

REVISTA DE ESTUDIOS ORIENTALES

CONSEJO DE INVESTIGACIONES CIENTÍFICAS
DEL INSTITUTO DE INVESTIGACIONES CIENTÍFICAS
DE LA UNIVERSIDAD NACIONAL AUTÓNOMA DE MEXICO

EDITADO POR SERGIO SANCHEZ
CON LA COLABORACION DE
MARIO HERNANDEZ Y ANTONIO MORALES

REDACCION
Calle de la Universidad 100, P.O. Box 703
Ciudad de México, México, D.F. 06702
Teléfono: 562 2400, 562 2401, 562 2402, 562 2403
Fax: 562 2404, 562 2405, 562 2406, 562 2407, 562 2408, 562 2409, 562 2410
E-mail: revista@iia.unam.mx

RIVISTA DEGLI STUDI ORIENTALI

VOLUME LXXI
(1997)

ROMA
BARDI EDITORE
1998

ENGLISH SUMMARY

The alchemical corpus attributed to Ġabir ibn Hayyān is considered here as the outcome of a scientific community, and it is taken as a typical example of production of knowledge achieved by a minoritarian scholarship. Our attention is focused especially on the last collection of the corpus, in which the topics of the artificial generation and the reproducibility of the intelligence are strictly related to the political views of the ḡabirīan school. These topics are in fact the subjects of a general debate in Xth century philosophical circles in Baġdād. In spite of the traditional historiographic view about this school, isolated in its sectarianism, we can evaluate its participation to the intellectual discussions through the paradigm of the court, here assumed as a formal frame of the historiographic discourses as regards the presence of the scientific knowledge among the purposes of the viziral cultural polity: the Barmakid court as it is related by Ibn al-Nadīm, and the Buyid court as reflected in Miskawayh's reading of the ḡabirīan corpus. Also on a sectarian ground, the scientific community inritled to Ġabir ibn Hayyān perhaps was not isolated, but interferred with its views about the intellectual and political heritage of the Shiite imams into the wide range of debates among the manifold Shiite trends during the time between the Smaller and the Greater Occultation of the Imam. Regarding this involvement, it is likely that the *Kiāb al-māǧid* on the rôle of the *ya'im* as supreme heir of the science of the imam, was the ḡabirīan refutation against the views of the great heresiarch Salmagāni.

These different approaches to the ḡabirīan «questions» are a contribution for an internal dating of the last collection of treatises achieved by this Shiite scientific community, which seemingly did not belong to any Shiite sect known and described by heresiography.

VEDIC AND TANTRIC MANTRAS

*vaidikas tāntriko miśra iti me trividho mahabā /
Bhāgavatapurāna 11.27.7*

INTRODUCTION.

An investigation of the relationship between Vedic and Tantric elements in the use of mantras in later Hinduism seems at first sight a rather specialised objective; some might even argue that such a distinction is artificial. True, the categories «Vedic» and «Tantric» are often subjected by Indian exegetes to a specific religious agenda and are therefore not purely descriptive term, but – as I hope to demonstrate in the following pages – they can still help us in understanding a neglected area in Indian religious history.

Although it is perhaps not wrong to say that Vedic and Tantric elements converge in later «Hinduism», it is important for the historian to focus on those aspects in which the Tantric is in clear opposition to the Vedic. The methodological justification for such a seemingly biased approach is that inclusivism in Indian religious culture has blurred the distinction between heterogeneous elements, and that if we start the investigation of issues like the one discussed here from the vedicized Tantric system of the Śrīvidyā, we fail to understand the historical process that has led to this apparent freedom from contradiction¹.

One peculiarity of many studies on Tantric mantras is their emphasis on linguistic and on «meta»-issues. But attacking the problem from a linguistic-cum-philosophic angle cannot inform us about the religious function of mantras, in

¹ Nevertheless this is often done in studies on Tantric mantras. Either because they are edited, easily available or well-represented in secondary literature, works like the *Mahānirvāṇatantra* are selected to stand for «Tantrism» or «Śāktism», as for instance in WHEBECK's article on «Mantra in Vedic and Tantric Ritual» (Alper 1989, p. 97). It is true that wide-spread misconceptions about the history of Tantrism have paved the way for ahistoric approaches.

for instance, the *Bhagavadgītā*, or one of the various *Sahasranāmastotra*s²³, is used as a single long mantra²⁴. This complete recitation of a text (*pāṇyana*) may be undertaken in order to promote one's religious welfare, or for very specific ends, such as curing an illness. For this purpose the text to be used is embedded in a ritual, which we shall briefly analyse. This liturgy is often only printed in recent editions or booklets for devotional use and, since the texts presented in them are popular versions, they are usually not systematically collected by libraries²⁵.

Before comparing the various elements that can appear in this preliminary recitation, we shall give the beginning of the *Bhagavadgītānāmāmantra* as an example. Fortunately this text is an exception, since it is edited in the appendix to the critical edition of the *Bhagavadgītā*²⁶.

asya śrībhagavadgītāmāmāmantrasya
bhagavān vedavyāsa ṛṣiḥ / anasūp
cbandab / śrīkṛṣṇaparāmāṇā devatā /
asoḡyān anusoḡyas tvaṃ prajānātāyās
ca bhāṣate ti bṛāṃ / sarvadharmān
parityaḡa mān ekam saraṇam vraja ti
śaktiḥ / abam tvaṃ sarvāpḡebhyo
moksyaḡyāmi mā śucaḥ ti kīlakaṃ /
śrīkṛṣṇapṛthvartham
dharmaṛthakāmamokṣarṥe jape
viniyogaḥ //

Of this *Bhagavadgītāmāmāmantra* the Ṛṣi is the holy Vedavyāsa, the metre is *anusūbh*, the deity is the highest self Kṛṣṇa. [The passage] «You grieve for those not to be grieved...» [2.11ab] is the seed [of the mantra]; [the passage] «Give up all dharmas, take refuge only in me» [18.66ab] is its power; [the line] «I will deliver you from all evils, do not grieve» is its *kīlaka*. [This mantra] is used in recitation for the pleasure of Kṛṣṇa in order to [obtain] the four goals of life.

