in vain. Therefore I give to you the merit (*puṇya*) which I have gained by standing for twelve years in the middle of the Godāvārī river and reciting the Three Names (of the Hindu Trinity). Moreover, whatever merit (*sukṛta*) I have obtained by penances, the lunar penance and so on, do you take all of it”. Thus speaking he gave the king all this merit, and, reciting a blessing, went away to his own place, together with his wife.” (Edgerton).⁴³⁾

III

However, apart from these examples found in the religious and mythological sphere, a more important application of the transfer of merit can be found in the context of the prescription of one’s duty, the retribution of evil deeds and finally of the formulation of an oath. We shall discuss these aspects in turn.

(III–1) First, we shall see how merit is transferred in the prescription of one’s duty. As is well-known, it was the prime duty for a king to protect his kingdom properly (*prajā-pālana*). A king was supposed to take one-sixth of the merit (*dharma-ṣaḍbhāga*) accumulated by his subjects as the reward of the due performance of his duty. On the contrary, if he failed to perform his duty properly and injustice prevailed in his kingdom, a sixth part of his subjects’ evil or demerit, arising from theft, murder, and adultery etc. fell upon the king. In Manusmṛti we read as follows,

sarvato *dharma-ṣaḍbhāgo* rājño bhavati rakṣataḥ
adharmād api *ṣaḍbhāgo* bhavaty asya hi arakṣataḥ (304)
yad adhīte yad yajate yad dadāti yad arcati
tasya *ṣaḍbhāga-bhāg* rājā saṃyag bhavati rakṣaṇāt
(MS 8. 305)

“A king who duly protects his subjects receives from each and all, the sixth part of their merit (*dharma*).⁴⁴⁾ If, however, he does not protect them, a sixth part of their demerit (*adharmā*) will fall upon him.

Whatever merit a man gains by studying the Veda, by sacrificing, by charitable gifts or by worshipping (*guru* and gods), the king obtains one-sixth of that in consequence of his duly protecting (his subjects).⁴⁵⁾

There are, however, several variations of the fraction conceived, because in the Yājñavalkyasmṛti, the king is said to incur half (*ardha*) of the guilt (*kilbiṣa*), while in some Epic passages one-fourth (*caturtha*),

arakṣyamāṇāḥ kurvanti yat kiṃcit *kilbiṣaṃ* prajāḥ

tasmāt tu nr̥pater *ardham* yasmād gr̥hṇāty asau karān
(Yājñavalkyasmṛti 1.337)

“If the subjects commit any sort of sin without being governed properly (by their king), the king incurs half (of the sin) from them (the sinners), for the king takes taxes (from his subjects).”

Taxes (*bali* or *kara*) are the king’s wages. He must earn them by good government.⁴⁶⁾ In the following Epic passages one-fourth (*caturtha*) is mentioned in place of the one-sixth of the MS.

yaṃ hi dharmam carantīha prajā rājñā surakṣitāḥ
caturtham tasya *dharmasya* rājā bhārata vindati
(MBh. 5. 130. 11)

“O scion of Bharata, a king acquires a quarter of the merit (*dharma*) that his subjects practise, when they are well protected by him.”

In the following passage *punya* appears in the place of *dharma*.

śubham vā yat prakurvanti prajā rājñā surakṣitāḥ
caturtham tasya *punyasya* rājā cāpnoti bhārata
(MBh. 13. 60. 23)

“O scion of Bharata, a king obtains a quarter of the merit (*punya*) of the good (pure act) that his subjects perform, when they are well protected by him.”

An Epic passage similar to the Manusmṛti 8.305 quoted above, reads as follows,

yad adhīte yad yajate yad dadāti yad arcati
rājā *caturtha-bhāk* tasya prajā dharmeṇa pālayan
(MBh. 12. 78. 7)

“Whatever merit a man gains by studying the Veda, by sacrificing, by charitable gifts or by worshipping (*guru* and gods), the king obtains a quarter of that, if he duly protect his subjects.”⁴⁷⁾

On the other hand, we have:

pāpam kurvanti yat kiṃcit prajā rājñā hy arakṣitāḥ
caturtham tasya *pāpasya* rājā bhārata vindati
(MBh. 13. 60. 21)

“O scion of Bharata, a king incurs a quarter of any sort of evil that his subjects commit while they are not well protected by him.”⁴⁸⁾

Whether it may be a sixth portion, or a quarter,⁴⁹⁾ or even a half, these fractional expressions are all indicative of the fact that a good deed (*sukṛta*, *punya*, *dharma*,

śubha) as well as an evil deed (*aśubha*, *pāpa*, *kilbiṣa*, *adharmā*) are the entity which can be divided, and then transferred to somebody else.

Not to speak of such fractional expressions, the incurring of sin (*kilbiṣa*) is spoken in general of the king who is negligent of dutiful government. The righteous king is expected to return stolen goods to the rightful owner. But a king who uses them for his own sake is supposed to take upon himself the guilt of the thief. A passage of the *Manusmṛiti* reads as follows,

dātavyaṃ sarva-varṇebhyo rājñā caurair hr̥taṃ dhanam
rājā tad upayujñāś caurasyāpnoti *kilbiṣam* (MS. 8. 40)

“Property stolen by thieves must be restored by the king to (the original possessor, regardless of) each and every (distinction of) caste. A king who uses such property for himself incurs the guilt of the thief.”⁵⁰⁾

It is the king's duty to punish criminals. The king who fails to punish a thief is supposed to incur the guilt of theft.

śāsanād vā vimokṣād vā stenaḥ steyād vimucyate
aśāsitvā tu taṃ rājā stenasyāpoti *kilbiṣam* (MS. 8. 316)

“Whether he be punished or pardoned, the thief is freed from the (guilt of) theft. But the king, if he punishes not, takes upon himself the guilt of the thief.”⁵¹⁾

Heaven is also promised to the king as the result of his due performance of duty, but once he fails, he loses heaven.

rakṣaṇād ārya-vṛttānāṃ kaṇṭakānāṃ ca śodhanāt
narendrās tridivaṃ yānti prajā-pālana-tatparāḥ (253)
aśāsaṃ taskarān yas tu balim gṛhṇāti pārthivaḥ
tasya prakṣubhyate rāṣṭraṃ svargāc ca parihīyate
(MS. 9. 254)

“By protecting those who are pious and by removing evil-doers (*kaṇṭaka-śodhana*), kings, solely intent upon guarding their subjects, reach heaven. The realm of that king who exact taxes (*balī*) while he does not punish thieves will be disturbed and he will lose heaven.”⁵²⁾

(III-2) In conjunction with the royal duty of protecting his subjects (*prajāpālana*), it was prescribed for the warrior-subjects to sacrifice their lives for their master-king's sake. *Sevā* (royal service) is equal to the state of being paid one's wages by the master (*bhartr-piṇḍa*), and is considered nothing but the selling of one's body to the master-king (*kāya-vikraya*). It is then to return the wages one has been paid by the king (*bhartr-piṇḍa-niṣkraya*) to die for the master's sake when an impending danger befalls the latter.⁵³⁾ In this circumstance, the warriors are

warned not to flee from the battle-field and abandon their master. Such action is discouraged in the following manner.

yas tu bhītaḥ parāvṛttaḥ saṃgrāme hanyate paraiḥ
bhartur yad *duṣkṛtaṃ* kiṃcit sarvaṃ *pratipadyate* (94)
yac cāśya *sukṛtaṃ* kiṃcid amutrārtham upārjitam
bhartā tat sarvaṃ *ādatte* parāvṛtta-hatasya tu (MS. 7. 95)

“But the Kṣatriya who is slain in battle, if he turns back in fear, takes upon himself all the sin (*duṣkṛta*) of his master, whatsoever it may be. And whatever merit (*sukṛta*) the warrior who is slain in flight may have gained for the next world, all that his master takes.”

A passage of the Yājñavalkyasmṛti speaks of the same purport,

padāni kratu-tulyāni bhagneṣv anivartinām
rājā *sukṛtaṃ* *ādatte* hatānām vipalāyinām (YS. 1. 325)

“Those who do not retreat (from the front) even when (their own allies are) completely defeated partake of a position equal to that obtained by (performing) the sacrifice. On the contrary, the master-king takes all the religious merit that warriors who are slain in flight have accumulated.”⁵⁴⁾

(III–3) As is well known, it is the duty of the *gṛhastha* to honour Brahmin mendicants and feed them, whenever the latter may come to the former’s house. If the *gṛhastha* fails to perform this duty intentionally or unintentionally, retribution will take place in the following way.

atithir yasya bhagnāśo gṛhāt pratinivartate
sa dattvā *duṣkṛtaṃ* tasmai *puṇyam* ādāya gacchati
(MBh. 12. 184. 12=Hitopadeśa 1.63)

“When a guest turns back from a man’s house, disappointed in his hopes, he (the guest) does so having transferred his evil deed to him (the householder) and takes the latter’s merit with him.”⁵⁵⁾

A passage of Manusmṛti also speaks of the same purport.

