**Sivasutra et Vimarsini de Ksemaraja. (Etudes sur le Sivaisme du Cachemire, Ecole Spanda.) Traduction et introduction**

Review Author[s]:
Alexis Sanderson

*Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London*, Vol. 46, No. 1 (1983), 160-161.

Stable URL:
http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=0041-977X%281983%2946%3A1%3C160%3ASEVDK%28%3E2.0.CO%3B2-R

*Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London* is currently published by School of Oriental and African Studies.

---

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at http://www.jstor.org/about/terms.html. JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal or multiple copies of articles, and you may use content in the JSTOR archive only for your personal, non-commercial use.

Please contact the publisher regarding any further use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at http://www.jstor.org/journals/soas.html.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

---

JSTOR is an independent not-for-profit organization dedicated to creating and preserving a digital archive of scholarly journals. For more information regarding JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

http://www.jstor.org/
Mon Jun 13 03:21:23 2005

It has long been a matter for regret that no complete translation of the *Book of Letters* into a European language exists, and Frivold's book marks a significant attempt to help fill this lacuna, for he provides an annotated translation of those texts in the *Book of Letters* belonging to the sixth century which have not yet been translated into a Western language. The works concerned are: (1) a short theological treatise attributed to Movses Khorenatsi (*BL*, 22–8); (2) letter from the Armenians to the Orthodox in Persia (*BL*, 48–51); (3–5) three letters from 'Abdisho' (*BL*, 62–9); (6–7) two letters from the Catholicos Nerses (*BL*, 70–1, 76–7); (8) homily on Epiphany by the Catholicos Yovhannes (*BL*, 85–9). The translations err on the side of slavishness, and there are a few passages where the rendering is inaccurate or misleading (the inclusion of the Armenian originals, reproduced photographically, is welcome).

The chapters on the historical and theological background are rather summary and contain some over-simplistic or even misleading statements.

The section on the credal formulations will be of particular interest to students of doctrine; here it might be noted that the Syriac background of certain phrases is overlooked (e.g. ' put on the body ', in the creed of Eznik, reproduces the standard phraseology of early Syriac writers). No doubt G. Winkler's detailed study in *Oriens Christianus*, 1979, dealing *inter alia* with the creed of Sahak, appeared too late to be used. In the bibliography the references to works by Philoxenus contain some serious confusions.

This, then, is a work which usefully makes available in English some important theological texts not hitherto translated, but which, at the same time, needs to be used with a certain amount of caution.

S. P. BROCK

LILIAN SILBURN: *Śivasūtra et Vimarśinī de Kṣemarāja. (Études sur le Śivaïsme du Cachemire, École Spanda.) Traduction et introduction.* (Publications de l'Institut de Civilisation Indienne, Série in-8°, Fasc. 47.) viii, 193 pp., 1 plate. Paris: Institut de Civilisation Indienne, 1980. (Distribution: Diffusion E. De Boccard, 11 rue de Médicis, Paris VIe.)

The author's promise in the title of this, her ninth major publication in the field of Kashmir Śaivism, to present a study within a smaller territory, within a specific ' school ' (' le Śivaïsme du Cachemire, école Spanda ') will not allay for long the suspicions of those who have recognized in her past work a homiletic method which, careless of history, of the diversity of lineages and sectarian affiliations, has seemed to model itself on the Śaiva maxim that the whole (in this case the literature gathered under the modern rubric of Kashmir Śaivism) is equally present in each of its parts (*sarvaṃ sarvatra*).

