VEDIC AND TANTRIC MANTRAS

*vaidikas tāntriko miśra iti me trividho makhabḥ/*
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 terms, 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 contradiction.

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 «Śaktism», 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» — 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 refutation.

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 Täntrikas 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 impure. A problematic area is Smārta Hinduism, i.e. the broad mainstream that is based on śruti and smṛti and therefore includes Purānic forms of worship. We may of course talk of Purānic 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 mantras, whereas the Devībhāgavata, to be discussed below, is not. To treat Purāṇas in this respect as independent would thus unnecessarily confuse the distinction.

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

3 Otherwise the fact that even contemporary Bavarian uses «hm» in three senses, and perhaps more importantly, the sound «a», i.e. the ekākāsarataprajñāpāramitā, in eight different meanings — if we include abhyāsa-forms like «a-a» vikalpe — would show a remarkable mantric awareness with an obvious propensity for bijas. 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 wādār, wādārnā 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 saiva Purāṇa, by the very subordinate role played by Tantra generally and Tantric bijamantras 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 this 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 bijas\(^8\). The term «ritualistic dadaism» therefore (inspired by the stobha «dada»), though amusing, is misleading\(^9\). Tantric bijas 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 knowledge\(^10\).»

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

---

\(^8\) This statement needs to be qualified. There are mantras without bijas 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 bija. The Mahānirvāṇatantra would seem to be a counter example, since its mūlamantra of Brahma in the 3rd chapter is indeed without bija. 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 Mahānirvāṇatantra 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 Kāli with the expected āndra-s (the mūlamantra is brīṃṣ kṛiṃ kṛiṃ, 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 ekam brahma (comm. on 3.41-3); its nyāsas, dhyāna and a brahma-gāyatri (3.105) etc. that follow are a Tantric cult, but without bijas, of a non-Tantric pseudo-deity. This practice, which is open to Śaivas, Vaishnavas and others (3.141), has strong Vedāntic overtones (saccidānandaśāntakām 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 mantra core.

\(^10\) Siddhāntadīśu tantraṣu ye mantrāḥ samudābṛtāḥ // vīryabhinās tu te sarve śaktitejajībhitā yataḥ / kaulikās tu mahāmantrāḥ svabhāvād dīpatejasah // sphuranti divyatejaskāḥ sadyahpratyayakārakāh //, Tantrālokaaviveka 29.3.
The occurrence of a *bijā* indicates that a mantra is Tantric, and the *bijā* 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 *bijā* that changes. By reciting *om kṣaṃ ṭāṇāmūrdhne namāḥ* one indicates that one is following the mantric system of the *Svacchandatantra*¹¹, whereas by saying *om hom ṭāṇāmūrdhne namāḥ* one follows the ritual system of the Śaiva-Siddhānta¹². We could therefore say that, regardless of their meaning, mantras, including *bijas*, *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» (*parā-mṛṣa*). 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 *bijā* 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 *tadvimarśasvabhāva hi sā vācyā mantradevatā / mahāsāṃvatsāmasanney uktam śrīgamanāsane //*, *Tantrāloka* 16.286.
¹⁵ *Tantrāloka* 16.253cd-256.
¹⁶ See *Tantrāloka* 5.141, which refers to *bijas* and *pindas*.
¹⁷ That is, full of «vitality» (*vīrya*). For this term, see *Tantrāloka* 4.141 and 30.121; *Śivasūtra* 1.22.
¹⁸ See *Tantrālokaviveka* 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 *bijā*?
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\(^\text{19}\) that are used in the Tantric kalānyāsa\(^\text{20}\). 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 effective\(^\text{21}\).

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 practices»\(^\text{22}\), 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 mālāmantras.