śīlān apy uñchato nityaṃ pañcāgnīn api juhvataḥ
sarvaṃ *sukṛtaṃ* *ādatte* brāhmaṇo ’narcito vasan (MS. 3. 100)

“A Brahmin who stays without being honoured (in the house of a *gṛhastha*) takes away with him all the good deeds, even when the latter subsists by gleaned ears of corn, or offers oblations in the five fires.”⁵⁶⁾

(III–4) A man who is invited to the *śrāddha* ceremony is expected to be in a chaste condition. If he indulges in sexual activity while being invited to the

śrāddha, it is believed that to such an impudent fellow will accrue all the evil deeds of the giver of the *śrāddha*-feast.

āmantritas tu yaḥ śrāddhe vṛṣalyā saha modate
dātur yad *duṣkṛtaṃ* kiṃcit tat sarvaṃ pratipadyate
(MS. 3. 191)

“But he who, being invited to *śrāddha*, dallies with a Śūdra woman, takes upon himself all the evil deeds which the giver (of the feast) committed (in the past).”

(III–5) In addition to such strictures in connection with the performance or neglect of duty, the concept of transfer of merit is used to discourage an intentional evil-doer who is not easily caught and punished by ordinary means. Thus, we read in Manusmṛti,

parakīya-nipāneṣu na snāyāt ca kadācana
nīpāna-kartuḥ snātvā tu *duṣkṛtāmśena* lipyate (MS. 4. 201)

“Let him never take a bath in another man’s tank (without permission), or he will be tainted by a portion (*aṃśa*) of the evil deed (*duṣkṛta*) of him who made the tank.”⁵⁷⁾

Similarly, we read in Manusmṛti 4. 202,

yāna-śayyāsanāny asya kūpodyāna-grhāṇi
adattāny upayujjāna *enasah* syāt turīya-bhāk (MS. 4. 202)

“He who uses without permission his (=another man’s) carriage, bed, seat, well, garden or house, takes upon himself one fourth (*turīya*) of (the owner’s) guilt (*enas*).”⁵⁸⁾

(III–6) Similar strictures are found for hypocritical practice in another passage of Manusmṛti.

aliṅgī liṅgi-veṣeṇa yo vṛttim upajīvati
sa liṅginām haraty *enas* tiryag-yonau ca jāyate (MS. 4. 200)

“He who without being a student (*aliṅgin*) gains his livelihood by wearing the dress of a student (*liṅgi-veṣa*), takes upon himself the guilt (*enas*) of (other) students, and is born in the womb of an animal.”

(III–7) The same belief serves the meting out of justice.⁵⁹⁾ The judge summons a witness and makes him swear not to lie in the following formula,

sukṛtaṃ yat tvayā kiṃcij janmāntara-śataih kṛtaṃ
tat sarvaṃ tasya jānihi yaṃ parājayase mṛṣā (YS. 2. 75)

“If you would intend to win a law-suit falsely, the good deeds (*sukṛta*) you have done during hundreds of your births in the past, will all become the share of this person (falsely accused by you).”

Manu also says in the same tone,

janma-prabhṛti yat kiṃcit *puṇyam* bhadra tvayā kṛtam
tat te sarvaṃ śuno gacched yadi brūyās tvam anyathā
(MS. 8. 90)

“(The reward of) all meritorious deeds (*puṇya*) which you have done since your birth, accrues to a dog, if in your speech you depart from the truth.”⁶⁰⁾

Breaking of one’s word deprives him of the merit.

samsāre ’sāratāsāre vācā sāra-samuccayaḥ
vācā vicalitā yasya *sukṛtaṃ* tena hāritam (Vikramacarita
24.1, HOS 27, p. 183, lines 20–21)

“In this wholly unprofitable round of existence (a plighted) word is the only thing of importance. Whosoever breaks his word loses his acquired merit.” (Edgerton)

(III–8) More positively, however, this giving of one’s good deeds (*sukṛta*) is applied in the formulation of oaths. One often swore by one’s good deeds. Thus, we read, for example, in Pūrṇabhadra’s version of the Pañcatantra.

tathāhaṃ yadi tvāṃ prati virudham ācarāmi tan madiyaṃ
janma-*sukṛtaṃ* tava (HOS. 11, p. 235, lines 21–22)

“If I do you any wrong, may all my good deeds from birth be yours.”⁶¹⁾

Also, in setting the boundary of land, people often swore by their good deeds. Thus, we read in the Manusmṛti as follows,

śirobhis te gṛhītvorvīm sragviṇo rakta-vāsasaḥ
sukṛtaiḥ śāpitāḥ svaiḥ svair nayeyus te samañjusam
(MS. 8. 256)

“Let them, putting earth on their heads, wearing chaplets (of red flowers) and red dresses, and each swearing by (the rewards for) his meritorious deeds (*sukṛta*), settle (the boundary) in accordance with the truth.”⁶²⁾

It was H. Lüders who collected the oath passages and pointed out that people in ancient India often made an oath upon their son, or weapon in the case of Kṣatriyas and cattle-herds in the case of Vaiśyas, all these being considered the dearest and most precious to their respective possessors.⁶³⁾

(III–9) The most important problem, however, from the philosophical point of view in connection with merit-transfer is what happens to *sukṛta* and *duṣkṛta* once one has attained final emancipation (*mokṣa*). A passage of the Manusmṛti speaks of this most eloquently.

priyeṣu sveṣu *sukṛtam* apriyeṣu ca *duṣkṛtam*
 viśrjya dhyāna-yogena brahmābhyeti sanātanam (MS. 6. 79)
 “Making over (the merit of his own) good deeds to his friends and (the guilt of) his evil deeds to his enemies, he attains the eternal brahman by the practice of meditation.”

The superb commentary of Kullūka leads us further to the relevant passages in Brāhmaṇa, Upaniṣad and Brahma-sūtra, which advocate the similar idea of transfer of merit and demerit. Since this point has been fully discussed by A. Wezler, here we only quote the passages in question.⁶⁴ First, to a fragment of a lost Brāhmaṇa which has been collected by B. Ghosh and finds its closest parallel in the Jaiminīya Brāhmaṇa 1. 18 and 1. 50.

tasya putrā dāyam upayanti suhṛdaḥ *sādhu-kṛtyām* dviṣantaḥ *pāpa-kṛtyām*
 “His sons enter upon his inheritance, (his) friends upon (the effects of his) good conduct, (his) enemies upon (the effects of his) bad conduct.”

Next comes the famous passage of the Kauṣītaki Upaniṣad,

tat *sukṛta-duṣkṛte* vidhunute⁶⁵ tasya priyā jñātayaḥ *sukṛtam* upayanty apriyā
duṣkṛtam (Kauṣītaki Upaniṣad 1. 4)
 “With it he shakes off (his) good deeds and (his) bad deeds. Thereupon those of his relatives who are dear (to him) inherit (the merit of his) good deeds (and) those who are not dear (to him) the demerit of his bad deeds.”⁶⁶

Finally, a relevant passage in the Brahma-sūtra which is referred to by Kullūka reads as follows,

hānau tūpāyana-śabda-śeṣatvāt kuśa-cchanda-stuty-upagāna-vat tad uktam
 (BS 3. 3. 26)
 “Where the getting rid (of good and evil) is mentioned (the obtaining of this good and evil by others has to be added) because the statement about the obtaining is supplementary (to the statement about the getting rid of), as in the case of the kuśas, the metres, the praise and the singing. This (i.e. the reason for this) has been stated (in the Pūrva Mīmāṃsā).”

IV

The passages quoted above amply testify to the fact that the referents of a number of abstract Sanskrit concepts such as *jarā*, *āyus*, *jīvita*, and *tejas* are reified and considered concretely as a subtle substance. Merit (*sukṛta*, *punya*, *dharma*, etc.) and its counterpart demerit (*duṣkṛta*, *pāpa*, *adharma*, *kilbiṣa*, etc.) are not the exception to this way of thinking. They are considered as entities which can be divided and then transferred from one to another.

It was, however, the Pāśupata Śaivites who took full advantage of the process of merit-transfer for attaining their religious goal, viz. final emancipation from the cycle of transmigration. But before entering into full discussion of this merit-transfer taught in the Pāśupata scripture, we must first give a brief account of what was prescribed by the Pāśupata system for the aspirant.

