

Kashmiri Shaivism or Trika

A Criticism of Orientology, as exemplified by Andre Padoux's "Vac: The Concept of the Word in Selected Hindu Tantras" and the contemporary writings of other Orientologists as Alexis Sanderson, from a Traditional Viewpoint

This is an article to aid Orientology to move onwards and advance scholarship. It is not intended in any other manner, that is, to undermine any one or criticize others for the sake of it. Not only is this article to advance scholarship, but also spirituality. That is, aspiring practitioners should know that the accuracy of their practice is important if they are undertaking a spiritual journey. How can an inaccurate doctrine lead one to liberation, except the mere belief that one is liberated? Thus this article is also to aid spiritualists, especially Shaivites, and especially Kashmiri Shaivites, to have a correct understanding of their ideology.

This article criticizes not only Orientology's infamous methodology in studying the Indic, Buddhist and other Asiatic traditions, but also their inability to understand the Veda, Agamas, and the Tantras. We are also pointing towards a new direction in these studies, which is the traditional or natural stand, as represented by these authors, different to that of the orthodoxy of India today.

We are also criticizing the inability of Orientologists to move forward and use modern information, that is, Psychology and Sociology. The Orientologists' sense of the world is colonial and many Orientologists are trapped within a sense of Supremacy and the fossilized culture of the colonial past. Often the conservatives of the West, in their eagerness to prove their false sense of supremacy, pursue this career.

This false sense of Supremacy is based on latent fear. It is narcissist and dysfunctional as far as Psychology understands. The fact that the institution of Orientology has not progressed yet is of grave concern, as it is only this branch of study that perpetuates hate, which has its roots in self hate. This self hate is, in a sense, the hate towards other's progress that Orientologists see as rivalry and they instead put others down so as to feel useful to humanity.

Modernism is based on the rationale of Democracy and freedom. Orientologists never reflect this but instead only colonialism and racism.

Orientalism had, from its inception, been at loggerheads with the Orthodoxy. This is so because with a false sense of supremacy they had to prove that they were better than the colonized. This sense of supremacy is also “clothed with fear” that the colonized world would eventually supercede the political and economical position of the “West.” In accordance with this view, myriads of books have been written to discount all perspectives of the Indic culture by Orientalism. Therefore, the Indic spiritual culture has been falsely represented from the time of Friedrich Max Muller of the last century. Indeed, in their eagerness to prove Darwinism, the past scholars not only misrepresented the Indic culture but also all cultures in the last century.

Almost from the onset, Traditionalists, that is, the exegetes of the Vedic tradition (inclusive of its various interpretations that form the various denominations as Agamas (“that which comes down from the Veda”) – Shaiva (Shiva), Vishnu, Saurya (Sun), Ganapatya (Ganapati), Bauddha (Buddha) and the Tantras – Shakti, Shiva or Vishnu) had a variant view as to that of the Orientologists (i.e. Indologists, Buddhologists and Sinologists).

This is not because Traditionalists (as these authors) are zealously romanticizing with their traditional spiritual science and culture (as would some, especially of Orientalological background perpetuate) but because they hold a better understanding of their traditional science.

This idea that Traditionalists over idealize their tradition is reflected in the following statement of Alexis Sanderson: “There was, of course, no doubt in the assertions of Swami Lakshman Joo’s devotees that Abhinavagupta’s Shaivism had reached them complete and unchanged; and when I asked Swami Lakshman Joo himself for his view of this matter he confirmed their faith. But systems of religious knowledge and practice such as this, which are rooted in the belief that they have been transmitted intact through an unbroken lineage of Gurus are more subject than most to the depredations of time. For if they fragment and contract, their teachers are barred from seeing this by their faith in the instruction received from their immediate predecessors and they will therefore be disinclined to reverse the process by recovering information from other sources, by searching, for example, for manuscripts of texts that were known to the authors whose works they

consider valid but are no longer current among them. For such documents would be seen as mere texts divorced from living authority” (article on “Swami Lakshman Joo and his place in the Kashmirian Śaiva Tradition” by Alexis Sanderson taken from *Samvidullasah: Manifestations of Divine Consciousness: Swami Lakshman Joo (Saint-Scholar of Kashmir Śaivism)*/edited by Bettina Baumer and Sarla Kumar. New Delhi, D.K. Printworld, 2007, p. 95).

