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Part I

Study
Chapter 1

Introduction

1.1 The Aim of the Thesis

The Vindhya mountains extend across the Indian subcontinent, forming a natural division between North and Central India. Vindhyavāsini, which means ‘the goddess who resides on the Vindhya’, may actually have been a generic name for many goddesses worshipped on the mountain range. Mountains are often seen to be peripheral to civilization, and this goddess was closely associated with peripheral people such as mountain tribes and bandits, and worshipped with rural rituals, such as animal sacrifice and liquor offerings. Her most distinctive characteristics are her dark complexion and her virginity, which may well express her untamed ferocity in the Indian context. At the same time, as the goddess who protected the order of the world through her demon-slaying exploits, she sometimes had royal devotees. Once she evolved into a pan-Indian martial goddess, these ambivalent aspects may have made a unique contribution to the link between local and royal levels of goddess worship. This goddess’s contribution to the evolution of the pan-Indian martial goddess, whom the present author calls the Warrior Goddess, is the main theme of this thesis.

In India, a great variety of goddesses have been worshipped in various forms by various social classes and religious groups throughout history. This diversity and complexity has attracted scholars inside and outside India; in particular, the last few decades have yielded riches of both quantity and quality in the field of the study of goddess worship. Reflecting a diversity of objects, research has been conducted in this field from various angles, anthropological, psychological, philological, archaeological, iconographical, etc. Several collections of articles devoted to the subject have been published,\(^1\) which may be due to the form’s suitability for reflecting this diver-

sity of both objects and methodology. When Kinsley’s popular work *Hindu Goddesses* (1986), a general survey of traditional Hindu goddesses mainly based on textual sources, is compared to another work that gives a general survey of goddesses in India, *Devī: Goddesses of India* (1996), one of the collections edited by Hawley and Wulff, greater diversity of objects and methodology in the latter work clearly reveals the considerable advancement of research. It is worth noting that this trend is more or less associated with an interest in women’s studies. In this context, the goddess image has often been regarded as reflecting the image of femininity in the culture that formed it, although to what extent the goddess image reflects the image of femininity from a woman’s point of view is controversial and needs to be considered on a case by case basis. The extent to which goddess worship is associated with the actual life of women in society is also controversial; for instance, can the goddess image be a model of life for women or not? In this respect, research in this field is often closely related with another subject, women’s participation in religious activities in general.

There are several recurrent themes in this field that share a common element with the present thesis, which will now be surveyed in brief. First, whether goddesses are linked with gods or remain single is considered to be an element decisive to their personalities. Also, when they are linked, a subject of discussion is what the relationship between the couple is—whether it is marital or not, or whether the goddess is obedient to her husband/lover, equal to him, or keeps him under subjection. *The Divine Consort*, a collection of articles edited by Hawley and Wulff (1982), is devoted to this theme, mainly focusing on Kṛṣṇa’s lover or wife Rādhā, but also including articles concerned with other types of relationships between couples, as well as a virgin goddess.

Second, the relationship between local and royal levels of goddess worship is discussed in many studies, two of which are monographs: Allen’s monograph on Kumārī worship in Nepal (1974) and Sax’s on the Mountain Goddess in the Himacal Pradesh (1991). Both are also related to the first theme. Allen’s study deals with virgin worship under royal patronage and Sax’s study shows that the goddess’s defining relationship to her birth place after her marriage is the central concern in her worship. The latter study also argues not only the contrast between local and royal levels but also the contrast between women’s and men’s viewpoints. As shown

---

2 Five articles in this collection are copied or revised from the same editors’ first collection, *The Divine Consort* (1982).

3 Leslie’s paper about Śrī and Jyeṣṭhā (1991) presents an intriguing example. See also Sax (1991).

4 A collection edited by Leslie (1991) provides various examples from the Vedic period down to modern society. In anthropological studies of goddess worship, what part the local women take in the worship is usually one of the main concerns. There are also many studies about women’s participation in Buddhism and Jainism.
in both studies, the royal level of goddess worship generally manifests itself in larger scale rituals under royal patronage. Representative of them is the Navarātra, or Durgāpūjā, the autumnal, or sometimes vernal, nine-night festival dedicated to the Goddess, which is still popular all over India and Nepal. The ritual of purifying weapons and tools on the tenth day, known as Vijayadaśami, is often added to the Navarātra, which suggests a close link between the Navarātra and kingship (see n. 48). Fuller’s *The Camphor Flame* (1992), whose intention is to submit a synthetic account of Hindu ethnography, provides a rich ethonographical account for this ritual. An instance of this ritual in modern Banaras is described in detail and analysed in Rodrigues (2003). Einoo’s article (1999), an exhaustive study of the descriptions of this ritual found in the Puranic literature, is valuable for the historical study of the development of the ritual.\(^5\)

The second theme is closely associated with the third theme, the relationship between local and pan-Indian goddesses, in other words, the Hinduization of local goddess worship. Although goddess worship at a royal level is part of the Hinduization of local goddess worship, it is useful to distinguish between the two sorts of Hinduization: royal and Brahmanical; Hinduization encompasses both phenomena in a more general term. A collection of articles about the Jagannath cult in Orissa, edited by Eschmann, Kulke and Tripathi (1978),\(^6\) is an excellent example of research on this subject. Several articles in Part I discuss the Hinduization process of aboriginal deities, both male and female, adding many instances collected in fieldwork and, furthermore, with Part II, deal with the contribution of royal patronage and political motivation in the Hinduization process. Marriage of a local goddess to a pan-Indian God-figure, such as Śiva, was one of the methods in the Hinduization of local goddesses, for which Shulman’s *Tamil Temple Myths* (1980) provides plenty of instances from both a large number of hitherto unknown local legends associated with Tamil temples and his own fieldwork. Humes’ article (1996) on Vindhyavāsini in the village of Vindhyācal,\(^7\) currently the most popular pilgrimage centre for this goddess, focuses on this theme, as shown in the title ‘Vindhyavāsini: Local Goddess yet Great Goddess.’ She also points out that the theme is linked with the contrast between the local scripture *Vindhyamāhātmya*\(^8\) and the

---

\(^{5}\)The royal patronage for this ritual in Nepal is well known. See also Stein 1992 for royal patronage of the Navarātra in mediaeval and modern South India.

\(^{6}\)A series of monographs titled ‘Studies in Orissan Society, Culture and History’ based on the German Orissa research project and edited by Kulke and Schnepel have been published since 2001.

\(^{7}\)The results of her field research at Vindhyācal are contained in her unpublished PhD thesis (1990), which mainly deals with the socioeconomic condition of the priests working at this pilgrimage centre and the practice of the *Devīmāhātmya* recitation at the main temple.

\(^{8}\)An edition of this text is being prepared by Dr Sudharkar Malaviya of the Kashi Raj Trust.
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pan-Indian scripture *Devīmāhātmya*. A study by Stapelfeldt (2001) on the goddess Kamakhya of Kamarpura in Assam, one of the popular centres of goddess worship, based on the *Kālikāpurāṇa* and field research, is also concerned with this theme. With regard to the sacred places of goddesses, a preliminary report was edited by Bakker and Entwistle (1983).

The fourth theme is ritual practices, which includes several significant subthemes, such as animal sacrifice, human sacrifice, self-immolation, possession and Navarātra. Concerning animal sacrifice, the distinction between royal and Brahmanical Hinduization, mentioned above, is necessary because the royal type does not ban animal sacrifice but sometimes intensifies it, while the Brahmanical type, viz. Brahmanization, bans it. With regard to buffalo sacrifice, Biardeau’s article in a collection edited by herself (1981) and her monograph (1989), in which the subject of her article is dealt with more comprehensively, are significant, although her interpretation of textual sources in the light of contemporary field evidence and vice versa should be evaluated cautiously. A thought-provoking argument on sacrifice in Fuller’s popular monograph (1992), mentioned above, is also noteworthy. The variety of ritual practices are related to the second and third themes; for instance, possession is common at the local level and the Navarātra is often connected with kingship. As mentioned above, whether animal sacrifice is allowed or not is often the crucial point in Brahmanization. The rituals described in the *Kālikāpurāṇa*, which include ‘heterodox’ (vāma) rituals, have been studied by van Kooij (1972).

The last, fifth theme is that of ‘the Goddess’ as a major, pan-Indian godhead. In spite of a diversity of goddesses, there also was a growing tendency to unify various goddesses, which lead to the rise of ‘the Goddess’. The goddesses who are subsumed into ‘the Goddess’ are regarded as her manifestations in different time and places with different objects. However, ‘the Goddess’ was not just one. There were a variety of levels and ideologies of unification, hence a variety of types and figures of ‘the Goddess’ (see p. 12). As a result, ‘the Goddess’ has been attractive to but confusing for scholars in this field. An investigation of ‘the Goddess’ is also indispensable for the study of the second and third themes, because local goddesses are considered to be local manifestations of ‘the Goddess’ or identified with her at a royal or Brahmanical level of worship. Theological aspects of ‘the Goddess’ were studied in two monographs by Coburn on the *Devīmāhātmya* (1984, 1991) and two by Brown on the *Brahmavaivartapurāṇa* (1974) and the *Devībhāgavatapurāṇa* (1990), respectively. Brown has also published a separate monograph (1998) on the *Devīgītā* contained in the *Devībhāgavatapurāṇa*, which interprets ‘the Goddess’ according to orthodox, Brahmanical theology. ‘The Goddess’ is usually identified with a variety of cosmic principles represented by feminine nouns, such as sakti, prakṛti, and māyā. Pintermann’s study about these and other female principles (1994) also contributed to
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...this theme. A collection edited by Pintchmann, Seeking Mahādevī (2001), attempts to confront the confusion of scholars studying "the Goddess," although the articles collected are intended to show multiple understandings of "the Goddess," rather than convergent ones.

In spite of the wealth of research from these decades, much still remains to be done in the area of historical studies based on literary and archaeological sources. Iconographical studies of individual goddesses have been accumulating; however, the results of archaeological studies should be combined with the results of textual studies and vice versa in order to reach a balanced overview of the historical situation. Tiwari’s monograph (1986) on the early history of goddess worship, which includes a study of individual goddesses such as the Mothers and Koṭavī as well, merits attention in this respect, although his study is more of a collection of material from archaeological and literary sources. One problem lies with the part of textual studies. The voluminous corpus of the Puranic literature may be the richest literary source for worship of goddesses from the fourth century onwards, including goddess mythology, theology, ritual practices, iconography, sacred places, devotional episodes, etc. However, sound philological studies based on critical editions have not matured in the research into this corpus, thus hampering plausible assessments of literary sources and synthesis with the archaeological sources. This problem may well be responsible for a tendency related to the idea of the Goddess: many scholars tend to presuppose this concept ahistorically without taking it as a historical product. We will now return to the theme of "the Goddess".

