

Aus: Rivista degli Studi Orientali LXXI (1997), S. 147–167

VEDIC AND TANTRIC MANTRAS

*vaidikas tāntriko miśra iti me trividho makhaḥ /
Bhāgavatapurāṇa 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 *Mabānirvāṇatantra* are selected to stand for «Tantrism» or «Śāktism», as for instance in WHEELOCK'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.

some cases the concentration on language theory produces incorrect and even absurd results. For instance STAAL has concluded that «it is not possible to make a systematic distinction between Vedic, Tantric, and other Hindu mantras»² – without realizing that it is his comparative approach that excludes any such distinction. His proclamation that «*hm*» is a universal mantra, which occurs even in the *Zauberflöte*, hardly needs refutation³.

The present article attempts to fill the gap by investigating some seemingly innocuous changes in the ritual use of mantras in their historical and theological dimensions.

THE THEOLOGY OF MANTRAS.

Vedic and Tantric mantras are obviously defined by their source: a Vedic mantra is one that is derived from the Veda, a Tantric mantra from the Tantras. Generally speaking Tātrikas consider Vedic mantras to be almost powerless, because they regard their source, i.e. Vedic revelation, as a lower form of knowledge that cannot lead to liberation. The Vaidikas on the other side of the religious spectrum do not accept the Tantras as valid revelation and consequently regard Tantric mantras as impure⁴. A problematic area is Smārta Hinduism, i.e. the broad mainstream that is based on *śruti* and *smṛti* and therefore includes Purāṇic forms of worship. We may of course talk of Purāṇic mantras, but it is, I think, important to do so without confusing the Vedic and the Tantric elements in them. The Śivapurāṇa, for instance, is predominantly Vedic in its selection of mantras⁵, whereas the *Devībhāgavata*, to be discussed below, is not. To treat *Purāṇas* in this respect as independent would thus unnecessarily confuse the distinction⁶.

Apart from this theological distinction between Vedic and Tantric mantras, there is also an important formal one in that Tantric mantras often contain *bījas*, «seed syllables», like *hrīm* etc. These *bījas* are not meaningful Sanskrit words,

² STAAL (1989), p. 63.

³ Otherwise the fact that even contemporary Bavarian uses «*hm*» in three senses, and perhaps more importantly, the sound «*a*», i.e. the *ekākṣaraprajñāpāramitā*, in eight different meanings – if we include *abhyāsa*-forms like «*a-a*» *vikalpe* – would show a remarkable mantric awareness with an obvious propensity for *bījas*. See *Bairische Grammatik von Ludwig Merkle*, München: Hugendubel 1986, p. 195-6: «*a-a* (zwei normale a, abgehackt hintereinander gesprochen) = ironischer Zweifel am Gesagten. Wann need ausgerechnet heids Auddo kabuddgangā wāär, wāärmā kemā. - A-a.»

⁴ SANDERSON (1985), fn. 69 (*Tantrāloka* 13.198).

⁵ «In contrast to the preeminence of and constant recourse to “Vedic” mantras, one cannot fail being struck, in this *śaiva* Purāṇa, by the very subordinate role played by Tantra generally and Tantric *bījamantras* in particular». ROCHER (1989), p. 192.

⁶ It must be emphasised that, because of the complexity of the processes involved, we should avoid constructing simple historical models. The aim of then present study is to show that «Vedic» and «Tantric» were important religious coordinates that may still sharpen our understanding of the history of Hinduism.

and as such are comparable to the Vedic *stobhas*⁷. But the comparison ends here, since there is no necessity for a *stobha* in a Vedic mantra, and there are indeed not too many *stobhas* in them, whereas a Tantric mantra is defined by its *bīja*⁸. The term «ritualistic dadaism» therefore (inspired by the *stobha* «*dada*»), though amusing, is misleading⁹. Tantric *bījas* can not be explained as artistic statements, even if it were convenient to do so for philosophising about them.

Generally speaking, all Vedic mantras – according to the proponents of Tantric practice – are, for the simple reason that they are derived from the Veda, incapable of leading to liberation. However, for the esoteric monist Śaivas the hierarchy of mantras is more complicated, since they teach a gradation of mantras within the Śaiva revelation. For instance, the mantras used by the Śaiva-Siddhānta are ineffective as compared with those of the Kaulas:

«All the mantras that are taught in Siddhānta-Tantras etc. are powerless, as they are devoid of the splendour of [Śiva's] power. The great mantras of the Kula [scriptures], whose splendour shines naturally, appear with supernatural [lit.: “heavenly”] splendour and are causes for immediate knowledge¹⁰».

Furthermore the division of schools into «general» (*sādhārāna*) and «special» (*viśeṣa*), with the implication that the «special» is more effective, but only accessible to an elite, is applied to mantras.

⁷ See STAAL in: STAAL (1989), p. 61.

⁸ This statement needs to be qualified. There are mantras without *bījas* in Tantric ritual, like for instance in general formulas of adoration of the type *om* [name in the dative] *namah*. It remains to be seen, whether these ever occur outside the subordinate parts of the ritual, but the impression is that the mantras of the main Tantric deities require a *bīja*. The *Mahānirvānatantra* would seem to be a counter example, since its *mūlamantra* of Brahma in the 3rd chapter is indeed without *bīja*. But this recent Tantra is a special case. Although DERRET's point in saying that it is a «well-intentioned fraud» (see GOUDRIAAN and GUPTA (1981), p. 99) is obvious, the terminology is inappropriate, because a scientific distinction between genuine and apocryphal Tantras will be difficult to maintain. A work can only be called apocryphal outside a theological context, if it is not what it claims to be. But DERRET is right in that the *Mahānirvānatantra* is in many ways an anomalous product. Despite the fact that the Tantra teaches as its main part a Kaula adoration of a form of Kālī with the expected mantras (the *mūlamantra* is *brīm śrīm krīm*, see comm. on 5.33-4) and procedures, one of its themes in the introductory dialogue is that of a purification of Tantrism. In its first chapters it claims the validity of Tantric worship, but only because Vedic mantras are ineffective in the Kali age (2.14-15). As if to lead the reader gradually to «real» Tantrism he is first presented with a cult of the absolute *brahma*. The *mūlamantra* of this «deity» is *om sac cid ekaṁ brahma* (comm. on 3.41-3); its *nyāsa*, *dhyaṇa* and a *brahma-gāyatrī* (3.105) etc. that follow are a Tantric cult, but without *bījas*, of a non-Tantric pseudo-deity. This practice, which is open to Śaivas, Vaiṣṇavas and others (3.141), has strong Vedāntic overtones (*saccidānandalakṣaṇam* 2.34d; *vedāntavedyo bhagavān* 2.45c), a perspective that is not uncommon in later Śrīvidyā, but with the distinction that here the cult is Vedāntic to the mantric core.