Such statements are reflective of Orientology’s defense against Orthodoxy or Traditionalists. They also reveal the flaws of Orientology’s methodology. That is, when it suits them they will say that the answers lie in the texts (and not the lineage) or they will argue the other way and say that the texts are wrong and must contain “forced readings.” This shows that the knowledge Orientology imparts is not necessarily valid.

This does not mean that Westerners would not be able to ever grasp the Indic spiritual science and its culture nor that Indians would be more conversant with the science and culture just because they are born Indians, as the following examples reveal.

Sir John Woodroffe or Arthur Avalon (his pseudonym as he was hesitant to be associated openly with Tantricism, as it was socially and politically unsafe during the colonial times, especially as he was a High Court Judge) was an Englishman and was erudite both in matters of Sanskrit language and the Tantras. Although there are some who propagate the view that Sir John Woodroffe had commissioned Indian scholars to aid him, this does not seem to be the case as his editing of the Tantric texts in the Sanskrit language itself, which took place at Oxford during his last days, not only reveals his proficiency of the Sanskrit language, but also the Tantras.

In the same light, R.G. Bhandarkar or Sarvepillai Radhakrishnan, both Indians by birth, although proficient in the Sanskrit language, were, nevertheless, ignorant of not only the Tantras, but also the traditional Indic science due to the overbearing influence of the colonial British education system (vide R. G. Bhandarkar, “Vaishnavism, Shaivism and Minor Religious Systems” and S. Radhakrishnan, “Indian Philosophies,” 1923).

Academicians or Professional scholarship

Another reason for us to scrutinize the institution of professional scholarship is to understand why many of the current era harbor an antagonistic attitude towards the Spiritual cultures of “others.”

In our analysis, we will consider the Vedic tradition and this will show the limitations of Orientology as an institution.

In these passages, we will answer the queries raised by the earlier propounder of an academical study of Tantra, that is, Agehananda Bharati (born Leopold Fischer), an Austrian, who lived and worked largely in America as Professor of Anthropology at Syracuse University in NY, in his work “The Tantric Tradition.”

The late Agehananda Bharati (1923-1991), a middle-class Western supremacist, betrays his ignorance on Tantra in the aforementioned work. The book is a classic in that without the input of the Orthodoxy, Orientology is sadly inferior. It also reveals the shortcomings of the Western middle-class abnormalities (i.e. the aspiration for “status” or the approval of others as a means of certifying or validating oneself, for vantage). Although Bharati wanted to expose the limitation of Indic cultures, his work more so reflects the limitation of the Western Anglo-Saxon person’s misunderstanding of others. Even with the aid of a Lama, “The Tantric Tradition” of Bharati betrays imparting any worthwhile knowledge excepting “clothed racism” and “one-sided petty politics.” This he claims as Social Anthropology.

Agehananda Bharati had hastily highlighted that the native Indic scholars as Mahamahopadhyaya Hara Prasad Shastri had held on to a language form that was not equal with that of Orientology (vide A. Bharati, “The Tantric Tradition,” 1966).

Presupposing this, he suggested that the apt undertaking would be to use terms and linguistics that originate from Ludwig Wittgenstein and other contemporary Western philosophers of the present era.

Herbert V. Günther, a reputable Orientalist, adopted this idea and since then his works are *untrue* to the Traditional texts, in both content and import (cf.

“Kindly Bent to Ease Us,” a work by the renowned thirteenth century [according to Orientology’s datings] Tibetan Nyingma tradition of Longchenpa, translated by Günther and published by Dharma Publishing). To apply modern linguistics and terminology is like applying incongruent car spare parts (i.e. English car parts for German cars even though they are both cars). This failure of Günther to recognize the inherent validity of the texts is not realized by either academics or today’s Orthodoxy. Both idealize Günther and until this day his views are dominant in teachings on Mahayana Buddhism.

Indeed, taking this approach, but even on different lines, Paul Eduardo Muller-Ortega states that he and the Orientologists are taking a scientific approach in the study of Shaivism (vide Paul Eduardo Muller-Ortega, “The Triadic Heart of Shiva,” Shri Satguru Publications, 1989). What is Muller-Ortega’s definition of science?

Even physicists as qualified and reputed as Dr. Fritjof Capra in his mammoth work the “Turning Point,” a sequel to his “Tao of Physics,” questions the credibility and approach of modern science. The questioning of modern science was not only raised by Dr. Capra but many earlier sociologists and psychologists (often addressed as alternative scholars because they held a variant and organic view) as the famous Scottish psychologist R.D. Laing.