This is followed by the so-called *karuṇyāsa*, the assignment of lines from the text as mantras to the fingers²⁷, then similarly to the *angas*, i.e. heart, head, top-

²³ On «Stotra Literature», see GONDA (1978), p. 25-38, which however focuses on the Veda.

²⁴ *mantras* are often divided into *bṛā*-, *phāda*- and *mālmāntras*. The *Ītanūgopadeśopādāhiti* has a division into *bṛā*, *bṛāmantras*, *mantras* and *mālmāntras* (1.18f, vol. 1, p. 2), according to which the latter consist of more than twenty *akṣaras*. They are also correlated to the stages in life: *bṛā* give perfection to children (1), *bṛāmantras* to youths etc.

²⁵ Bibliographically this «*śaḡazār literature*» (GONDA) is a problem, since in some cases the text is printed without any bibliographical information.

²⁶ The text has been edited in Appendix I (p. 78) to: The Bhagavadgītā. Being Reprint of Paris of Bhīsmarparvan von B.O.R. Institute's Edition of the Mahābhārata. Ed. S.K. BELVALKAR, Poona: Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute 1945. I have also seen a Telugu edition of the *Gītā*, which quotes two versions of this ritual. See also: WALTER SLAF, Katalog der Sanskrit-Handschriften der österreichischen Nationalbibliothek, Wien: Verlag der Akademie der Wissenschaften 1990, mss. 7 and 8. Furthermore I have compared an undated, probably Kashmirian Nāgarī manuscript of the text in a private collection.

²⁷ *nāman chindanti śastrāni nāman dāhanti patakah ti angusṥābhyaṃ namah / nāman kledayanti apo na soḡyati mānabḥ ti tarjanībhyāṃ namah / accheḡyo ḡam adāḡyo ḡam akleḡyo 'soḡya*

knot, and weapon²⁸. Having thus prepared the body ritually the practitioner proceeds to imagine the deity with the help of the meditation verse(s) (*dhyānāśloka*) that contains the iconographical details. After completing this introductory ritual the recitation of the text, here the *Bhagavadgītā*, may be undertaken. In such a ritual preliminary to the *pāṇyana* many other elements of a fully-fledged *pūā* may occur. One pocket edition of the *Rāmāyana*²⁹ describes a *rāmāyanaḡyā* preliminary to a *pāṇyana* in almost thirty pages³⁰. But here we shall concentrate on the simpler ritual as quoted.

First the *mantra*, i.e. the text to be recited, is mentioned and three pieces of information about this *mantra* are given: the Ṛṣi, the «seer» of the *mantra*; then the metre; and finally the deity of the *mantra*. These are said to be indispensable for the use of Vedic mantras: the *Aṛcyaḡrahmaṇa* states that one who uses a mantra without knowing these three, together with the *viniyoga*, incurs sin³¹. And it is indeed only for Vedic mantras that the first two of these make sense; in early heterodox Saivism mantras have no seer, and most of them are unmetrical³².

Then the *bṛā*, *śakti* and *kīlaka* are given. These elements are Tantric in the sense that the terms are known from Tantric ritual³³. APTE gives *kīlaka* in his dictionary as «the inner syllables of a mantra», but his reference to the *Hansopaniṣat* is unfortunate, since the mantra «*hamsa*», which is the object of this small Upaniṣat, is too short to satisfy the conditions of this pattern: according to that work the Ṛṣi is *hama*, the metre *avyakṡagṡyatrī*, the deity *paramahansa*, the *bṛā* «*hama*», the *śakti* «*sa*», the *kīlaka* «*so 'ham*». In her edition and translation of the *Pūānābhiniṛṇaṇa* NOWOTNY gives another example in which *bṛā*, *śakti* and *kīlaka* are the first, second and third word of a 3-word mantra³⁴, but, if we look at

eva ca ti madhyamābhyaṃ namah / nityaḥ sarvagataḥ śhānūr acalo ḡam sanānubḥ ti anāṃḡebhyāṃ namah / paḡyo me pāṇā nṛpanti śataḡo 'tha sahasraśabḥ ti kanṥṥikābhyaṃ namah / nānānubhāni dhyānti nātāvamākrṥṇṥi ca ti karatalakarpṥṥābhyaṃnamah / ti karanyāśabḥ //

²⁸ *angaryāśabḥ / nāman chindanti śastrāni nāman dāhanti patakah ti bṛdayāya namah / nāman kledayanti apo na soḡyati mānabḥ ti śraḡe suḡhā / accheḡyo ḡam adāḡyo ḡam akleḡyo 'soḡya eva ca ti śḡebḡvati vasaḡ / nānānubhāni dhyānti nātānūrānṛṇṥi ca ti arṥāya phā / ti angaryāśabḥ //*

²⁹ Śrinācakhāṃkṡamāyāna of Mahārsi Vālmīki (Along with its virtue and mode of recitation). Ed. by Shivram Sharma Varshih, Varanasi: Chowkhamba Vidya Bhawan 1982. See the *Sundaracāṇḡa* for a brief *pūā* for «*Smārtas* and others».