According to ancient Pāśupata treatises,⁶⁷⁾ the aspirant (*sādhaka*), who was a celibate Brahmin of good repute,⁶⁸⁾ had to pass through five stages. In the first stage it was prescribed that he should retreat from the world and live in a temple (*āyatana*).⁶⁹⁾ He was to go naked or clad in a single cloth⁷⁰⁾ and wear the sectarian marks (*liṅga*).⁷¹⁾ This was done principally by the daily application to the body of ashes (*bhasma-snāna*)⁷²⁾ and by lying down in ashes (*bhasma-śayana*).⁷³⁾ Every day the aspirant was to honour the God Rudra (Śiva), by laughing, singing, dancing, imitating the lowing of a bull, by worship and by prayer.⁷⁴⁾ These practices enabled him to attain purity of mind.⁷⁵⁾ Upon achieving this purity of mind the aspirant gained super-natural powers, such as seeing, hearing, thinking and recognizing object from a distance,⁷⁶⁾ swiftness in action equal to that of the mind,⁷⁷⁾ and the ability to take any form desired.⁷⁸⁾ He also became possessed of the miraculous ability to enter another's body,⁷⁹⁾ to kill him, and so forth.⁸⁰⁾

In the second stage the aspirant was to leave the temple, put off his sectarian marks,⁸¹⁾ conceal his learning,⁸²⁾ his religious vows⁸³⁾ and purified speech (that is, the Sanskrit language),⁸⁴⁾ and to return to the ordinary world.⁸⁵⁾ While wandering about in public the aspirant was recommended to perform peculiar actions so that accusations might flood upon him from the common people.⁸⁶⁾ Thus, it was prescribed that he snore,⁸⁷⁾ tremble,⁸⁸⁾ limp,⁸⁹⁾ play the lecher,⁹⁰⁾ act improperly⁹¹⁾ and speak nonsensical words⁹²⁾ in full view of people. Such ridiculous actions were to be performed so as to give the impression that he was a madman (*unmatta*)⁹³⁾ and thus provoke disgust and contempt (*avamāna*).⁹⁴⁾ The ritual of abuse and contumelious speech is here in evidence.⁹⁵⁾ To provoke false accusations from another was considered to be a way to purify one-self⁹⁶⁾ and to endure the contempt thus incurred was to invigorate oneself.⁹⁷⁾

The third, fourth and fifth stages represented a gradual progress in asceticism. In the third stage the aspirant was to retreat from the world and dwell in an empty house (*śūnyāgāra*) or cave (*guhā*),⁹⁸⁾ to live on alms,⁹⁹⁾ utter mentally various hymns,¹⁰⁰⁾ contemplate God,¹⁰¹⁾ and hold Him in his heart (*dhāraṇā*).¹⁰²⁾

In the fourth stage, he was to dwell in a cremation ground (*śmaśāna*),¹⁰³ live upon food acquired by chance¹⁰⁴ and finally be absorbed in God.¹⁰⁵ In the fifth stage the aspirant was deprived of his body and sense-organs, freed from all faults, and had his mind fixed upon God.¹⁰⁶ In this fifth or last stage the aspirant finally attained the end of suffering (*duḥkhānta*) through the grace of God (*prasāda*).¹⁰⁷

It is in the second stage of the aspirant's religious life that he was thought to gain profit from the mechanism of merit-transfer. In the case of the Pāśupata Śaivites, however, this transfer of merit was intermingled with the ritual of seeking dishonour. Below, we shall focus our attention on this seeking of dishonour peculiar to the Pāśupatas and see how this ritual was related to the process of merit-transfer.

As mentioned above, the Pāśupata placed special importance upon blame or accusation by the common people. The ridiculous and disgusting practices listed earlier remind us of those of the Greek Cynics who might have influenced the Indian Śaivites, as has been suggested by D. H. H. Ingalls.¹⁰⁸ The very name Lakulīṣa, the name of the founder of the sect, besides its usual etymological explanation, viz. *lakulī-ṣa* (lord of club-bearers) may have been a corrupt form of Heracles.¹⁰⁹ Comparative studies of Lakulīṣa's images which have been discovered recently in various parts of India¹¹⁰ and those of Heracles point to a similarity between the two. Further, it is strange that the seeking of dishonour, which the Pāśupata shared with the Cynics and which is taught in the original Pāśupata scriptures, almost disappeared in the Pāśupata teaching mentioned in later Purāṇic literature. To discuss these points in detail, however, separate monographs may need to be written.

Whatever the historical relationship between the Pāśupatas and the Cynics, being blamed by others is recommended in the Pāśupata scriptures as the highest means of attaining perfection.¹¹¹ The following passages of the Pāśupata-sūtra and Kaunḍinya's commentary upon it illustrate the point.

asaṃmāno hi yantrāṇāṃ sarveṣāṃ uttamaḥ smṛtaḥ (PS. 4. 10)

"Dishonour indeed is traditionally said to be the best of all stratagems."

kṛtsnāṃ mahīm paryaṭataḥ saśaila-vana-kānanām
apamānāt paraṃ nāsti sādhanam manur abravīt
(PABh. p. 32. lines 1–2)

"Manu has said that a man may wander over the whole earth with its mountains and forests, and find no means of perfection better than scorn from others."

amṛtasyeva lipseta hy avamānaṃ¹¹² vicakṣaṇaḥ
viśasyeva jugupseta saṃmānasya sadā dvijaḥ¹¹³
sukhaṃ hy avamataḥ śete sarva-saṅga-vivarjitāḥ

doṣān parasya na dhyāyet tasya pāpaṃ sadā munīḥ

(PABh. p. 79. lines 1–4)

“A wise Brahmin should seek dishonour like ambrosia; he should hate honour like poison. For he who is despised lies happy, freed of all attachment. The monk should never think of the faults or the evil of another.”¹¹⁴⁾

Although to be despised by others is highly praised in the above passages, it is a general Brahmanical tenet that one must not despise Brahmins. The Brahmin caste must always be honoured in Indian society. There is repeated warning in Brahmanical treatises that if one fails to please a Brahmin, the Brahmin who possesses *tapas* will cast upon him an infallible curse. The two following passages may suffice to illustrate the fact that by speaking ill of Brahmins noble families are likely to be ruined, and that a Brahmin might destroy the three worlds by his angry curse.

brāhmaṇānāṃ paribhavāt parivādāc ca bhārata

kulāny akulatāṃ yānti nyāsāpaharaṇena ca (MBh. 5. 36. 27)

“By dishonouring and speaking ill of Brahmins, O scion of Bharata, noble families lose their status. Also by taking things entrusted to one by others.”

na brāhmaṇe paribhavaḥ kartavyas te kadācana

brāhmaṇo ruṣito hanyād api lokān pratijñayā

(MBh. 3. 189. 18)

“You must never speak ill of a Brahmin. If he is enraged, he may destroy (the three) worlds by his solemn utterance (viz. curse).”

Now, as has been mentioned above, the Pāśupata aspirants were Brahmins of good repute. At the time of initiation it was the duty of the Pāśupata teacher to examine carefully the Brahminhood of a novice.¹¹⁵⁾ But, if it was a general Brahmanical tenet that Brahmins were not to be censured, and if only Brahmins could be admitted to the Pāśupata order, why should the Pāśupata aspirant, a Brahmin himself, seek dishonour among the common people?

A careful reader of the Pāśupata scriptures will discern that the accusations on the part of the common people against the Pāśupata aspirant were false, because the aspirant was only play-acting. The aspirant's ridiculous actions were done on purpose, with the intention of arousing feelings of blame and disgust among the common people against himself. People considered the aspirant to be a madman and regarded him as such, though he was in reality a Brahmin of good repute. The accusations of the people were thus false and it was regarded as a serious fault on their part that they despised the aspirant, who in fact was a Brahmin, totally innocent of blameworthy behaviour!