The idea of the Goddess appears in Sanskrit literature in around the sixth century, after the Hindu pantheon and the two God figures, Śiva and Viṣṇu/Kṛṣṇa, were established. In order to better understand this, it...
is vital to investigate the mechanism of its emergence—how and why ‘the Goddess’ was brought into being—around the sixth century. Coburn’s first study on the *Devīmāhātmya* (1984) is the greatest contribution to the subject. However, his main question is the functions that sacred scriptures, in this case the *Devīmāhātmya*, fulfilled in the Hindu tradition, which is further emphasized in his second study of the text (1991). Although his first monograph includes a historical study of the Goddess myths found in the *Devīmāhātmya*, it is not a major subject. Another problem is that the *Devīmāhātmya* is often ascribed to the fifth to seventh centuries, which dating is also followed by Coburn. In this early dating, however, the description of the Goddess killing the buffalo demon in the *Devīmāhātmya* does not correspond to archeological and literary evidence related to the iconography representing a goddess killing a buffalo demon, usually called Mahiṣāsura-mardini. Weighing all the available evidence, it is most reasonable to date this text to the eighth century.

In this text, the Goddess into whom present. Concerning the Vedic period, the goddess Vāc ‘Speech’ often came into question. The so-called Devi-sūktā dedicated to Vāc in the tenth book of the *Rgveda* (10.125) has often been incorporated along with the Rātri-sūktā (*Rgveda* 10.127) into a programme of ritual recitation of the *Devīmāhātmya* and regarded as a significant mantra of ‘the Goddess’ (Coburn 1984, 255f). However, the connection of this Sūkta with the *Devīmāhātmya* and the Goddess as seen in this text is likely to be a later development as a result of Brahmanization of the Goddess. It is not impossible that the goddess Vāc was a goddess unifying and ranking higher than other minor goddesses in the Vedic period. As mentioned in the next section, however, warrior-type goddesses played a prominent role in the rise of ‘the Goddess’ who has been a major godhead in the Hindu pantheon since the Mediaeval period. Therefore, even if a unification of goddesses could be discerned in the Vedic goddess Vāc, she cannot be considered to be an immediate predecessor of ‘the Goddess’ dealt with in this thesis.

The goddess Durgā found in the *Taittirīya Aranyaka* may be more controversial in this regard because Durgā is often seen as the proper name of the Warrior Goddess, or ‘the Goddess’. However, as discussed on p. 16, Durgā in TĀ 10 (viz. the *Mahānārāyanaka Upanisad*) and the Khila to the Rātri-sūktā (*Rgveda Khila* 4.2.5–13) is described as neither ‘the Warrior Goddess’ nor a warrior-type goddess. Furthermore, the epithet Durgā was one of the popular epithets of the developing Warrior Goddess during the sixth to the eighth century, but neither her proper name nor her most prominent name. The goddess Durgā mentioned in TĀ 10 may have either been assimilated to Mahiṣāsura-mardini at a certain point before the sixth century or absorbed into the developing Warrior Goddess; eventually, the epithet Durgā, as well as her lineage name Kātyāyani, came to apply to ‘the Warrior Goddess’. The origin of the goddess Mahiṣāsura-mardini is another matter. We should not confuse three subjects: the goddess Durgā in the Vedas, the origin of Mahiṣāsura-mardini (or, that of the myth of a goddess slaying a buffalo), and the rise of ‘the Warrior Goddess’. This thesis deals with the third subject. For the opposite standpoint, see several articles by Parpola (1984, 1988, 1992, 1999, 2002, etc.), which contains a wealth of valuable material and intriguing arguments, but in which the three subjects mentioned above are completely conflated.
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demon-slaying warlike goddesses are subsumed is considered to be the highest divinity, the embodiment of \( \text{\textasciitilde sakti} \), ‘power’, pervading all the universe. All the beings in the universe are embodiments of this principle, \( \text{\textasciitilde sakti} \), so that they are all partial manifestations of the Goddess. Thus, in this text from the early mediaeval period, the Goddess as the highest divinity was firmly established by means of the concept of \( \text{\textasciitilde sakti} \), and afterwards the \textit{Devi-m\textasciitilde h\textasciitilde atmya} became the most popular scripture of the Goddess. Therefore, in order to investigate the mechanism of the emergence of the Goddess, attention should be directed to the period before the composition of the \textit{Devi-m\textasciitilde h\textasciitilde atmya}.

However, the deficiency in historical studies mentioned above is also true of this period. Furthermore, the fragmentary condition of relevant literary sources interfered with the progress of research. In the mythology of the Goddess related in the \textit{Devi-m\textasciitilde h\textasciitilde atmya}, two myths about her slaying demons, one about her slaying the buffalo demon Mahi\textasciitilde asura and the other the demon brothers Sumbha and Nisumbha, occupy the major part. As for the first myth, her slaying of the buffalo demon, there are a number of images depicting this scene from the K\u{u}\textasciitilde sh\u{a}na period, and the historical development of this iconography has been studied by von Stietencron (1983) and others. On the other hand, literary references to this myth datable before the \textit{Devi-m\textasciitilde h\textasciitilde atmya} are scant and none of them describes the myth in a chronological sequence. As far as the second myth of slaying the demon brothers Sumbha and Nisumbha is concerned, the slaying of the namesake demon brothers by a goddess called Vindhyav\textasciitilde asini is alluded to in the K\u{u}\textasciitilde sh\u{a}na myths found in the \textit{Hariv\textasciitilde m\textasciitilde asa}. Although the text allots considerable verses to describing Vindhyav\textasciitilde asini, her demon-slaying exploit is referred to in just half a verse. Thus, there is no source that relates this myth in detail before the \textit{Devi-m\textasciitilde h\textasciitilde atmya}. Moreover, unlike the goddess who slays the buffalo demon, namely Mahi\textasciitilde asuramardin\textasciitilde i, Vindhyav\textasciitilde asini seems not to have had her own distinct iconography in this period. Therefore, what type of goddess Vindhyav\textasciitilde asini was before the \textit{Devi-m\textasciitilde h\textasciitilde atmya} remains even more ambiguous than Mahi\textasciitilde asuramardin\textasciitilde i.

Despite these drawbacks, there are a few scholars who have paid attention to this goddess. They have tended to consider her in relation with K\u{r}\textasciitilde sha or Vi\textasciitilde su\textasciitilde n because of her first appearance in the \textit{Hariv\textasciitilde m\textasciitilde asa}. Hazra, albeit cursorily, emphasized the prominence of her role in affiliating many small goddesses to Vai\textasciitilde navism and compared it to the role of \u{S}iva’s consort in \u{S}aivism (1963, 34f). In her study of the cowherd god K\u{r}\textasciitilde sha, on the other hand, Vaudeville discussed the account of Vindhyav\textasciitilde asini in the \textit{Hariv\textasciitilde m\textasciitilde asa} along with other relevant sources she regarded as early and argued that ‘the

---

\(^{18}\)For the origin of the demons’ names Sumbha and Nisumbha instead of the usual \u{S}umbha and Nisumbha, see p. 84 in 4.2.

\(^{19}\)For the references to the study of this iconography, see 5.1
Great Goddess’ had a prominent position among the people who worshipped this god.\(^{20}\) Coburn agreed with her opinion and concluded that the myth of the Goddess slaying the demon brothers Śumbha and Nisumbha in the Devīmāhātmya was ‘a fragment of the mythology of the great Goddess as it was current among the north Indian peoples who came to know of the heroic exploits of Kṛṣṇa Gopāla’ (1984, 241). Both authors wrongly presupposed that the notion of the Goddess had existed long before the composition of the Harivaṃśa, which obscures the historical role of Vindhyavāsini in the evolution of the Goddess. Tiwari was more cautious with his enquiry into the evolution of the cult of ‘the Great Goddess’. Following his reasonable hypothesis that the buffalo-slaying goddess (viz. Mahiṣaśuramārdini) may have served as the nucleus for the growth of ‘the Great Goddess’, he was ‘strongly inclined to believe’ that she was the same goddess as Vindhyavāsini (1986, 89f). This identification, however, is also a product, albeit one of the earliest ones, of the evolution of the single, supreme Goddess.

Humes laid stress on the independent origin of Vindhyavāsini. In her 1996 paper, she states that the Vindhyavāsini myth in the Harivaṃśa ‘suggests that she had an independent force and identity before she became incorporated into the legend and worship of Krishna, and that her power could be mobilized to support the ongoing evolution of Hindu religion’ (p. 49), and that the same work also suggests ‘her origins among tribal peoples’ (p. 52). Moreover, she calls Vindhyavāsini a third alternative means of absorbing other goddesses, alongside the Śaiva and Vaishāvaya manners, and, paying attention to her virginity, says ‘Vindhyavāsini was thus capable of providing the nuclear origin for a cult of the unmarried, virgin Great Goddess’ (p. 51). Her insight tallies roughly with the conclusion of this thesis; on the other hand, it should be substantiated by historical evidence. In addition, in contrast to Tiwari, Humes dismissed the interplay between Vindhyavāsini and Mahiṣaśuramārdini.

The state of affairs has been changed by the publication of the Skandapurāṇa edited by Kṛṣṇa Prasāda Bhaṭṭarāi in Kathmandu in 1988 and subsequently by the correct evaluation of the text as the original Skandapurāṇa by Adriaensen, Bakker and Isaacson (1994). This original Skandapurāṇa is one of the oldest Śaiva Purāṇas and was probably composed in North India during the period from the sixth to the seventh century. Not only the antiquity of the text but also the fact that the text is preserved in three early manuscripts, dated to the ninth to tenth centuries, provides a fairly firm footing for the historical study of its content.\(^{21}\) The text contains the myth cycle of Kāuśikī-Vindhyavāsini (hereafter the Kāuśikī cycle) covering seventeen and a half chapters, in which Vindhyavāsini’s fight with the de-


\(^{21}\)The description of this text, its recensions and manuscripts will be found in 1.3.
The Aim of the Thesis

mon brothers Sumbha and Nisumbha, supplemented by a brief episode of her fight with the buffalo demon and embedded in the Śaiva mythology, is narrated. A comparison of this myth cycle, as well as other parts relevant to goddesses in this text, with the Devīmāhātmya indicates that the Skandapurāṇa probably exerted a great deal of influence upon the Devīmāhātmya, specifically the myth of the Goddess’s fight with the demons Sumbha and Nisumbha found in DM 5–11. Thus this material is of great value as the earliest source that relates Vindhyavāsini’s demon-slaying exploit in detail. In addition, this material is important for the study of the evolution of the Goddess on the following three points. First, the text is chronologically located between the Harivaṁśa and the Devīmāhātmya, so that it can reveal the mid point of the evolution of Vindhyavāsini from her status in the Harivaṁśa to that in the Devīmāhātmya. Second, the Vindhyavāsini myth is embedded in the Śaiva mythology in the text, whereas the goddess appears in the Bhāgavata/Vaiṣṇava mythology in the Harivaṁśa. Hence, a comparison of the two is helpful for an impartial assessment of her affinity with the two dominant traditions of this period. Lastly, the myth cycle includes the episode of Vindhyavāsini slaying the buffalo demon Mahiṣa, albeit very briefly, which, when put together with other early but fragmentary textual sources of this myth and the rich body of the Mahiṣāsuramardini images, provides a clue to the interplay between Vindhyavāsini and Mahiṣāsuramardini.

