

PREFACE

A reader striking open this third volume of our dictionary may receive the impression that we have moved away somewhat from the style, the methods, the scope and even, arguably, the aims of the first. And indeed although we have striven to follow the lines laid down by the pioneers of this lexicographical project, resistless time has rolled on and wrought all manner of changes that, cumulatively, might create such an impression.

First, the team of the most active contributors has continued to change, and the latest arrivals – DIWAKAR ACHARYA, SHAMAN HATLEY, CSABA KISS, ISABELLE RATIÉ, SOMDEV VASUDEVA, and CLAUDIA WEBER – have different interests and reading experiences. They bring with them knowledge of the philosophical literature of Kashmir (ISABELLE RATIÉ), of the more esoteric and transgressive Śaiva traditions (SHAMAN HATLEY, CSABA KISS, SOMDEV VASUDEVA), of the Śrīvidyā (CLAUDIA WEBER), and of a range of Śaiva, Saura and Vaiṣṇava literature recently uncovered in old Nepalese manuscripts (DIWAKAR ACHARYA).

Second, the range and quantity of texts available to us today have continued to expand: the field of tantric studies is at the moment a relatively active one, and new editions have been appearing at a steady rhythm in the last decade, particularly of Śaiva literature. Just since the appearance of our second volume, for instance, we now have to hand new printed editions of the *Ajītamahātantra*, of the one-hundred-verse recension of the *Kālotara*, of the *Tattvatrayanirṇayavivṛti* of *Rāmakaṇṭha*, of the *Dīptāgama*, of the *Pañcāvaraṇastava* of *Aghoraśiva*, of the *Parākhyatantra*, of a huge section of the *Manthānabhairava*, of the *Mahotsavavidhi* attributed to *Aghoraśiva*, and of part of the *Sūkṣmāgama*. Given this wealth of freshly available material, there are some works that we have either not been able to refer to at all or that we have cited only in certain recently added articles.

But it is also the easy availability of digital photographs of manuscripts spread across the globe that has given us access to

more primary sources. This is thanks especially to such initiatives as those of the Muktabodha Indological Research Institute, who have digitised and put on line images of all the transcripts of the French Institute of Pondicherry (IFP), with a catalogue prepared by the EFEO and IFP; the San Marga Trust, Chennai, who have this year (2011) finished photographing all the palm-leaf manuscripts of the IFP and of the EFEO Centre in Pondicherry; and the Nepal-German Manuscripts Preservation Project and its successor, the Nepalese German Manuscript Cataloguing Project, which have opened up the manuscript treasures of Nepal. This means that, for the Śaivasiddhānta for example, we can now read much of the literature that was known at one of its highpoints – the twelfth century in the Tamil-speaking South – to the prolific commentator Aghoraśiva and his disciples; but we can also read some of the works that members of his South Indian school never cite and that may have been lost to them, such as the *Niśvāsātattvasaṃhitā* and the *Tattvatrayanirṇayavivṛti* of the tenth-century Kashmirian theologian Rāmakaṇṭha.

Furthermore, there has been a revolution in terms of ease of access to primary material entailed by the growth of a library of machine-searchable electronic versions of both published and of hitherto unpublished works. We have made use particularly of the e-texts available through GRETEL (the Göttingen Register of Electronic Texts in Indic Languages) maintained by REINHOLD GRÜNENDAHL, of the Digital Library of the Muktabodha Indological Research Institute, of the smaller collections posted on sites such as that of the Institut Français de Pondichéry and the Tantric Studies website, and of electronic texts not posted on such sites but made available to us (or to individuals among us) by individual scholars. For such contributions, we should like to thank in particular Dr. ANIL KUMAR ACHARYA, NIRAJAN KAFLE, Dr. NINA MIRNIG, Dr. DEVIPRASAD MISHRA, Dr. NIBEDITA ROUT, Prof. ALEXIS SANDERSON, Dr. S.A.S. SARMA, Dr. R. SATHYANARAYANAN, Dr. OLGA SERBAEVA SARAOGI, MICHAEL SLOUBER, and Professor JUN TAKASHIMA. Another individual who deserves special mention for his help in the preparation of this volume is CHRISTIAN FERSTL, not for furnishing electronic texts, but for painstakingly combing through the finished book in order to check cross-references and to eradicate inconsistencies, oddities and errors of various kinds. We are grateful for his careful work.

Especially useful are the electronic transcriptions of hitherto unpublished works, reading which would otherwise require many hours of patient decipherment. For such transcriptions, we have tended to include in our abbreviations an initial in parentheses of those responsible for the onerous but extremely useful work of reading and entering them. Thus, for instance, when we refer to MARK DYZCKOWSKI's electronic text of the unpublished Tantrasadbhāvatāntra – which is not simply the transcription of one manuscript, but a collation of several – we use the siglum TSB(D). Similarly, for another vast work of historical importance, the Picumatabrahmayāmala, typed in by SHAMAN HATLEY and revised by CSABA KISS, we use the siglum PBY(H). This practice serves not only to acknowledge our debt to those who have passed patient hours poring over manuscripts and typing, but also to distinguish the versions we have used, since for some works there are several transcriptions or partial transcriptions that circulate informally, often with differing chapter- and verse-numerations. (Many of these electronic texts, although unprinted, are available online, and for those that are not, we have been working to make them available soon, for instance through the recent ANR-DFG-funded Franco-German project “Early Tantra”, so that our sources may become available to those who consult the dictionary.)