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,

\(^{\text{19}}\) Preserved in the Taittirīyāranyaka. The passage occurs in Śaṇṭa's text (The Taittirīyāranyaka of the Black Yajur Veda with the Commentary of Śaṇṭaśāryā. Ed. Rajendralāla Mitra, Calcutta 1872 [Bibliotheca Indica]) as prapātha 10, anuvāka 43-47; as prapātha 6, anuvāka 43-47 in Bhāskara's text (The Taittirīya āranyaka with the Commentary of Bhāṭṭa Bhāskara Mīśra. Ed. Mahādeva Sastri and K. Rangacarya, MLBD 1985); as Khaţa 17, 1-5' in Jacob's edition; and no. 277-286 in Varenne's edition which is based on what he calls the Śāndhra version, represented by the Anandāśrama Series. Bhāskara predates Śaṇṭa, who died in 1387 A.D. (See Sebastian J. Carri: Contribution of Bhāṭṭa 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 Pāñcāpatasūtra, where these mantras occur divided into Śūtras. Compare also Nṛṣimhapūrvatapaniyopanisat 1.6 for the śākta mantras, Maitrāyanisambhitā 2.9.10 for the aghoramantra, and Kāṭhaka 17.10.11 for the tātpūrāsamantra.

\(^{\text{20}}\) See Rauravāgama, kriyāpāda, paṭala 2 (p. 22-28).

\(^{\text{21}}\) According to the Jñānapācaśākā, a short text that is transmitted in a manuscript together with other recensions of the Kālottaratantra, 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: paṇcaavatrodhbhavair maṇtriḥ śivoktaḥ Siddhāṃktaidaiḥ / sanyāk yāgādī samsthāpyam nānyāt vādādīcādytaibī /, Jñānapācaśākā folio 1 verso (NGMPP B 118/7). My theoretical explanation that 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, Śūdras and other disqualified social groups (see Śaṇṭanāvigurudevapaddhati, vol. 3, p. 33 and 62). That the latter work is influenced by Śrīvidyā is evident from the fact that it quotes the Prapācaśāra quite regularly (those instances which are not formal quotations are not recorded by the editor, like for instance 1.73: prapācaśāraurakasātūta yathāvād iba sangrabhā / atrodādhiyante bijāni bijamaneñā samantrākāh/).

\(^{\text{22}}\) Goṇḍa, for instance, has used the term «Hindu practice» in a rather loose sense, as applied to the mantra hom iśānamūrdhne namb. See Goṇḍa (1976), p. 47.
for instance, the Bhagavadgītā, or one of the various Sahasranāmamastotras \(^{23}\), is used as a single long mantra \(^{24}\). This complete recitation of a text (pārāyana) 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 libraries \(^{25}\).

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\(^{26}\).

\[\begin{align*}
\text{asya śrībhagavadgītāmālāmantrasya} \\
\text{bhagavān vedavyāsa rśiḥ / anuṣṭup} \\
\text{chandāḥ / śrīkrṣṇaparamātmā devatā /} \\
\text{āsocyān anusaocyas tvam praṇāvādamsī} \\
\text{ca bhāṣase iti bījām / sarvadharmān} \\
\text{parityāja mām ekam śāraṇam vṛjā iti śaktīḥ /} \\
\text{āham tvām sarvāpāpebhyyo} \\
\text{mokṣayāyāmāmātucāḥ iti kilakam /} \\
\text{śrīkrṣṇapṛtyarthaḥ} \\
\text{dharmārtakāmamokśārthe jape} \\
\text{viniyogāḥ //}
\end{align*}\]

Of this Bhagavadgītāmālāmantra the Rṣi is the holy Vedavyāsa, the metre is anuṣṭup, 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 dharman, take refuge only in me» [18.66ab] is its power; [the line] «I will deliver you from all evils, do not grieve» is its kilāka. [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 fingers \(^{27}\), 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 bijā-, pīndā- and mālāmantras. The Itiṣanāvagurudevapaddhati has a division into bijas, bijamantras, mantras and mālāmantras (1.18ff; vol. 1, p. 2), according to which the latter consist of more than twenty aksaras. They are also correlated to the stages in life; bijas give perfection to children (!), bijamantras 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 dabati pāvakah iti aigustbābhyaṁ namah / nainam kledayanty āpo na śoṣayati mārutāḥ iti tarjanibhyāṁ namah / acchedyo ‘yam adābyo ‘yam akledyo ‘socya
knot, and weapon. 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 describes a rāmāyaṇapūjā preliminary to a pārāyaṇa in almost thirty pages. 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 Rṣi, 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 Ārṣeyabrāhmana states that one who uses a mantra without knowing these three, together with the viniyoga, incurs sin. 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 unmetrical.