My paper ‘The Warrior Goddess in the Devīmāhātmya’, published in 1999, was a preliminary attempt to present a survey of how the Goddess in the Devīmāhātmya evolved from two demon-slaying goddesses, Mahiṣāsuramardini and Vindhyavāsini. Although the Kauśikī cycle in the Skandapurāṇa is taken into account in the paper, at that time my research on this new material was just beginning, so that the references to it were cursory and unsynthesized with the other sources. Although my hypothesis about the historical process of the evolution of the Goddess has not changed by and large since my former paper, the research on the new material in the Skandapurāṇa has made it possible to delineate the process much more concretely as far as available evidence allows.

The first aim of the present thesis is to make this new material, the myth cycle of Kauśikī-Vindhyavāsini in the Skandapurāṇa, available to those scholars interested in the goddess mythology in India, for which the English synopsis of the entire myth cycle (Part Two) and the new critical edition of parts crucial for the study of the Goddess (Part Three) have been prepared. Secondly, based on the fruits of research on this new material, this thesis intends to make a contribution to the early history of the evolution of the Goddess before reaching her establishment in the Devīmāhātmya, as well as the mechanism of her emergence, with a special emphasis on the role of Vindhyavāsiṇī (Part One).
1.2 The Early History of the Goddess

1.2.1 Three streams in the early history of the Goddess

As mentioned earlier, there were a variety of levels and ideologies of unification of goddesses into ‘the Goddess’. Thus, in order to avoid confusion, three types of ‘the Goddess’ will be distinguished in the present study: the Warrior Goddess, the Consort Goddess and the Supreme Goddess. The Warrior Goddess is the unity of demon-slaying, warlike goddesses. She is the main subject of the present study, and who the Warrior Goddess was will hopefully be clear by the end of this study. When a goddess coupled with a God figure is considered to incorporate many other goddesses into herself as her manifestations, she will be called the Consort Goddess. There are several figures of the Consort Goddess according to religious affiliation; Pārvatī is usually the Consort Goddess for the Śaivas and Śrī-Laks.āmi for the Vaiś.ṇavas. The Consort Goddess embodies the cosmic principle represented by feminine nouns, but it is subordinate to the cosmic principle represented by masculine, or sometimes neutral, nouns and embodied by God. When a goddess is the highest divinity superior to all the other deities, she is the Supreme Goddess and, theoretically, all the other goddesses and the other types and figures of ‘the Goddess’ are subsumed into her. The Supreme Goddess is either single or, even if she is the wife of a God figure, superior to her husband whether theologically, mythologically or devotionally. In the latter case, it is often difficult to determine whether the Goddess is regarded as the Consort Goddess or the Supreme Goddess; a theological conclusion may be contradictory to the mythological and/or devotional one. The Supreme Goddess is the embodiment of the highest cosmic principle, such as śakti and brahman. On the other hand, śakti can also be embodied by the Consort Goddess, when the concept is regarded as secondary to the highest cosmic principle embodied by God. Here, too, is an ambiguity in the distinction between the Consort Goddess and the Supreme Goddess.

These types cannot be considered to be clearly demarcated from each other, as just mentioned. The relationships between the three types of the Goddess also change according to the text and actual religious context. For instance, in the Devīmāhātmya, the Warrior Goddess attains the status of the Supreme Goddess, absorbing the latent Consort Goddess, Pārvatī, into herself. In the Skandapurāṇa, on the other hand, the Consort Goddess, Pārvatī, absorbed the developing Warrior Goddess, Vindhyāvasinī, into herself.

---

22This does not mean that the types of ‘the Goddess’ are limited to these three. Cāmuṇḍī-type, dreadful goddess, often called Kāli, may be another type of ‘the Goddess’, and there may be other types.

23There are also a variety of God figures in India. However, the identity of God, in principle, depends on communities of believers, e.g., Śiva is God for the Śaivas and Viṣṇu is God for the Vaiṣṇavas. In the case of the Goddess, on the other hand, the situation is
Based on the present author’s research so far, the following rough sketch can be drawn of the early history of the Goddess, from the early centuries of our era down to the eighth century, leading to the rise of the Supreme Goddess. Three streams can be discerned. First, the Warrior Goddess developed as a unity of warlike, demon-slaying goddesses, some of whom were tied to certain localities/regions. Mahiṣāsura-mardini and Vindhyavāsini may have been the most popular demon-slaying goddesses. These bellicose goddesses probably emerged from goddesses worshipped in rural and tribal circumstances peripheral to the Hindu dhamic society and, therefore, the Warrior Goddess became an effective means to affiliate the rural/tribal goddesses into the Hindu world by integrating them into herself. Second, the Śaiva mythology and theology that was harmonized with the Hindu dhamic tradition developed in this period, probably under the influence of the Śaiva theology in esoteric circles of Śaivas, such as Pāśupatas and several groups of Śaiva Tantras (the redactors and followers of the Śaiva Tantras). In the Śaiva mythological world, while Śiva is regarded as God, the Lord or Father of the World, Pārvatī, his consort, is regarded as the Goddess, the Mother of the World. Furthermore, as a result of efforts to incorporate the worship of the nascent Warrior Goddess and the rural/tribal goddesses into the Śaiva fold, Pārvatī came to be considered as the Goddess, in this case ‘the Consort Goddess’, absorbing all these goddesses into

different and more complicated. The distinction between the three types just mentioned does not depend on religious affiliation, which is meaningful only for figures of the Consort Goddess. The other types of the Goddess overarch different religious tendencies. One of the reasons for the greater elasticity of the Goddess compared to the God may be that the identity of the Goddess in each context largely depends on devotional attitude rather than theological doctrine. Furthermore, the application of the immensely versatile concept sakti (‘power’) to the Goddess may also have reinforced the elasticity of the Goddess.

All the descriptions in this section are concerned with North and Central India. In the southernmost part of India under the Dravidian culture, the early history of the development of the Goddess may have been different; for instance, Vindhyavāsini probably did not take any significant part in it. The investigation of this falls beyond the scope of the present study and should be left handed over to the Tamil scholars.

Terms such as the Hindu (dhamic) society/world or the traditional Hindu society/world used in the present study do not presume a well-demarcated, unchanging entity. It is obvious that the religious tradition of the Hindu society/world underwent changes before and after the Goddess held a position in its main stream. Thus the usage of these terms is no more than conventional. In using these terms I intended to roughly refer to a society/world possessing the norms and world view expressed in the later part of the Epic (e.g. the Śāntiparvan in the Mahābhārata), the early layer of the Puranic literature (e.g. the Purāṇapañcabākṣaka corpus), and the Śruti.

SP I, p. 4 for the case of the Skandapurāṇa. For a more detailed discussion about the relationship between the Skandapurāṇa and the Pāśupatas, see Bischop 2004b, 34ff. He also points out that the paṇcāstaka (five groups of eight worlds in the Śaiva cosmography) list found in many Śaiva Tantras shares many names with the list of Śiva’s sacred places and his avatāras at Kārohaṇa in the Skandapurāṇa, mainly found in chapter 167 (ibid., 25–33).
herself. The *Skandapurāṇa* is a representative work of this stream (see 2.3). Third, the concept of Śiva’s sakti came to play a distinguished part in the Śaiva theology that was being developed in some groups of the Śaiva Tantrics.

These three streams interacted with each other. In most of the sources representing the first stream in this period, the Warrior Goddess under development was identified with Pārvatī, so that the first and second streams appear to have been inseparably intertwined. Furthermore, the mythology of demon-slaying goddesses is found only in the form of being incorporated into either Śaiva or Bhāgavata/Vaisnava mythology. Thus, careful examination is necessary to distinguish between the first and second streams in available sources. The interplay between the second and the third streams may be less questionable; both were within the Śaiva fold. Concerning the relationship between the first and third streams, the Warrior Goddess that had evolved in the first stream may have been unable to become the Supreme Goddess without theological support from the concept of sakti that had developed in the third stream. In addition, it seems that some of the local/tribal goddesses who were integrated into the Warrior Goddess had a close affinity with Tantric Śaivism.

Nevertheless, it is necessary to distinguish between the three streams, because they were facilitated by different social segments: the first by the segment centred on kingship, such as the warrior class and Brahmans involved in the royal court (e.g. royal priest, minister, and court poet); the second by lay Śaiva Brahmans, especially redactors of Śaiva Purāṇas; the third by several groups of the Śaiva Tantrics. Part of the second segment

---

27 The attempt to incorporate a warlike goddess, Vindhyavāsini, into the Bhāgavata/Vaisnava fold is attested in the *Harivaṃśa* and her role in the Kṛṣṇa mythology is partly inherited by the Viṣṇupurāṇa and Bhāgavatapurāṇa. In the *Harivaṃśa*, Vindhyavāsini was assimilated to Nidrā, the female personification of Viṣṇu’s cosmic sleep, on one hand, and, on the other hand, Kṛṣṇa’s foster-sister Ekaṇāṃśā, which will be studied in Chapter Three. Neither Nidrā nor Ekaṇāṃśā, however, acquired prominent positions in the Bhāgavata/Vaisnava theology and mythology after the *Harivaṃśa*. On the other hand, Viṣṇu’s Consort, Śri-Lakṣmī, came to be established as the Consort Goddess, but this seems to be later than Pārvatī’s development into the Consort Goddess in the Śaiva fold. In a much later period, Rādhā, a cowherd lover of Kṛṣṇa, became the Consort Goddess, or even the Supreme Goddess, in the *Brahmavaivartapurāṇa* (Brown 1974; 1982).

28 For the various groups of the Śaiva Tantrics, see Sanderson 1988, which gives an excellent overview of the development of esoteric Śaivism. See also Goudriaan & Gupta 1981; Lorenzen 1991. For the early historical evidence of Tantric Śaivism, see Sanderson 2001.

29 According to the Koṭiṣvara-Māhātmya in SPmb, 171, Bahumāṃśā was the tutelary goddess of Koṭiṣvara as the leader of the Mothers, and Śiva along with other gods composed a Yāmala group of the Tantric scriptures, also called Mātṛtantras, for their sake at that place. At the same time, Bahumāṃśā is one of the goddesses who emerged from Vindhyavāsini in SP 68 (p. 106ff in 4.3.1).