³⁰ Since most of the elements described here are also part of the *Smāṇa pūā*, one may consult the detailed treatment of this ritual in BÜHNEMANN (1988).

³¹ See *Aṛcyaḡrahmaṇa* 1.6. Similarly *Bṛhaddevatī*: *nṛvamo ḡm jape home ṛṣi chando 'tha dānānam / anyāḡā eva pṛajāyānās tapahatā cāra bṛvate //* 8.134. The passage following [in ms. A of the edition] elaborates on the same theme.

³² GOUBRIAN writes that «the vedic sages, as has been said, continue to play an important role, but only as transmitters, not as revealers. It should be noted that each mantra possesses its ṛṣi who is often mentioned together with its deity, *śakti*, etc., and assigned to the parts of the speaker's body (*ṛṣyādānyāḡā*)». GOUBRIAN and GUPTA (1981), p. 6. But this, as we shall see, applies only to vedicised Śraḡvā.

³³ I do not know of an instance in early non-Śṛividyā Tantrism where these terms denote parts of mantras.

³⁴ NOWOTNY (1957).

mantra during the *sandhyā*-rite, the author, having dealt with the enunciation of the R̥si (here *viśāmitra*), the deity (*śavitā*), the metre and the use (*virijoga*) of the mantra, describes the placing (*nyāsa*) of the constituents of this mantra on six parts of the body. He then remarks:

«This placement (*nyāsa*) on six limbs is optional, since it is clear in the appendix to the *Gṛhyasūtra*]⁴⁴ that the performance of *nyāsa* is unvedic. One must understand this to mean that there is no obligation [to perform] the *nyāsa* of syllables, words, or quarter-verses etc. as well as the performance of *mudrās*, or [recitations] for release from a curse etc., since they are Tantric and therefore unvedic»⁴⁵.

As we would expect from an impartial writer on law, the author does not condemn such a practice, he even describes Tantric *nyāsa* in other places without repeating his cautionary remarks⁴⁶. Thus a de facto acceptance of a Vedic-cum-Tantric practice does not necessarily indicate that two religions have merged beyond recognition. It is on the contrary plausible that *śītas* were always aware of the disparate nature of its elements⁴⁷.

It would be possible to produce a collection of passages on the issue from different authors and times, but for the present purpose, that is, for understanding the rationale behind the hybridization, the elaborate discussion by Rāmeśvara in the beginning of his commentary on the *Parasūramakalpasūtra* will be the best choice. His position is that of a Smārta who argues for a hybrid cult of Tripura.

He starts with the question whether it is proper for a Vaidika to expound the *Parasūramakalpasūtra*, because it is Tantric and the Tantras are, since they are motivated only by greed, invalid. As support for this conservative view he quotes Kumārila as well as passages from various *Parāśaras*. In one quotation from the *Āgripurāna* some denizens of hell say «we burn [in hell], since with our mind affected by covetousness we have obtained Tantric initiation and given up the way of the Vedas»⁴⁸. Summarising this negative view of the Tantras Rāmeśvara says: «Through this censure of Tantric practitioners⁴⁹ it is made clear that Tantra is not

⁴⁴ This must refer to the apocryphal *Asvalāyanaḡṛhyaparīśiṣṭi*, where, after a description of the *nyāsa* of the parts of the *gṛhya*-mantra, it is stated: *enam* [i.e. *nyāsa*] *eke nechanti, sa hi vādir* *avaidika* *ti*... *Asvalāyanaḡṛhyaparīśiṣṭi* 1.5. See below on this text.

⁴⁵ *iti sandhanyāśah kārṇo na vā k'āryaḥ* // *nyāsanubher avaidikānāḥ* *iti ḡṛhyaparīśiṣṭe spṛṣtam* // *etevāśāsanayāśapadānyāśādānam mudrādānyāśobhā kāpāninoḥcandānubhāḥ ca tāntrīkārtenāvai-* *katvād anāvśyaktvān veditānyam* // *Dharmasūtra*, p. 227.

⁴⁶ See p. 265, 269 etc.

⁴⁷ One Pandit whom I asked about details of his daily *pāṭṛjyā* was fully aware of the presence of non-vedic elements in his ritual, but maintained that although the *bhāsa* should not really be used, there was no question of infringing proper conduct and, *vānācāra* being ruled out, this practice was unobjectionable.

⁴⁸ *tantravidikān amuprāpāḥ lobhopahatacātā / nyaktvā vaidīkām adbhānam tena dābhyāmāhe* *nyam* //, p. 4.

⁴⁹ Lit.: «Tantric men».

to be trusted. For we see the same censure of Tantras frequently in many other Purānas too. And it is obvious that a scripture that enjoins the use of the five "m" is based only on greed»⁵⁰.

Rāmeśvara rejects this conservative position and argues that, since Purānas are valid scripture, their position on the Tantras should be the guiding line. He then adduces passages that permit Tantric practice for those who are specially qualified, and only for them; that means, the problem is resolved by adhering to a strict *adhikārabheda* for Vaidikas only Vedic worship, for Tantrikas only Tantric *pūjā*. Then the author leads us, through a series of quotations⁵¹, to the position that there are in fact two forms of *valid* worship, Vedic and Tantric.

Still the opponent cannot soften his position on *adhikārabheda* and says: «I concede that the Tantras are valid for persons who have special qualification, [i.e.] men fallen from the Veda, for the mixture of women and Śūdras[?] But] not for the Vaidika. And it is possible to quote a valid statement to the effect that the qualification for Tantra is limited to non-Vaidikas»⁵².