Then the bōja, sakti and kilaka are given. These elements are Tantric in the sense that the terms are known from Tantric ritual. APTE gives kilaka in his dictionary as «the inner syllables of a mantra», but his reference to the Hamspaniṣat 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 Rṣi is hamsa, the metre avyaktaṅga, the deity paramahamsa, the bōja «ham», the sakti «sa», the kilaka «so ‘ham».

In her edition and translation of the Pūjāvidhinirūpāṇa NOWOTNY gives another example in which bōja, sakti and kilaka are the first, second and third word of a 3-word mantra, but, if we look at

\begin{quote}
eva ca iti madhyamābhīyām namah / nityaḥ sarvagataḥ sthānac ca / \textit{acalo 'yam nānāvidhāni devyān nānāvānākṛtāni ca iti karanyāsah} //
\end{quote}

\begin{quote}
\textit{Srūnadvalmikirāmāyaṇa} of Maharṣi Vālmiki (Along with its virtue and mode of recitation), Ed. by Shivram Sharma Vasisht, Varanasi: Chowkamba Vidyā Bhavan 1982. See the \textit{Śundarakāṇḍa} for a brief pūjā for «Śmārtas and others».
\end{quote}

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

\begin{quote}
\textit{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 Rṣi who is often mentioned together with its deity, sakti, etc., and assigned to the parts of the speaker’s body (\textit{rājāyogās})». Goudriaan and GUPTA (1981), p. 6. But this, as we shall see, applies only to vedicised Śrīvidyā.
\end{quote}

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

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 samkalpa. One example for such a medical application is contained in one edition of the Śūryasahasranāma\(^\text{35}\). This formula may also include the deśakāloccaraṇa\(^\text{36}\) known from pūjā\(^\text{37}\) and sandhyā\(^\text{38}\).

The liturgy is concluded by one or more nyāsas (usually anga- 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»\(^\text{39}\).

The following table gives an overview of variations\(^\text{40}\):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RŚV</th>
<th>VSN</th>
<th>SSN</th>
<th>ŚSN</th>
<th>DS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ṛṣi</td>
<td>ṛṣi</td>
<td>ṛṣi</td>
<td>ṛṣi</td>
<td>ṛṣi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chandaḥ</td>
<td>chandaḥ</td>
<td>chandaḥ</td>
<td>chandaḥ</td>
<td>chandaḥ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>devatā</td>
<td>chandaḥ</td>
<td>devatā</td>
<td>chandaḥ</td>
<td>chandaḥ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bijam</td>
<td>bijam</td>
<td>bijam</td>
<td>bijam</td>
<td>saktih</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>saktih</td>
<td>saktih</td>
<td>saktih</td>
<td>saktih</td>
<td>saktih</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hṛdayam</td>
<td>kilakam</td>
<td>kilakam</td>
<td>astram</td>
<td>kavacam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>paramo mantraḥ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>viniyoga</td>
<td>viniyoga</td>
<td>viniyoga</td>
<td>viniyoga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{35}\) adyetyādipūrvo... amukanāṃmno mama śarīra utpannāṃ... vā vātapiṣṭakaparvā... santripātajvarāgamāṃdyaśīrāh sūlakṣṇīnaḥdāvīrogaṇām... sam MANITASANAD... “kṣiprāeroγaṃ SARHRAHI... puṣtīrīgāhyaṣyāstavāyadīvurdhībīṣṭāṣṭraparājaṇādīnīnākāmānaṇāsāddhayaye śrīśūryārāyanapriyaye ca śrīśūryādīvivasahasranāmābhīḥ... sahasrasakṣamīkāmukādvyanamasarpanam karisyey... iti samkalpyā. According to the dictum bhāskaraḥ arogyam icchēt the sun is the proper addressee for such a wish.

\(^{36}\) See Durgāsāptātis, p. 13f (pāthavādyḥ).

\(^{37}\) For which, see BUHENEMANN (1988), p. 114.


\(^{39}\) Compare also the Śrīrāmapūrṇatāpīnīyapanisat 3.2-5a: mantra ‘yam vācako rāmo vācyāḥ... ṣādyoga etayoh/ phalaḍaḥ ciṣa svār vāmāvī sām sādhakānām na samāyāḥ// yathā nāmi viṣcakena nāṁnā yo ‘bhimukho bhavet/ tvā bhiṣṭṭamako mantrō bhimukho bhavet/ bhimukho bhavet/ bijasaktiḥ nyased daksavāmayoh stanayor api/ kilo madhye ‘vinābhāvāḥ svavāvābhāvāvīnyogavān// sarvēsām eva mantrāṇām esa sādhāraṇah kramaḥ.