⁹ STAAL (1989), p. 61.

¹⁰ *siddhāntādiṣu tantresu ye mantrāḥ samudābrtāḥ // vīryabhīnās tu te sarve śaktitejōjihitā yataḥ / kaulikās tu mahāmantrāḥ svabhāvād dīptatejasah // sphuranti divyatejaskāḥ sadyahpratyayakarakāḥ // Tantrālokaḥ 29.3.*

The occurrence of a *bīja* indicates that a mantra is Tantric, and the *bīja* may further reveal the particular cult in which the mantra is used. If we take, for instance, the five Tantric *brahmamantras*, we see that in the different mantric systems it is only the *bīja* that changes. By reciting *om kṣam īśānamūrdhne namaḥ* one indicates that one is following the mantric system of the *Svacchandatantra*¹¹, whereas by saying *om hoṃ īśānamūrdhne namaḥ* one follows the ritual system of the Śaiva-Siddhānta¹². We could therefore say that, regardless of their meaning, mantras, including *bījas*, *make sense* in a ritual context.

Above, or below, the level of ritual¹³ theological positions on mantras may differ widely. This is not the place to enter into a discussion of the theology of mantras in different Tantric schools, but we may add a few points made by the non-dualist exegetes that help to elucidate the place of mantras in Tantric ritual: A mantra denotes a deity and is used in ritual to evoke its presence, to awaken the deity in the consciousness of the worshipper¹⁴. The power of the mantra is thus its ability «to make aware of something», or «to articulate» (*pañ-mṛs*). For a sectarian Śaiva like Abhinavagupta this is of course only the property of Śaiva mantras, the *parāmarśa* of mantras of other schools like Vaiṣṇava etc. is impure¹⁵. Now the *bīja* represents this awareness (*parāmarśa*) more fully in that it is not limited to a specific denotation¹⁶.

But even a Tantric mantra is powerful¹⁷ only if learned from the teacher directly; a mantra taken from a manuscript is powerless¹⁸. In other words, the mantra is a sound that is transmitted through a line of teachers (*paramparā*) and has as its source the supreme deity; it is thus thought to be efficient only within this specific socio-religious context.

¹¹ See *Svacchandatantra* 1.45cd-46 with Kṣemarāja's commentary.

¹² See BRUNNER (1986), p. 93. For the pattern *om* plus a name in the dative case, see *Tantrāloka* 15.183.

¹³ It should be noted that despite the fact that research on Tantrism has almost exclusively concentrated on philosophy, Tantric religion is highly ritualistic and can only be understood comprehensively with that perspective. SANDERSON writes on the importance of the study of ritual manuals: «However, once one has realized that it is necessary to approach the Śaiva traditions of Kashmir from an understanding of their basis in ritual, then the importance of these materials becomes obvious. For they are almost our only evidence of Śaivism in the region which is not of a theoretical or prescriptive kind. They provide us with a background of reality against which to evaluate the implications of theory and to consider the degree and manner of the idealisation of actual practice that we must expect in authoritative prescription». SANDERSON (1995), p. 15.

¹⁴ *tadvimarśasvabhāvā hi sāvācyā mantradevatā / mahāsaṃvitsamāsanety uktam śrīgamaśāsane //*, *Tantrāloka* 16.286.

¹⁵ *Tantrāloka* 16.253cd-256.

¹⁶ See *Tantrāloka* 5.141, which refers to *bījas* and *pinḍas*.

¹⁷ That is, full of «vitality» (*vīrya*). For this term, see *Tantrāloka* 4.141 and 30.121; *Sivasūtra* 1.22.

¹⁸ See *Tantrāloka* 4.66 for the idea that written mantras are ineffective except in the cases of *sāmsiddhika-gurus*; and the slightly obscure quotation in *Tantrāloka* 15.594 that one should not write down the «heart of the mantra», i.e. its *bīja*?

Here one might ask about the status of those mantras that are used in Tantric ritual but are ultimately derived from the Veda, like for instance the five Vedic *brahmamantras*¹⁹ that are used in the Tantric *kalānyāsa*²⁰. I have not seen an attempt to resolve this inconsistency, but it is easy to imagine a justification: for instance the aghora-mantra that is used in Tantric ritual, it might be argued, is taken by the adherents of the Āgamas from the *Svacchandatantra*, not from the *Taittirīyāranyaka* and therefore effective²¹.

This simplified description of a clear-cut division between Vedic and Tantric mantras applies to the more heterodox Tantric traditions, which we took as our starting point. As we shall see, the picture changes in the system of the later Śrīvidyā where the boundary between the Vedic and the Tantric is indeed more difficult to draw. But in order to understand the historical process of amalgamation that has led to present day «Hindu practice»²², it is important to investigate Vedic and non-Vedic elements *within* later Hinduism. This I wish to demonstrate by analysing such a hybrid, that is Vedic-cum-Tantric practice, namely the ritual used for the recitation of *mālamantras*.

MĀLĀMANTRAS.