Then a passage adduced before, in which the principle of a division of qualification is explicitly stated, is quoted in favour of the opponent's position. Rāmeśvara disagrees and eventually quotes a passage from the *Adhyātmanāyana* in which Tantric *pūjā* is taught for obtaining liberation in order to prepare the reader for his next step, namely that both ways of worship have to be combined! He quotes passages that enjoin worship according to Veda and Tantra, or with Vedic and Tantric mantras, and presents his final position: Tantric worship is not for those fallen from the Veda, it is in fact an additional practice for Vaidikas, whereas for Śūdras and other disqualified groups it is the only practice. Thus there is an *adhikārabheda*, but the boundary is different. To the twice-born the following principle, quoted from the *Tripurāna*, applies: «By the three higher castes all the Tantric [worship] is performed after the Vedic [worship]»⁵³.

Before discussing another aspect of the process of hybridization, namely the infiltration of Tantric practices into Smārta Hinduism, we have to mention another important example of a hybrid ritual: the veneration of the junctures

⁵⁰ *iti tāntrīkpuruṣamidyā tāntrasyāśraddheḥvān spṛṣtam / enam anyesi api bahupurānasya* *tantvanindyaḥ* *bahūn upalambhāi / mupāñcākadānāvāḥ* *ḡyūkeśāśtrasya lobhāntānāḥ* *tantrīkārtenāvai-* *sūpāśitam* /, p. 4.

⁵¹ Including an instance of a Tantric *pūjā* in a Purāna: *taḥā brāhmanāntarānāḥ* *pradāyamāḥā-* *nye tāntrīkāsānyā brāhmanāntarānāḥ* *upāśiṣā*, p. 6.

⁵² The phrase *śrīśādhānān samkareṣu ca* is not clear. One expects either «women and Śūdras», both of whom are not qualified for Vedic mantras, or unlawful intermarriage (*samkara*) with (female) Śūdras.

⁵³ Lit.: «And it is not possible to say that there is an absence of a *pañāna* that limits the *adhikāra*... The original runs as follows: *na ca vaitikāntarīke tāntrasya* *adhikārasamkocāpamāḥābhāva* *ti vaktvān tānyam*, p. 7.

⁵⁴ *tantraḥ nīkān vaidīkām tāntrīkām keryāte* 'kṛtīm /, p. 9.

(*sandhyā*). In Śrīvidyā works it is, as we expect from Rāmeśvara's remarks, indeed standard practice to perform the Vedic *Sandhyā* first and then the Tantric⁵⁵.

As far as the mantras are concerned this hybrid ritual is remarkable, since the practitioner is enjoined to perform the recitation of the Vedic *gāyatrī*⁵⁶, then, in the Tantric part, the recitation of a Tantric *gāyatrī*⁵⁷. The question remains, whether the heterodox schools, i.e. those who unlike the Śrīvidyā thought of the Veda as totally ineffective and therefore did not subscribe to this process of hybridization, did also perform, for instance, this double *sandhyā*. Unfortunately the evidence is not quite conclusive, since we cannot be absolutely sure that the Tantric sources intended to describe the whole ritual to be performed, and not just its Tantric part. If we look at the *Somasambhupaddhati*, we find a Tantric *Siva-gāyatrī*⁵⁸, without indication of a Vedic part to be performed beforehand. Neither is there anything in Abhinavagupta's account of the *sandhyā* to suggest such a combination, but there is a brief remark by Kṣemarāja⁵⁹, to the effect that a Vedic *sandhyā* is to be performed by the practitioner of the *Śaṅkhanda*-cult.

But this is not too surprising, since the Tantrics are «Vedic to the extent that like all Hindus of caste they had first been purified by the Vedic rites of passage (*samkārāḥ*) [...] And even when they had gone through the ceremony of initiation (*dīkṣā*), the Tantric rite of passage which gave them access to Saiva ritual, they were still bound to conform to the rules of the Veda-based social system (*varṇāśramadharmāḥ*) and its local variants (*deśādharmaḥ*). The Śaiva initiate therefore saw himself as subject to two levels of injunction: the general or common Vedic level and the special level reached by his initiations»⁶⁰. This has to be borne in mind when we discuss the combination of Vedic and Tantric elements; it is above all the attitude of the heterodox exegeses that is markedly different from that of the adherents of the combined practice: for them the performance of the Vedic cult is seen as a merely exterior compromise, whose practice neither adds to, nor detracts from their goal – unless one would believe in it⁶¹. However, with the *ṛṣyāhryāsa* Tantric mantras themselves are vedicized.

⁵⁵ Also *Mahānirāṇatantra* 5.44: *vaidikīm tāntrikīm caiva yathānukramayogaṭṭh / sandhyāṁ samācāren mantrī tāntrikīm śrīṇu kaḥyate //*. The *Syāmapaddhati* by Śāhīh Kaṭi states that the physical and the Vedic bath have to be performed before the Tantric *stana* (*mulapākaśamanānam svāśāhokāvaṇīkhanānam ca vidhyācārya...*); the same principle applies to the *sandhyā* (*vaidīkacāmyāḥiṇi samāyāye tāntrikīm ārabheta*) and *tanpāna*. The text will be edited in my forthcoming «Śāhīh Kaṭi's *Storas* and *Paddhatis*».

⁵⁶ That is *Rgveda* 3.62.10.

⁵⁷ See SANDERSON (1995), p. 28.