\(^{40}\) RSV Rudraśapātāvīmocanāvidhiḥ (in: VSN); VSN Viṣṇusahasranāmaṭotra; SSN Śūryasahasranāma; SSN Śivasahasranāmaṭotra; DS Durgāsāptātis. 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

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 rṣi etc.41.

We have seen that, whereas the Vedic liturgy introduces its mantras by stating the rṣi, the metre, deity and the mantra’s application, it is standard Śmārta practice to add Tantric elements, such as bija, sakti and the like. Although one can find nyāsas 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 Śmārta. 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 Śmārta 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 Kāsinātha Upādhyāya (died A.D. 1805). In the context of the recitation of the gāyatrī-

41 Devīrāhasya, p. 420.
42 The Rgvedīya Trikālasamādyā, for instance, uses only Vedic mantras with the expected rṣi etc., but describes an aṅganyāsa of the gāyatrīmantra. Similarly the sandhyopāsanā in: Nityakarmavīdhiḥ, p. 7ff; and in the Śmārta version as practised by the Maharashtrian (Sākala) Rgvedins: SRINIVĀSAŅ (1973), p. 176-178 (no. 16).
43 An early authority on dharma, Härita, apparently started his work by saying: «sūtti is twofold: Vedic and Tantric». This quotation in Kullāka’s commentary on Manusmṛti 2.1 is very problematic. Firstly, Härita is too early to mention Tantrism as we know it (see DERRETT (1973), p. 38f and KANE (1968-), vol. 1, p. 127ff.), secondly it would be quite unusual for a dharmastāstra, 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 sūtti is used here in a wider sense.
mantra during the sandhyā-rite, the author, having dealt with the enunciation of the Rṣi (here viśvāmitra), the deity (savitā), the metre and the use (viniyoga) 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 Grhya[sūtra] 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».

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 remarks. 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 sīstas were always aware of the disparateness of its elements.

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 Tripūrā.

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 Purāṇas. In one quotation from the Agnipurāṇa 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 Veda». Summarising this negative view of the Tantras Rāmeśvara says: «Through this censure of Tantric practitioners it is made clear that Tantra is not».

---

44 This must refer to the apocryphal Aśvalāyanagrhyaparīṣṭa, where, after a description of the anāganyāsa of the parts of the gāyatrī-mantra, it is stated: enany [i.e. anāganyāsa] eke necchanti, sa hi vidhīr avaidika iti... Aśvalāyanagrhyaparīṣṭa 1.5. See below on this text.

45 iti saṅganyāsah kāryo na va kāryab // nyāsavidhe avaidikatvād iti grhyaparīṣṭe spatam // eṣtenākṣānāsasapadānasyānivāśādaṁ muddrāviditveh śāpavimosanādividdhe ca tāntrikatvaṇavaidikatvād anāvyastakratvam veditavyam // Dharmasthānītu, p. 227.

46 See p. 265, 269 etc.

47 One Pandit whom I asked about details of his daily pānīyana 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 tantrādikṣām anuprāptāḥ lobbopabatacetasa / tyaktvā vaidikam adhvānaṁ tena dabyāmabhavayam //, p. 4.

49 Lit.: «Tantric men». 
to be trusted. For we see the same censure of Tantras frequently in many other Purūṇas too. And it is obvious that a scripture that enjoins the use of the five “m” is based only on greed”\textsuperscript{50}.

Rāmeśvara rejects this conservative position and argues that, since Purūṇas 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 adhikārabhedā: for Vaidikas only Vedic worship, for Tāntrikas only Tantric pūjā. Then the author leads us, through a series of quotations\textsuperscript{51}, to the position that there are in fact two forms of valid worship, Vedic and Tantric.

Still the opponent cannot soften his position on adhikārabhedā 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»\textsuperscript{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 Adhyātmaraṁāyaṇa 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 adhikārabhedā, 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]»\textsuperscript{53}.