This type of mantra recitation common in present-day Hinduism has to my knowledge never been the object of scientific analysis. In this practice a text like,

¹⁹ Preserved in the *Taittirīyāranyaka*. The passage occurs in Śāyana's text (The *Taittirīyāranyaka* of the Black Yajur Veda with the Commentary of Śāyanaḥārya. Ed. Rājendralāla Mitra, Calcutta 1872 [Bibliotheca Indica]) as *prapāthaka* 10, *anuvāka* 43-47; as *prapāthaka* 6, *anuvāka* 43-47 in Bhāskara's text (The *Taittirīyā āranyaka* with the Commentary of Bhaṭṭa Bhāskara Mīśra. Ed. Mahādeva Sastri and K. Rangacarya, MLBD 1985); as *Khaṇḍa* 17, 1-5 in JACOB'S edition; and no. 277-286 in VARENNE'S edition which is based on what he calls the *āndhra* version, represented by the *Ānandāśrama* Series. Bhāskara predates Śāyana, who died in 1387 A.D. (See Sebastian J. Carri: Contribution of Bhaṭṭa Bhāskara Mīśra to Vedic Exegesis, Pune: Institute for the Study of Religion 1985 [Studies in Indian Religious Texts 1]). Another source that predates the two commentators is the *Pāsupatasūtra*, where these mantras occur divided into *Sūtras*. Compare also *Nṛsimhapūrvatapanīyopaniṣat* 1.6 for the *īśānamantra*, *Maitrāyaṇīśambhitā* 2.9.10 for the *aghoramantra*, and *Kāṭhaka* 17.10.11 for the *tatpurasamantra*.

²⁰ See *Rauravāgama*, *kriyāpāda*, *paṭala* 2 (p. 22-28).

²¹ According to the *Jñānapañcāśikā*, a short text that is transmitted in a manuscript together with other recensions of the *Kālotaratantra*, Śaiva ritual is to be performed with mantras that were spoken by the five faces of Śiva, but not with those taken from the Veda: *pañcavaktrodbhavair mantraiḥ śivoḥkaiḥ siddhimuktidaib / samyak yāgādi samsthāpyam nānyair vedādicoditaiḥ // Jñānapañcāśikā* folio 1 verso (NGMPP B 118/7). My theoretical explanation of the discrepancy does not apply to the more Veda-oriented Tantric schools, which freely acknowledge that the long *brahmamantras* are Vedic and are therefore not to be used by women, *Sūtras* and other disqualified social groups (see *īśānaśivagurudevapaddhati*, vol. 3, p. 33 and 62). That the latter work is influenced by *Śrīvidyā* is evident from the fact that it quotes the *Prapañcasāra* quite regularly (those instances which are not formal quotations are not recorded by the editor, like for instance 1.73: *prapañcasāra katbitā yathāvad iba sangrahāt / atroddhriyante bhījāni bhījāmantrāḥ samantrakāḥ //*).

²² GONDA, for instance, has used the term «Hindu practice» in a rather loose sense, as applied to the mantra *boṇī īśānamūrdhne namaḥ*. See GONDA (1976), p. 47.

for instance, the *Bhagavadgītā*, or one of the various *Sabasranāmastotras*²³, is used as a single long mantra²⁴. This complete recitation of a text (*pārūyana*) 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 *Bhagavadgītāmālāmantra* 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 śrībhagavadgītāmālāmantrasya
bhagavān vedavyāsa ṛṣiḥ / anuṣṭubh
chandaḥ / śrīkṛṣṇaparamātmā devatā /
aśocyān anvaśocyas tvam prajñāvādānś
ca bhāṣase iti bījam / sarvadharmān
parityaja mām ekam śaranam vraja iti
śaktiḥ / abam tvām sarvapāpebhyo
mokṣayisyāmi mā śucaḥ iti kilakam /
śrīkṛṣṇaprītyartham
dharmārthakāmamokṣārthe jape
viniyogaḥ //*

Of this *Bhagavadgītāmālāmantra* the Ṛṣi is the holy Vedavyāsa, the metre is *anuṣṭubh*, 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 *kilaka*. [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 *karanyāsa*, the assignment of lines from the text as mantras to the fingers²⁷, then similarly to the *aṅgas*, 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 *bīja-*, *pinḍa-* and *mālāmantras*. The *Īśānaśivagurudevapaddhati* has a division into *bījas*, *bījamantras*, *mantras* and *mālāmantras* (1.18ff; vol. 1, p. 2), according to which the latter consist of more than twenty *aḥśaras*. They are also correlated to the stages in life; *bījas* give perfection to children (!), *bījamantras* to youths etc.

²⁵ Bibliographically this «bazaar 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 Parts of *Bhīṣmaparvan* from 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 SLAJE, *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 *nainam chindanti śastrāṇi nainam dahati pāvakaḥ iti aṅguṣṭhābhyām namaḥ / nainam kledayanty āpo na śoṣayati mārutaḥ iti tarjanībhyām namaḥ / acchedyo 'yam adābhyo 'yam akledyo 'śocyā*

knōt, and weapon²⁸. Having thus prepared the body ritually the practitioner proceeds to imagine the deity with the help of the meditation verse(s) (*dhyānaśloka*) 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 *parāyaṇa* many other elements of a fully-fledged *pūjā* may occur. One pocket edition of the *Rāmāyaṇa*²⁹ describes a *rāmāyaṇapūjā* preliminary to a *parāyaṇa* 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 *Ārṣeyabrāhmaṇa* states that one who uses a *mantra* without knowing these three, together with the *vinīyoga*, incurs sin³¹. And it is indeed only for Vedic mantras that the first two of these make sense; in early heterodox Śaivism mantras have no seer, and most of them are unmetrical³².

Then the *bīja*, *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 *Haṃsopaniṣat* is unfortunate, since the *mantra* «*haṃsa*», 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 *haṃsa*, the metre *avyaktagāyatrī*, the deity *paramahaṃsa*, the *bīja* «*ham*», the *śakti* «*sa*», the *kīlaka* «*so 'ham*». In her edition and translation of the *Pūjāvaidhīnirūpaṇa* NOWOTNY gives another example in which *bīja*, *śakti* and *kīlaka* are the first, second and third word of a 3-word mantra³⁴, but, if we look at

eva ca iti madhyamābhyām namaḥ / nityaḥ sarvagataḥ sthānur acaḥ 'yam sanātanaḥ iti anāmikābhyām namaḥ / paśya me pāṭha rūpāni śataśo 'tha sabasraśaḥ iti kaṇiṣṭhikābhyām namaḥ / nānāvīdhāni divyāni nānāvārnakertīni ca iti karatalakaraprsthābhyām namaḥ / iti karanyāśaḥ //

²⁸ *ānganyāśaḥ / nainam chīndanti śāstrāni nainam dabati pāvakaḥ iti brdayāya namaḥ / nainam kledayanty āpo na śoṣayati mārutaḥ iti śīrase svāhā / acchedyo 'yam adāhyo 'yam akledyo 'śocyā eva ca iti śikhāyāi vausaḥ / nānāvīdhāni divyāni nānāvārnakertīni ca iti astrāya phaḥ / iti ānganyāśaḥ //*

²⁹ Śrīmadvalmīkirāmāyaṇa of Mahārṣi Vālmīki (Along with its virtue and mode of recitation), Ed. by Shivram Sharma Vasishth, Varanasi: Chowkhamba Vidya Bhavan 1982. See the *Sundarakāṇḍa* for a brief *pūjā* for «*Smārtas* and others».