⁵⁸ Compare the description in the *Somasambhupaddhati* 90f: *śrīṅgāyatrīṅgāḥ dātūṅgā gāyatrīṅgā śāhīto jāpet // 90 // om tamabeṣṭya vidhāne uḡvāśāhāḥyā dhīmāhī tan mah śīhāḥ pṛacodayāḥ //*

⁵⁹ Commenting on *Śaṅkhanda* 2.6cd *sandhyāyā vandanam kuryāc chāśrāḍṣīyena kaṁmanā* he says *śāśrāḍṣīyena vedāśrīhāḥena*.

⁶⁰ SANDERSON (1995), p. 23.

⁶¹ See *Tantrālokanīceta* 4.25.

We see here a further step in parallelising Tantric ritual with its Vedic counterparts, because for those who practiced the religion «the need to match these orthodox rituals was strong enough to compromise the very beliefs which justified the separate existence of the Tantric system. Equivalence in observable practice was ultimately more important than insider theories of superiority»⁶². The tension created by these diverse forces of compromise, rejection and fusion goes some way towards understanding the development of Tantrism as well as the change of main-stream Hinduism under its influence.

THE PROCESS OF INFILTRATION.

Purāṇas.

For the process of infiltration of Tantric material into the mainstream we find evidence in the manuals for domestic ritual, the *Purāṇas*, and some later *Upaniṣads*. We quote examples from each and shall concentrate on passages where the *ṛṣi*, metre and deity are mentioned for a mantra that is tantric, or tantricized through *bjāṣ*, or used in a Tantric *nyāsa*.

For one wishing to lift Tantric ritual into the orthodox realm, *Purāṇas* were an excellent starting point, since they, because of their status as *smṛiti*, could be accepted as valid scripture by non-sectarians, but were at the same time prone to amplification and redaction. As an example for this I shall briefly analyse some of the relevant passages from the *Devībhāgavatapurāṇa*.

Without the present issue in mind one might come to the conclusion that the *Devībhāgavatapurāṇa* has no consistent attitude towards non-Vedic cults, because it seems to present widely diverging standpoints about Tantric worship even within a few lines. But read as a defence for including Tantric cults into the Vedic domain, the contradictions in it could well be intentional, for in order to teach Tantric practices to orthodox Brahmīns, while maintaining its authority as *smṛiti*, it has to degrade Tantric elements and pay lip service to the *śruti*. This is done in chapter 7.39, which touches upon the problem of Vedic versus Tantric *pūjā*. Both rituals are to be performed only by those initiated into it; whoever performs the wrong *pūjā* «loses», i.e. loses his religious status. In the section about the Vedic *pūjā* the text assures the Vaidika that there is no reason for him to adopt non-Vedic practices: «In some places, sometimes, a religion is taught which integrates Tantric doctrines»⁶³. This [Tantric] element is never to be adopted by the Vaidikas⁶⁴. Thereafter the validity of the Veda is asser-

⁶² SANDERSON (1995), p. 27.

⁶³ Lit. «with a side-glance at Tantric doctrines».

⁶⁴ *smṛitayoḥ ca śruter arthāṇaḥ gṛhīṇvīta ca nṛgātāḥ / manavāñīnāṁ śrūñīnāṁ ca tatāḥ pṛāṇāṅgāṇaḥ iṣṭe // kevalāi kevalācī tantrārbhokāiṣṭīyena parvāṭīam // dharmāṇaḥ vadānti so 'nyāsa tu natīva gṛhīyo 'ṣi vaitākarāḥ // 7.39.17-18.*

ted⁶⁵, and it is stipulated that the king should expel those who adopt other *dharmas* from the country. In this category would be the Vāna, Kapālikas⁶⁶, Kaula, Bhairavāgama, all of which are in contradiction to *śruti* and *smṛti*, and which were produced by Śiva in order to delude.

Then there is a sudden shift in perspective:

«There are some good Brāhmaṇas, who are distressed [since they are] outside the path of the Veda. In order to liberate them gradually Śiva composed the Śaiva-, Vaiṣṇava-, Saura, Śākta and Gāṇapatya-Āgamas. In them some elements are taught here and there that are not in contradiction to the Veda. It is never a sin for Vaidikas (?)⁶⁷ to adopt these»⁶⁸.

In other words, some Brāhmaṇas who have lost their *adbhikāra* for the Veda may adopt Tantric worship wholeheartedly, and we may add that by so doing they would in any case lose it. To this excuse is added a list of Tantras, which signals that there are groups of scriptures related to all the five deities of the so-called *pañcāyatana* that receive offerings in Smārta ritual. With this the author wants to suggest that, though leaving the Vedic domain, we are still within the non-sectarian Smārta religion. Perhaps the slip of the pen that follows indicates what the author really meant, namely Āgamas composed by Śiva (*śaṅkareṇa*); presumably all the other groups of Āgamas are in this context empty⁶⁹.

The solution first envisaged by the *Devībhāgavata* in this passage is that of *adbhikārabheda*: in principle the Vaidikas should adopt Vedic rites and the Tantrikas Tantric ones. But the arguments mentioned in the previous section also provide us with an excuse for those who adopt Tantric rites, namely the *śāpa*, and reassure the hesitant that no sin is incurred. We must add that the author had as an introduction to the passage distinguished an internal and an external form of *pūjā*. The division into Vedic and Tantric applied only to the external mode, whereas the internal is now described in the conclusion of the chapter: the internal *pūjā* is the dissolution of consciousness (*samvillaya*), which is to say that the differences in *krtyā* are resolved in *yoga* and the conservative reader may calm down.

Compared with the early heterodox Tantric tradition that declares the Veda invalid and the practices derived from it ineffective, the *Devībhāgavata* is very

⁶⁵ There is one passage on valid scripture where it is stated that *śruti* and *smṛti* are the eyes, but the Purāna is the heart. In the case of contradiction, however, the Veda is valid! (11.1.20-33).