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

\textsuperscript{50} iti tāntrikapurusānt专业人士 tantrasāśraddhāyatvam spaśtam / evam anīṣev api babupurāṇeṣu tantraprayāyāb babalam upalambhāt / mapancaśāmaraśādāyakāśāsāstrasāya lobbhakūmarātśavam suspaśtam /, p. 4.

\textsuperscript{51} Including an instance of a Tantric pūjā in a Purūṇa: tarbā brahmottarakhande pradosamābhāt-
mye tāntrikasaranyā brāhmaṇarājputmayor upadistā, p. 6.

\textsuperscript{52} The phrase strīśudrāṇām samkara āt ca is not clear. One expects either «women and Śūdras», both of whom are not qualified for Vedic mantras, or unlawful intermarriage (śāmbara) with (female) Śūdras.

\textsuperscript{53} Lit.: «And it is not possible to say that there is an absence of a pramaṇa that limits the adhikāra... The original runs as follows: na ca vaidikātirikte tantrasāya adhikārasāmkocapramāṇābhāva iti vaktum śākyan, p. 7.

\textsuperscript{54} tāvast snikārā tāntrikāṃ kriyate ‘khilam /, 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 Tantric.\(^{55}\)

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 Kṣemarāja\(^{59}\), to the effect that a Vedic sandhyā is to be performed by the practitioner of the Svachchanda-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 (samskāraḥ) [...] 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 (varṇāśrama-dharmaḥ) and its local variants (desadharmahaḥ). 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 it\(^{61}\). However, with the rṣyādinyāsa Tantric mantras themselves are vedicized.

\(^{55}\) Also Mahānirvāṇatrantra 5.44: vaidikīṃ tāntrikīṃ caiva yathānukraramayogataḥ / sandhyāṃ samācaren mantri tāntrikīṃ śṛṇu kathyate //. The Śyāmapaddhati by Sāhab Kaul states that the physical and the Vedic bath have to be performed before the Tantric snāna (malāpakaranah svaśākhoktavaidikasānam ca vidhāyācayamya...); the same principle applies to the sandhyā (vaidikkasandhyāṃ samāpya tāntrikīṃ ārabbeta) and tarpāna. The text will be edited in my forthcoming «Sāhab Kaul’s Stotras and Paddhatis».

\(^{56}\) That is Rgveda 3.62.10.


\(^{58}\) Compare the description in the Somaśambhupaddhati 90f.: śivāyārghyāñjālinī dattvā gāyatrīṃ śaktito japet // 90 // om tanmabesāya vidmabe vāgvisuddhāya dīhimbī tan naḥ śivah pracodayāt /.

\(^{59}\) Commenting on Svachchhandatantra 2.6cd sandhyāyāṃ vandanam kuryāc chāstradrṣtena karmanā he says śāstradrṣtena vedādisuddhena.


\(^{61}\) See Tantrālokevīvaka 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»¹. 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 rṣi, metre and deity are mentioned for a mantra that is tantric, or tantrized 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 doctrines. This [Tantric] element is never to be adopted by the Vaidikas». Thereafter the validity of the Veda is asser-

¹ SANDERSON (1995), p. 27.
² Lit. «with a side-glance at Tantric doctrines».
ted, and it is stipulated that the king should expel those who adopt other dharmas from the country. In this category would be the Vāma, Kāpālika, 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 Brähmaṇas, who are distressed [since they are] outside the path of the Veda. In order to liberate them gradually Śiva composed the Saiva-, Vaiṣṇava, Saura, Sākta and Gaṇapatya-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 (?) to adopt these».

In other words, some Brähmaṇas 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 Śmaṭa ritual. With this the author wants to suggest that, though leaving the Vedic domain, we are still within the non-sectarian Śmaṭa religion. Perhaps the slip of the pen that follows indicates what the author really meant, namely Āgamas composed by Śiva (śaṅkāraṇa); presumably all the other groups of Āgamas are in this context empty.