Here, however, one should not overlook another important element that

intervenes, that is, the teaching of non-anger (*akrodha*). We have already seen that an ascetic had always to be careful not to lose his *tapas* by anger. It was a special teaching for an ascetic that he was to protect his *tapas* from anger, or the anger would carry off his *tapas*.¹¹⁶⁾ The Pāsupata scriptures also recommended for aspirants the virtue of non-anger as one of their ten general commandments (*yama*).¹¹⁷⁾ Verses quoted in the PABh read as follows:

kañka-gr̥dhra-srgāleṣu daṃśeṣu masakeṣu ca
pannageṣu ca jāyante narāḥ krodha-parāyaṇāḥ

“Men who give themselves up to anger are (re-)born as herons, vultures, jackals, gad-flies, mosquitoes and snakes.”

vidviṣṭaḥ sarva-bhūtānāṃ bahv-amitro 'lpa-bāndhavaḥ
krūra-dharmā durācāraḥ krodhiṣṇur jāyate naraḥ

“The cruel man of evil conduct and anger is (re-)born as one hated by all creatures, having many enemies and few friends.”

kruddhaḥ karoti pāpāni kruddhaḥ pāpāni bhāṣate
kruddho bhavati nirlajjas tasmāt krodhaṃ vivarjayet

“The angry man does evil; the angry man speaks evil; the angry man becomes shameless; therefore one should avoid anger.”

yat krodhano japati yac ca juhوتي yad vā
yad vā tapas tapyati yad dadāti tat sarvam
vaivasvato harati pūrtam amuṣya sarvam
mithyā śrutam bhavati tasya śamo 'pi tasya
(PABh. p. 26. lines 12–22)

“Whatever the angry man prays, whatever he sacrifices, whatever asceticism he performs, and whatever he gives, the God of death, Vaivasvata, takes all that merit away from him. His learning is in vain and his quietude is in vain.”¹¹⁸⁾

Thus the ascetic was to keep himself free from anger. Anger would destroy everything including *tapas*, for the acquisition of which he had been performing such severe austerities. The ascetic's curse in anger might be feared, but as soon as he pronounced such a curse his *tapas* would be consumed.¹¹⁹⁾

Now, if a Brahmin of good repute who was innocent of blame-worthy behaviour were accused falsely by the common people, it naturally would tend to arouse anger in him. But he was not to give himself up to anger, otherwise he would lose his *tapas*. He had to endure this sort of slander and blame. According to PABh., ascetic merit (*tapas*) is said to be produced in those who endure sufferings stoically. Though the text is corrupt, the relevant passage reads as follows,

.. ādhyātmikādhībhaṭikādhidaivikās . . . teṣāṃ svaśāstroktena
krameṇa manasi . . . anupāyataḥ pratīkāram akurvataṃ tapo
niṣpadyate (PABh. p. 69. lines 4–6)

“Ascetic merit (*tapas*) is produced in those who endure in mind the sufferings arising from the self, from the outside world, and from fate,¹²⁰⁾ without resort to external means, in conformity with the manner prescribed in their own scripture.”

Also, the Ratnaṭikā of Bhāsarvajña speaks of the same purport.

svavidhy-abhiniviṣṭasyaiva trividha-duḥkhohanipāte sati
anupāyataḥ pratīkāram akurvataḥ sahiṣṇutvaṃ tāpaḥ (RT. p. 18 lines 1–3)

“Asceticism is a man’s endurance such that when he has set himself to his prescribed regimen even if the three forms of suffering should assail him, he will not seek remedy by any means.”

Here we notice that *tāpa*, which is nothing but *tapas* in a similar context, is made synonymous with *sahiṣṇutva* (endurance). By endurance and non-anger the ascetic was protected from the danger of losing the *tapas* which he had so far accumulated.

But in addition to this negative method of preserving his ascetic merit, the Pāśupata ascetic invented a positive way of acquiring merit. This positive method seems rather unusual, because the method involves the system of merit-transfer. As has been shown above, he first provoked false accusations from others by acting in a ridiculous or suspicious manner; he then took advantage of these false accusations by accumulating merit transferred from his attackers. By incurring false blame from others and by enduring the contempt thus incurred, the aspirant Brahmin was supposed to gain merit from them, while giving away his evil *karma* to them. The process of merit-exchange may be best illustrated by the Pāśupata sūtra 3.3–9 and a verse quoted in the PABh ad PS. 4. 12.

avamataḥ (3) sarva-bhūteṣu (4) paribhūyamānaś caret (5)
apahata-pāpmā (6) pareṣāṃ parivādāt (7) pāpaṃ ca tebhyo
dadāti (8) sukṛtaṃ ca teṣāṃ ādatte¹²¹⁾ (PS. 3–9)

“Dishonoured (3) amongst all beings (4), and ill-treated, he should wander about (5). (He thus becomes) free of evil (6) because of the slander of others (7). He gives his bad *karma* to them (8) and he takes their good *karma* from them.”¹²²⁾

ākrośamāno nākrośen manyur eva titikṣataḥ¹²³⁾
sa teṣāṃ duṣkṛtaṃ dattvā sukṛtaṃ cāśya vindati
(PABh. p. 103. lines 11–12)

“When censured (by others), one should not censure (them). The grievance

of the man who endured wrong transfers his evil deeds to the wrong-doers, and takes their good deeds (for himself)."¹²⁴

The success of this asceticism depends on the use of a trick (*māyā*)¹²⁵ by which a power-substance¹²⁶ is generated, which is here identified with the grievance (*manyu*) on the part of the one who endures the false accusation. When this trick duly functions, the aspirant becomes able to take merit from others.¹²⁷ Unlike the Greek Cynics, the Pāśupata aspirants, the Indian counterparts of the Cynics, invented a philosophical or ritual foundation for their practice of seeking dishonour.

In discussing the transfer of merit which in the Pāśupata is intermingled with the teaching of non-anger and endurance, one may notice that a sort of *satya-kriyā* intervenes and comes into play. As has been fully investigated by H. Lüders,¹²⁸ there was an ancient Indian belief in the Act of Truth, *satya-kriyā* (Pali, *sacca-kiriya*). By a solemn pronouncement of the truth in front of the gods young Damayantī accomplished her wish and Sāvitrī moved Yama, the god of the dead, and restored the life of her husband. We see in these stories that ancient Hindus attached a special potency to true speech (*satya*), and by this Act of Truth they believed they could accomplish their heart's desire. Now, let us apply the process of *satya-kriyā* to the Pāśupata's seeking of dishonour.

As has been shown above, if the accusations of the common people are false and if the aspirant who is a Brahmin protects his *tapas* by non-anger, the process of *satya-kriyā* will operate in the reverse. That is to say, if one accomplishes his heart's desire through true speech, he will fail to accomplish his wish by a false statement, or, going one step further, he will lose something precious to him by false accusation. In the Pāśupata's seeking of dishonour, the common people who are the false accusers lose their merit, while the Brahmin ascetic who is the falsely accused gains the merit transferred from them. Of course, here the aspirant must endure the false accusation. The counter-process of the Act of Truth may be called the Act of Untruth, that is, False-hood **anṛta-kriyā*.¹²⁹ As a matter of fact, PABh. uses repeatedly the word *anṛta* in this connection of merit-transfer.¹³⁰ In prescribing for the aspirant ridiculous actions like snoring (*krāthana*) and so on, by which merit is acquired from the common people, Kauṇḍinya says as follows,

tatas te manasā vā vācā vā nidrāviṣṭo 'yam iti laukikāḥ prapadyante
paribhavanti ca/anenānṛtābhiyogenāśya yat teṣāṃ sukr̥taṃ tad āgacchati/
asyāpi ca yat pāpaṃ tat tān prati (PABh. 84. 1–3, Cf. also 84. 18–19, 85.
13–15, 86. 7–9, 87.8–9, 16–17)

"Then the common people will say in their hearts or out loud, 'This fellow has fallen asleep,' and will mistreat him. By this false accusation (*anṛta*) whatever good *karma* they possess passes to him and whatever bad *karma* he has goes to them."

By virtue of this **anṛta-kriyā* which is called *māyā* in the Pāśupata sūtra 4. 12 (Cf. *tasminn anṛte māyā-samjñā* PABh. 103. 7), the Pāśupata aspirant accomplishes his wish, that is, the accumulation of *tapas*. It is upon the merit thus transferred from the common people that the aspirant depends for the achievement of his goal, final emancipation. By supposing the presence of the Act of Falsehood (**anṛta-kriyā*, or *māyā*) we may be able to explain the reason why the Pāśupata aspirant who is a Brahmin of good repute seeks dishonour among the common people by performing such ridiculous actions as snoring, limping, etc. It is only to be expected that the more abusive the accusation, the greater the merit transferred to the ascetic.

It should be noted, however, that in Pāśupata Śaivism the gain of religious merit is focused only on the aspirant himself; it is not transferred to other people. Unlike the Buddhist *dharma*, the Pāśupata teaching is a thoroughly selfish system of asceticism and not an altruistic moral doctrine.