⁶⁶ «Kapālikas» is given in the text.

⁶⁷ The instrumental *vaidīkaiḥ* is odd.

⁶⁸ *daḅhā ye brāhmanānā vedaṃtāyabakṣyētāḥ / teṣāṃ uddhavanārthiḥya sopānādevamāḥ sadā // śaṅkāt ca vaiṣṇavāś caiva saurāḥ śāktāś ca / gāṇapatyaḥ āgamāś ca pṛṇvāḥ śaṅkareṇa tu // tānā vedaṃtānūddhō 'nyō 'py ukta eva kvaci kvaci / vaidīkēś tadgrāhe doṣo na bhāvādy eva kvacit //* 7.39.29-30.

⁶⁹ There are of course Vaiṣṇava-Āgamas, and there are traces of a lost canon of scriptures taught by Śiva, but if all are thought to be taught by Śiva, the perspective is in any case sectarian Śaiva, not neutral Smārta.

moderate; but elsewhere in the text it is strongly suggested that the actual practice advocated is Tantric. We find one indication in the chapter that describes the *bāhupūjā* in detail: there the goddess is imagined as sitting on five corpses⁷⁰. These five are identical with «the five elements and the five states of consciousness [i.e. waking state up to *tuṃyāṅīlā*], but I [Devī] am unmanifest consciousness and utterly beyond them. Therefore these [five] always become my seat in the *Saktiantṛas*»⁷¹. This unspecific reference to a group of Tantras might be interpreted as neutral eclecticism, in other words that the Tantras are sources just like the Veda. As proof for this one could adduce passages that pretend to give a résumé of Vedic, Tantric and other modes of worship, as for instance in the case of *ācamana* of which six modes are listed⁷². But if we examine further passages⁷³ we must conclude that the authors or redactors of this Purāna tried their best to appear unbiased while including Tantric practices into orthodoxy.

In its eagerness to build bridges for the conservative to a Tantric *pūjā* the *Devībhāgavata* describes the use of the *gāyatrī-mantra*, but expands it by including Tantric elements. First the author states that the *nyāsas* to be described are optional⁷⁴. It then lists the *ṛṣiś*, *chandas*, and *devatāś*; the names for the «parts» of this mantra: *hṛīḥ*, *śākti*, *klāḥa*, *hṛdaya*, *śiraś*, *śikhā*, *kanaca*, *netra*, and *astṛā*⁷⁵. As expected, this is followed by the *abhyāna* of the deity and the *nyāsa* of parts of the mantra on the worshipper's body. The chapter concludes with a *gāyatrībhāṣya*, a *gāyatrīstotra* and *-śaḅasanāma*.

In chapter 12.7.5 the author says that the fact that *dīkṣā* qualifies for ritual acts, grants (*dā*) divine knowledge and removes (*key*) evil is known by those who are «proficient in Veda and Tantra». In the same chapter we also find the *nyāsa* of the *ṛṣi* etc.⁷⁶

The technique here is, not unlike that of Rāmeśvara discussed above, to expound different views on Tantric worship in order to get the attention of a broader public. The outcome is not a clear recommendation of Tantric worship, but an integration of heterodox elements into the orthodox domain.

⁷⁰ The list is identical with that of the five so-called *kāruṇīyāras* in Śaivism.

⁷¹ *pañcābhātāmukā by eṣe pañcāśaṣṭhātāmukā apī / dharmā to anyakācācārpā tadatīrāmi varuḥā // tato vīṣṭānāṃ yātāḥ śaktiantṛasā sanvātā / 7.40.11-12ab.*

⁷² *suddham smāntam cācamanam paurāṇam vaidīkam taḥā / tānṛtikam śantam ity ābūḥ sadāḅham smṛtīcoditam //*, 11.3.1. It should be noted that here all these modes are said to be sanctioned by *śruti*!

⁷³ For Tantric elements in others parts of the text, see the *māṅkēpūjā* (7.40.6); the main mantra of Devī is *hṛīm*, the *hrillekḥā* (*hrillekḥā saramantrārāṇāṃ nāyikā* 7.40.28). Even in a mythological passage: *hṛīṅkṛajapantīśāś tu pakṣīpndar mīṣvītā 3.3.41. namāmi hṛīṅmoyīm devīm* 12.14.27. For the *nyāsa* of *hṛīm* in a Śrīvidyā manual, see *Śubhagolāpa* 3ab.

⁷⁴ *nyāśān karoti vā mū vā gāyatrīm eva cābhyaṣet / 12.1.11.*

⁷⁶ 12.3.6-9.

⁷⁶ 12.7.14.

Domestic Ritual.

There are traces of attempts to tantricize Vedic ritual in the Sūtra literature, or rather its appendices. We have already mentioned the apocryphal *Āśvalāyanaśrīghyaparīśiṣā*, which is to be distinguished from the one edited by АТТНАЛ⁷⁷. The apocryphal work, which teaches an *anganyāsa* of the *gṛyāṛīmanta*, has made its way into mainstream ritual and was not only quoted by later authors, but also used by HILLEBRANDT and KANE for their description of details of domestic ritual.

Another case is the *Mānavasūritasūtra*, which contains a hybrid ritual called *nudajāpa* that includes the preparatory *nyāsa* of mantras on several parts of the body⁷⁸. Here we find a hybrid ritual, namely the *ṛṣi*, metre and deity of a mantra that contains a *bija*.