The solution first envisaged by the Devībhāgavata in this passage is that of adhikārabhedā: 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 (saṃvillaya), 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 Purāṇa is the heart. In the case of contradiction, however, the Veda is valid! (11.1.20-33).
66 «Kāpālika» is given in the text.
67 The instrumental vaidikāh is odd.
68 dagdā ye brāhmaṇavārā vedāṃgabahiskritāḥ / teśām uddharanārthāya sopānakramatah sadā // saivā ca vaiṣṇavāḥ caiva saurāḥ śāktīs tathāvai ca / gānapatya āgamāḥ ca pranītāḥ śākāreṇa tu // tatra vedāṇvṛddho 'mśo 'py ukta eva kuvaicit kvacit / vaidikās tādgrabe doṣo na bhavati 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 Śūrya, but if all are thought to be taught by Śiva, the perspective is in any case sectarian Saiva, not neutral Śmaṭa.
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 corpses\textsuperscript{70}. These five are identical with «the five elements and the five states of consciousness [i.e. waking state up to turyātita], but I [Devi] am unmanifest consciousness and utterly beyond them. Therefore these [five] always become my seat in the Śaktitantras»\textsuperscript{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 listed\textsuperscript{72}. But if we examine further passages\textsuperscript{73} 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 optional\textsuperscript{74}. It then lists the rṣis, chandas, and devatās; the names for the «parts» of this mantra: bīja, sakti, kīlaka, hrdaya, śīras, sīkhab, kavaca, netra, and astra\textsuperscript{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 gāyatrihrdaya, a gāyatristotra and -sahasranāma.

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

The technique here is, not unlike that of Rāmesvara 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.

\textsuperscript{70} The list is identical with that of the five so-called kāraṇeśvaras in Saivism.

\textsuperscript{71} pāncabhitātāmakā by ete pāncāvasthātāmakā apti / abham tu avyaktacidrūpā tadatītaśmi sarvatbā // tato viśitarām yatāh saktitantreśu sarvādā / 7.40.11-12ab.

\textsuperscript{72} luddham smārtam cācamanam paurāṇam vaidikam tathā / tāntrikāṃ śrutam ity ābhud saddvidham śruticoditam //, 11.3.1. It should be noted that here all these modes are said to be sanctioned by śruti!

\textsuperscript{73} For Tantric elements in others parts of the text, see the mārkānyāsa (7.40.6); the main mantra of Devī is brīm, the hṛlekhā (hṛlekhā sarvamantrānāṃ nāyikā 7.40.28). Even in a mythological passage: brimkārajanipisthats tu paksivindair niṣeva t 3.3.41. namāmi brīmmayim devīm 12.14.27. For the nyāsa of brīm in a Śrīvidyā manual, see Subbagodaya 3ab.

\textsuperscript{74} nyāsān karotu vā mā vā gāyatrīṃ eva cābhyaṃ / 12.1.11.

\textsuperscript{75} 12.3.6-9.

\textsuperscript{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 Āśvalāyanagrhyaparīśīṣṭa, which is to be distinguished from the one edited by AITHAL. 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 Mānavāretaustasūtra, which contains a hybrid ritual called rudrajapa that includes the preparatory nyāsa of mantras on several parts of the body. Here we find a hybrid ritual, namely the rṣi, metre and deity of a mantra that contains a bija.

The case of the Baudhāyanagrhyaparīśīṣṭa 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 Tāntric elements».

HARTING, while subscribing to the opinion that there is a strong Purāṇic influence, has rejected the notion that Tāntric elements are present. An obvious case is, however, a quotation of the Baudhāyanagrhyaparīśīṣṭa in the Nirṇayasindhu in a tantricized form, that is, with lists of bijas inserted.

A further, but quite different instance is the Parasūrāmakalpasūtra, which is a Śrīvidyā manual with a pseudo-Vedic title. The long introductory passage on the validity of the Tantras by the commentator Rāmesvara 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 Hamsopaniṣat the rṣi etc., bija, sakti, kilaka, as well as aṅga- and karanyāsa. Compare also the Dakṣinamūrtopyupaniṣat, the Śrīrāmapurūvatāpīnyupaniṣat quoted above, the Gauapatyupaniṣat, and the Sarasvatīrābasyopaniṣat.
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 Somaśambhupāddhata do not use the hybrid ritual and it is also absent from the earliest scriptural sources of the Śrīvidyā itself, i.e. the Nityāsodāśikārṇava and the Yoginīhṛdaya. This is perhaps not enough to prove the hybridization to be late, since we would expect the information about the rṣi etc. not necessarily in scripture itself, but in ritual manuals. Of those the more accessible ones are: the Prapañcasāra, attributed to Śaṅkara, the Tripurāśarasamuccaya by one Nāgabhāṭṭa, the Subhaṃdaya by Śivānanda and the Śāradātilaka. All of these works, except the one by Śivānanda teach the hybrid ritual.