These so-called alternative scholars criticized this scientific mono-vision, meaning narrow vision: a vision that originates from pre-opinionated thinking. Dr. Capra quips, “Scientists will not need to be reluctant to adopt a holistic framework, as they often are today, for fear of being unscientific. Modern physics can show them that such a framework is not only scientific but is in agreement with the most advanced scientific theories of physical reality” (Dr. Fritjof Capra, “Turning Point,” Chapter 1).

As is clear, Traditionalists have a variant view. However, not many Traditionalists have the language to deal with Orientologists. The language as set by Orientology suits its political stand and is not necessarily valid. This article will demonstrate this.

With this as the backdrop, let us analyze the views of Orientology in contrast with those of the Traditionalists, at least as these authors represent.

In traditional settings, the Veda is understood to be the basis of all Indic sciences. (The word science is extended to term more organic notions as the Indic spiritual sciences as against the scientific mono-vision being the only notion of science.)

Orientology, having the belief that the Veda is Pantheistic, read a verse of the Paratrishika Vivarana, a core Tantric text, as expressing the view that the Veda must have been the lowest in the hierarchy of knowledge and importance.

Thus, Andre Padoux, an eminent French Orientologist (and director of the research team of the CNRS on Hinduism from 1982–89), remarks albeit cursorily, “Further they are more important in the sphere of Theology (of the pantheons) and of practices than in the very structure of the metaphysical system, which is precisely our main concern here” (vide Andre Padoux, “Vac,” p. 76).

Padoux, like all Orientologists of his class, i.e. Alexis Sanderson, already mentioned above, who is currently the Spalding Professor of Eastern Religions and Ethics at All Souls College, Oxford, holds the erroneous view that the Veda must be Pantheistic, if not Animistic. This stand has caused severe misinterpretations of the Agamic and Tantric philosophy and history.

This view that the Veda is Animistic or Pantheistic has been proven false by these authors in their works “Divine Initiation” and “Third Eye of the Buddhist.” These works show that the Veda held a Monist (*Advaita*) ideology from the very onset.

The alluded verse of the Paratrishika Vivarana (Jaideva Singh, p. 81) that these scholars exploit is as follows:

Vedac chaivam tato Vamam tato daksham tatah Kulam/
Tato Matam tatas ca api trikam Sarva Uttamam
Param//

“Vedac Chaivam” does not suggest that the Veda is the lowest in the rungs of spiritual philosophies but, indeed, indicates that the Veda is the basis for its various denominations as the Agamas and Tantras.

In traditional quarters, the verse is read as – From the Veda [originates] *Shaivam*, then *Vamam* [the Vama Tantras], then *Daksham* [Daksha Tantras, popularly now known as Right-hand Tantras], then *Kulam* [*Purva*, *Uttara*, *Paschima*, *Dakshina* Tantras], then *Matam* [the Mata Tantras], and then the *Trikam* [the Uttara Shaiva Amnaya now known to Orientology as Kashmiri Shaivism], *Sarvah Uttamam Param* [the last three words are to be read in accordance with the reader’s tradition and the rules of Sanskrit grammar]. This interpretation that the Veda is the basis of all denominations is also true of the Trika.

This verse can be read as the Veda is the basis of *Shaivam* and *Shaivam* is the basis of *Vamam*, *Daksham*, *Kulam*, *Matam*, and *Trikam*, being the foremost.

However one reads this verse, it never means that the Veda is inferior to Shaivam as Padoux and Sanderson allude. In fact, these Orientologists, not understanding the Veda and its Monist ideology, had only erred.

Of the Vedas, the Rg Veda or “the Veda of the Eulogy” has 1017 hymns and has been grouped in ten parts known as mandalas.

The hymns or Suktas of the Rg Veda are composed of various metres. These metres are precisely accounted for, and run from one or twenty-four syllables to metres consisting of one hundred and four syllables.

The Yajur Veda accompanies the rites of the offering Priest. Hence its name “the Veda of the Yajus or Priests.” It has two portions: the *Shukla* (White) portion and the *Krishna* (Black) portion.

The *Shukla* portion presents the Yogic aspect and the *Krishna* portion refers to the gnosis; it, therefore, contains the esoteric or Tantric notions and therefore comes with a commentary.