The ' Spanda school ' was founded, we are told (p. 1), by Vasugupta in the first half of the ninth century with his promulgation of the *Śivasūtras*. These were developed in the *Spandakārikās* composed by Vasugupta himself according to Kṣemarāja (*c.* 1000–1050) or by Kallaṭa, his pupil and a contemporary of King Avantivarman (855/6–883), according to Bhāskara (*c.* 925–975), Utpalavaiṣṇava (probably *c.* 950–1000) and Rāmakaṇṭha (*c.* 950–1000). The ' mystical lineage ' of the Spanda school passed, she reports, from Vasugupta through Bhaṭṭasūri to Kallaṭa (her Bhaṭṭasūri is in fact an epithet of Kallaṭa in her source, *Śivasūtravārtika*, *upodghāta* v. 4) and thence through four intermediaries to Bhāskara, the author of the *Śivasūtravārtika*, whom she assigns to the eleventh century forgetting that he is quoted by Rāmakaṇṭha (*c.* 950–1000). Since she has begun by defining ' school ' in terms of a lineage, and since this study in the Spanda school concerns the *Śivasūtravimarśinī* of Kṣemarāja, we might have expected her to show that he was similarly connected; but in place of historical continuity a much more intimate bond appears. Any separate identity which Vasugupta and his Spanda school might have disappears within that of Kṣemarāja; for when it comes to determining what the former meant but did not say in his brief aphorisms the latter is her unquestioned guide. Thus, to take a case of great importance, she unhesitatingly attributes to Vasugupta and therefore to her Spanda school the categorization of spiritual disciplines into the three ' *upāyas* '. Now, that Kṣemarāja has superimposed this structure upon the three sections of the *sūtras* will be apparent to anyone who looks at the *sūtras* themselves, and indeed at Kṣemarāja's commentary. This evident artificiality and the absence of any reference to the *upāyas* in the *sūtras*, in the *Spandakārikās*, in Kallaṭa's *Spandakārikāvṛtti*, in any of the commentaries and in particular in Bhāskara's organization of the same sections, have clearly counted for nothing in Silburn's judgement when weighed against the opinion of Kṣemarāja. In short, for Silburn Vasugupta is no more than an aspect of Kṣemarāja. This identity established, any claim to be expounding an independent school, if this term is to be more than a name for commentaries of any kind on the two root-texts, must evaporate. For the *Vimarśinī*, as the presence of these categories illustrates, is less a text of a Spanda school than a colony of the Trika and, more specifically, of the syncretistic Trika exegesis of Kṣemarāja's teacher Abhinavagupta (*c.* 975–1025). The three *upāyas* (*śāmbhava*, *śākta* and *āṇava*) out of their humbler origin in the *Mālinīvijayottaratantra* (2.21–23), Abhinavagupta's root-text for the Trika, had become in his exegesis the defining core of his entire system, more than a thousand verses being devoted to their definition in his *Tantrāloka*.

More serious than this attribution to Vasugupta of Trika categories is the fact that she misinterprets them (pp. 11–17) and has done so throughout her voluminous output. Consequently in her commentary on the *Vijñānabhairavatantra* (1961) she disagrees again and again with the commentator

Śivopādhyāya when he applies these categories to the meditations which that tantra enumerates. But it is Silburn not Śivopādhyāya who has misunderstood Abhinavagupta's painstaking definitions. It must suffice here to point out that she fails to distinguish between the first and highest 'means' (*śāmbhavopāya* or *icchopāya*) in which the yogin centres himself in the pre-discursive impulse (*icchā*) to cognition and action without the intervention of thought (*akiñciccintaka*), and the second (*śāktopāya* or *jñānopāya*) in which the yogin, incapable of approaching consciousness from a point so close to its undifferentiated essence, resorts to the field of cognition (*jñāna*), intensifying a 'truth'-perception ('I am omniscient', 'I am omnipotent', 'This universe is the expansion of my own identity', etc.) to the point of direct revelation (*sākṣātkāra*) unmediated by thought. Now Silburn omits all reference to this defining 'truth'-perception and makes Abhinavagupta's definition of this process, which he calls *vikalpasaṃskāra* (*Tantrāloka* 4.2), apply to all cognitive and affective states (p. 13, ll. 11–25) without distinction, and from this error it is but a short step which leads her to the statement that the yogin in *śāktopāya* 'can turn to his advantage the paroxysmal climax of such emotions as terror, anger and passion . . .' (p. 13, ll. 26–28). Clearly she has in mind here *Spandakārikā* 1.22 which Kṣemarāja aptly connects with *Vijñānabhairavatantra* (Śivopādhyāya's recension), 101. Now the practice which the latter (and, by implication, the former) delineates belongs not to *śāktopāya* but to *śāmbhavopāya*, for it involves the obliteration of the act of thought within the spontaneous upsurge of non-cognitive states of intense emotion. As Śivopādhyāya, the last reliable Trika exegete, puts it, 'this is the *śāmbhava* plane because it is achieved without the intervention of a thought-act' (*eṣā nirvikalpaupayikī śāmbhavī bhūḥ*). As for *śāmbhavopāya* itself, which because of the encroachment of her *śāktopāya* now lacks any clear identity of its own, she divides it into two levels (p. 12, ll. 25–30) on the basis of a mistranslation of Kṣemarāja's *Spandanirṇaya* (p. 19, ll. 16–20). She makes him say that *udyama*, the primal upsurge of pre-cognitive power which is the domain of *śāmbhavopāya*, is firstly *sevanā* ('un hommage assidu') and secondly 'a return to perfect interiority'. The Sanskrit (glossing *udyamena*) is *paripūrṇāntarmukhasvarūpasevanātmanā*. It is knowledge not of Śaiva doctrine but of Sanskrit language which tells us that her second level has been conjured up, against the laws of grammar, out of a simple description of her first.