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

³¹ See *Ārṣeyabrāhmaṇa* 1.6. Similarly *Brhaddevatā*: *nīyamo 'yam jape home ṛṣiś chando 'tha daivatam / anyathā cet prayujānas tatphalāc cātra hīyate //* 8.134. The passage following [in ms. A of the edition] elaborates on the same theme.

³² GOUDRIAAN 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 (*ṛṣyādīnyāśa*)». GOUDRIAAN and GUPTA (1981), p. 6. But this, as we shall see, applies only to vedicised Śāvidyā.

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

³⁴ NOWOTNY (1957).

more examples, we can only conclude that this pattern is adapted to a variety of mantras and therefore better not defined in a rigid way. We may therefore distinguish in this segment of the ritual a Vedic and a Tantric part.

There are also specific aims, for instance health, to be gained by reciting a text. Those must be stated before the recitation in the *saṃkalpa*. One example for such a medical application is contained in one edition of the *Sūryasahasranāma*³⁵. This formula may also include the *deśakāloccaraṇa*³⁶ known from *pūjā*³⁷ and *sandhyā*³⁸.

The liturgy is concluded by one or more *nyāsas* (usually *aṅga-* and *karanyāsa*), and a *dhyāna*, but we cannot go into details here. In any case the pattern has become a standard procedure for the ritual use of mantras in a large segment of later «Hinduism»³⁹.

The following table gives an overview of variations⁴⁰:

RŚV	VSN	SSN	ŚSN	DS
ṛṣi	ṛṣi	ṛṣi	ṛṣi	ṛṣi
chandaḥ	devatā	chandaḥ	devatā	devatā
devatā	chandaḥ	devatā	chandaḥ	chandaḥ
bījam	bījam	bījam	bījam	śaktiḥ
śaktiḥ	śaktiḥ	śaktiḥ	śaktiḥ	bījam
				tattvam
	hṛdayam			svarūpam
kīlakam	kīlakam			
	astram			
	kavacam			
	paramo mantraḥ			
viniyoga	viniyogaḥ	viniyogaḥ	viniyogaḥ	viniyogaḥ
	ṛṣyādinyāsa			

³⁵ *adyetyādipūrvo... amukanāmnō mama śarīra utpannānām utpatsyamānānām vā vātāpittakapbasannipātajvarāgnimāṃdyāśirahśūlakśīmadhātvađirogānām samūlanirasanadvārā kṣiprārogyaśarīrapuṣtidīrghāyusyaśivaryādivrddhīsatruparājayādinikhilakāmanāsiddhaye śrīśūryānārāyaṇaprītaye ca śrīśūryādivyasahasranāmabhiḥ sahasrasamkhyāyākāmukadravyasamarpaṇam karīṣye // iti saṃkalpya.* According to the dictum *bhāskarād ārogyam icchet* the sun is the proper addressee for such a wish.

³⁶ See *Durgāsaptasatī*, p. 13f (*pāṭhavidhiḥ*).

³⁷ For which, see BUEHNEMANN (1988), p. 114.

³⁸ See the *Sandhyā* handbook published by the Gītā Press, and VASU (1991).

³⁹ Compare also the *Śrīrāmapūrvatāpinyupaniṣat* 3.2-5a: *mantra 'yam vācako rāmo vācyah syādyoga etayoh / phaladāś caiva sarve sām sādhanānām na samsayah // yathā nāmī vācakena nāmnā yo 'bhimukho bhavet / tathā bījātmaḥ mantra mantriṇo 'bhimukho bhavet // bījaśaktim nyasedakṣavāmayoh stanayor api / kīlo madhye 'vinābhāvyaḥ svavāncchāviniyogavān // sarveṣām eva mantrānām eśa sādhananah kramah.*

⁴⁰ RŚV *Rudraśāpavimocanavidhiḥ* (in: VSN); VSN *Viṣṇusahasranāmastotra*; SSN *Sūryasahasranāma*; SSN *Śivasahasranāmastotra*; DS *Durgāsaptasatī*. The abbreviations refer of course to the introductory liturgy given in these «bazaar editions». None of these have any bibliographical information.

karanyāsa	karanyāsa			
ṣaḍaṅganyāsa	ṣaḍaṅganyāsa			
	samkalpa			
dhyānam	dhyānam	dhyānam	dhyānam	dhyānam

It should be noted that some of these elements occur also as names of independent texts: the *Śarikākavaca*, for instance, is a text of forty verses with its own *ṛṣi* etc.⁴¹.

We have seen that, whereas the Vedic liturgy introduces its mantras by stating the *ṛṣi*, the metre, deity and the mantra's application, it is standard Smārta practice to add Tantric elements, such as *bīja*, *śakti* and the like. Although one can find *nyāsa*s in otherwise purely Vedic manuals⁴², this practice is, as we shall see, considered unvedic.

VEDIC AND TANTRIC.

We have so far mentioned three areas within Hindu literature and practice: Vaidika, Tāntrika and Smārta. Of these two the Veda and the Tantras are independent and competing revelations⁴³, whereas *smṛti* is dependent on and subordinate to the Veda.

One might now speculate whether the combination of Vedic and Tantric elements was an issue or, indeed, whether those who performed the rituals continued to be aware of the distinction. For this one must keep in mind that the uncompromising Vaidikas, i.e. the Śrautas, as well as the Tāntrikas, were minorities keenly aware of their religious identity and therefore most probably alert to foreign influences. Within Smārta Hinduism, however, the inclusion of Tantric material may have occurred more or less unnoticed by the public, but we do find records of the controversy that shed light on the process of inclusion. An interesting remark that shows awareness of Vedic and Tantric elements in rituals is found in a comparatively recent text, the *Dharmasindhu* of Kāśinātha Upādhyāya (died A.D. 1805). In the context of the recitation of the *gāyatrī-*

⁴¹ *Devīrahasya*, p. 420.