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 Śmārtta 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 Āgamas.

One other ritual manual that regularly mentions the Rṣi etc. for Tantric mantras is theĪśānasivaṃgurudevapaddhati. 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 Rāmānanda. Two references to the Kashmirian non-dualists that I noticed is a Paraphrase of Pratyabhijñāhṛdaya. 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 SURDA (1984). The text of this important work is unfortunately not accessible to me.

82 The Prapañcasāra and the Tripurāśarasamuccaya are quoted in Śivānanda’s Rjuvimarśini.

83 Tripurāśarasamuccaya 2.18. Prapañcasāra 6.2. Śāradātilaka 1.5.

84 In his Rjuvimarśini p. 25 he quotes Śivasotrotāvalī 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.

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

86 citīḥ svatantrābhisāddhibhavataḥ /... vol. 3, p. 25.
Jürgen Hanneder

mentions the incorporation of Śrauta and Smāra elements. The compromise with Vedism is made clear in the quotation from a Śvāyambhuva tantra, which states that the Veda is valid, since it is, like the Āgamas, authored by Śiva. Instead of establishing a superior position for the Āgamas, the author seems more concerned with adding 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.

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 literature, 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 rṣi 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 rṣi etc. belonged to Vedic mantras only – and we have reason to believe this – no explicit prohibition of the practice of reciting the rṣi, 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 tradition in order to present the originally heterodox Śrīvidyā as compatible with Vedicism.

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

91 Compare the prominent position of the śricakranirmāṇa in the 65th chapter of Anandagiri’s Śāṅkaravijaya.
93 svapancākṣaram by etad rādāyadbiadivavatam / anuṣṭubādibhāndānśi anādā y rṣayāh smṛtāḥ // 3.4.
1. PRIMARY SOURCES


Āṣvalāyanagrhyaparīśista in: Grhyasūtra of Āṣvalāyaṇa, Bibliotheca Indica XLI, Calcutta 1869 (p. 265 ff.).

Īśānaśivagurudevapaddhatī [also: Tantrapaddhatī, Siddhāntasāra], ed. Gaṇapatī SĀSTRI, Trivandrum Sanskrit Series 69, 72, 77 & 83, Trivandrum 1920-25.

Ṛgvedīyā Trikālasaṃdhyā Pothi; atha ṛgvedīyā trikālasaṃdhyā, mūlya 25 paise, nirnayasāgara bukprakāsaṇ munābī 2; 12 folios; colophon: idam pustakam nārāyana rāma ācārya ‘kāvyā-nīyā-tīrtha’ ity etaiḥ samśodhitam [...], śāke 1888, san 1966.

Ṛjuvimārsini → Nityāśodāśikārṇava.


Nṛsimhapūrvatapanīyopanisat, Nṛsimhapūrvatapanīyopanisat. [Ed.] hari nārāyana āpaṭe, anāndārasamgranṭhavalīḥ 30 (1895).


Manusmṛti. The Manusmṛti with the Commentary Manvarthamuktāvali of Kullūka, ed. by Nārāyaṇ Rām Āchārya, Published by Satyabhāmābāī Pāṇḍuraṅg For the Nārāya Sāgar Press, Bombay 1946.


Rauravāgama → BHATT (1985).


Śivasūtra → Śivasūtravimārṣinī

Śivasūtravimārṣinī. The Śivasūtravimārṣinī of Kṣemarāja, ed. J.C. Chatterji, Delhi 1990 (KSTS 1) [1 Srinagar 1911].

Śivasūtravimārṣinī. Śivasūtravimārṣinī, by Utpala Devāryāya, with the Commentary of Kṣemarāja. Ed. by Rai Pramādāsī Mitra Bahādur [...], Benares 1902 (The Chowkhambā Sanskrit Series No. 51, Fasc. I).

Sandhyā. Sandhyā. Gitapres, Gorakhpur.

Sundarakānda. Sundarakānda, cennapuryn vāvilā rāmasvāmiśāstrulu and sans, madras 1928.

Subhagodaya, Edited as an appendix to → Nityāodasikāena
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