The translation of the *Vimarśinī* (pp. 33–112) is far from exact, though generally her familiarity with Śaiva doctrine saves her from 'heresy' when she misconstrues the Sanskrit. Thus on 1.2 (. . . *svasvātantryaśaktyābhāsitasvarūpagopanārūpayā mahāmāyāśaktyā* . . . '. . . by his power 'Mahāmāyā', i.e. by that concealing of his true nature which his own autonomous agency manifests') Silburn gives (Sanskrit parentheses mine) '. . . grâce à sa libre énergie (*svasvātantryaśaktyā*), afin de voiler sa véritable nature (*svarūpagopanārūpayā*) spontanément lumineuse (*ābhāsita-* !) (le Seigneur se sert) de l'énergie de la grande Illusion . . .'. Orthodox, but not exactly what Kṣemarāja said.

The 'Analysis of the Śivasutras and their commentary' (pp. 113–82) which ends the work summarizes the translation and, rightly abandoning any attempt to treat the *Vimarśinī* as a text of an independent school, elaborates certain details by drawing on the Trika and Pratyabhijñā literature of the author's famous teacher. Thus she achieves in her exegesis the *sāmarasya*, the sameness of flavour, which she so admires in the spiritual vision of the Kashmirian non-dualists.

ALEXIS SANDERSON

MICHEL HULIN: *Mṛgendrāgama: sections de la doctrine et du yoga, avec la vṛtti de Bhaṭṭanārāyaṇakaṇṭha et la dīpikā d'Aghoraśivācārya. Traduction, introduction et notes.* (Publications de l'Institut Français d'Indologie, No. 63.) ix, 387 pp. Pondichéry: Institut Français d'Indologie, 1980.

Nothing so much reveals the inappropriateness of the expressions 'Kashmir Śaivism' or 'Śaivism of Kashmir' for the syncretistic Trika of Abhinavagupta and the various non-dualistic Śaiva texts and traditions on which it draws (Spanda, Pratyabhijñā, Kula and Krama) as the fact that Kashmir was at the same time the scene of a vigorous school of Śaiva dualism (based on the canon of the twenty-eight āgamas) which produced a corpus of scriptural commentaries and independent treatises to which the so-called Southern Śaivism looked for the rigorous formulation of its authority. The current use of these expressions would have seemed impertinent to the Siddhāntin dualists, but it would also have embarrassed the non-dualist Śaivas of Kashmir, particularly those of the inclusivist Trika school, for whom the doctrines of their dualist compatriots and the āgama-canon on which they were based were always the object of reverent study and front-line quotation.

The present work is to be warmly welcomed as the first translation into a European language of a detailed text belonging to this tradition, and the inclusion of the sub-commentary of Aghoraśiva, the illustrious Siddhāntin of the Cola country places before a wider public rich evidence of the formative influence of the Kashmirian school on the Śaiva theology of the South.

In a regrettably brief *avant-propos* (pp. v–ix) the author modestly summarizes his predecessors' evidence for the dates of the *Mṛgendrāgama* (*terminus post quem*: A.D. 300), the Kashmirian Nārāyaṇakaṇṭha (tentatively, eleventh century) and Aghoraśiva (mid-twelfth century). The second can, however, be dated more precisely; for his son and pupil Rāmakaṇṭha II whose upper limit was fixed hitherto by Aghoraśiva's references to him, is quoted by Kṣemarāja (*c.* 1000–1050) (*Netratantroddyota*, vol. 2, p. 285). Since, as Hulin points out (p. vi) his father Nārāyaṇakaṇṭha quotes