

*Summary of 'Tantric Śaivism',
24 lectures delivered at the École Pratique des Hautes Études,
Section 5, from April to June 1991*

Alexis Sanderson

Since the beginning of research in the field of Tantric Śaivism scholars have directed their attention to one of two bodies of Tantric Śaiva literature concentrated at opposite ends of the Indian subcontinent. They have worked either on the [Śaiva] Siddhānta using largely south Indian sources and called this 'Southern Śaivism' (le śivaïsme du sud), or on the works of Abhinavagupta and other Kashmirians of his tradition and called this 'Kashmir Śaivism'. This division of labour has been reinforced by the fact that two bodies of evidence invited very different approaches. 'Kashmir Śaivism' attracted study of its nondualistic doctrines and intuitionist soteriology, while the literature of 'southern Śaivism' was studied primarily for its detailed prescriptions of Śaiva ritual. Nor were researchers likely to find much in the living tradition that would invite them to question this dichotomy. South Indian informants of the Siddhānta have been Ādiśaiva temple-priests concerned almost exclusively with ritual and only with the ritual of their own tradition, while the 'Kashmir Śaivism' now accessible in Kashmir and reflected in many modern publication is strongly gnostic or yogic and neither understands nor wishes to understand the texts on ritual which were once an important part of its inherited literature, far less the relation between their ritual and that of the Siddhānta.

This series of lectures parts with this dichotomy in research. It has shown that 'Southern Śaivism' and 'Kashmir Śaivism' are intimately related in the primary scriptural sources (Tantras) which they claim to interpret and also in the earliest exegesis of these texts, which was Kashmirian for both schools. The relation is rightly characterized in sources of both trends as that between the common or fundamental (*sāmānyasāstram*) and the specialized (*viśeṣasāstram*). The common scriptures at the root of 'Southern Śaivism' are the Siddhāntas or Siddhāntatantras. The specialized scriptures are those of the Vāma, Dakṣiṇa and Yāmala cults including or extending into the Tantras of the Trika and Krama cults which are at the root of 'Kashmir Śaivism'. The common Tantras recognize the systems or ritual and observance taught in the specialized Tantras; but they see themselves as the core of Śiva's revelation and the specialized Tantras as secondary teaching which principally serve the desires of siddhi-seeking sādhakas rather than ordinary (liberation-seeking) initiates (*putrakah,* *dīkṣitah*) and the officiants (*ācāryah,* *guruh*) appointed from their number. The specialized traditions perceived the same relation differently. For them the Siddhāntatantras were certainly the basic revelation, in the sense that they were the most universally

applicable, their instructions applying everywhere in the canon unless specifically modified or countermanded; but they were also seen as the more exoteric, as the broad base beneath a non-Saiddhāntika superstructure consisting of a series of progressively more esoteric levels.

So the analysis of Śaivism developed in these lectures has treated the Siddhāntatantras and the non-Saiddhāntika Tantras as complementary parts of a single greater system, applying the principle recognised by both aspects of Śaivism that the Siddhāntatantras are the basic prescription which the specialised traditions modify or inflect in various particulars. Consequently we first considered Tantric Śaivism using the Siddhāntatantras as our primary evidence, and then proceeded to an analysis of the specialized systems, defining them through their divergences from this norm.

This model of dependence corresponds to the order of historical development in general; but we saw that there are some aspects of the specialized systems which probably predate the basic system found in the Siddhāntatantras, namely the doctrine of the Vāmatantras and the cult of Yoginīs found in the texts of the Yāmala, Trika and Krama divisions of the canon.