⁴² The *R̥gvedīya Trikālasamdhya*, for instance, uses only Vedic mantras with the expected *ṛṣi* etc., but describes an *aṅganyāsa* of the *gāyatrīmantra*. Similarly the *sandhyopāsanā* in: *Nityakarmavidhiḥ*, p. 7ff; and in the Smārta version as practised by the Maharashtrian (Śākala) R̥gvedins: SRINIVASAN (1973), p. 176-178 (no. 16).

⁴³ An early authority on *dharma*, Hārīta, apparently started his work by saying: «*śruti* is twofold: Vedic and Tantric». This quotation in Kullūka's commentary on *Manusmṛti* 2.1 is very problematic. Firstly, Hārīta is too early to mention Tantrism as we know it (see DERRET (1973), p. 38f and KANE (1968-), vol. 1, p. 127ff.), secondly it would be quite unusual for a *dharmasāstra*, when dealing with its sources, to include the Tantras! Whichever interpretation of *tantra* may be correct here (see KANE, *op. cit.*, p. 130f.), it is obvious that the word *śruti* is used here in a wider sense.

mantra during the *sandhyā*-rite, the author, having dealt with the enunciation of the Ṛṣi (here *viśvāmitra*), the deity (*savitā*), the metre and the use (*vinīyoga*) 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 *Gr̥hya[sūtra]*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 *nyāsas* 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 *śiṣṭas* were always aware of the disparateness 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 *Paraśurāmakalpasūtra* will be the best choice. His position is that of a Smārta who argues for a hybrid cult of Tripurā.

He starts with the question whether it is proper for a Vaidika to expound the *Paraśurāmakalpasūtra*, 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 *Purānas*. In one quotation from the *Agnipurāna* 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 *Aśvalāyanagr̥hyaparīṣiṣṭa*, where, after a description of the *aṅganyāsa* of the parts of the *gāyatrī*-*mantra*, it is stated: *enam* [i.e. *aṅganyāsaṃ*] *eke necchanti, sa hi vidhir avaidika iti ... Aśvalāyanagr̥hyaparīṣiṣṭa* 1.5. See below on this text.

⁴⁵ *iti śaḍaṅganyāsaḥ kār̥yo na vā kār̥yaḥ // nyāsa vidher avaidikatvād iti gr̥hyaparīṣiṣṭe spaṣṭam // etenākṣaranyāsapadanyāsapādanyāśādinām mudrādividbēḥ śāpavimocanādividbēḥ ca tāntrikatvenāvaidikatvād anāvāsyakatvam veditavyam // Dharmasindhu*, p. 227.

⁴⁶ See p. 265, 269 etc.

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

⁴⁸ *tantradīkṣām anuprāptāḥ lobhopabatacetasā / tyaktvā vaidikam adhvānaṃ tena dabyāmābe vayam //*, p. 4.

⁴⁹ Lit.: «Tantric men».

to be trusted. For we see the same censure of Tantras frequently in many other Purāṇas 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 Purāṇas 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 *adbikārabheda*: for Vaidikas only Vedic worship, for Tāntrikas 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 *adbikārabheda* 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[?]⁵² [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»⁵³.

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 *Adhyātmarāmāyaṇa* 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 *adbikārabheda*, but the boundary is different. To the twice-born the following principle, quoted from the *Tripurārṇava*, applies: «By the three higher castes all the Tantric [worship] is performed after the Vedic [worship]»⁵⁴.

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 tāntrikapurusandayā tantrasyāśraddheyatvam spaṣṭam / evam anyesu api babupurāṇesu tantranindāyāḥ babulam upalambhāt / mapañcakādaravidhāyakaśāstrasya lobhaikamūlatvaṃ suspaṣṭam /*, p. 4.

⁵¹ Including an instance of a Tantric *pūjā* in a Purāṇa: *tathā brahmottarakhaṇḍe pradoṣamābhātmye tāntrikasāraṇyā brāhmanarājaputrayor upadiṣṭā*, p. 6.

⁵² The phrase *strīśūdrāṇām samkareṣu ca* is not clear. One expects either «women and Śūdras», both of who 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 *pramāna* that limits the *adbikāra*... The original runs as follows: *na ca vaidikātirikte tantrasya adbikārasamkocapramānābhāva iti valetum śakyam*, p. 7.

⁵⁴ *traivarṇikair vaidikānte tāntrikaṃ kriyate 'khillam /*, 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 *Somaśambhupaddhati*, we find a Tantric Śiva-*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 *Svacchanda*-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 (*saṃskāraḥ*) [...] And even when they had gone through the ceremony of initiation (*dīkṣā*), the Tantric rite of passage which gave them access to Śaiva ritual, they were still bound to conform to the rules of the Veda-based social system (*varnāśramadharmah*) and its local variants (*deśadharmaḥ*). 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 initiation»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 exegetes 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 *ṛṣyādīnyāsa* Tantric mantras themselves are vedicized.

⁵⁵ Also *Mahānirvāna Tantra* 5.44: *vaidikīm tāntrikīm caiva yathānukramayogataḥ / sandhyām samācaren mantrī tāntrikīm śnu kathyate //*. The *Śyāmapaddhati* by Sāhib Kaul states that the physical and the Vedic bath have to be performed before the Tantric *snāna* (*malāpakarsaṇasnānam* *svaśākhoktavaidikasnānam ca vidhāyācāmya*...); the same principle applies to the *sandhyā* (*vaidīkasandhyām samāpya tāntrikīm ārabheta*) and *tarpaṇa*. The text will be edited in my forthcoming «Sāhib Kaul's Stotras and Paddhatis».

⁵⁶ That is *Rgveda* 3.62.10.

⁵⁷ See SANDERSON (1995), p. 28.