The Yajur Veda can be taken as a commentary enunciating the Rg Veda or can be read as an approach of its own.

Similarly, the Sama Veda is only the Rg Veda employed in Chanting at instances of rituals and worship.

Then there is the Atharva Veda, an esoteric science that offers a variant perspective to that of the Rg Veda. This Veda consists of 6000 Verses consisting of 731 hymns and is apportioned into twenty parts. William Dwight Wightney had translated this Veda in 1856. It has come to be known as the Wightney Lanman Series, as Lanman had revised the work in 1905.

Influenced by Orientology, S. Radhakrishnan, succumbing to the Aryan Migratory Theory (vide “Divine Initiation”), mistakes the Atharva Veda as the Veda of the non-Aryan people. One can see the blunders perpetuated by Orientology in the works of S. Radhakrishnan, especially his two volumes entitled “Indian Philosophy,” first published in 1923. This is because it suited his racist ideology, which originated from Orientalism in the then colonial clime. Similarly, the writings of R. G. Bhandarkar exemplify the colonial approach to Indic studies.

The Vedic tradition and its adherents, that is, the people of India, hold that it was Veda Vyasya, the foremost of the Rishis, who compiled the Veda into four aspects and iterated it to his disciples Paila Vaisampayana, Jaimini, Sumantu, and his grandson Sukarma. This is an accurate understanding that is according to the Monistic and jargonic rendition of the Veda but, unfortunately, this is unknown to Orientology.

Not only are the Vedas set precisely in metres, but also the Rishis account for each phoneme in a metre. The Veda or its four aspects, that is, Rg, Yajur, Sama, and Atharva, had been precisely preserved. Apart from this, the Vedas also have defined ways of reciting and chanting.

Indeed, with such precise accounting, it is a wonder how Orientologists blunder. The works of these authors, “Divine Initiation” and “Third Eye of the Buddhist,” reveal not only the errors of Orientology but also that the Veda holds a Monist (*Advaita*) ideology.

Since the Veda, itself, is Monist, it, of course, has in it all the principles that are enumerated in the Agamas and the Tantras; the distinction being the reconciliation of metaphysics.

Thus, not knowing that the Veda is Monist, Andre Padoux, while attempting to piece together the Tantras, says, “As mentioned above, it is hardly possible, in the present state of scholarship, to put into historical perspective, or even to follow the evolution of the post-Vedic—and notably Tantric—developments of the speculations about the word. One can hardly go beyond recording the presence, and even for some of them, the omnipresence, of those speculations from a certain period in time, the beginning of which is also hardly datable. Furthermore, some elements—as mentioned earlier—just seem to be there from the origin. Thus if ritualistic notions and customs are found as early as ancient Brahmanism, and if identical or quite similar concepts or practices emerge once again ten centuries later in Tantric lore, must we view them rather as a more or less accountable reappearance of a vanished material? Or shouldn’t it rather be assumed that those elements that revealed their presence to us from a certain period in time have in fact never ceased to exist locally, but were simply not mentioned in the texts as long as another ideology prevailed? I believe the latter view could all the more be admitted since we do not by far know all the texts that might have been in existence, and we are very far also from being able to date precisely those texts that we do happen to know (Andre Padoux, “Vac,” pp. 30–31).

The ambiguity and justifications offered by Orientology originate due to lack of knowledge of the Vedic jargon.

Andre Padoux, relying on his earlier predecessors (colonial Orientalists as Friedrich Max Mueller and Max Weber), had fallen for the speculation that the Veda must have evolved and, in lieu of this evolution, he advocates the evolutionist stand as holds Orientology. Therefore Padoux, believing it to be a safe line of reasoning, quips, “Such being the case, and with all due reservations, the viewpoint that might be called evolutionist seems to me, for the time being, more convincing, and indeed the case for it is stronger than for a, so to speak, “transformist” standpoint (Andre Padoux, “Vac,” p. 31).

This being Padoux and also Orientology’s view on the Veda and the Indic culture, the Orientalists fall to wild speculation. Of course, if Padoux had understood the Veda and the Trika, he would not have chosen the word speculation whilst describing *Vac*. The extremely esoteric reason for the Trika’s description of *Vac* or the sonic essence as apparently variant in a few instances (i.e. Orientalists claim that the Shaiva Siddhanta is contra to Tantras and this is contra to Agamas, and so on), and especially as different to the Vedic (Bṛhahari’s) description of *Vac*, has escaped the current state of

scholarship. On account of this, Padoux has used the word speculation for the word *Vac*. It is unfortunate that while having reservations or even admitting, as above, that Orientology is ignorant of the Veda and also the Tantras that Padoux formed a premature conclusion, which only reflects the errors of Orientology.