V

However, in dealing with the Pāśupata ritual of seeking of dishonour, one is naturally reminded of a story of the Bodhisattva Sadāparibhūta recounted in the 19th chapter of the Saddharma-puṇḍarīka-sūtra. As his name reveals, he was ever despised (*sadā-paribhūta*) by others, without himself teaching others (*noddeśam karoti*) or studying (*na svādhyāyam karoti*). He was despised, because he was in the habit of exclaiming to every monk or nun, male or female lay devotee (*bhikṣu*, *bhikṣuṇī*, *upāsaka*, *upāsikā*), while approaching them, “I do not condemn you (*nāham āyuṣmanto yuṣmākaṃ paribhavāmi*). You deserve no contempt (*aparibhūta yūyam*), for you all observe the course of duty of Bodhisattvas and are to become Tathāgatas (*sarve hi bhavanto bodhisattva-caryām carantu, bhaviṣyatha yūyam tathāgatā arhantaḥ sambuddhā*) iti.” All, however, who were thus addressed became extremely irritated and angry, and showed him their displeasure by abusing and insulting him (*ākrośanti*, *paribhāṣanti*). They said to each other: “Why does he, unasked, declare that he feels no contempt for us? Just by so doing he shows contempt for us. He renders himself contemptible by predicting our future destiny to be supreme, perfect enlightenment; we do not care for what is not true.” Many years passed in the abuse of Sadāparibhūta, but he was not angry at anybody. Even to those who, when thus addressed, cast a clod or stick (*loṣṭam vā daṇḍam vā kṣipanti*) at him, he loudly exclaimed the same—from afar. The Bodhisattva heard his Dharma-paryāya of the Lotus of the True Law from a voice in the sky, when the time of his death was at hand. On hearing this, he grasped this Dharma-paryāya and obtained the perfections, the perfection of sight, hearing, smell, taste, body and mind. With the attainment of these perfections, he at the same time made a vow to prolong his life for twenty hundred thousand myriads of koṭis of years and promulgated this Dharma-paryāya of the Lotus of the True Law. And all those proud beings, monks, nuns, male and female lay

devotees became his followers to hear the Law, after they had seen the power and strength of his sublime magical faculties, and of his vow and of his wisdom. All these beings were by him roused to supreme, perfect enlightenment. So his words were, in the final event, true!¹³¹⁾

In sharp contrast with the above mentioned Pāśupata strategem (*yantra*) of carrying away other persons' merit for the personal gain of religious merit, the Buddhist attitude to the transfer of merit seems to be more altruistic. Beside this example, Buddhist literature, both the Pali and Mahāyāna texts, abounds in references to this mechanism of merit-transfer. One may notice that a Buddhist counterpart of the Pāśupata *yantra* is *patti*, *patti-dāna*, or *pattānumodanā* in Pali Buddhism; unlike the Pāśupata practice of taking away other's merit, however, in Buddhism the emphasis is placed on the giving of one's merit to others.

In Mahāyāna Buddhism, some inscriptions contain a votive formula in the following form:

deya-dharmo¹³²⁾ 'yam . . . (of, title and name) . . . yad atra puṇyaṃ¹³³⁾
bhavatu mātā-pitr-pūrvvaṅgamaṃ kṛtvā sakala-satvānām anuttara-
jñānāvāptaye
"This is the religious gift . . . (of, title and name) . . . what here is the merit,
may that, having placed my parents first, be for the obtaining of supreme
knowledge by all beings."^{134,135)}

Colophones of Gilgit¹³⁶⁾ and Nepal¹³⁷⁾ manuscripts speak of the same purport. In the Mahāyāna Buddhist texts, the idea of transfer of merit is expressed by the word *parināmaṇa* (its verb forms, *pari-ṇāmayati* or simply *nāmayati*),¹³⁸⁾ the term being too well-known for further comment.

Notes

- 1) This is an English rendering of the Pali compound *patti-dāna* (= *puñña-dāna*), though its adequacy has been questioned by J. Filliozat (1980) pp. 101–116, esp. 112ff. In Hinduism, however, there is no special word for this notion, its being only sporadically indicated by such words as *dā-ādā-*, *tyaj-āp-* (give and take) and *samākram-* etc.
- 2) Although the present writer once tried to list a bibliography on this subject (Hara 1985 p. 309, cf. also J. W. de Jong *IJ* 24 1982 pp. 313–314, note 1 and T. Vetter, *The Ideas and Meditative Practices of Early Buddhism*, Leiden 1988 p. 87–88 note 1), reference should be made now to A. Wezler, "List of Works and Articles on 'Transfer of Merit'", attached to his article "On the Gaining of Merit and the Incurring of Demerit through the Agency of Others: I. Deeds by Proxy," to be published in *O. Botto's volume*. The most recent references to the subject that have come to my notice are found in Schmithausen (1991) p. 143, and H. Bechert (1992).
- 3) For example, the latest publication of *Epic and Purāṇic Bibliography* (Wiesbaden 1992) lists under "transfer of merit" (p. 1842) only three articles: viz. Hara (1968), O'Flaherty (1980) and H. G. Narahari, "Ideas about karma in the Rāmāyaṇa," in *Munshi Indological Felicitation volume* (1963). Cf. also L. Schmithausen (1986) note 48 (p. 224), which refers to P. Horsch, "Vorstufen der

- indischen Seelenwanderungs-lehre," AS 25/1971, pp. 147–8ff.
- 4) Cf. Hara (1975) pp. 514–518.
 - 5) This is also the starting point of J.-M. Agasse's elucidation of the problem (Agasse 1978) pp. 311ff. Cf. also Filliozat (1980) p. 112 and Schmithausen (1986) p. 214.
 - 6) For this stanza, see Sternbach (1967) pp. 158–159.
 - 7) For this stanza, see Lüders (1940) p. 39 note 2.
 - 8) Also, in Pali verses, as quoted by Agasse (1978) p. 311.
 kamma-ssakā, māṇava, sattā kamma-dāyādā kamma-yonī kamma-bandhū kamma-paṭisaraṇā
 (Majjhimanikāya 3. 203)
 na antalikkhe na samudda-majjhe
 na pabbatānaṃ vivaraṃ pavissa
 na vijjati so jagati-ppadeso
 yattha-tthito muñceyya pāpa-kammā (Dhammapada 127)
 - 9) For *akṛtābhyāgama-prasaṅga*, cf. Ingalls (1957) p. 228 note 2. More references have been collected in *An Encyclopaedic Dictionary of Sanskrit on Historical Principles* (Poona 1976). I, p. 123.
 - 10) Cf. *akṛtāgama-doṣa*, *akṛtābhyāgama-prasaṅjana*, *akṛtābhyāgama-bhaya* and *akṛtābhyāgamāpāta* in the Poona Dictionary mentioned above, pp. 123–124.
 - 11) Cf. NSBh. ad NS.4.1.64 (*karma-vaiṣṭhalya-prasaṅga*)
 - 12) Cf. NSBh. ad NS. 4.1.10 (*kṛta-hāna*), Śaṅkara ad BS. 3–9 (*kṛta-vipranāśa*).
 - 13) Cf. Ingalls (1957) *loc. cit.* As for *kṛta-vipranāśa* and *akṛtābhyāgama*, cf. also Schmithausen (1991), p. 100 (36.5.3).
 - 14) Cf. Hopkins (1906) pp. 581–593 and O'Flaherty (1980) pp. 28–9, where *yoga*, meditation, renunciation, and pilgrimage are also mentioned.
 - 15) Cf. the phrase *tapasā dagdha-kilbiṣa*, which occurs in MBh., but never appears in R. For this phrase, see M. Hara, "Verses not shared by MBh and R," to be published in *IT*.
 - 16) Cf. Bhagavadgītā 4.19, 4.37. Cf. also MBh. 12.204.16, 12.208.16.
 - 17) This conflict between the rigid, strictly individualistic theory of *karman* and the concept of transfer of merit seems to be still discernible among commentators on Manusmṛti 7. 94, where there is an admonition for the warrior not to flee in fear. Medhātithi, Bhāruci and Govindarāja stick to the individualistic theory, while Kullūka advocates the concept of the transfer of merit, resorting to the authority of the Vedas and elsewhere (Kauṣītaki Upaniṣad 1.4 and Brahmasūtra 3.3.26). This point has been fully discussed in Wezler (1987–88) pp. 396ff.
 - 18) Cf. Hara (1968–69).
 - 19) Cf. Hopkins (1905).
 - 20) Cf. Defourny (1978) pp. 131–137.
 - 21) For a bibliography of *satya-kriyā* in general, cf. Hara (1968–9) p. 406 note 2. One may add the following:
 P. Hacker, *Prahlāda* (Wiesbaden 1959) pp. 59 and 96ff.
 W. Norman Brown, "The Metaphysics of the Truth Act," *Mélanges L. Renou* (Paris 1968) pp. 171–177, "Duty as Truth in the Rig Veda," *India Major* (J. Gonda vol.) (Leiden 1972) pp. 57–67.
 A. Wayman, "The Hindu-Buddhist Rite of Truth," *M. B. Emeneau vol.* (Annamalainagar 1968) pp. 365–369.
 R. Hauschild, "Das Selbstlob des somaberauschten Gottes Agni," *Asiatica* (F. Weller vol.) (Leipzig 1955) pp. 254–5.
 J. S. Speyer, *The Jātakamālā* (Indian Reprint 1971) p. 16, note 1. Thieme (1984) pp. 117–120 (I owe this reference to Shee 1986 p. 215 note 121)
 - 22) In his prayer to the goddess, the king Śūdraka says as follows:
 yady aham anukampanīyas tadā mamāyuh-śeṣeṇāyaṃ sa-dāra-putro vīravaro jīvatu (Hito-padeśa 3.101 prose)
 - 23) tato viṣaṇṇa-hṛdayaḥ śuśrāvēṃśaṃ giraṃ divi
 etāṃ kṣīṇāyuṣaṃ brahman svāyuso 'rdhena jīvaya (80)

tac chrutvā sa dadau tasyai tadaivārdham nijāyusaḥ
pratyujjīva sā tena so 'pi tām pariṇitavān (KSS. 14.81)

Cf. also, C. H. Tawney and N. M. Penzer, *The Ocean of Story* (Indian Reprint 1968) vol. 1, p. 188 note 2.