30 In the studies of the history of the Goddess, the development of the notion of the Goddess and that of sakti are often confused. As mentioned, however, these two developed in different circumstances originally independently. The earliest evidence for their union
and an orthodox faction of the third segment have sometimes been involved in kingship from their own standpoint.\footnote{For the involvement of the Saiddhāntikas, the most orthodox group among the various groups of Śaiva Tantrics, in kingship, see Sanderson 2001, 8 n.6, where he refers to the inscriptions that record the Śaiva initiation of three kings of the dominant dynasties in the second half of the seventh century. A more comprehensive argument on the subject will be found in Sanderson forthc., which also deals with the involvement of the lay Śaiva Brahmins in kingship attested in the Śivadharma corpus. Concerning the Bhāgavata/Vaiṣṇavas, both lay Brahmins and Pāñcarātra renouncers, Inden (2000) argues their involvement in the Karkota dynasty in Kashmir during the seventh to eighth centuries, which, according to him, resulted in the composition of the Visṇudharmottarapurāṇa. His argument is very intriguing, but more internal evidence in the Visṇudharmottarapurāṇa is needed to support his assumption about the chronological layers in the text, the Nilamatapurāṇa’s precedence over the Visṇudharmottarapurāṇa, etc.}

It is conceivable that political motivation was a great factor in the first stream, in which there may have been two cases. When a king expanded or moved his kingdom into tribal or peripheral areas, it was necessary to integrate local goddesses, who were often the primary objects of worship in the areas, into the Hindu tradition in order to integrate the people in the areas into the kingdom.\footnote{The Mediaeval kingdoms in Orissa provide good examples of this case (Eschmann, Kulke, and Tripathi (ed.) 1978).} The second case was where a chieftain of a tribe or peripheral territory had martial success and gained control over a larger territory, his original religion, which may have been a belief in a tribal/local goddess, would have to conform to the Hindu dharmic tradition in order to assume authority. The motivation behind the second stream can also be

is the Devimāhātmya. In the Skandapurāṇa, which is earlier than the Devimāhātmya, Pārvati was established as the Consort Goddess and Vindhyavāsini almost as the Warrior Goddess, while conversely, the term sakti in the meaning of ‘power’ embodied by the Goddess occurs only once. In a lengthy eulogy dedicated to Pārvati by the gods, Pārvati is called Maheśa’s (i.e. Śiva’s) sakti among a number of her other epithets (SPBh 32, p. 202 l.9; see n. 30 in 2.2 for this eulogy). In this text, furthermore, Pārvati emits Vindhyavāsini and some other goddesses as her separate manifestations and Vindhyavāsini, in turn, emits terrifying goddesses as her manifestations (see 2.3); however, in both cases, the emitted goddesses are not styled saktis of the goddess of their source as they are in the Devimāhātmya. Likewise, in the Koṭīvarṇa-Māhātmya in SPBh 171 there is an episode in which male deities emitted their manifestations in the shape of women, which includes the standard Seven Mothers; however, these female counterparts of the male deities are not described as their sakti as they are in the Devimāhātmya. The composer of the Devimāhātmya seems to have adapted these episodes in the Skandapurāṇa in a unique way, interpreting them with the concept of sakti. It may largely have been due to the success of the Devimāhātmya that the idea that goddesses are embodiments of all-pervasive sakti became predominant since the Mediaeval period. Therefore, it is possible to call the theology and religious practices centred on the Goddess Saktism—or even better, ‘popular Śaktism’ in the sense that the concept of sakti that had developed in the esoteric Śauivism was applied to popular worship of the Goddess—since the Mediaeval period onwards; on the other hand, this nomenclature should not be applied to the early phase of the worship of the Goddess and goddesses. The argument about the terms Saktism and Śākta in relation to Tantrism by Gupta, Hoens, and Goudriaan (1979, 6f) reveals a considerably confused usage of these terms among scholars.
said to have been political in a wider sense. For the lay Śaiva Brahmins who promoted the second stream, how to exert stronger cultural influence on society against their opponents, such as the Bhāgavata/Vaiṣṇavas, Buddhists and Jains, must have been one of their main concerns. Hence, the incorporation of the worship of goddesses who were popular among the majority of society into their mythological and theological system would have been felt to be essential.

As mentioned earlier, the present study will focus on the first stream. The second is also taken into account because the first was intertwined with the second and because the main material of this thesis, the Kauṣṭikī cycle of the Skandapurāṇa, represents the second stream. An investigation of the third stream is far beyond the scope of the present study and the author’s ability; it will be touched upon only when some of its elements turn out to be relevant for the present study.

1.2.2 The evolution of the Warrior Goddess

Before explaining the first stream in more detail, it may now be a good occasion to discuss the epithet Durgā and the goddess Durgā, because ‘Durgā’ is often popularly seen as the proper name of the Warrior Goddess in India and among scholars inside and outside India. It is true that, in the period in which the Warrior Goddess had been taking shape, from the sixth to the eighth century, ‘Durgā’ was one of the popular epithets of this developing Warrior Goddess. However, it was one of them and did not stand out from the other several epithets (see 5.3 for these epithets). Rather, ‘Caṇḍī’ or ‘Caṇḍikā’ may have been the most popular in the period. Bāna’s work, consisting of a series of verses, most of them concerning the goddess who slays the demon Mahiṣa, is styled Caṇḍīsātaka ‘a work consisting of a hundred verses dedicated to Caṇḍī’ (see 5.3). Also, ‘Caṇḍikā’ is the most frequently used epithet of the Goddess in the Devīmāhātmya and outstanding alongside ‘Ambikā’ from the other epithets in terms of frequency.33

The earliest reference to Durgā34 is found in the tenth Prapāṭhaka of the Taittirīya Aranyaka, which is also called the Mahānārāyaṇa Upaniṣad. In a series of mantras addressed to Agni ‘Fire’, who is asked for deliverance from dangers (durga, durita (neut. pl.)), is a verse seeking the protection of the goddess Durgā, who has the colour of fire, flames with heat, belongs to Virocana (sun or fire), and delights in [granting] the fruits of actions.35

It is clear from this verse that Durgā was closely linked with Agni. In

33For frequency of use of each epithet of the Goddess in the Devīmāhātmya, see Coburn 1984, 330f.
34For the history of this epithet, see also Coburn 1984, 115–121; Divakaran 1984.
35TA 10.1 (p. 708 in ASS Ed.; nos. 166f in Varenne’s):

| tāṁ agnamvarṇāṁ tapasā jñāliniṁ vairocanaṁ karmaphaleṣu juṣṭāṁ |
| durgaṁ deviṁ śaraṇaṁ aham prapadye sutarasī tarase namaḥ ||
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the same Anuvāka (TĀ 10.1) are a series of variations of Sāvitri Gāyatrī (a famous verse of Gāyatrī metre dedicated to Savitṛ) addressed to various deities. One of them may be addressed to Durgā with two epithets Kātyāyani and Kanyakumāri. However, the verse is problematic because the three names appear in feminine forms only in the Ātharvaṇa recension and, in the other two recensions (the Āndhra and the Drāvida), take masculine forms, Durgī, Kātyāyana, and Kanyakumāri.36 Even if the deity addressed in it was the goddess Durgā, this verse reveals nothing more than that she was called Kātyāyani and Kanyakumāri and that she was acknowledged as a Brahmanical deity. Another, possibly early, reference is found in the khila ('supplement') to the Rātri-sūkta (Ṛgveda 10.127). In this Khila (Ṛgveda Khila 4.2), nine verses dedicated to Durgā (4.2.5–13), one of which (12) is a quotation of the verse addressed to Durgā in the Agni hymns in TĀ 10.1, are inserted in the verses dedicated to Rātri.37 Here again Durgā is associated with Agni and described as a saviour from dangers (durgā, durita). These references indicate that Durgā was closely related to Agni and her name was interpreted to derive from durga ('danger') from which she was asked to save people. On the other hand, there is no indication that she was regarded as either the Warrior Goddess or a warrior-type goddess.

In the Skandapurāṇa, the epithet Durgā is used for Pārvatī three times (SP 29.209a, SPm 60.41a, 157.24f) and the epithet Kātyāyani two times (SP 29.193d, 69.14a). However, these occur in hymns to Pārvatī along with many other epithets. The single occurrence of ‘Durgā’ as Kauśikī’s epithet (SP 58.20a) is also found in a list of epithets of Kauśikī. On the other hand, the goddess Durgā appears once as a member of the Mothers of the world (Lokamātṛī). This group consists of Brahmanical goddesses (n. 32 in 2.3) and Durgā is mentioned alongside of the goddesses Gāyatrī and Sāvitrī in the same line (SPm 111.4ab). Among the occurrences of the epithet Durgā mentioned above, ‘Durgā’ is mentioned in a line with ‘Gāyatrī’ and ‘Sāvitrī’ in SPm 60.41ab and 157.24ef. Thus the goddess Durgā seems to have partly retained her Brahmanical or Vedic character in the Skandapurāṇa.

In the Devīmāhātmya, in addition to several occurrences of ‘Durgā’ as an

36 The Ātharvaṇa recension reads (no. 82 in Varenne’s):

kātyāyanyai vidmahe, kanyakumārayai dhīmahi, tan no durgā pracodayāt ||

The other recensions reads (p. 700 in ASS Ed.):

kātyāyanyai vidmahe, kanyakumārayai dhīmahi, tan no durgīh pracodayāt ||

Furthermore, there is the suspicion that some of these Gāyatrī verses might be a later addition. One of the verses in this series is addressed to Puruṣa-Vakratuṇḍa-Dantin (p. 699 in ASS Ed.; no. 73 in Varenne’s), who is usually regarded as Vināyaka. However, it is as late as the fifth century that Vināyaka took a firm position in the Hindu pantheon. See Rocher 1991, 69–72; Törzsök 2004, 20 n. 12; see also Narain 1991 for a possibly early archaeological evidence for an Elephant-headed deity.

37 Scheffelowitz 1906, 110–112; Coburn 1984, 264–267; Yokochi 1999a, 73. Concerning Ṛgveda Khila 4.2, Scheffelowitz considers verses 1–4 to represent the first stratum and verses 5–14 to be secondary (ibid., 110f).
epithet of the Goddess, the goddess Durgā is said to kill the demon Drugama, being one of future manifestations of the Goddess (DM 11.45cd–46ab). This demon’s name appears to have derived from the goddess’s name Durgā, which suggests that Durgā was not originally a demon-slaying goddess, so that her demon-slaying myth had to be created from her name.