While cursorily remarking on the Veda and offering insight to fellow Orientologists, Padoux remarks, “First, a major feature of the Word, as conceived of in India and as it will be considered here, is its strictly verbal or aural–unwritten–character. The Revelation is the *Shruti*, the word heard by the sages, the *rishis*, the seers-poets of the Vedic hymns. The earliest of these hymns were composed at a time when Aryan India did not know about writing. May not this early, purely verbal stage account for the subsequent depreciation of written texts? That is a moot point. However, the fact remains that henceforth Brahmanic-Hindu India has always proved to be suspicious of the written aspect of the word” (Andre Padoux, “Vac,” pp. xiii–xiv).

Relying on earlier funds of colonial Oriental scholarship (i.e. again Max Weber and F. Max Mueller), Padoux did not understand the distinct difference between the written word (*lipi*) and *Shabda* (Sonancy). India always had its spiritual texts written down as the Veda and its commentaries (vide “Divine Initiation”). However, Padoux and the institution of Orientology, being dependent on a “precedent-based, hierarchical system of institutionalized education,” erred.

Apart from this, the profundity of the Veda itself betrays this view of Orientology. It is unlikely that such a profound spiritual philosophy did not understand the term *Shabda* in its totality. Indeed, the Veda, being a Monist (*Advaita*) philosophy, not only understood the intricacies of *Shabda* and hence *Vac*, but also had its own import throughout its renditions. Indeed, the whole four renditions of the Veda are based on the notion of *Vac*. Padoux’s statement, representative of Indology even today, that “Aryan India did not know about writing” is based on the earlier fund of knowledge as provided by colonial Orientology, as said above. “Divine Initiation,” by these authors, gives the correct insight into the nature of the Indic philosophies, that is, the Veda, Agamas and Tantras. This work clearly shows that Orientology, not understanding the jargonic rendition of the Veda and its derivatives, has ignorantly postulated that the whole Vedic science shows phases of development.

As the Veda is inspired with the idea of *Shabda* and therefore *Vac* or “Vac Devi,” it is only Orientological colonial speculation that “Aryan India did not know about writing.” The *lipi* (written word) is the basis of all renditions of the Veda. And, indeed, the *lipi* is inseparable to *Vac* and *Vac* is inseparable from Vac Devi. Hence, the Vedas are based on the notion of mantras. India had *lipi* or “alphabets” from the inception of the Veda – whatever time the Veda was composed. We need not conform to colonial bias.

Indeed, the Veda is the earliest legacy of humankind. Its relics are extant in not only the subcontinent of India but also the whole world. Not only do the early texts the Chinese book of Odes, Homer’s epic works, India’s Veda and Mahabharata, and Iran’s Avestha all reveal a common source (i.e. the Veda), but also there are similarities between the world’s Divinities as the Indic Dyaus that is the same as the Western Zeus, the Indic Varuna that is the counterpart of the Western Ouranos or Uranus, Kama (the Indian God of Love) that equates with the Western God of Love Cupid, and the Vedic Aditi that is akin to the Greek Aphrodite or the Roman Goddess Venus.

Indeed, these Divinities are not only metaphysical depictions of an earlier civilization, but also ideographs that are exact alphabets in the science of mantras (vide “Divine Initiation” and “Third Eye of the Buddhist”).

Since the above is the case, Orientology, in its attempt at piecing together this ancient science, had jumped to erroneous conclusions. A system that for structure has the notion of “precedent and mentors” does not allow for innovative thinking. This brief write up will show the anomaly in Orientology and its rationale.

As a sample of Orientology, Padoux states, “The Veda, as is well known, should not be written down, a mantra is truly a “dead letter”; it should only be imparted by word of mouth during initiation” (Andre Padoux, “Vac,” p. xiv). This, however, does not mean that the Vedic and therefore the Indic civilization is averse to scriptural representations but, simply, that the Veda asserts on a philosophy that transcends the sonic essence or *Vac*. Of course, the “dead letter” refers to the sonic Energy manifesting as the “World Reality.” This is also true of other scriptures as The Book of Odes, the Bible and the Koran.