Because we set out to examine Śaivism from its earliest sources, the corpus of Siddhāntatantras used does not include all the texts which Saiddhāntikas have accepted as canonical. Many works which claim to belong to the Saiddhāntika canon are found only in south Indian manuscripts; and some, such as *Kāmika*, the *Ajita*, the *Kāraṇa*, the *Cintya*, the *Dīpta*, and the *Suprabheda*, are definitely late products of that region. We have therefore recognized only those works which survive with or in Kashmirian commentaries, are preserved in early Nepalese manuscripts, or through surviving only in south Indian manuscripts can be supported by early citations or comparison with other early materials. The principal among the Siddhāntatantras admitted by these criteria were the *Kālottara* in various versions, including the *Ṣaṣṣahasra-* or *Bṛhatkālottara*, the *Kiraṇa*, the *Matāṅgapārameśvara*, the *Mrgendra*, the *Niśvāsamukhasaṃhitā*, the *Niśvāsasaṃhitā*, and the *Niśvāsakārikā* (including the *Dikṣottara*), the *Pauṣkarapārameśvara*, the *Rauravasūtrasaṃgraha* and the *Svāyambhuva*. These are only a small part of the titles listed in accounts of the Saiddhāntika canon. However it seems that they were the core and greater part of the canon known in the tenth century and after, because there is a close correlation between the range of Siddhāntatantras attested in Kashmir and that which survived independently in Nepalese manuscripts among the Newars of the Kathmandu valley.

As introduction to these specific Tantric traditions we considered a number of matters bearing on the relations between Tantric Śaivism and the non-Tantric traditions. First we looked at the question of the degree of historical continuity between Tantric Śaivism and the earlier, non-Tantric Śaivism of the Pāśupatas. We found that Tantric sources divide that tradition into two distinct groups, the Pāśupatas/Pañcārthas

and the Lākulas. The first are evidently the Pāśupatas about whom something is already known, the followers of the system of the Pāñcārtha (the *Pāśupatasūtra*) expounded in the *Pañcārthabhāṣya* etc. We saw that though the Vaidikas condemned them as outside the Vedas (*vedabāhyaḥ, pāṣandah*), the Pāñcārtha-Pāśupatas themselves considered their tradition to be the highest and most esoteric path within Vedic knowledge, accessible only to a Rudra-inspired élite among regenerate men of the highest caste. It has already been noted that their mantras, the five *brahmamantras*, are Vedic. Our analysis observed other Vedic features. We argued, for example, for the Vedic origin of their practice of provoking abuse from public in the belief that this will cause demerit to pass from them to their abusers and merit to be pass from their abusers to themselves. We connected this with the Vedic rule doctrine that one must avoid all criticism of one who is following the observance (*vrataṃ*) consequent on *dīkṣā* for a Soma sacrifice, because regardless of whether it is just or unjust it will cause just such a transfer (*Kāthakasaṃhitā* 23.6; *Āpastambaśrautasūtra* 10.15.15 and the *Bhāṣya* of Rudradatta). The Pāśupata too is observing a *vrataṃ* (*pāśupatavrataṃ, atyāśramavrataṃ*), though in this case it is a lifelong condition; and he too enters on his observance through a *dīkṣā*.

Considering the importance of *dīkṣā* or ‘initiation’ in later, Tantric form of Śaivism, we examined the evidence for the Pāśupata ritual and concluded that it corresponds closely enough to the first phase of the Tantric to justify the hypothesis that the latter developed out of the Pāśupata though extension and elaboration. We saw, however, no evidence of the belief, so crucial in the Tantric texts, that *dīkṣā* is not only a ritual of qualification (*saṃskārah*) for certain observances but also brings about liberation at death by destroying the bounds of the soul.

The nature of the practice and doctrine of the Lākulas, the second division of the Pāśupatas, was clarified with the help of the *Niśvāsamukha*, an unpublished Siddhāntatantra surviving in a Nepalese manuscript which may be assigned on palaeographic grounds to the tenth century. This text is unique in the surviving literature in that it gives an account of their practice and the hierarchy of cosmic levels which is the basis of their soteriology. We saw that these Pāśupatas were Kapālavratins or Mahāpāśupatas, ash-smearing ascetics like the Pāñcārtha-Pāśupatas, but set apart from them by the fact that they included among the insignia of their observance a begging-bowl fashioned from a human cranium (*kapālam*) and a staff topped with a human skull (*khatvāṅgaḥ*). We saw also that their hierarchy of worlds is embedded in the Tantric Śaiva hierarchy that appears in the *Niśvāsaṃhitā* and the *Dīkṣottara*, and also, beyond the Siddhāntatantras, in the *Svacchanda* (Dakṣiṇa) and the *Tantrasadbhāva* (Trika). The embedded versions established the identity of these ascetics with the followers of the eight Pramāṇasāstras (*Pañcārtha, Guhya* or *Śivaguhya, Aṅkuśa* or *Rudrāṅkuśa, Hṛdaya, Vyūha, Lakṣaṇa, Ākarṣa* and *Ādarśa*). These scriptures