Thus it seems very likely that the goddess Durgā was originally not a demon-slaying, warlike goddess. It may well be that this goddess was absorbed into the nascent Warrior Goddess by the sixth century and the epithet Durgā, as well as probably her lineage name Kātyāyanī, came to apply to the Warrior Goddess. Alternatively, it is possible that Durgā was first assimilated to Mahiṣāsuramardini and ‘Durgā-Kātyāyanī’ became the proper name of Mahiṣāsuramardini. The epithet Kātyāyanī, which means a woman who belongs to the lineage Kātyāyana, may have been useful for Mahiṣāsuramardini to legitimize her position in the Hindu pantheon, as the epithet Kauśikī was for Vindhyaśāini. Then, as a result of Mahiṣāsuramardini’s evolution into the Warrior Goddess, ‘Durgā’ and ‘Kātyāyanī’ would have become epithets of the Warrior Goddess. When ‘Durgā’ came to stand out from the other epithets of the Warrior Goddess remains to be studied; it was at least later than the eighth century, possibly much later.58

Concerning the historical process of the first stream, the evolution of the Warrior Goddess from demon-slaying, bellicose goddesses, the following conclusion can be drawn from the present study, mainly from Chapters Three to Five, and my former study about the Devīmāhātmya.39 Two representative demon-slaying goddesses, Mahiṣāsuramardini and Vindhyaśāini, played prominent roles in order to realize the idea of the Warrior Goddess. Therefore, we will start at the rise of these two figures.

Vindhyaśāini and Mahiṣāsuramardini are both descriptive epithets rather than personal names. Vindhyaśāini means ‘a lady who has an abode in the Vindhya mountains’ and, even if the qualified figure is confined to a superhuman female, namely a goddess, this epithet could designate any goddess who is worshipped in the Vindhya mountains. There must have been a great number of, mostly anonymous, goddesses who were objects of worship in the Vindhya mountains, so that ‘Vindhyaśāini’ may

---

38The Devīmāhātmya is popularly called Durgāsaptāśati ‘A work consisting of seven hundred verses dedicated to Durgā’. In Kavaça, one of the six supplements added to the Devīmāhātmya later, on the other hand, this text is called Caṇḍi Saptaśati (49ab: japet saptāśatiḥ caṇḍīḥ kṛtvā tu kavaçaḥ puraḥ). A shorter form of the Kavaça is found in a Nepalese manuscript of the Devīmāhātmya in possession of Sam Fogg (London), ascribed to the twelfth century palaeographically, although the relevant passage is not found in this shorter form.

39Yokochi 1989, 1993, 1999a, and 2000a. The 1993 paper, written in Japanese, is incorporated into the 1999a paper with significant revision. The description of the Devīmāhātmya in the following is mainly based on the 1999a paper, which is unfortunately full of errors in English and Sanskrit spelling due to insufficient proofreading in the editorial stage, however.
have originally been the generic term used for these goddesses by outsiders. At a certain point, the generic epithet came to represent a specific figure called Vindhyāvasinī ‘the goddess who has an abode in the Vindhya mountains’. It can be assumed that this specific figure was brought into being simultaneously with her myth. Her proto-myth may have taken shape not much earlier than the composition of the Harivaṃśa, the earliest evidence for her mythology, and can be reconstructed from elements shared by the Bhāgavata/Vaiṣṇava version in the Harivaṃśa and the Śaiva version in the Skanda-purāṇa (see 4.2). In the reconstructed proto-myth, Indra, possibly as a reward for her killing of the demon brothers Sumbha and Nisumbha, adopted her as sister, gave her the name Kauśikī derived from the Vedic sage Kuśika—probably from one of Indra’s epithets, Kauśika—and assigned her to the office of controlling the Vindhya mountains. Thus Vindhyāvasinī became a legitimate member of the Hindu dharmic world and the legitimate protectress of the Vindhya mountains. She was also characterized as a formidable, dark-skinned, demon-slaying virgin.

In the case of Mahiṣāsuramardinī, on the other hand, a number of images that depict a goddess fighting with a buffalo began to be produced in the Kuśāṇa period, centred on Mathurā. There may have been a number of goddesses to whom the slaying of a buffalo was attributed; or, in a wider sense, goddesses to whom buffaloes were sacrificed, since the goddess’s slaying of a buffalo was probably associated with the ritual practice of sacrificing buffaloes to goddesses. In the Kuśāṇa images, however, there is a considerable uniformity of iconography, called the Kuśāṇa iconic type (see p. 115 in 4.3.2 and p. 131 in 5.1), which attests to the rise of a specific goddess who can be called Mahiṣāsuramardinī or Mahiṣamardinī ‘the goddess who kills a buffalo (demon)’ descriptively and retroactively from later sources. Like Vindhyāvasinī, the rise of the specific figure of Mahiṣāsuramardinī may well have been accompanied by a specific myth of her slaying a buffalo demon. Unfortunately, however, there is no textual source referring to this goddess until the sixth century, so that the early stages of her myth and character remain unclear. There seems to be a fair possibility that Hellenistic deities such as Nanaia and Cybele may have had some influence on the formative period of these goddesses (see n. 94 and n. 98 in 4.3.2).

Vindhyāvasinī’s figure and mythology were incorporated into the Bhāgavata/Vaiṣṇava mythology in the Harivaṃśa. There the composers endeavoured to identify her with Nidrā, a personification of Viṣṇu’s cosmic sleep, on the one hand, and with Ekānaṃśā, Kṛṣṇa’s foster-sister and

---

40 As mentioned below, there is no contemporary textual source for this Kuśāṇa goddess. However, I have no problem in conventionally applying this epithet to the goddess because it is descriptive rather than a personal name. For this point, see also n. 92 in 4.3.2.

41 For the early textual sources for Mahiṣāsuramardinī, see 5.1 and 5.3. In Tamil literature, the Cilappatikāram may be the earliest source referring to the South Indian version of this goddess by the name of Koṟavai (n. 92 in 4.3.2).
protectress, on the other hand (see Chapter 3). Towards AD 400 a new iconography of Mahiṣasuramardini emerged in east Malwa under the Gupta dynasty and east Vidarbha under the Eastern Vakāṭaka, possibly in the political and cultural interchange between the two regions (see 5.2). This new iconography, called the Gupta iconic type, may have been created in order to represent Vindhyaśāsini when she became the object of worship in a manner of proper Hindu rituals; adapting the popular Mahiṣasuramardini iconography was obviously preferred to inventing a completely new one. If that were the case, it would have resulted in the assimilation of both goddesses. At that time, the idea that the goddess killed the demon Mahiṣa in the Vindhya mountains, which is probably discerned in some of the four sources mentioned below, may have formed the core of the goddess unifying the character of both goddesses.

The goddess in whom Mahiṣasuramardini and Vindhyaśāsini are united appears in four textual and epigraphic sources from the sixth to the middle of the eighth century; in all sources, the description of Mahiṣasuramardini is related to the Gupta-type iconography. Of them, a coherent mythology is found only in the Kauśikī cycle of the Skandapurāṇa, which provides far and away the richest material of the four. In the Kauśikī cycle, this goddess is called Kauśikī-Vindhyaśāsini and the slaying of the demon Mahiṣa is attributed to Vindhyaśāsini as a brief supplement to her myth proper. It is worth noting that the scene in which Vindhyaśāsini kills Mahiṣa in this brief episode conforms exactly to the iconography of a subtype of the Gupta iconic type that emerged on the Vindhya plateau around AD 500 (see 5.1 and 5.2). The Kauśikī cycle includes three features of Vindhyaśāsini that suggest her ongoing evolution into the Warrior Goddess. First, Kauśikī-Vindhyaśāsini integrated into herself terrifying animal and bird-headed Mothers as her partial manifestations, who are also regarded as local/regional goddesses (see 4.3.1 and 4.3.3). Second, she is described as a noble warrior resorting to the battlefield in a chariot embellished with a white parasol and chowries, i.e. regal emblems (see 4.3.2). Lastly, she was, after her victory over the demon brothers Sumbha and Nisumbha, acknowledged as the protectress of all the earth by Indra in front of all the gods; then, her relationship with the Mothers is described in analogy with that of a monarch with his vassals in that she assigned each goddess, her subsidiary manifestation, control over a specific territory. In other words, each local/regional goddess was acknowledged as the legitimate protectress of her territory under her authority (see 4.3.3).

As mentioned earlier, the Skandapurāṇa is a representative work of the second stream in the early history of the Goddess. Hence, the Vindhyaśāsini myth is, along with the episode of her killing the demon Mahiṣa, incorporated in the Śaiva mythology by making Kauśikī-Vindhyaśāsini subordinate to Pārvatī, the Consort Goddess, as Pārvatī’s separate manifestation and daughter (see 2.3). By contrast, the other three sources referring to the god-
dess uniting Mahisāsuramardini and Vindhyavāsinī in herself are associated with the royal court; two of them, the Caṇḍīśataka and the Gaūḍavaha, were composed by court poets, Bānabhaṭṭa—who served King Harṣavardhana—and Vākpatirāja—who served King Yaśovarman—, respectively, and the third is an inscription of Anantavarman, a prince of the Maukharis. In these sources, this goddess was equated with Pārvatī, but the primary object of devotion appears to have been this goddess rather than Pārvatī (see 5.3).

During the fifth to the eighth centuries, Mahisāsuramardini images of the Gupta iconic type were disseminated over a wide range, to Orissa in the east, to the Kṛṣṇa and Tuṅgabhadrā rivers and along the western coast in the south, to Saurashtra in the west, and to Chamba, Kashmir and possibly Afghanistan in the northwest (see 5.2). Several of the images were made under royal patronage. Given that the aforementioned three literary sources that describe Mahisāsuramardini in line with this iconic type are associated with the royal court, it is likely that this dissemination was facilitated by the social segment centred on kings. As attested by a few examples, the images may have been used to represent local/regional goddesses, who had been worshipped locally in the form of aniconic images (e.g. wood post, stone) for a long time and whose iconic images came to be required for proper Hindu rituals when local/regional kings compelled them to be affiliated with the Hindu world (see 5.4).

Consequently, the dissemination of the iconic images of Mahisāsuramardini propagated the idea that each local/regional goddess was a manifestation of her. The mythological development of Vindhyavāsinī, as shown in the Kauśikī cycle in the Skanda purāṇa, promoted a similar idea in regard to Vindhyavāsinī: each local/regional goddess was a manifestation of her. As mentioned earlier, the assimilation of both goddesses may have commenced concomitantly with the emergence of the Gupta-type iconography of Mahisāsuramardini towards AD 400. Even if this were not the case, it is attested that both goddesses began to be assimilated by the sixth century, although they continued to keep their separate identities. Through this assimilation, the aforementioned two processes, the integration of local/regional goddesses into Mahisāsuramardini through the dissemination of her iconic images and that into Vindhyavāsinī through the development of her mythology, must have interacted and enforced each other. From this interaction between the two processes, which happened during the fifth or sixth to the eighth centuries, a more universal, martial goddess, who may have been analogous to a monarch, gradually took shape, namely the Warrior Goddess (see 5.4).