Whilst admitting scanty knowledge of even the Tantras, Padoux ventures to have an opinion of the Veda, which far antecedes even certain Tantras by several millenniums even going by the historical accounts of Orientology. It is strange that Padoux conjectures that he can give an accurate account of the Vedic culture and its civilization whilst he reasons that he might not be able to give a clear account of even the “later Tantric culture and civilizations.” Apart from this, Padoux also maintains, like the rest of the Orientologists, that Sanskrit was not the spoken language and he proposes that ancient India had other vernaculars (i.e. Prakriti). If this was then the case, how did he happen to conjecture the then Indic culture and civilization from merely Sanskrit records? This view originates from the colonial Orientologists, who could not digest the similarities of world cultures, as this would contravene their supremacist standpoint.

Of course, Orientology believes that its position of advantage is in politicizing, dividing and exploiting. Therefore, it preserves and propagates the colonial view.

Psychologists and Sociologists in the US have condemned this colonial view as Anglocentric dysfunction in the last few decades and termed it as the Western Anglo-Saxon person’s prejudice – Anglomania! The institutions of Psychology and Sociology see no validity in holding to a narcissist worldview.

Now let us take a look at the traditional views, especially on Tantric philosophy and culture, as contrasted with the views of Orientology.

Not realizing that the Tantric science, like the Agamas, is only a variant perspective of the Veda (vide “Divine Initiation”), Padoux, representative of Orientology, seems to be puzzled by the thought that Tantra suddenly becomes popular in India. Padoux quips, “Thus if ritualistic notions and customs are found as early as ancient Brahmanism, and it is identical as early as ancient Brahmanism, and if identical or quite similar concepts or practices emerge once again ten centuries later in Tantric lore, must we view them rather as a more or less accountable reappearance of a vanished material? Or shouldn’t it rather be assumed that those elements that revealed their presence to us from a certain period in time have in fact never ceased to exist locally, but were simply not mentioned in the texts as long as another

ideology prevailed? I believe the latter view could all the more be admitted since we do not by far know all the texts that might have been in existence, and we are very far also from being able to date precisely those texts that we do happen to know” (Andre Padoux, “Vac,” pp. 30–31).

The answer Padoux or Orientology seeks is not to be found in the myriads of texts but in the Veda (vide “Divine Initiation”).

The jargonic rendition of the Veda and its knowledge shows us that Padoux and Orientology have strayed far and made it almost impossible for future Orientologists to understand the nature of this ancient science. This has led to the enormous hunt for texts and editions and countless funds spent on re-editing the texts without understanding why differences occur in the various extant manuscripts.

Alexis Sanderson, presupposing Indians to be limited by a lack of academic culture (therefore, the “often harped belief that India did not understand history”), offers his academic salvific hands (to uplift lesser humankind).

So he dwells on “the tangible dating of manuscripts” and even reveals how an Orthodox practitioner, Swami Lakshman Joo, did not understand the relevance of dating. Thus, following concepts with an academician’s eyes, Sanderson says, “The attentive reader will have noticed that I have distinguished here between the texts of Abhinavagupta and Swami Lakshman Joo’s understanding of them, and will hope for my assessment of the accuracy and completeness of that understanding. For the two teachers are separated by approximately a thousand years. There was, of course, no doubt in the assertions of Swami Lakshman Joo’s devotees that Abhinavagupta’s Shaivism had reached them complete and unchanged; and when I asked Swami Lakshman Joo himself for his view of this matter he confirmed their faith. But systems of religious knowledge and practice such as this, which are rooted in the belief that they have been transmitted intact through an unbroken lineage of Gurus are more subject than most to the depredations of time. For if they fragment and contract, their teachers are barred from seeing this by their faith in the instruction received from their immediate predecessors and they will therefore be disinclined to reverse the process by recovering information from other sources, by searching, for example, for manuscripts of texts that were known to the authors whose works they consider valid but are no longer current among them. For such documents would be seen as mere texts divorced from living authority

(article on “Swami Lakshman Joo and his place in the Kashmirian Śaiva Tradition” by Alexis Sanderson taken from *Samvidullasah: Manifestations of Divine Consciousness: Swami Lakshman Joo (Saint-Scholar of Kashmir Śaivism)*/edited by Bettina Baumer and Sarla Kumar. New Delhi, D.K. Printworld, 2007, p. 95).”