- 24) kiṃ punar menakodbhūtā sarpa-daṣṭā pramadvarā
dattvāyuso 'rdham muninā na bhāryā ruruṇā kṛtā (KSS. 28. 87–88)
- 25) The story of Ruru is also referred to in Saundarananda 7.37.
- 26) Cf. Tawney and Penzer *op. cit.*, vol. 8, p. 117 note 2.
- 27) Cf. Hara (1982) pp. 527–543.
- 28) For this story of an unchaste wife, see Daśakumāracarita 6 (*Dhūminī*) (p. 218 lines 1–p. 220 line 11) and KSS. 65. 1–42. Cf. C. H. Tawney and N. M. Penzer, *op. cit.*, vol. 5 p. 153 note 1.
- 29) Cf. Hara (1987), pp. 134–151.
- 30) Cf. O'Flaherty (1980) p. 30 and A. Hildebeitel, *The Ritual of Battle* (Ithaca-London 1976) pp. 148, 157, 167, 217–191. Cf. also MS. 11.120 (*brāhmaṇa tejas*).
- 31) For the word *āsīs*, in general, cf. Gonda (1989).
- 32) For *dviguṇī-kṛta-tejas*, cf. *dviguṇī-kṛta-vikrama* in MBh.7.18.9 and R.3.33.33.
- 33) For *svastyayana*, cf. Gonda (1989) pp. 177ff.
- 34) The expressions *sukṛtaṃ vṛkṣte* and *sukṛtaṃ ā-vṛjate* appear in Bṛhadāranyaka Upaniṣad 6.4.3, where it is indicated that there is transfer of merit between man and women (plural) at the time of sexual intercourse (*adhopahāsa*). A man who approaches women with Upaniṣadic knowledge gains merit from them, otherwise vice versa. Cf. O'Flaherty (1980) p. 11.
- 35) Cf. Filliozat (1980), especially pp. 108ff.
- 36) Cf. Hara (1975).
- 37) Similarly, sin is considered a substance. There is a well-known story of Indra purifyning himself by distributing his sin to several entities. Cf. P. V. Kane, *History of Dharma-sāstra* II, pp. 801–802, Heesterman (1962) p. 23, and O'Flaherty (1980a), pp. 141–160. See the discussion below on transfer of *duṣkṛta*, *kilbiṣa*, *pāpa* and *enas*.
- 38) Cf. Hara (1985) pp. 310–311. Cf. also MBh. 12.192.73.
- 39) Cf. Defourny (1978) pp. 31–35.
- 40) For the story of Jaratkāru, cf. Schneider (1959–60) pp. 1–11 and Shee (1986) pp. 31ff.
- 41) Cf. M. Hara, "A Note on the gr̥hasthāśrama" to be published in *IT O. Botto Felicitation Volume*.
- 42) I owe this reference to my friend, Ramashraya Sharma of Delhi.
- 43) Cf. also Vikramacarita (HOS. 27) p. 116, lines 27ff.
- 44) Cf. MS. 11.23 (rājā hi dharmasadbhāgaṃ tasmāt prāpnoti rakṣitāt). Cf. also MS. 7.136.
- 45) Cf. YS. 1.335 (*punyāt śadbhāgaṃ ādatte nyāyena paripālayan . . .*) and VS. 3.28 (rājā ca prajābhyah *sukṛta-duṣkṛtebhyah śaṣṭhāmśa-bhāk*)
- 46) Cf. KAS. 1.13.5–8 (*matsya-nyāyābhibhūtāḥ prajā manuṃ vaivasvataṃ rājānaṃ cakrire, dhānya-śadbhāgaṃ paṇya-daśabhāgaṃ hiraṇyaṃ cāsyā bhāgadheyaṃ prakalpayaṃ āsuḥ, tena bhṛtā rājānaḥ prajānaṃ yoga-kṣemāvahāḥ, teṣāṃ kilbiṣaṃ adaṇḍakarā haranty ayoga-kṣemāvahāś ca prajānām*)
- 47) Cf. MBh. 12.67.26, 12.73.20, 12.76.6 (*caturthaṃ tasya dharmasya*)
- 48) Cf. MBh. 12.76.8 (*caturthaṃ tasya pāpasya*).
- 49) Cf. prabhur niyamane rājā ya etan na niyacchati
bhunkte sa tasya *pāpasya caturbhāgaṃ* iti śrutiḥ
tathā kṛtasya *dharmasya caturbhāgaṃ* upāśnute (MBh. 12.89.17)
- 50) Cf. deyaṃ caura-hṛtaṃ dravyaṃ rājñā jānapadāya tu
adadad dhi samāpnoti *kilbiṣaṃ* yasya tasya tat (YS. 2.36)
Cf. also MS. 9.243 (*ādadānas tu tal-lobhāt tena doṣeṇa līpyate*)
- 51) Cf. pādo 'dharmasya kartāraṃ pādaḥ sāksīnaṃ ṛcchati
pādaḥ sabhāśadaḥ sarvān pādo rājānaṃ ṛcchati (MS. 8.18)
Cf. also Lüders (1940) pp. 453ff.
- 52) The failure of non-protection which results in the protector's incurring of evil (*pāpa*) from the

- un-protected is not limited to king and subject, but is extended to *kutumba-svāmin* and *kutumba*, *grāma-svāmin* and *grāma*, and *deśa-svāmin* and *deśa*. Cf. Vikramacarita, 25th story (HOS 27, p. 188 II, lines 3–7)
- 53) M. Hara "A Note on the Hindu Concept of Loyalty to the King (*bhartr-piṇḍa-niṣkraya*)", to be published in *Bulletin of the Deccan College, Post-graduate Research Institute* (Sir William Jones Death Bicentenary volume).
- 54) Cf. Wezler (1987–88) pp. 393ff.
- 55) Cf. IS. 134, Sternbach (1967) p. 184–5, O'Flaherty (1973) p. 183 note 44, J. J. Meyer, *Sexual Life in Ancient India* (Indian reprint 1971). p. 515 note 2.
- 56) Cf. IS. 4028, 5428, 5587, J. Brockington "Vālmiki proverbs" *IT*. 7 (1979) p. 146. Cf. also. P. V. Kane, *History of Dharmaśāstra* 5, p. 1596, R. Sharma, *A Socio-political Study of the Vālmiki Rāmāyaṇa* (Delhi 1986) pp. 153, 358–361 and PABh. p. 32. lines 1–4.
- 57) Cf. YS. 1.159, VS. 64.1, Baudh II.5.6. as G. Bühler's note ad loc.
- 58) Cf. YS. 1.60, Baudh II. 6.29 as Bühler's note ad loc.
- 59) Cf. MBh. 2.61. 56–57 and 69–72. Cf. also Lüders (1940) pp. 453ff.
- 60) Cf. VS. 8.41 and KAS. 3.11. 35–37.
- 61) I owe this reference to Ingalls (1962) p. 293 note 25. Cf. also Pañcatantra ed. by G. Bühler (BSS. 4, p. 9, lines 9–12).
- 62) Cf. Hopkins (1932) p. 326.
- 63) Cf. Lüders (1959). For the transfer of *āsis*, see Gonda (1989) pp. 112–115.
- 64) Wezler (1987–88) pp. 406ff.
- 65) Cf. Chāndogya Upaniṣad 8. 13 (aśva iva romāṇi *vidhūya pāpam*), Muṇḍaka Upaniṣad 3.1.3 (tadā vidvān *puṇya-pāpe vidhūya nirañjanaḥ paramam sāmyam upaiti*) and Maitri Upaniṣad 6.18 (tadā vidvān *puṇya-pāpe viḥāya . . .*)
- 66) Cf. Thieme (1984) pp. 91–92.
- 67) The basic texts of Pāśupata Śaivism which are to be referred to here are PS with its commentary PABh (TSS 143) and GK with its commentary RT (GOS 15).
- 68) PABh. p. 3, line 8 and PS. 4.20. For further discussion, cf. Hara (1964) pp. 398ff. and K. Bhattacharya, *Les Religions brahmaniques dans l'ancien Cambodge d'après l'épigraphie et l'iconographie* (Paris 1961) pp. 45–6.
- 69) PS. 1.7 : *āyatana-vāsi*. Cf. RT. (p.) 16. (lines) 21–24 and 12.18.
- 70) PS. 1.10–11 : *eka-vāsāsāḥ, avāsā vā*
- 71) PS. 1.6 : *liṅga-dhārī*. Cf. RT. 8.2–3 and 12.12,14.
- 72) PS. 1.2 : *bhasmanā triṣavaṇam snāyita*. Cf. RT. 18.4, 10–17, 8.3,12.11–14 and 17.26, 29.
- 73) PS. 1.3 : *bhasmani śayita*. Cf. RT. 18.4, 19.10–13 and 8.3.
- 74) PS. 1.8 : *hasita-gīta-nṛtta-ḍuṇḍumkāra-namaskāra-jaṇyopahārenopatiṣṭhet*. Cf. RT. 18.23–19.6.
- 75) PS. 1.18 : *akaluṣa-mateḥ*. Cf. RT. 6.12–13.
- 76) PS. 1.21 : *dūradarśana-śravaṇa-manana-vijñānāni cāsyā pravartante*. Cf. RT. 10.1.
- 77) PS. 1.23 : *mano-javitvam*. Cf. RT. 10.3.
- 78) PS. 1.24 : *kāma-rūpitvam*. Cf. RT. 10.4.
- 79) PS. 1.29 : *sarvāṃś cāviśati*. On the art of entering another's body, cf. Bloomfield (1917). Cf. also Hara (1979) p. 263 note 15.
- 80) PS. 1.31 : *sarve cāsyā vadhyā bhavanti*
- 81) PS. 3.1 : *avyakta-liṅgī*. Cf. RT. 8.4–5.
- 82) PS. 4.1 : *gūḍha-vidyā tapa ānantyāya prakāśate*. Cf. RT. 8.5.
- 83) PS. 4.2 : *gūḍha-vrataḥ*. Cf. RT. 16.24.
- 84) PS. 4.3 : *gūḍha-pavitra-vāṇiḥ*
- 85) PS. 3.4–5 : *sarva-bhūteṣu paribhūyānāś caret* and PS. 4.6 *unmattavad eko vicareta loke*. Cf. RT. 18.6, 19.24.
- 86) PS. 3.11 : *pretavac caret*, PS. 4.6: *unmattavad eko vicareta loke* and PS. 4.8: *unmatto mūḍha ity evaṃ manyante itare janāḥ*. Cf. RT. 8.11.