The case of the *Baudhāyanaśrīghyaparīśiṣā* is less clear: It has been observed already by BÜHLER that «many of the newly-added rites do not belong to the ancient Brāhmanical worship, but to the Paurāṇic religions, the service of Śiva, Skanda, Nārāyaṇa, and other deities, and some show an admixture of Tantric elements»⁷⁹. HARTING, while subscribing to the opinion that there is a strong Paurāṇic influence, has rejected the notion that Tantric elements are present. An obvious case is, however, a quotation of the *Baudhāyanaśrīghyaparīśiṣā* in the *Nirṇayasiddhu* in a tantricized form, that is, with lists of *bija*s inserted⁸⁰.

A further, but quite different instance is the *Parasūratmakalpasūtra*, which is a Śrīvidyā manual with a pseudo-Vedic title. The long introductory passage on the validity of the Tantras by the commentator Rāmeśvara shows that he was fully aware of this discrepancy.

Secularian Upanisads.

One could also quote examples from another Vedic genre, namely the Upanisads. We find in the *Hamsopaniṣat* the *ṛṣi* etc., *bija*, *śakti*, *ketaka*, as well as *aṅga*- and *karanyāsa*. Compare also the *Dakṣiṇāmūrtiyupaniṣat*, the *Śrīrāmapūrvaṭāpinyupaniṣat* quoted above, the *Gaṇapatyupaniṣat*, and the *Sarasvatībhasyopaniṣat*.

⁷⁷ See PARAMESHWARA АТТНАЛ: *Āśvalāyanaśrīghyaparīśiṣā*, ALB XXVII, Advar 1963, p. 230f.

⁷⁸ *sadoho jāta tiry asya sadhojāta ṛṣiḥ brahmad devatā trisūp chandah bhasvadhānah paścamaakṛtuh pṛthivītatubh brahmanarīpa oya brām paścamaakṛtubdhanne vintyogah «sadyo jātib paścamaakṛtāya nama ānubhogaḥ» // Mānavasūritasūtra, p. 238.*

⁷⁹ Quoted in HARTING (1922), p. xvii.

⁸⁰ See HARTING (1922), p. xxiii.

CONCLUSIONS.

What are the conclusions to be drawn from these observations? The early accounts of Śaiva ritual that predate any Śrīvidyā influence, namely the *Tantrāloka* and the *Somasambhūpādābhāṣā*⁸¹ do not use the hybrid ritual and it is also absent from the earliest scriptural sources of the Śrīvidyā itself, i.e. the *Nṛyāśodasīkārṇava* and the *Yoginīhrdaya*. This is perhaps not enough to prove the hybridization to be late, since we would expect the information about the *ṛṣi* etc. not necessarily in scripture itself, but in ritual manuals. Of those the more accessible ones are: the *Prapañcasāra*, attributed to Saṅkara, the *Tripurānārasa-muccaya* by one Nāgabhaṭṭa, the *Subhagoḍaya* by Śivānanda and the *Śara-dātīlaka*⁸². All of these works, except the one by Śivānanda teach the hybrid ritual⁸³.

One can only speculate about the reason for Śivānanda's omission. He is strongly influenced by the exegetical terminology of the Pratyabhijñā, but his position with regard to the Veda is more compromising, as quotations from Vedic sources as well as from the Smārta *Prapañcasāra* show. This position leads to inconsistencies: on the one hand he quotes the Trika's doctrine of an increasing series of cults (Veda, Saiva, Vāma, Kaula, Trika), but then he carefully downgrades all statements about a conflict between Veda and Āgama which he finds in his sources. He deliberately misunderstands the statements in the Trika about Śiva being the author of all scriptures, in order to show that the Veda is as valid as the Āgamas⁸⁴.

One other ritual manual that regularly mentions the Ṛṣi etc. for Tantric mantras is the *Īānaśivagurudevopādābhāṣā*⁸⁵. But this is of no help, since the work is an unusual mixture of Śrīvidyā elements, not with the expected Pratyabhijñā background, but with many quotations from Siddhānta authors such as Bhaṭṭa Rānakarṇṭha II. One reference to the Kashmirian non-dualists that I noticed is a paraphrase of *Pratyabhijñāhrdaya* 1⁸⁶. The author is explicitly eclectic in that he

⁸¹ The same holds true for Aghoraśiva's *Kṛyāṭaramadhyaikā*, as far as one can judge from the passage translated in SURDAM (1984). The text of this important work is unfortunately not accessible to me.

⁸² The *Prapañcasāra* and the *Tripurānārasamuccaya* are quoted in Śivānanda's *Ryūminarṣinī*.

⁸³ In his *Ryūminarṣinī* p. 25 he quotes *Śivastotrānandī* 2.7 as if it supported his relativistic position, and also statements from the *Tantrāloka* that could at first sight mean that, since Śiva is the author of the Vedānta, i.e. the Upanisads, they are equally valid; this, by the way, is not Abhinavagupta's position. Since it is unlikely that this has escaped the attention of Śivānanda, I imagine that his doctrinal position forces him to reinterpret.

⁸⁴ See, for instance, the *nyāsar* in I.66ff; also the description of the Vedic Sandhyā, where the necessity of Ṛṣi etc. is reiterated (9.87, vol. 1, p. 88).

⁸⁵ ...*chīb sautartrābhīlāsiddhāntuh* / ... vol. 3, p. 25.