⁵⁸ Compare the description in the *Somaśambhupaddhati* 90f.: *śivāyārghyāñjalim dattvā gāyatrīm śaktito jayet // 90 // om taumabeśāya vidmabe vāgviśuddhāya dhīmahi tan naḥ śivah pracodayāt /*.

⁵⁹ Commenting on *Svacchandatantra* 2.6cd *sandhyāyā vandanam kuryāc chāstradrṣṭena karmaṇā* he says *śāstradrṣṭena vedādisiddhena*.

⁶⁰ SANDERSON (1995), p. 23.

⁶¹ See *Tantrāloka* 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 *bījas*, 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 *smṛti*, 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 Brahmins, while maintaining its authority as *smṛti*, 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* «falls», 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 doctrines⁶³. This [Tantric] element is never to be adopted by the Vaidikas»⁶⁴. Thereafter the validity of the Veda is asser-

⁶² SANDERSON (1995), p. 27.

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

⁶⁴ *smṛtayaś ca śruter arthaṃ grhītvaiḥ ca nirgatāḥ / manvādīnāṃ śrūtīnāṃ ca tataḥ prāmānyam iṣyate // kvacit kadācīṭ tantrārthakāṭāksheṇa paroditam // dbarmaṃ vadanti so 'mśas tu naiva grāhyo 'sti vaidikāḥ // 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 Vāma, Kāpālīka⁶⁶, 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 *adhikāra* 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 (*śaṅkarena*); 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 *adhikārabheda*: in principle the Vaidikas should adopt Vedic rites and the Tāntrikas 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 *kriyā* 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 «Kapālaka» is given in the text.

⁶⁷ The instrumental *vaidikaib* is odd.

⁶⁸ *dagdhā ye brāhmaṇavarā vedamārgabhiṣkṛtāḥ / teṣāṃ uddbaranārtbhāya sopānakramataḥ sadā // śaivās ca vaiṣṇavās caiva saurāḥ śāktās tathaiḥ ca / gāṇapatya āgamās ca pranītaḥ śaṅkarena tu // tatra vedāvīruddho 'mśo 'py ukta eva kvacit kvacit / vaidikais tadgrabe doṣo na bhavaty eva karhicit //* 7.39.29-30.

⁶⁹ There are of course Vaiṣṇava-Āgamas, and there are traces of a lost canon of scriptures taught by Sūrya, 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 *bāhyapūjā* 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 *turyātīta*], but I [Devī] am unmanifest consciousness and utterly beyond them. Therefore these [five] always become my seat in the *Saktitantras*»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 Purāṇa 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 *ṛṣis*, *chandas*, and *devatās*; the names for the «parts» of this mantra: *bīja*, *śakti*, *kūlaka*, *hṛdaya*, *śiras*, *śikhā*, *kavaca*, *netra*, and *astra*⁷⁵. As expected, this is followed by the *dhyāna* of the deity and the *nyāsa* of parts of the mantra on the worshipper's body. The chapter concludes with a *gāyatrīhṛdaya*, a *gāyatrīstotra* and *-sahasranāma*.

In chapter 12.7.5 the author says that the fact that *dṛkṣā* qualifies for ritual acts, grants (*dā*) divine knowledge and removes (*ksi*) 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 *kāraṇeśvaras* in Śaivism.

⁷¹ *pañcabhūtātmaḥ by ete pañcāvasthātmaḥ api / aham tv avyaktacidrūpā tadatītāsmi sarvathā // tato viśvataḥ yātīh śaktitantraṣu sarvadā / 7.40.11-12ab.*

⁷² *śuddham smārtam cācamanam paurānam vaidikam tathā / tāntrikaṃ śrautam ity ābuh śadvīdham śruticoditam //, 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 *mātrkānyāsa* (7.40.6); the main mantra of Devī is *hrīm*, the *hrillekhā* (*hrillekhā sarvamantrānām nāyikā* 7.40.28). Even in a mythological passage: *brīmkārajanīṣṭhais tu pakṣivṛndair nisevitā* 3.3.41. *namāmi hrīṇmayīm devīm* 12.14.27. For the *nyāsa* of *hrīm* in a Śrīvidyā manual, see *Subhagodaya* 3ab.

⁷⁴ *nyāsan karotu vā mā vā gāyatrīm eva cābhyaset / 12.1.11.*

⁷⁵ 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 *Āśvalāyanagr̥hyaparīśiṣṭa*, which is to be distinguished from the one edited by AITHAL⁷⁷. The apocryphal work, which teaches an *aṅganyāsa* of the *gāyatrīmantra*, 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 *Mānavaśrautasūtra*, which contains a hybrid ritual called *rudrajapa* 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 *bīja*.

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

A further, but quite different instance is the *Paraśurāmakaḥpāsūtra*, 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.

Sectarian Upaniṣads.

One could also quote examples from another Vedic genre, namely the *Upaniṣads*. We find in the *Haṃsopaniṣat* the *ṛṣi* etc., *bīja*, *śakti*, *kīlaka*, as well as *aṅga*- and *karanyāsa*. Compare also the *Dakṣiṇamūrtyupaniṣat*, the *Śrīrāmapūrvatāpinyupaniṣat* quoted above, the *Gaṇapatyupaniṣat*, and the *Sarasvatīrabasyopaniṣat*.

⁷⁷ See PARAMESHWARA AITHAL: *Āśvalāyanagr̥hyaparīśiṣṭa*, ALB XXVII, Adyar 1963, p. 230f.

⁷⁸ *sadyo jāta ity asya sadyojāta ṛṣir brahmā devatā trīṣṭup chandaḥ haṃsavāhanaḥ paścimavaktraḥ pṛthivītatvaḥ brahmarūpāya brāhṃ paścimavaktrāvāhane viniyogaḥ «sadyo jātaḥ paścimavaktrāya nama āvābhayāmi» //, Mānavaśrautasūtra*, 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 *Somaśambhupāddhati*⁸¹ do not use the hybrid ritual and it is also absent from the earliest scriptural sources of the Śrīvidyā itself, i.e. the *Nityāśoḍaśikārnava* and the *Yoginīhṛdaya*. 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 Śaṅkara, the *Tripurāsārasamuccaya* by one Nāgabhaṭṭa, the *Subhagodaya* by Śivānanda and the *Śāradātīlaka*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, Śaiva, 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 *Īśānaśivagurudevapāddhati*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 Rāmakaṇṭha II. One reference to the Kashmirian non-dualists that I noticed is a paraphrase of *Pratyabhijñāhṛdaya* 1⁸⁶. The author is explicitly eclectic in that he

⁸¹ The same holds true for Aghoraśiva's *Kriyākramadyotikā*, 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 *Tripurāsārasamuccaya* are quoted in Śivānanda's *Rjuvimarśinī*.