do not survive. But a passage from the first was found in Kṣemarāja's commentary on *Svacchanda* 1.41–43, and it confirmed the identification with the Kapālavratin Pāsupatas of the *Niśvāsamukha*. We also established the identity of these ascetics with the Mahāvratas/Mahāvratins whose views of the universe and the nature of liberation are mentioned by the Kashmirian Saiddhāntika Bhaṭṭa Rāmakaṇṭha. These and other references showed that it is this same group that is referred to as the Kālamukhas or Kālavaktras in Kashmirian sources. An ascetic order named thus or Kālāmukha (a variant to be attributed to the influence of Kannada pronunciation) is known to have flourished in Karṇāṭaka, Mysore and Āndhra from epigraphs dating from the ninth to the thirteenth centuries. We saw that these epigraphs confirm the conclusion that this is the same tradition; and we were therefore able to vindicate Yāmunācārya's brief account of their observances which Lorenzen had rejected in his study *The Kāpālikas and Kālāmukhas: Two Lost Śaivite Sects* (1972) on the grounds that the epigraphs, which are his sole evidence, show the Kālamukhas to be Pāsupatas, while the use of the skull-bowl which that account attributes to them is associated with the Kāpālikas. It is true that the Pañcārtha-Pāsupatas' observance lacks such mortuary elements, but, as we can now see, this was not the case with the other division of the tradition.

Continuities between the Lākula/Kālamukha/Pramāṇa system and that of the Śaiva Tantras were observed. The Tantric's universe (*bhuvanādhvā*) is an extended version of the Lākula's and inherits its dualistic division between impure levels (*asuddhādhvā*: the cosmos of the bound) and pure levels (*śuddhādhvā*: the cosmos of the liberated). We also saw that the *Niśvāsamukha*'s Mahāpāsupatas share the Tantric Śaiva view that *dīkṣā* is a means of liberation. It was suggested with the support of a verse quoted from an unknown work by the Kashmirian Somānanda (see Abhinavagupta, *Parātriṃśikāvivarāṇa* pp. 99, l. 8–101, l. 7) that the mysterious 'descent of the word *atha*' (*athaśabdānipātaḥ*) which is said by this text to accomplish the *dīkṣā* is the descent of the power of Śiva (*śivaśaktinapātaḥ*) of which the texts speak in the context of Tantric *dīkṣā*.

Continuities between Pāsupatism (which the *Niśvāsamukhasamhitā*, referring to both systems, calls the Outer Way [Atimārga]) and Tantric Śaivism (which that text calls the Way of Mantras [Mantramārga]) were also seen in the area of observance (*vratacaryā*). Both kinds of Pāsupata observance were shown to be part of the Tantric tradition of asceticism. Those who adopted the basic ascetic observance prescribed by the Siddhāntatantras were barely distinguishable in appearance from Pañcārtha-Pāsupatas in their first stage, that is to say, the stage in which they assumed sectarian insignnia; and in the *rudravratam* of the *Matanīgapārameśvara* we recognized a more comprehensive survival of Pāsupata practice which included the courting of contempt. The observance with the skull-bowl and skull-staff (*khaṭvāṅgaḥ*) followed by the Lākulas was found as a special ascetic observance for the attainment of siddhis in

the *Nisvāsasamhitā*, and very commonly outside the Saiddhāntika part of the canon.