The culminating point of the evolution of the Warrior Goddess can be found in the Devīmāhātmya ascribed to the eighth century.42 In this text

---

42There are three sorts of evidence to examine the date of the text: epigraphy, ma-
Mahiśāsura-mardini and Vindhyavāsini are completely integrated into the manuscripts and iconography. First, the inscription found in the old temple dedicated to Dadhimatī Mātā (about 24 miles north-east of Nagaur, Nagaur District, Rajasthan) may provide a terminus ante quem for its composition because it cites a verse nearly identical to DM 11.9 (Karna, 1911–12). The cited verse reads sarvamāṅgalamāṅgalye śive sa • ṛtha-sādhike | oranye tryāmveke gauri = rāyani namo stu te || (the corrected reading by Karna: sarvamāṅgalamāṅgalye śive saṝṛṣaṟtha-sādhike | ṣaṝanye tryāmveke gauri ṣaṝrāyani namo i’stu te ||). According to Karna (ibid.) and Bhandarkar (1914), the inscription gives the date as being the thirteenth of the dark half of Shrāvana month of the year 289 of an unspecified era, which is the Gupta era, so the date falls in AD 608. However, Mirashi (1964) argues that the characters and content of the inscription does not fit with the early date, AD 608, and also points out correctly that the first numeral letter of the year is not 200 but 100, so the year is 189 rather than 289. Then he proposes that the unspecified era is probably the Bhātiya era and that the date corresponds to AD 812–813, if the year was current, and to AD 813–814, if the year had expired. As an alternative he refers to his former opinion to take the era as the Harṣa era; in that case, the date is equivalent to AD 795–796. In any case, because of the correction of the reading of the year from 289 to 189, the Gupta era proposed by Karna and Bhandarkar is not feasible.

There is also a considerable possibility that the verse was not quoted from the Devī-māhātmya. In the Devī-māhātmya, the verse occurs in a hymn to the Goddess, the so-called Nārāyaṇī hymn, and this hymn gives the impression of being adapted in the text from an outside source. In that case, the verse in the inscription and that in the Nārāyaṇī hymn in the Devī-māhātmya would have derived from a common source, a hymn to Nārāyaṇī. The cited verse does not have any feature specific for the theology and mythology of the Devī-māhātmya. There is also an indication of the independent circulation of this verse. The same verse, except for a few trivial alterations to syllables, occurs at the end of a peculiar version of the Śrī-sūkta (Rgveda Khila 2.6.30) in the Pañcarātrāyābhisāka-Sūkta (Scheftelowitz 1906, 72–79; Coburn 1984, 63 n.204, 258–264). Therefore, this inscription cannot provide a definite terminus ante quem for the Devī-māhātmya, although, even if the verse was not directly quoted from the text, it shows that the verse, or a Nārāyaṇī hymn including it, was popular around AD 800.

Second, the oldest dated manuscript of the text to have come down to us has the date NS (Nepal Samvat) 229 = AD 1109 (MS No. 1077 jha of Shastri’s Catalogue of the Durbar Library, Nepal, NGMPP Reel Nr. A1157/11). Shastri cited a manuscript dated NS 118 = AD 998 (MS No. 1534 ca, NGMPP Reel Nr. A1157/12), but this is actually dated NS 518 = 1398 AD. See Shastri 1905, liv, 64. Three wooden boards with illustrations of a goddess fighting demons, including one which also depicts two devotees, are preserved in the British Library. These were probably covers of palm-leaf manuscripts of this text. The exhibition card of the British Library ascribes them to the eleventh century, whereas Pal to the second half of the twelfth century (Pal 1981).

Third, the description of the Goddess’s killing of the demon Mahiṣa in DM 3.37–39 is very similar to the mediaeval icon type of Mahiśāsura-mardini. Although it does not completely tally with the iconography of the type, the correspondence is beyond doubt because the earlier icon types of the goddess, the Kusana and Guptas, differ significantly from the description and the mediaeval type. The earliest specimen of the Mediaeval type may be a small relief found in Ellora, ascribed to the first half of the eighth century. There are also some other examples that indicate this type’s emergence in early eighth century (see p. 132 in 5.1). By contrast to the Devī-māhātmya, the descriptions of a goddess’s slaying of Mahiṣā in the literary sources during the sixth to the middle of the eighth centuries, including the Skandapurāṇa, Bāna’s Candiṣātakas and Vaiṣṇa-pājā’s Gaṇḍīvaṇa, are all related to the earlier, Gupta icon type (see 5.3). Thus it can reasonably be supposed that these literary sources are not later than the Devī-māhātmya.

In my 1999a paper, I proposed dating the text around the early eighth century (p. 80f).
Warrior Goddess. The *Devīmāhātmya* includes three deeds of the Warrior Goddess concerning slaying demons, which are as a whole enveloped by a frame story. The first deed is a version of the myth of Viṣṇu slaying the demons Madhu and Kaitabha, in which Viṣṇu’s Yoganidrā/Mahāmāyā, who is the same as Nidrā assimilated with Kauśikī-Vindhyavasini in the *Harivamsa*, assisted Viṣṇu. In the second deed, it is said that the Warrior Goddess, usually called Cauḍikā or Ambikā in this text, emerged from a mass of *tejas* of all the gods and killed Mahiṣaśura. At the beginning of the third deed, the same Warrior Goddess, who is also consciously identified with Viṣṇu’s Yoganidrā/Mahāmāyā in the first deed by calling her Viṣṇumāyā, sprang out of the body of Pārvatī and was called Kauśikī. Then she killed the demon brothers Sumbha and Nisumbha. It is evident that this final deed is based on the Vindhyavasini myth, although in the *Devīmāhātmya* it was not located in the Vindhyā mountains so that the Warrior Goddess could not remain Vindhyavasini any longer. In this way, the Mahiṣāsuramardini myth and the Vindhyavasini myth, in which Vindhyavasini’s Vaishāvīva identification with Nidrā and her Śaiva one with Pārvatī are combined, are synthesized into the mythology of the Warrior Goddess at the cost of Vindhyavasini’s identity, viz. her ties with the Vindhyā mountains.

In this text, the Warrior Goddess is further elevated to the status of the Supreme Goddess as the highest divinity over all the other deities in the traditional Hindu pantheon. Her emergence from a mass of *tejas* of all the gods expresses this idea; however, the episode of her second emergence from Pārvatī’s body represents it more manifestly. In the SP version of this episode, the dark-coloured Vindhyavasini emerged from the dark skin Pārvatī sloughed off and Pārvatī became fair-coloured (viz. Gaurī), but in the DM version, on the other hand, the Warrior Goddess, who is said to have illuminated all the world with her radiance at the time of her first birth, emerged from the body of fair-coloured Pārvatī (viz. Gaurī, DM 4.36), who, in turn, became dark (viz. Kālikā, DM 5.41) as if she were the residue left behind once a vital essence had left her in the form of the Warrior Goddess. This adaptation of the episode clearly shows that the composer of the *Devī-

But, as a result of progress in my research on the archaeological and literary sources related to the Mahiṣāsuramardini iconography, discussed later in Chapter Five, I am now inclined to think that the second half of the eighth century is more appropriate, taking into consideration the time lag from the emergence of a new icon to its appearance in Sanskrit literature. The early ninth century may also be a possibility. For the chronology between the *Devīmāhātmya* and other related texts, see Yokochi 1999a, 89.

43Vindhyavasini’s role in the Krīṣṇa myth as his foster-sister is isolated from this myth cycle and attributed to one of the future incarnations on earth of the Warrior Goddess (DM 11.37–38), who was therein foretold to live in the Vindhyā mountains and kill the demon brothers Sumbha and Nisumbha. As a result, the slaying of the demons Sumbha and Nisumbha is stated twice in this text.

44Yokochi 1989, in which the DM version is compared to a Śaiva version of the episode common to both the *Matsyapurāṇa* and *Padmapurāṇa*.
māhātmya intended to reverse the superiority of Pārvatī over Vindhyavāsini (or the Warrior Goddess) in the Śaiva hierarchy of goddesses, as found in the Kauśikī cycle of the Skanda Purāṇa. Consequently, the Warrior Goddess came to rank higher than the Consort Goddess. That one of Vindhyavāsini’s characteristics, virginity, was attributed to the Warrior Goddess in the Devī-māhātmya may also have been a way to establish the Warrior Goddess as the Supreme Goddess because she, as an eternal virgin, cannot be coupled with any God figure. The Supreme Goddess in the Devīmāhātmya was theoretically underpinned by the concept of śakti, ‘power’ pervading all the universe as the ultimate cosmic principle, which was probably borrowed from the third stream in the early history of the Goddess as mentioned above. The Supreme Goddess is the ultimate embodiment of śakti, and all goddesses, or rather all beings, are embodiments of this principle and therefore partial manifestations of the Supreme Goddess. This idea and the devotional climate centred on the Supreme Goddess can be called popular Śaktism.45

In the Devīmāhātmya, the Warrior Goddess became the Supreme Goddess; nevertheless, she remains the Warrior Goddess in terms of her character and her association with kingship. As mentioned above, the Goddess’s mythology in the text is largely devoted to her slaying various demons in order to protect the order of the world, and her emergence from the gods’ tejas is described as homologous to the enthronement ritual of a king.46 Furthermore, the frame story relates that King Suratha, who is therein the principal figure, regained his kingdom and was promised to be made the eighth Manu, the lord of the Manu epoch succeeding ours, in the next life thanks to the Goddess. It can thus be maintained that this text conveys the propaganda that a man who is ambitious for regal power can gain or sustain it in reward for his devotion to the Goddess.47 Moreover, the recitation of this text in the ritual worship of the Goddess in general and, in particular, in her autumnal festival (DM 12.11), which probably corresponds to the popular Navarātra, or Durgāpūjā, is strongly suggested within the text. By the time of the composition of this text, the Navarātra may well have

45See n. 30.
46Coburn 1982, 159f; 1984, 229f; Yokochi 1999a, 79f.
47Coburn’s conclusion that the Goddess in this text is ‘Consort of None, Śakti of All’, which manifests itself in the title of his 1982 paper, is plausible at a celestial or mythological level. At a terrestrial level, however, it should be reconsidered, taking the frame story into account. The Goddess, in her mythology embedded in the frame story, is the ultimate embodiment of śakti and, at the same time, exercises śakti herself in her demon-slaying deeds. Moreover, as mentioned above, she, being an eternal virgin, cannot be the consort of any God figure. In the frame story, on the other hand, the Goddess bestows power and authority upon King Suratha, an example of her royal devotees on earth, and King Suratha, or any of her royal devotees who follow his example, exercises power (śakti) embodied by the Goddess, assuming authority derived from her. At a terrestrial level, therefore, the Goddess in the Devīmāhātmya could be regarded as the śakti of her royal devotee and could be described as his consort. See Yokochi 2000a, 263–265.
become a royal ritual united with the worship of weapons, as described in the Viṣṇudharmottarapurāṇa.48 All these elements indicate that the Devīmāhātmya was composed in royal surroundings. Through public recitations of this text in the Navarātra and other rituals for the Goddess, the king who sponsored them could have demonstrated that he assumed the power (sakti) and authority of the Goddess. This also consolidates the point of view that the Devīmāhātmya was the culminating point of the first stream in the early history of the Goddess.