- Mānuvasāraṅgāra*, ed. Jeanette M. van Gelder, New Delhi 1961 (Śata-Piṅka-Series 17).
Mahānirvāṇanta. Mahānirvāṇa Tantra with the Commentary of Harharananda Bharatī,
 ed. Arthur Avalon, Tāntric Texts 13, Delhi 1989.
Maitrīyañāṣambhita. Maitrīyañi Saṁhitā. Ed. Leopold von Schroeder. Erstes Buch. Leipzig
 1881.
Rauravāgama → BHATT (1985).
Saṅkaraśāstra. Ed. Jagannārāyaṇa Tarkapañcāna, Bibliotheca Indica 37, Calcutta 1868.
Saradātilaka. Saradātilakatantram, ed. Arthur Avalon, Delhi 1982 [Calcutta 1933] (Tan-
 tric Text Series XVII).
Śivapurāṇa. The Śiva Mahāpurāṇa. Ed. Pushpendra Kumar, Delhi: Nag Publishers 1981.
Śivasūtra → Śivasūtravimarśinī
Śivasūtravimarśinī. The *Śivasūtravimarśinī* of Ksemarāja, ed. J.C. Charterji, Delhi 1990
 (KSTS 1) [Śrinagar 1911].
Śvastotrāvalī. Śvastotrāvalī, by Utpala Devāchārya, with the Commentary of Kshe-
 marāja. Ed. by Rai Pramādāśā Mitra Bahādur [...], Benares 1902 (The
 Chowkhambā Sanskrit Series No. 51, Fasc. I).
Sandhyā. Sandhyā. Gītapres, Gorakhpur.
Sundarākāṇḍa. Sundarākāṇḍaḥ, cennapurāṇam vāvilā rāmasvāmīśāstrulu and sans, madras
 1928.
Subhagodaya, Edited as an appendix to → *Nityāśodasikāraṇava*
Somasāmbhupaddhati → BRUNNER-LACHAUX (1963), BRUNNER-LACHAUX (1977).
Svacchandānttra. The Svacchanda-Tantra with Commentary by Kshemarāja. Ed. with no-
 tes by Madhusudan Kaul, 6 vols., Bombay: Niraya Sagar Press 1921-35 (KSTS
 31/38/44/48/51 (Vol. VA)/53 (Vol. VB)/56).

REFERENCES

- ALPER HARVEY P. (ed.) (1989) *Mantra*. SUNY series in Religious Studies, State University
 of New York Press, Albany.
 BHATT N.R. (ed.) (1985) *Rauravāgama*. Vol. 1, Institut Français d'Indologie, Pondichéry.
 BRUNNER HÉLÈNE (1986), Les membres de Śiva. *Asiatische Studien* 40, 1:89-132.
 BRUNNER-LAUCHAUX HÉLÈNE (1963), *Somasāmbhupaddhati*. Première Partie. Institut
 Français d'Indologie, Pondichéry.
 BRUNNER-LAUCHAUX HÉLÈNE (1977), *Somasāmbhupaddhati*. Troisième Partie. Institut
 Français d'Indologie, Pondichéry.
 BÜHNEMANN GUDRUN (1988) *Pūjā*. A Study in Smārta Ritual. Publications of the De Nobili
 Research Library XV, Vienna.
 DERRERT J. AND DUCAN M. (1973), *Dharmasāstra and Juridical Literature*. A History of In-
 dian Literature IV, Otto Harrassowitz, Wiesbaden.
 GONDA JAN (1976), *Viṣṇuism and Śaivism*. Munshiram Manoharlal, Delhi.
 GONDA JAN (1978), *Hymns of the Ṛgveda Not Employed in the Solemn Ritual*. North-Hol-
 land Publishing Company, Amsterdam etc.
 GOUDRIJAN TEUN AND GUPTA, SANJUKTA (1981), *Hindu Tantric and Śākta Literature*.
 Hill, Vol. II, Fasc. 2. Harrassowitz, Wiesbaden.
 HARTING PIETER NICOLAAS UBBO (1922), *Selections from the Baudhāyana-
 Gṛyapariśiṣṭasūtra*. J. Valkhoff & Co., Amersfoort.
 KANE PANDURANG VAMAN (1968-), *History of Dharmasāstra*. Bhandarkar Oriental Resear-
 ch Institute, Poona.
 NOWOTNY FAUSTA (1957), *Das Pūjāvidhimeritpāna des Trimalla*. III 1:109-154.
 ROCHER LUDO (1989), *Mantras in the Śivapurāṇa*. In: *Mantra*, edited by Harvey P. Alper,
 SUNY series in Religious Studies, State University of New York Press, Albany.
 SANDERSON ALEXIS (1985), *Purity and Power Among the Brahmins of Kashmir*. In: *The
 Category of the Person*, edited by Steven Lukes Michael Carrithers, Steven Collins,
 pp. 190-216., Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
 SANDERSON ALEXIS (1990), *Śaivism and the Tantric Traditions*. In: *The World's Religions:
 The Religions of Asia*, edited by Friedrich Hardy, pp. 128-172, Routledge, London.
 SANDERSON ALEXIS (1995), *Meaning in Tantric Ritual*. In: *Essais sur le Rituel III*, edited by
 A.M. Blondeau and K. Schipper, Paris.
 SRINIVASAN DORIS (1973), *Sandhyā: Myth and Ritual*. III XV:161-178.
 STAAL FRITS (1989), *Vedic Mantras*. In: *Mantra*, edited by Harvey P. Alper, SUNY series in
 Religious Studies, State University of New York Press, Albany.
 SURDAM WAYNE EDWARD (1984), *South Indian Śaiva Rites of Initiation: The Dikṣavidhi of
 Aghorasivācārya's Kṛiyākramadyotika*. Ph.D. thesis, University of California, Berkeley.
 VASU ŚRISĀ CHANDRA (1991), *The Daily Practice of the Hindus*. Munshiram Manoharlal,
 Delhi.