We then considered discontinuities between Pāśupatism and Tantric Śaivism. The only goal offered by Pāśupatism is liberation through the definitive cessation of suffering (*duḥkhāntah*): Tantric Śaivism offers liberation, lesser rewards (*bhuktiḥ*), or both. All Pāśupatas are, at least in theory, permanent ascetics: Tantric Śaivas may be permanent ascetics (*naiṣṭhikavratī*), temporary ascetics (*bhautikavratī*) or non-ascetics (*grhastah*). Only regenerate brahmin men may take up the Pāśupata observances: the benefits of Tantric *dīkṣā* are accessible to men of all four castes and to women. All Pāśupatas are required to be actively Pāśupata: Tantric initiates are of two kinds, (i) those in whom *dīkṣā* initiates a lifelong obligation to perform Tantric rites (*sabīja-dīkṣitāḥ* and [*śivadharma*]sādhakāḥ) and (ii) those whose involvement in Tantric ritual may be limited to passing through the ceremony of their initiation (*nirbījadīkṣitāḥ* and [*lokadharmi*]sādhakāḥ). Pāśupatism is personal religious activity: Tantric Śaivism extends from this into the public domain.

Since Pāśupatism is a path to liberation for ascetics, while Tantric Śaivism adds married householders and lesser rewards to its initiates and goals, it might be assumed that the reward-seekers, termed sādhakas, were the householders. However, although some texts mention that the sādhaka can be a married man, it seems that it was the ascetic sādhaka that was the model. It appears, then, that a fundamental aspect of the relation between the Pāśupata and Tantric systems was the contrast between two kinds of ascetics: those seeking liberation and those seeking powers.

If Tantric reward-seekers were typically ascetics, were the liberation-seekers, among whom all Śaiva gurus were numbered, typically householders? The answer is that they may have been, but not because the Tantric tradition saw any natural connexion between the householder's state and a person's qualification or desire for liberation. On the contrary, it considered the ascetic liberation-seeker to be purer and superior type. Tantric Śaivism, then, contains both the types of asceticism whose contrast we saw as characterizing the difference between this system and Pāśupatism; and it was suggested that the former is the result of a synthesis of two distinct traditions, a liberationist tradition prolonging that of the Pāśupatas and a tradition of ascetic power-seeking represented by the sādhaka.

This model has the strength that it fits the picture of the interaction of the various classes of initiates that we get from the rules stating their rights and duties. We do not see a community of initiates of both types fully integrated under the authority of a guru, but rather a community of liberation-seekers under the control of their guru and living in his home (*gurukulavāsaḥ*) with the addition of one or more sādhakas who, though nominally under authority of the guru, are in fact independent practitioners who live apart at a sacred site (*kṣetram*) chosen for their mantra-practice or wander from one site to another.

The synthesis, however, entails a compromise. The Tantric tradition does not allow sādhakas to obtain their empowerments from other sādhakas: they must be initiated and consecrated by gurus, who are liberation-seekers by definition. But it is conceded that these rituals can only be done by a married guru. Ascetic gurus can initiate other liberation-seekers: married gurus alone can initiate both liberation-seekers and reward-seekers. It might well be said that the married guru ought to be equally unqualified to empower the sādhaka, since he is, after all, a liberation seeker. The objection is sound and good proof of the awkwardness of the arrangement. The liberationist tradition could justify its position in the Tantric synthesis only by applying a principle that should have no place on the supramundane level at which Tantric activity is supposed to operate, namely the Vedic or exoteric (*laukika*-) opposition between the liberation-seeking ascetic and the man in the world seeking limited and transient benefits from his dharma. Householder gurus are liberation-seekers, because they are gurus; but they can initiate reward-seekers because they are householders, who pursue transient rewards rather than salvation. So the price of the sādhaka's incorporation and subordination is a problematic domestication.

This domestication is also apparent in Tantric Śaivism's extensions beyond personal religious activity. While Pāśupatism is limited to religious activity which benefits the performer alone, going beyond that only in the *dikṣā* performed by gurus to qualify others for such activity, Tantric Śaivism extends the range of rituals for others beyond those which enable the personal cult to include rituals in which the beneficiary is deceased, an uninitiated *yajamānaḥ* or even a group. Thus Tantric gurus perform Śaiva versions of the Smārta funerary and postfunerary rites (*antyeṣṭiḥ*, *pretakriyā*, *śrāddham*) for the benefit of a dead individual, ancestor or ancestors at the request of their relatives. They may be engaged by an uninitiated *yajamānaḥ* to consecrate non-personal idols and temples; and they may be appointed to perform the regular and incidental rituals in such temples, rituals whose beneficiary is the whole community within the temple's range. Their activities, then, extend from the performance of rituals such as initiation which are consistent with their status as gurus and are shared by the Pāśupata tradition, to others such as processing the dead and serving in temples which take them into the less prestigious category of priests.