### 1.3 The Skandapurāṇa

‘The Skandapurāṇa’ is currently well known as a collection of independently composed works, each of which claims to be a part (khaṇḍa) of a ‘Skandapurāṇa’. Seven khaṇḍas were gathered and published by the Veṅkaṭeśvara Press in 1910 under the collective title of ‘the Skandapurāṇa’. There are several other such khaṇḍas that were not included in the Veṅkaṭeśvara Edition (SP I, p. 3). On the other hand, our Skandapurāṇa, the main material of the present thesis, consists of 183 chapters without any division into parts, and old Nepalese manuscripts of this text call it ‘Skandapurāṇa’ without any khaṇḍa name. The research on early testimonia of this text, mainly the Dharmanibandha literature, by the editors of SP I (pp. 5–19) proved that this text was well circulated around the twelfth century in North India under the name of ‘Skandapurāṇa’ and, therefore, is the genuine Skandapurāṇa, not a khaṇḍa attributed to a Skandapurāṇa. This research also revealed that this text nearly sank into oblivion after the fourteenth century. Meanwhile, some of the newly composed works in the genre of Puranic literature found a way to authorize themselves by claiming to be a part of the Skandapurāṇa and, after the oblivion of the genuine, old Skandapurāṇa, many independent works attributed to a ‘Skandapurāṇa’ remained. Although the manuscripts of the later two recensions of this text survived in northeastern India, these style themselves a khaṇḍa of a ‘Skandapurāṇa,’ the Revākhaṇḍa and the Ambikākhaṇḍa respectively.

From the result of the aforementioned research on early testimonia of this text, it is almost certain that the Skandapurāṇa was composed in North India, probably in the northeastern quarter of India. It is much more difficult to date the text with any certainty. The editors of SP I said ‘we are inclined to situate it between the sixth and eighth century AD’ (p. 5). As the research on the text has progressed, the scholars working on this text have been more inclined to the earlier part of the period proposed above.49 From

---

48 See Eimoo 1999, 42 Table 6, 49ff. He also argues that the worship of weapons incorporated in the Navarātra may have had some association with a Vedic royal ritual for purifying weapons or troops, called nīrūjana (ibid., 49–54). For the connection of the Navarātra with kingship, see p. 5.

49 Bakker says in his 2004 paper that ‘I now tend to ascribe’ this text ‘to the 6th century’
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the study on the Kauśikī cycle, particularly the comparison of iconographical information concerning Mahiśāsuramardini in the cycle with the actual images (see 5.3), the present author supposes for the time being that the text can be ascribed to c. 550–650.

The first edition of the text by Krṣna Prasāda Bhaṭṭarāi was published in Kathmandu in 1988 under the title Skandapurāṇasya Ambikākhaṇḍaḥ. This title is taken from the colophon of the most recent manuscript he consulted, although his edition is mainly based on three old Nepalese manuscripts, all of which style themselves ‘Skandapurāṇa’ without any khaṇḍa designation. The publication of this edition is an indispensable contribution to scholarship, but it is regrettable that the editor did not realize the true value of the text as the genuine, old Skandapurāṇa. The credit for the correct evaluation of this text belongs to a group of scholars (Adriaensen, Bakker and Isaacson) at the Institute of Indian Studies, University of Groningen, who announced the publication of a new critical edition of the text at the IXth World Sanskrit Conference held in 1994. The announcement was published later in the same year in the Indo-Iranian Journal. The first volume of the new critical edition, comprising Chapters 1 to 25 was published in 1998. Thereafter, several articles on individual topics related to this text were published under the series title ‘Studies in the Skandapurāṇa’ and the proceedings of the panel devoted to this text at the XIth World Sanskrit Conference, including six articles and edited by Bakker, was also recently published (2004). In addition, Chapter 167 on the Śaiva topography was edited by Bisschop with a study and submitted to the University of Groningen as his doctoral thesis (2004). The succeeding volume IIA of the new critical edition, comprising the Vārāṇasi-Mahātmya (SP 26.1–31.14), is in press.

In the present thesis, siglum SP with chapter and verse numbering is used for the text section contained in Volumes I and IIA, Chapter 167 in Bisschop 2004b, and the text edited by the present author and contained in Part Three of this thesis. For the other section, siglum SPbh with chapter and verse numbering denotes Bhaṭṭarāi’s edition.

The currently available Skandapurāṇa manuscripts are classified into three recensions. The oldest, Nepalese recension, designated by siglum S, is represented by the four (actually three) manuscripts. The oldest of them, S1, is dated AD 810 and S2 is slightly less old than S1. S3 and S4, which form one codex but are differentiated because they are transmitted in different conditions and preserved in different libraries, are later than these two but probably not later than AD 1000. S2 and S3/S4 form a group

---

50Bakker 1996, 2000, forthc. a; Yokochi 1999b, 2000b; Bisschop 2002, forthc.,

51For a detailed description of the manuscripts, the three recensions, and their relationship, see pp. 31–38 and 41–45 in Prolegomena, SP I. The list of manuscripts used for my edition, with a brief outline, will be provided at the beginning of Part Three.
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opposed to S₁.

The other two recensions are preserved in Bengal. The older Revā recension, designated by siglum R, is represented by only one manuscript copied in AD 1682, which is written in an old Bengali script. The Ambikā recension, designated by siglum A, comprises seven manuscripts, all of which derive from one hyparchetype. Of them A₇, written in an old Bengali script, appears considerably older than the others, although younger than R. In my edition, four of the seven (A₁, A₂, A₃ and A₄) are collated; the other three have recently been acquired by Dr Kengo Harimoto, a member of the Skandapurāṇa Project in Groningen, and have not been used in my edition due to lack of time.

These two recensions, R and A, probably derived from one and the same recension, which we refer to as the RA recension. This common ancestor of R and A came into being through a major redaction earlier than AD 1100. The R and A recensions largely diverge from the S recension after SP 162 and, although they occasionally have additional episodes before SP 162, as shown in the Appendix of SP I. In the Kauśikī cycle, however, these three recensions basically preserve the same text. Although the dropping of many verses in the R and, especially, A recensions frequently occurs, this appears to be accidental in most cases. The A recension drops the part from SP 66.19b to 67.12d, which is probably due to the loss of a folio in a hyparchetypal manuscript of this recension. The lack of A₄ in Chapter 34 in my edition is due to the loss of the folios of this codex. The interpolation of a passage consisting of less than four pādas is not rare in both R and A recensions, but there is no additional material longer than that.

The edition contained in Part Three is in principle based on the Nepalese recension, because it is the oldest recension and it can be reasonably be supposed that it retains an earlier form of the text than the two other recensions. My study in this thesis of the early history of the Goddess

---

52 For information about the three recently acquired manuscripts (A₅, A₆, and A₇), see Bisschop 2004b, 4 n. 5 and SP IIA. A₇ is occasionally referred to in the footnotes of my study when necessary. Of the recent six manuscripts, A₁ is written in the modern Bengali script and the other five in the modern Devanāgarī.

53 Bisschop 2002, in which he shows that a passage quoted by Lakṣmīdhara, who flourished in the first half of the twelfth century, from a ‘Skandapurāṇa’ is found in the additional material in the R and A recensions of the Skandapurāṇa. The articles by Tőrzsők, Harimoto, Bisschop, and Yokochi in Bakker (ed.) 2004 discuss the character of the RA recension from various angles.

54 SP I, p. 41f. In the Kauśikī cycle, the four pādas interpolated between SP 57.38c and 38d in MS R clearly show the secondary character of the R recension, when the passage is compared with the parallel passages in the Harivamśa and other Purāṇas (Yokochi 2000b, 534–537; the parallel passages were first collected in Hara 1983). The relevant passage is missing in the A recension, probably accidentally. At this place, Bhaiṭaṭāraṇī interpolates four pādas similar to those in R without any support from the manuscripts he consulted and without reporting the fact. His interpolation, which exactly agrees to Bhāvaśyapurāṇa Brāhmaṇaparvan 40.27d–28c among the parallel passages, probably entered his edition from
Introduction

is concerned with that earlier form of the text. As in the case of SP I, the primary aim of this edition is to establish the text based on the old Nepalese manuscripts, but the editor has ‘also attempted to go at least to some extent beyond their readings to recover’ ‘an earlier form of the text’ (SP I, p. 42).

1.4 The Content of the Thesis

This thesis comprises three parts: Part One Study, Part Two Synopsis and Part Three Sanskrit Text.

Part One, which is divided into five chapters, contains the study of the history of the evolution of the Warrior Goddess from about the fourth to the eighth centuries, focused on Vindhyavāsini’s contribution to it. After the introductory chapter, the second chapter deals with the myth cycle of Kauśikī-Vindhyavāsini in the Skandapurāṇa: its structure, function in the entire Skandapurāṇa, and the hierarchical system of goddesses, ranking the Consort Goddess, Pārvatī, on top. This chapter, in addition to providing a general view of the main material of this thesis, the Kauśikī cycle, is intended to clarify the ideology of the second stream in the early history of the Goddess.

The main part of the study is from the third to the fifth chapters, in which the historical development of Vindhyavāsini leading to the Warrior Goddess in association with the other significant goddess, Mahiṣaśuramardini, will be investigated. In the third chapter, the passages related to Vindhyavāsini in the Harivaṃśa and her relationship with the two female figures, Nidrā and Ekāṇamātā, will be discussed in order to examine whether Vindhyavāsini was originally affiliated to the Bhāgavata or Vaiṣṇava fold.

Chapter Four, the longest chapter, will be devoted to the study of the Kauśikī cycle of the Skandapurāṇa. In the first section of this chapter, whether Kauśikī-Vindhyavāsini originated in the Śaiva fold or not will be discussed. After establishing her original independence from either Bhāgavata/Vaiṣṇava or Śaiva, the present author will attempt to reconstruct her proto-myth in the second section, comparing the myth found in the Harivaṃśa with that in the Kauśikī cycle. The last section of this chapter will deal with the development of her mythology from the Harivaṃśa (or her proto-myth) to the Kauśikī cycle in the Skandapurāṇa.