⁸³ *Tripurāsārasamuccaya* 2.18. *Prapañcasāra* 6.2. *Śāradātīlaka* 1.5.

⁸⁴ In his *Rjuvimarśinī* p. 25 he quotes *Śivastotrāvalī* 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 Upaniṣads, 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.

⁸⁵ See, for instance, the *nyāsas* in 1.66ff; also the description of the Vedic Sandhyā, where the necessity of Ṛṣi etc. is reiterated (9.87, vol. 1, p. 88).

⁸⁶ ...*citiḥ svatantrākebilasiddhibetuh* /... vol. 3, p. 25.

mentions the incorporation of Śrauta and Smārta elements⁸⁷. The compromise with Vedism is made clear in the quotation from a *Svāyambhūvatantra*, which states that the Veda is valid, since it is, like the Āgamas, authored by Śiva⁸⁸. Instead of establishing a superior position for the Āgamas, the author seems more concerned with adducing arguments in order to defuse possible objections from the Mīmāṃsakas, such as: if Śiva is the author of the Veda, then the Veda is not beginningless. But the contradiction is only apparent, because Śiva is beginningless!⁸⁹.

Other manuals, like the *Śāradātilaka*, regularly teach the hybrid mantras. Verse 1.5, for instance, enjoins the use of mantras «together with the seers, metres and deities» and the commentator Rāghavabhaṭṭa supplies us with arguments in support of this rule. He quotes several non-Tantric sources to the effect that a mantra is not effective without them.

It would be simple to adduce further instances of the hybrid ritual throughout later literature⁹⁰, but what are the conclusions?

One fundamental problem remains, namely the judgement of the scope of our sources: does a certain liturgy cover the whole ritual or only part of it, that is the part that is modified? In the present study one could of course argue that the omission of an element in a ritual, like the *ṛṣi* etc., may mean no more than that its performance was taken for granted. But if, on the other hand, it was clear to the heterodox Śaivas that the *ṛṣi* etc. belonged to Vedic mantras only – and we have reason to believe this – no explicit prohibition of the practice of reciting the *ṛṣi*, metre and deity can be expected. If we take into consideration the internal logic of the Tantric systems, the hybrid practice appears as an important modification of the core of Tantric ritual which aims at bringing it in line with Vedic orthodoxy. And this fits perfectly with the observation that the hybrid ritual is a feature only of the Śrīvidyā tradition. It could have been introduced in the process of an alliance with the orthodox Śaṅkarite tradition⁹¹ in order to present the originally heterodox Śrīvidyā⁹² as compatible with Vedism.

The preceding analysis is perhaps unspectacular in itself, but can be usefully applied. For instance, the fact that the *Rauravatantra* teaches such a practice⁹³ in its *kriyāpāda* is an additional argument to exclude the possibility that it is part of the old *Rauravasūtrasaṃgraha* printed with it.

⁸⁷ 10.188; vol. 1, p. 96. On the work, see GOUDRIAAN and GUPTA (1981), p. 128.

⁸⁸ Vol. 3, p. 7.

⁸⁹ Vol. 3, p. 9.

⁹⁰ Śivāidyānātha Dixita's *Smṛtimukhāphalam*, *Āhnikakāṇḍa*, Part II, ed. J.R. Gharpure, Bombay 1938 (teaches *nyāsa* with *bījas*). *Nityācārapradīpaḥ* by Narasiṃha Vājapeyī, Vol. II, Calcutta 1928 (Bibliotheca Indica CLV) (teaches *ṛṣyādinyāsa*). One could add other Tantras, like *Kulārnavatantra* 4.15.

⁹¹ Compare the prominent position of the *śricakranirmāna* in the 65th chapter of *Ānandagiri*'s *Śaṅkaravijaya*.

⁹² See SANDERSON (1990), p. 156-58.

⁹³ *śivapañcākṣaram hy etad vīṅādyadhidaivatam / anuṣṭubādichāndāṃsi anādyā ṛṣayah smṛtāḥ // 3.4.*