Another aspect of domestication was brought out in an analysis of the evidence for the two categories of inactive initiates. It was shown that while the Kashmirian authors of both schools hold that the *nirbījadikṣita*-devotee is not qualified to perform Tantric rites, the *Bṛhatkālottara*, Somaśambhu and Aghoraśivācārya hold that initiates of this kind must take on as much of that discipline as they can. Such initiates are not excluded from ritual: they are exonerated from the full discipline that binds others. This meant that Tantric observance was no longer restricted to the presumably small numbers of individuals who, like Śrautins in the context of the Vedic system, were in

a position to take on an arduous and inflexible routine of rituals. Most significantly, those whom this view admitted to Tantric worship included women. They might not become gurus or sādhakas and they might not become ascetics (*liṅgi*); but they were permitted do Tantric worship, even if only the annual *pūjā* on Śivarātri believed to make up for any omissions during the year.

We also saw that the *Bṛhatkālottara* made Tantric worship even more accessible to women by admitting them as full initiates, though still not as gurus, to an annexed cult of Gaurī, Śiva's subordinate consort.

That Tantric Śaivism was compromised by these various extensions into the religion of the home and the temple (the *laukiko dharmah* of the *Niśvāsamukha*) was shown in the case of the Śrāddhas by the fact that such rites contradict the tradition's doctrine of salvation. It is equally clear in the case of women's initiation into the cult of Gaurī; for we are told by the *Bṛhatkālottara* that if at any time there should be a conflict between a woman's Tantric deity and her husband's command, the latter must prevail.

We also saw that Tantric Śaivism was aware that its incorporation of elements of the exoteric, social religion, and, more generally, its embeddedness in the system of castes and life-stages (*varṇāśramadharmah*), were problematic. After examining the various orthodox (Vedic) views of the Tantras seen in Kumārila, Aparārka, Jayantabhaṭṭa, the *Sūtasamhitā*, and other works, we considered the way that the Tantric initiate is required to perceive the Vedic religion or more exactly the relation between the Vedic and the Tantric in his religious activity. We studied passages in the *Mataṅgapārameśvara*, the *Sarvajñānottara*, and the *Jayadrathayāmala*. These taught (i) that Vedic and Tantric prescriptions are so ordered in the totality of revelation that the Tantric may incorporate the Vedic but never be overridden by it, (ii) that for the same reason the Vedic elements that coexist with the Tantric are not to be seen as aṅgas of the Tantric, that is to say, as contributing in any degree to the efficacy of the Tantric; and (iii) that the true purpose of the incorporation of the Vedic is to preserve worldly conventions (*lokasaṃvṛtiḥ*), either out of compassion for the unenlightened or to protect the reputation of the gurus and thereby to protect the faith.

Other subjects in these lectures: (i) an outline of the non-Saiddhāntika Tantric systems from the Vāma to the Krama with an analysis of the principles behind the perception of these systems as increasingly esoteric: this entailed further study of women's role and participation in Tantrism; (ii) a consideration of the question of whether there was a Kāpālīka tradition independent of the Kāpālīkism of the more radical of these systems; (iii) a demonstration that the hierarchical structure of these Śaiva Tantric systems was mirrored in the development of the Buddhist Tantric canon, and that in the case of the Śaṃvaratantras of the Yoganiruttara (/Yoginītantra) division, the most 'kāpālīka-' stratum of that canon, this dependence extended to incorporations,

often imperfectly disguised, of passages, indeed chapters, of non-Saiddhāntika Śaiva works surviving in early Nepalese manuscripts; and (iv) a refutation of the doctrine of Abhinavagupta and his school that dualism is restricted to the Siddhāntatantras. It was shown that the nondualism which these nondualists claimed for the whole non-Saiddhāntika canon is found only at the most esoteric periphery of that corpus, in some texts of the Trika and Krama.