Third, these new resources, and the new forms in which they are available to us, have also changed our working methods. Whereas the initiators of this project worked with notes and card-indices that they had compiled over a life-time of reading, we are faced with dozens, hundreds, or sometimes even thousands of usages of a given tantric expression at the touch of a search-button. Many instances are therefore inevitably unfamiliar to us, but we must at least attempt to take what is relevant into account. Searching through an electronic library with “grep” thus has considerable and obvious advantages, but carries with it an obligation to take into account more passages than we would otherwise encounter. Furthermore “grepping” is especially helpful for revealing the contours of evolutions in usage for certain expressions. We can see at a glance, for instance, that some usages appear almost exclusively in pre-tenth-century Śaiva works – for example *pavitra* in the sense of *brahmamantra* –, or that they are shared only by Pāñcārātra scriptures and Śaiva post-twelfth-century Temple Āgamas – the terms *diśāhoma* and *nityotsava*, for instance – or again that

they are used across the whole tantric spectrum and beyond, but with differing senses or nuances. The term *prāyaścitta*, for example, is an extremely common one in all periods and most genres in our purview, but we can quickly see that in Śaiva works up to the twelfth-century emphasis is placed upon rites of expiation for an individual's religious and social transgressions (inter-caste contact during meals, sexual acts, etc.), while post-twelfth-century Temple Āgamas emphasise reparatory rites for problems in large-scale public rituals. The changing meaning of the expression *dakṣiṇāmūrti* might also be cited as an example: familiar now as the label for an iconographic type, it was once only used to express the position of the locus of divinity with respect to the position adopted by a tantric practitioner.

It is thus no less than a methodological revolution which could not have been avoided that has led to the considerable difference in style between volumes 1 and 3. The stated aim at the outset was to furnish a basic dictionary of tantric terminology that would make reference only to published literature and whose definitions would be largely devoid of speculation about dating and about terminological evolution. (The only concession to such historicising of tantric terms was the effort made to rank texts roughly in what might be supposed to have been their chronological order whenever the texts are named together in lists of references.) In this third volume, many of the articles are now arguably a little more like the entries of an encyclopaedia than of a dictionary: not only do they often include more text-references, they also contain allusions to questions of chronology and to changes of usage over time and across genres. This shift may be regretted by some, who wanted this project to result in a quick-reference guide to tantric terminology, and who may therefore reproach us for not having exercised our editorial responsibilities; it may be welcomed by others, who will be happy to find more exploratory discussions and even divagations. A shift of this kind, if not of this degree, was in any case, it now seems to us, inevitable.

It is to be hoped that our knowledge of the history of tantric literature will continue to grow, and it is to be expected that changes in the way we work will continue to surprise us, and so we shall have to continue to adapt. It is therefore no shame to acknowledge that this five-volume *kośa* will no sooner be finished than it will almost certainly be seen to be in need of revision by an-

other generation of scholarship. Already today colleagues tell us how fruitful it would be to expand the project to include also Buddhist tantric literature, more and more of which is also coming to light and whose terminology overlaps with that of the Śaiva and Vaiṣṇava sources examined in this dictionary. But this will obviously have to be left to others.

By way of conclusion, since we have, in defending our lengthiness, been stressing the degree to which this volume departs from its predecessors, we should like to emphasise that we have nonetheless been following the principles and structure laid down by HÉLÈNE BRUNNER†, GERHARD OBERHAMMER and ANDRÉ PADOUX, who conceived this dictionary and to whom we acknowledge our profound indebtedness. We only rarely depart from the list of words that they drew up—working at a time when much tantric literature was still quite unmapped—as requiring definition, and the individual articles are structured as before. We wish also to reiterate our gratitude to each of them individually: to GERHARD OBERHAMMER for having first assured for the project the considerable support of the Austrian Academy of Sciences (whose tradition of hospitality in a stimulating environment has been maintained by ERNST STEINKELLNER and now HELMUT KRASSER); to HÉLÈNE BRUNNER†, few of whose definitions are present in this volume, but whose monumental four-volume study of the *Somaśambhupaddhati* laid the foundations for the study of Śaiva ritual terminology; and to ANDRÉ PADOUX, who has often announced his intention to withdraw from active duty, but who has nonetheless continued to contribute and who has tirelessly followed the development of the volume, dispensing encouragement and advice, ever ready to open the doors of his study for unscheduled discussions with dictionary-contributors who pass through Paris.

The editors,
June 2011, Paris and Vienna.