- 87) PS. 3.12 : *krātheta vā*. Cf. RT. 18.5, 19.19..
- 88) PS. 3.13 : *spandeta vā*. Cf. RT. 18.5, 19.20.
- 89) PS. 3.14 : *maṇṭeta vā*. Cf. RT. 18.5, 19.20.
- 90) PS. 3.15 : *śṛṅgāreta vā* Cf. RT. 18.5–6, 19.21–22.
- 91) PS. 3.16 : *apītat kuryāt* Cf. RT. 18.6, 19.22.
- 92) PS. 3.17 : *apītaḍ bhāṣet* Cf. RT. 18.6, 19.22–23.
- 93) PS. 4.8 : *unmatto mūḍha ity evaṃ manyante itare janāḥ*. Cf. RT. 8.11.
- 94) PS. 3.5 : *paribhūyamānaś caret* and PS. 4.14: *nindyamānaś caret*.
- 95) For the phthonos-abwendende Bedeutung of the abuse and contempt, cf. Gonda (1943) pp. 352ff., 416 and (1961) pp. 79–80.
- 96) PS. 4.15 : *anindita-karmā* and PS. 4.13: *nindā hy eṣānindā tasmāt* Cf. also Hara (1984) pp. 240ff.
- 97) PS. 4.19–20 : *anena vidhinā rudra-samīpaṃ gatvā na kaś cid brāhmaṇaḥ punar āvartate*
- 98) PS. 5.9 : *śūnyāgāra-guhāvāsi*. Cf. GK. 6. RT. 16.28–17.3.
- 99) PS. 5.14–5 : *bhaiksyam pātrā-gatam*
- 100) PS. 5.21–2 : *ṛcam iṣṭām adhyāta gāyatrīm ātma-yantritaḥ raudrīm vā bahurūpīm vā*
- 101) PS. 5.24 : *omkāram abhidhyāyita*
- 102) PS. 5.25 : *hrdī kurvita dhāraṇām*
- 103) PS. 5.30 : *śmaśāna-vāsi*. Cf. GK. 6. RT. 17.3–5.
- 104) PS. 5.32 : *yathā-labdhopajīvakāḥ*
- 105) PS. 5.33 : *labhate rudra-sāyujyam*
- 106) PS. 5.37–8 : *samcittam sthāpayitvā ca rudre*
- 107) PS. 5.40 : *apramādā gacched duḥkhānām antam iśa-prasādāt*
- 108) Cf. Ingalls (1962)
- 109) Cf. Ingalls (1962) p. 296 note 30.
- 110) For Lakulīśa's images, cf. M. W. Meister ed., *Discourses on Śiva* (Philadelphia 1984), pp. 92–118 and plates 79–138.
- 111) For the tradition of the ritual “reviler” (*apagara*) in contrast to “praiser” (*abhigara*), see Kuiper (1979) pp. 207ff. Cf. also the note above 95.
- 112) I read here *hy avamānam* for *naiva mānam* of our printed text. Cf. Ingalls *op. cit.*, p. 286, note 13.
- 113) Cf. IS. 536.
- 114) Cf. MS 2.162–3, Kūrma purāṇa 2.16.41, Liṅga purāṇa 1.34.23 and 1.89.4.
- 115) Cf. above note 68.
- 116) Cf. Hara (1970) pp. 69ff.
- 117) Cf. PABh. p. 25, lines 6ff.
- 118) Cf. IS. 5045 (MBh. 12.288.27)
- 119) Cf. Hara (1970) pp. 67ff.
- 120) For this three-fold suffering, cf. the commentators' remarks on the Sāmkhya-kārikā 1 (*duḥkha-traya*).
- 121) For the phrase *ādatte sukr̥tam*, cf. MBh. 12.288.10 (*parasya*) and 11 (*pareṣām*).
- 122) Cf. PABh phrase, *anenānṛtābhīyogenāsyā yat teṣāṃ sukr̥tam tad āgacchati. asyāpi yat pāpam tat tāt prāti* (p. 84, lines 2–3, 18–19, p. 85, lines 13–15, p. 86, lines 7–9, and p. 87, lines 8–9, 16–17).
- 123) I read *titikṣataḥ* for *titikṣati* of the printed text.
- 124) Cf. IS. 856 (MBh. 1.82.7, 5.36.5 and 12.288.16)
- 125) Cf. PS. 4.12 *māyayā sukr̥tayā samavindata*
- 126) For *māyā* as a power (*śakti*), cf. Gonda (1959) pp. 119ff.
- 127) PABh. p. 103 line 10.
- 128) Lüders (1959a). For a further reference see Hara (1975) p. 538 note 36.
- 129) One may note that PABh. uses the word *kriyā* in commenting upon the PS words *krāthana* (*evaṃ krāthanam iti kriyā*, p. 84, line 4) *spandana* (p. 84, line 20), *maṇṭhana* (p. 85, line 15) and *śṛṅgāraṇa* (p. 86, line 9)
- 130) Cf. PABh ad PS. 4.12 (p.103, lines 5–7): *krāthana-spandanādi-prayogaiḥ dhik-kṛtasya nidrāviṣṭo*

vāyu-saṃspr̥ṣṭo mandakārī asamyakkārī asamyagvādīti yo 'yaṃ duṣṭa-śabda 'bhīyoga-śabdaś ca nīṣpadyate, tasmīn anr̥te māyā-saṃjñā.

- 131) Bibliotheca Buddhica 10 (H. Kern and B. Nanjo) (Osnabruck Reprint 1970) p. 377, lines 11ff.
- 132) For this compound, cf. Damsteegt (1978) pp. 163–4, 176, 308 (note 40).
- 133) Cf. Damsteegt (1978) pp. 145, 302 (note 23), 186–7 and 332 note 261.
- 134) This is the basic form of the so-called “common Mahāyāna formula,” of which there are several variations with additions and subtractions of particular elements. Cf. Schopen (1979) pp. 4ff. Later the same author published a more elaborate article (1984), where he discussed the features peculiar to the Hīnayāna and Mahāyāna votive inscriptions (pp. 31–47).
- 135) Cf. also C. Mallebrein, “Inscriptliche Quellen zur Datierung des historischen Buddha in Indien,” Bechert ed. (1991) p. 345.
 ca tathā Māṇikyasiṃhasya hi/puṇyoddeśa-vaśac cakāra rucirāṃ Sauddhodaneḥ śradhayā śrīmad-gandhakuṭīm imām iva kuṭī(13)mokṣasya saukhyasya ca
 “Dieser erbaute infolge seines Glaubens an den Sauddhodana diese glänzvolle Gandhakuṭī wie ein Haus für die Erlösung und für Glück, zur Verdienstübertragung für Māṇikyasiṃha.”
- 136) Cf. von Hinüber (1980). Cf. also, Madhyāntavibhāga-bhāṣya ed., by G. Nagao (Tokyo 1964) p. 77.
 vyākhyām imām upanibadhya yad asti puṇyaṃ
 puṇyodayāya mahato jagatas tad astu
 jñānodayāya ca yato 'bhyudayam mahāntaṃ
 bodhi-trayaṃ ca na cirāj jagad aśnuvīta
 I owe this reference to Filliozat (1980) p. 251.
- 137) Cf. Schopen (1979) p. 12.
- 138) Cf. Schopen (1979) p. 8 and p. 16 note 8.