1. PRIMARY SOURCES

- Ārṣeyabrāhmaṇa*, Ārṣeya Brāhmaṇa with Vedārthaprakāśa of Sāyaṇa. Ed. Bellikoth Ramachandra Sharma, Tirupati: Kendriya Sanskrit Vidyapeetha 1967.
- Āśvalāyanagr̥hyaparīśiṣṭa* in: Gr̥hyasūtra of Āśvalāyana, Bibliotheca Indica XLI, Calcutta 1869 (p. 265 ff.).
- Īśānaśivagurudevapaddhati* [also: *Tantrapaddhati*, *Siddhāntasāra*], ed. Gaṇapati SĀSTRĪ, Trivandrum Sanskrit Series 69, 72, 77 & 83, Trivandrum 1920-25.
- Ṛgvedīyā Trikālasaṁdhyā* Pothi; *atha ṛgvedīyā trikālasaṁdhyā, mūlya 25 paise, nīrnayasāgara bukeprakāśan mumbai 2*; 12 folios; colophon: *idaṁ pustakaṁ nārāyaṇa rāma ācārya 'kāvya-nyāya-tīrtha' ity etaiḥ saṁśodhitam [...], śāke 1888, san 1966*.
- Ṛjuvimarśinī* → *Nityāśoḍaśikārṇava*.
- Kāthaka*. Kātham. Die Saṁhitā der Kāthā-Çākhā. Ed. Leopold von Schroeder. Erstes Buch. Leipzig 1900.
- Kulārṇavatantra*. Kulārṇava Tantra. Introduction: Arthur Avalon. Readings: M.P. Pandit. Sanskrit Text: Tārānātha Vidyāratna, Delhi 1984.
- Tantrāloka/-viveka*. The Tantrāloka of Abhinavagupta with the Commentary of Jayaratha. Ed. by R.C. Dwivedi and Navjivan Rastogi. (Enlarged Edition with Introductio) 8 vols., Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass 1987 [Sanskrit text is a reprint of the editio princeps KSTS 1918-1938].
- Tripurāsārasamuccaya, tripurāsārasamuccayah śrīnāgabhāṭṭaviracitaḥ*. [Ed.] *rām kumār rāy, vārānaśī: prācyā prakāśan* 1983.
- Durgāsaptasatī*. Paṇḍeya Rāmanārāyaṇadatta Śāstrī: *sacitra durgāsaptasatī [saṭīkā] gorakhpur: gītāpres*.
- Nityakarmavidhi*. Nityakarmavidhiḥ // na. 3. Ed. by Kesho Bhat Jotshi, Srinagar.
- Nityāśoḍaśikārṇava*. Nityāśoḍaśikārṇava with two Commentaries *Ṛjuvimarśinī* by Śivānanda & Artharatnāvalī by Vidyānanda. Edited by VRAJAVALLABHA DVIVEDA, Varanasi 21985 (Yogatantragranthamālā 1).
- Nṛsimhapūrvatapanīyopaniṣat, Nṛsimhapūrvatapanīyopaniṣat*. [Ed.] hari nārāyaṇa āpaṭe, ānandāśramagranthāvaliḥ 30 (1895).
- Paraśurāmakalpasūtra*. Paraśurāmakalpasūtra with Rāmeśvara's Commentary, Ed. A. Mahādeva Sastri, Rev. and Enl. by Sakarlal Yajneswar Sastri Dave, Baroda: Oriental Institute 1979.
- Prapañcasūratantra. Prapañcasūratantra*. Ed. Avalon, Calcutta 1935 (Tantrik Texts XVIII & XIX).
- Bṛhaddevatā*. The Bṛhad-devatā attributed to Śaunaka. Ed. Arthur Anthony Macdonell, Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University 1904.
- Manusmṛti*. The Manusmṛti with the Commentary Manvarthamuktāvalī of Kullūka, ed. by Nārāyaṇ Rām Āchārya, Published by Satyabhāmābāī Pāṇḍuraṅg For the Nārāya Sāgar Press, Bombay 1946.

- Mānavasrāutasūtra*, ed. Jeanette M. van Gelder, New Delhi 1961 (Śata-Piṭaka-Series 17).
- Mahānirvāntantra*. Mahānirvāṇa Tantra with the Commentary of Hariharananda Bharatī, ed. Arthur Avalon, Tāntric Texts 13, Delhi 1989.
- Maitrāyaṇīsambhitā*. Maitrāyaṇī Saṃhitā. Ed. Leopold von Schroeder. Erstes Buch. Leipzig 1881.
- Rauravāgama* → BHATT (1985).
- Śaṅkaracījaya*. Ed. Jagannārāyaṇa Tarkapañcānana, Bibliotheca Indica 37, Calcutta 1868.
- Śāradātilaka*. Śāradātilakatantram, ed. Arthur Avalon, Delhi 1982 [1st Calcutta 1933] (Tantric Text Series XVII).
- Śivapurāṇa*. The Śiva Mahāpurāṇa. Ed. Pushpendra Kumar, Delhi: Nag Publishers 1981.
- Śivasūtra* → Śivasūtravimarśinī
- Śivasūtravimarśinī*. The *Śivasūtravimarśinī* of Kṣemarāja, ed. J.C. Chatterji, Delhi 1990 (KSTS 1) [1st Srinagar 1911].
- Śivastotraāvalī*. Śivastotraāvalī, by Utpala Devāchārya, with the Commentary of Kṣemarāja. Ed. by Rai Pramadādāsā Mittra Bahādur [...], Benares 1902 (The Chowkhambā Sanskrit Series No. 51, Fasc. I).
- Sandhyā*. Sandhyā. Gītapres, Gorakhpur.
- Sundarakāṇḍa*. Sundarakāṇḍaḥ, cennapuryāṃ vāviḷḷa rāmasvāmīśāstrulu. aṇḍ sans, madras 1928.
- Subhagodaya*, Edited as an appendix to → *Nityāśoḍaṣikāeṇava*
- Somasambhupaddhati* → BRUNNER-LACHAUX (1963), BRUNNER-LACHAUX (1977).
- Svacchandatantra*. The Svacchandra-Tantra with Commentary by Kshemarāja. Ed. with notes by Madhusudan Kaul, 6 vols., Bombay: Nirnaya 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) *Rauravāgma*. Vol. 1, Institut Français d'Indologie, Pondichéry.
- BRUNNER HÉLÈNE (1986), Les membres de Śiva. *Asiatische Studien* 40, 1:89-132.
- BRUNNER-LAUCHAUX HÉLÈNE (1963), *Somaśambhupaddhati*. Première Partie. Institut Français d'Indologie, Pondichéry.
- BRUNNER-LAUCHAUX HÉLÈNE (1977), *Somaśambhupaddhati*. 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.
- DERRETT J. AND DUCAN M. (1973), *Dharmaśāstra and Juridical Literature*. A History of Indian Literature IV, Otto Harrassowitz, Wiesbaden.
- GONDA JAN (1976), *Viṣṇuism and Śaivism*. Munshiram Manoharlal, Delhi.
- GONDA JAN (1978), *Hymns of the R̥gveda Not Employed in the Solemn Ritual*. North-Holland Publishing Company, Amsterdam etc.
- GOUDRIAAN TEUN AND GUPTA, SANJUKTA (1981), *Hindu Tantric and Śākta Literature*. HIL, 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 Dharmaśāstra*. Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, Poona.
- NOWOTNY FAUSTA (1957), *Das Pūjāvidhinarūpaṇa des Trimalla*. *IJ* 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 Friedhelm 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.
- SRINIVASN DORIS (1973), *Samdhya: Myth and Ritual*. *IJ* 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 Saiva Rites of Initiation: The Dikṣavidhi of Aghorasivacarya's Kriyakramadyotika*. Ph.D. thesis, University of California: Berkeley.
- VASU SRISA CHANDRA (1991), *The Daily Practice of the Hindus*. Munshiram Manoharlal, Delhi.