After examining the character of the terrifying goddesses, also known as the Mothers, who are said to have emerged from Kauśikī-Vindhyavāsini in the Kauśikī cycle, in 4.3.1, attention will be drawn to two features in her mythology that suggest her evolution into the Warrior Goddess: the Kshatriyaization of her character (4.3.2) and the integration of the Mothers into her as her subordinates (4.3.3). Her consecration ritual (abhiṣeke) by Indra will also be discussed in 4.3.3 in comparison to that in the memory.
Harivaṃśa, which may clarify the culminating point of the evolution of Vindhyavāsinī’s character in the Kauśikī cycle. The last chapter will focus on Vindhyavāsinī’s association with Mahiṣāsuramardini in the evolutionary process of the Warrior Goddess. Firstly, the supplementary episode of Vindhyavāsinī slaying Mahiṣāsura in the Kauśikī cycle will be studied and then the history of the development of Mahiṣāsuramardini iconography in North and Central India will be introduced in order to compare it with the iconographical information in the episode. Secondly, Mahiṣāsuramardini images of the Gupta iconic type, which is the most relevant for the Kauśikī cycle, will be further classified into subtypes, of which the origin and diffusion of the three main subtypes will be dealt with in greatest detail. Thirdly, in addition to the Kauśikī cycle, the early three sources referring to Mahiṣāsuramardini, in all of which the description of a goddess killing the buffalo demon is related to the Gupta iconic type, will be studied, which will show that in all three sources she was probably assimilated to Vindhyavāsinī. In the final section of the chapter, how the development of Vindhyavāsinī and that of Mahiṣāsuramardini caused the rise of the Warrior Goddess will be discussed.

Part Two contains the English synopsis of the entire Kauśikī cycle. The synopsis is based on my edition contained in Part Three, if it is extant. For the parts that are not edited in Part Three, the synopsis is based on Bhāṭṭarāi’s edition. For those parts too, the present author collated the oldest manuscript S₁, and sometimes other manuscripts. As a result, when readings different from those in Bhāṭṭarāi’s edition are adopted, it is reported in the footnotes.

Part Three contains the critical edition by the present author of about two-thirds of the Kauśikī cycle. Text parts edited for this thesis include the first half of Chapter 34 (1–61), Chapters 55–59, the first half of Chapter 62 (1–63), and Chapters 63–64 and 66–69. These include most of Narrative Layer A (34.1–61, 55–56, 58–59 and 69)—the classification of the myth cycle into three narrative layers is to be made in 2.1—, the parts of Narrative Layer B crucial for the study in Part One (62.1–63, 63–64, and 66–68), and one episode belonging to Narrative Layer C (56–57). In Layer A the two chapters (53 and 54) that describe Brahmā’s journey with his entourage to Pārvatī are omitted as they are not related to the goddesses. In Layer B, two chapters (60 and 61), which also include three episodes in Layer C, are not edited because they are part of the episode of the demons Sunda and Niṣunda, which, as will be discussed in 4.2, was not originally integral to the Vindhyavāsinī myth proper. The latter half of Chapter 62 and Chapter 65 deal with the demons’ counsel about the war against the gods and the battle scene between the demons’ army and the goddesses respectively, which are not very relevant to the present study. From Layer C, the longest episode found in Chapters 56 and 57 is edited because its authenticity in the Kauśikī cycle is the most problematic, as discussed in the next chapter. In addition, these
two chapters are a good example for considering the relationship between the Skandapurāṇa and the Harivaṃśa.\textsuperscript{55}

1.5 Presentation of the Text and Critical Apparatus

The presentation of the text in Part Three in principle follows the example of SP I. For the convenience of readers, basic information will be provided below, extracted and abridged from the relevant part of the Prolegomena of SP I (pp. 45–54). Readers will find a list of symbols and abbreviations used in the critical apparatus at the beginning of Part Three.

In the main text, a wavy line has sometimes been placed under words, or parts of words. This device is used to indicate a relatively high degree of uncertainty as to the reading that should be adopted in the constituted text. The use of it is quite subjective. It is designed to draw attention to some especially insecure parts of the text; however, the absence of a wavy line by no means indicates that the constituted text is beyond doubt. The verse numbering and division is my own.

The critical apparatus is divided into a number of different layers or registers, mainly following the difference of the three recensions. On most pages there are four registers of apparatus. The lowest, at the bottom of the page, is the main critical apparatus, in which deviations from the constituted text in the Nepalese manuscripts and in Bhatṭarāṇa’s edition are reported. On many pages, a register of lacunae appears directly above the main critical apparatus, reporting the syllables that are lost, illegible or poorly legible in each of the Nepalese manuscripts. Above the register of lacunae is a layer of apparatus in which variants of the manuscripts of the Ambikā recension are to be found. This register is positive for the A manuscripts only. Above this is one similarly dedicated to the variants in the sole manuscript of the Revā recension. A few pages have a further layer above the registers, reporting testimonia.\textsuperscript{56}

More explanation is necessary for the main register of apparatus. This apparatus is positive; the sources immediately after the lemma sign are all those that have had the reading accepted, i.e. the reading of the lemma,

\textsuperscript{55} The subject is studied separately in Yokochi 2000b.

\textsuperscript{56} There are very few testimonia in the Kauśiki cycle. SP 55.30ab and 32ab are quoted in a commentary on the Amarakośa, the Tikāsarasvaśva by a Vandyaghaṭiya Sarvāṇāṇḍa, in order to give an explanation of one of Skanda’s epithets, Kumāra. This author flourished around the middle of the twelfth century in Bengal (SP I, p. 16). Another testimonium is found in the Adbhutasāgara by Ballālasena, a Sena king in the second half of the twelfth century. He quotes SP 64.13ab and 14cd from the description of the ill omens that befell the demons’ army at the outset of their march against Kauśiki-Vīdhūvīśiṇī, on p. 379 and p. 709, respectively, attributing them to a ‘Skandapurāṇa’ (skandapurāṇe dāityaparājyayamīttam). See SP I, p. 81f, n. 27.
which include the manuscripts of the Revā and Ambikā recensions. For the
Ambikā manuscripts, the bold-type siglum A is used here and in the Ambikā
register, when the readings of all the A manuscripts collated for the chapter
agree. In reporting the manuscripts that have the accepted reading, merely
orthographical variants (e.g. interchange of anusvāra and homorganic nasal)
have been ignored.

In some cases, the adopted reading is not actually found in any of the
manuscripts. In such cases what follows the lemma sign is either the ab-
 Abbreviation 'em.', indicating that the reading is a proposed emendation, or
the abbreviation 'conj.', indicating a conjecture that is somewhat less se-
cure. The difference is of course a subjective one. If the reading in question
was already printed in the editio princeps, either of these abbreviations is
followed by the siglum Bh to acknowledge that the emendation or conjec-
ture was Bhaṭṭarāi’s. When Bhaṭṭarāi’s apparatus does not reveal that a
reading is not found in the manuscripts, ‘(silently)’ is also added. There
are also cases where the reading adopted is found only in one or more of
the manuscripts that Bhaṭṭarāi had no access to, but where he emended or
conjectured the same reading as well. The reader will then find, for instance,
after the lemma sign something like ‘RBh (em.)’, or, if Bhaṭṭarāi’s apparatus
does not make clear that his reading is not that of his manuscripts, ‘RBh
(em.?)’. This explicit marking of Bhaṭṭarāi’s emendations and conjectures,
whether they were conscious or not, has led in some cases to entries in the
apparatus where no actual variant is given. If, for instance, the reading
that we have adopted is found only in S₃ (to which Bhaṭṭarāi did not have
access) but was conjectured by Bhaṭṭarāi, there will be an entry in the main
apparatus consisting simply of the lemma, followed by the lemma sign and
‘S₃ Bh (conj.)’.

Variant readings in the Nepalese manuscripts and in Bhaṭṭarāi’s edition
follow the comma. However the readings of the R and A manuscripts, if
they are not identical to the accepted text, are not reported in this main
apparatus but in the Revā and Ambikā registers respectively.

There are a few orthographical variants of the Nepalese manuscripts
that have been treated as non-substantive and therefore remain unreported.
This category includes the interchange of anusvāra and homorganic nasal,
assimilation of visarga with following consonants, gemination after or be-
before semi-vowels, and de-gemination before semi-vowels or consonants.⁵⁷ In
S₃/S₄, s and ō are often indistinguishable. Thus, some cases where S₃/S₄
could be read as having ō for s or vice versa are also not reported. The
same is true of the distinction between ja/je and jā/jo in S₃/S₄. However,
in a very small number of cases where the variant could be interpreted as

⁵⁷When assimilation of visarga with following sibilants happens before semi-vowels or
consonants, it usually results in de-gemination of double sibilants. This phenomenon
frequently occurs and is not always reported in my edition.
substantively different and suggests an alternative interpretation, the editor has even reported variants of this type.

Aside from the cases mentioned above where the precise orthography of the manuscripts supporting the constituted text is not reported, the editor has tried in this apparatus to be particularly precise in recording exactly what the Nepalese manuscripts read. At the beginning of Part Three readers will find a list for various symbols and abbreviations that are used in the apparatus to achieve this aim and, at the same time, save space.

In reporting the variants of the editio princeps, i.e. the differences between the constituted text of my edition and that of Bhaṭṭarāṇī, the editor has explicitly indicated when the previous editor adopted a reading that is not found in any of his manuscripts by the addition of ‘em.’ or ‘conj’. in parentheses after the siglum Bh. If, as is not infrequently the case, Bhaṭṭarāṇī’s apparatus does not allow a user of his edition to see that the reading is not that of any of his manuscripts, a question mark is added after the ‘em.’ or ‘conj’. In cases, however, where the editor felt quite certain that a reading was not an emendation or conjecture, but merely an error by the printer, ‘typo’ in parentheses is added after the siglum Bh.

In the Ambikā register, the editor has been selective in reporting the variants because the aim of this register is to note all cases where it is clear that the hyparchetype of the A manuscripts must have differed from the constituted text. This layer of apparatus should therefore ideally allow the reader to reconstruct the readings of the hyparchetype of the A manuscripts, with its numerous obvious corruptions, but cannot be safely used to reconstruct the readings throughout any one of the manuscripts.

In the Revā register, the editor has taken the middle way between the main and the Ambikā registers in reporting the precise reading. The distinction between ante correctionem and post correctionem or between a first and second hand is not reported in most cases. Nevertheless, the information provided should allow a reader to follow at least all the substantive differences of this recension.

In addition, on the first page of each adhyāya, which manuscripts are available for the chapter are reported in the register of lacunae, also giving references to the relevant folios. With respect to S₂ and S₄, the references are to the number of the exposure on the microfilms made by the NGMPP; folio numbers are added in parentheses. With respect to S₁, the references are to the colour photographs; they are given in the form of a number of a roll of film and a number of the exposure.

Lastly, the heading at the beginning of each adhyāya, which merely provides the chapter number in Sanskrit, is my addition and in no sense to be considered part of the text. The colophon too is my own, simply giving the chapter number in Sanskrit. The colophons of the manuscripts, as well as those printed by Bhaṭṭarāṇī, are given in full in the respective layer of apparatus. As for the speaker indications, although they may not
be considered to be substantial parts of the text, the editor has for the present treated them as parts of the text to be edited. However the speaker indications are usually subject to abbreviation in the Nepalese manuscripts and in such cases they are not reported in the apparatus.
Introduction