Abbreviations used in this article are as follows,

(1) Texts

- ASS : Ānandāśrama Sanskrit Series (Poona)
- BS(Bh) : Brahma-sūtra-Śaṅkarabhāṣya (Motilal Banarsidass, Delhi 1980)
- BSS : Bombay Sanskrit Series (Bombay)
- GK : Gaṇa-kārikā (GOS. 15)
- GOS : Gaekwads' Oriental Series (Baroda)
- HOS : Harvard Oriental Series (Cambridge, Mass)
- IS : Indische Sprüche by O. Böhtlingk (St. Petersburg 1870–1873)
- KAS : Kauṭilya Artha Śāstra, text ed. by R. P. Kangle (Bombay 1960)
- KSS : Kathāsaritsāgara of Somadevabhāṭṭa (NSP. 1931)
- MBh : Mahābhārata (Poona Critical Ed.)
- MS : Manusmṛti (NSP. 1951)
- NS(Bh) : Nyāya-sūtra(-bhāṣya) (ASS 91)
- NSP : Nirnayasagar Press (Bombay)
- PABh : Pañcārthabhāṣya of Kauṇḍinya (TSS 143)
- PS : Pāśupata-sūtra (TSS 143)
- R : Vālmiki Rāmāyaṇa (Baroda Critical Ed.)
- RT : Ratna-ṭikā (GOS 15)
- TSS : Trivandrum Sanskrit Series (Trivandrum)
- VS : Viṣṇu-smṛti (Adyar 1964)
- YS : Yājñavalkya-smṛti (NSP. 1943)

(2) Secondary Sources

- ALB : The Adyar Library Bulletin (Adyar)
 AO : Acta Orientalia (Copenhagen)
 AS : Asiatische Studien (Bern)
 IBK : Indogaku-Bukkyogaku-kenkyu (Tokyo)
 IIJ : Indo-iranian Journal (Dortrecht)
 JA : Journal Asiatique (Paris)
 JAOS : Journal of the American Oriental Society (Baltimore)
 JRAS : Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland (London)
 StII : Studien zur Indologie und Iranistik (Reinbek)
 WZKSO : Wiener Zeitschrift für Kunde des Süd-und Ost Asiens (Wien)
 ZDMG : Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenlandischen Gesellschaft (Wiesbaden)
- Agasse, J. M. (1978) "Le Transfert de Mérite dans le Bouddhisme Pāli classique" *JA*. 1978. pp. 311ff.
- Bechert, H. ed. (1991–2) *The Dating of the Historical Buddha*, parts I (1991) and 2 (1992) (Göttingen).
- Bechert, H. (1992) "Buddha-Field and Transfer of Merit in a Theravāda Source" *IIJ*. 35 pp. 95–108.
- Bloomfield M. (1917) "On the Art of Entering Another's Body" *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society* 56 1917, pp. 1–43.
- Damsteegt, Th. (1978) *Epigraphical Hybrid Sanskrit* (Leiden 1978)
- Defourny, M. (1978) *Le mythe de Yayāti* (Paris 1978)
- Filliozat, J. (1980) "Sur le Domaine sémantique de *punya*" *Indianisme et Bouddhisme, Mélanges offerts à Mgr. E. Lamotte* (Louvain 1980) pp. 101ff.
- Gonda, J. (1943) "Zur Frage nach dem Ursprung und Wesen des indischen Dramas" *AO* 19 1943, pp. 352ff.
- (1959) *Four Studies in the Language of the Veda* (the Hague 1959)
- (1961) "Ascetics and courtesans" *ALB* 25 1961 pp. 71–102
- (1989) *Prayer and Blessing, Ancient Indian Ritual Terminology* (Leiden 1989)
- Hara, M. (1964) "Pāsupata Kenkyu" *IBK*. 23 1964, pp. 398ff.
- (1967) "Transfer of Merit" *ALB* 31–32 1967–8 p. 383ff.
- (1970) "Tapo-dhana" *Acta Asiatica* 19 (Tokyo 1970) pp. 58–76.
- (1975) "tapas, dharma, punya (= / =sukṛta)" *A. Hirakawa Felicitation volume* (Tokyo 1975) pp. 507–544.
- (1979) "Śraddhāviveśa" *IT* 7 pp. 261–273.

- (1982) "Mitabi (for the third time)" *Y. Tamura Felicitation volume* (Tokyo 1982) pp. 527ff.
- (1984) "A Note on the Pāsupata Concept of Purity (śauca)" *Svasti Śrī* (B. Ch. Chhabra Felicitation Volume) (Delhi 1984) pp. 237–244.
- (1985) "A Note on the Sādhina Jātaka (ZDMG Supplement VI [XXII Deutscher Orientalisten-tag, Tübingen 1983]), p. 308–314.
- (1987) "Invigoration" *Hinduismus und Buddhismus* (Festschrift U. Schneider) (Freiburg 1987) pp. 134ff.
- Heesterman, J. C. (1962) "Vrātya and Sacrifice" *IJ.* 1962 pp. 1–37.
- Hopkins, E. W. (1905) "The Fountain of Youth" *JAOS* 1905 pp. 1–67.
- (1906) "Modifications of the karma Doctrine" *JRAS* 1906, pp. 581–593.
- (1932) "The Oath in Hindu Epic Literature" *JAOS* 52, pp. 316–337.
- Ingalls, D. H. H. (1957) "Human Effort versus God's Effort in the Early Nyāya (NS. 4.1.19–21)" *Dr. Belvalkar Felicitation volume* (Banaras 1957) pp. 228ff.
- (1962) "Cynics and Pāsupatas: The Seeking of Dishonor" *The Harvard Theological Review* 55, 1962 pp. 281–298.
- Kuiper, F. B. J. (1979) *Varuṇa and Vidūṣaka*, On the origin of the Sanskrit drama (Amsterdam, Oxford, New York, 1979).
- Lüders, H. (1940) *Philologica Indica* (Göttingen 1940)
- (1959a) "Die Satyakriyā" *Varuṇa* II (Göttingen 1959) pp. 486–509.
- (1959) "Der indische Eid" *Varuṇa* II (Göttingen 1959) pp. 655–674.
- O'Flaherty, W. D. (1973) *Asceticism and Eroticism in the Mythology of Śiva* (London 1973).
- (1980) *Karma and Rebirth in Classical Indian Tradition* (California 1980)
- (1980a) *The Origins of Evil in Hindu Mythology* (California 1980)
- Schmithausen, L. (1986) "Critical Response" *Karma and Rebirth: Post Classical Developments* ed., by R. W. Neufeldt (Albany 1986), pp. 203–230.
- (1991) *The Problem of the Sentience of Plants in Earliest Buddhism* (Tokyo 1991)
- (1992) "An Attempt to estimate the Distance in Time between Aśoka and the Buddha" Bechert ed. (1992) pp. 110–147.

- Schneider, U. (1959) "Die Geschichte von den beiden Jaratkāru" *WZKSO* 3/4 (1959–60) pp. 1–11.
- Schopen, G. (1979) "Mahāyāna in Indian Inscriptions" *IJJ.* 21 1979 pp. 1–19.
- (1984) "Two Problems in the History of Indian Buddhism: Layman/Monk Distinction and Doctrines of the Transference of Merit" *SIJ* 10 1984 pp. 9–47.
- Shree, M. (1986) *tapas und tapasvin in den erzählenden Partien des Mahābhārata* (Reinbek 1986)
- Sternbach, L. (1967) *Juridical Studies in Ancient Indian Law*, Pt. 2 (Delhi 1967).
- Thieme, P. (1984) *Kleine Schriften* (2 Auflage) (Wiesbaden 1984)
- von Hinüber, O. (1980) "Die Kolophone der Gilgit-Handschriften" *SIJ* 5–6 (1980) pp. 49–82.
- Wezler, A. (1987–89) "The Warrior taking to Flight in Fear, Some Remarks on Manu 7.94 and 95" *IT.* 14 (C. Caillat Felicitation volume) pp. 393ff.

This study was made possible with the Mitsubishi Foundation Subsidy for the Human Sciences.