This view of Sanderson has influenced not only Padoux but also the rest of current day Orientology.

In fact, knowledge of the Veda clearly shows that Padoux’s statement, “Thus Tantric Hinduism would have emerged progressively through a process of ongoing evolution over an extended period of time” (Andre Padoux, “Vac,” p. 31) is silly and only accords with Social Darwinism but not with the Veda and its Agamic and Tantric texts. Indeed, this is not only the view of Padoux, but also the rest of Orientology. The sad fact is that these scholars know that their study of this ancient science is scanty (even though they maintain it is due to lack of texts).

Orientology, from the onset, prematurely concluded on the Veda as emerging from Animism (i.e. thunder and lightning-fearing primitives as Weber understood) to Pantheism (as believed Max Muller).

It is a surprise that after years Max Muller conceded that the Veda was not Pantheistic but uniquely Henotheistic (i.e. the exalting of one Divinity at a time). This view still allowed him to uphold his Lutheran Christian supremacy. Henotheism is a word Max Muller gave to the world. It is this idea that Arthur Kostler revises and represents as the holon (a word derived from the Greek “holos” meaning whole, and the suffix “on,” which suggests a particle or part).

Overwhelmed with Darwinian ideology, these scholars did not realize that the Veda, being a legacy of the past, could have been differently presented.

A hundred years has gone and this primitive view of Weber and Muller is still bewildering Orientologists and keeping them far from the true study of the Veda and its sub-perspectives and therefore the Vedic culture.

Indeed, the latent, politically biased colonial attitude is still hindering us from appreciating a global or human world.

As the Veda holds a Monist ideology (vide “Divine Initiation”), it is then a different account. This shifts the entire understanding of the Agamas, Tantras and Buddhism (vide “Third Eye of the Buddhist”). It is due to this continuous Monistic thread that the Indic Tantrics until this day iterate a Vedic mantra and its Tantric counterpart when observing their rituals. This has been pointed out by Sir John Woodroffe in his translation of the Mahanirvana Tantra (Mahanirvana Tantra refers to recitation of the gayatri mantra one hundred and eight times in Chapter 1, that the Vaidika and Tantric Sandhyas should be performed in their respective orders, Chapter 3, and that Sandhya, whether Vaidika or Tantrika, should be performed thrice daily (i.e. sunrise, noon and sunset) in Chapter 8; vide blogroll for online Mahanirvana Tantra). Woodroffe, being a Tantric practitioner and therefore a sympathizer of the Indic Tantras, *although not realizing that the Veda is Monist*, pointed out to the world the practice of Tantras as he encountered in the early decades of the twentieth century. Woodroffe, although a British High Court Judge, being a Tantric, is yet not, characteristically, permitted any worthwhile status by Indology (vide “An Indian Soul in a European Body?” by Kathleen Taylor, Routledge, 2001, a work that maintains that Woodroffe was only “supposedly learned” and only “appeared to be deeply versed” and that he relied too heavily on his friend, A. B. Ghose). Even the title of Taylor’s work is condescending. This is the kind of scholarship that perpetuates colonial superiority that this article is exposing. Publishers like Routledge also support “the establishment.”

However, if one understands the Monist ideology of the Veda, one will easily see the reason why the Indic Tantrics recite both sets of mantras in their practice. Indeed, even otherwise, the Tantric mantras are only analogous to those of the Vedic exegetes.

This not only proves that the Indic Tantrics would have from the onset read the Veda as a Monistic science, but also substantiates the view that the verse from the Paratrishika, mentioned above, does, indeed, refer to the Veda as the basis of all. The knowledge of the Veda as a Monist ideology invalidates the views and statements of Orientologists, and especially the following statement: “One important distinction between Tantrism and Vedism (or orthodox Brahmanism) is that, contrary to the Veda, the Tantric revelation is supposed to be available to all, irrespective of caste or sex. This is something new, in contrast with the Vedas and Upanishads. This has sometimes been considered as a result (and evidence) of the Brahmanic–Hindu religion

expanding into new social strata or groups and it may be so” (Andre Padoux, “Vac,” p. 35).

This charge and stand against the Indic culture and the Veda that it is caste-orientated, itself, originates from the baseless, biased views of colonial Orientologists’ divide, rule and exploit attitude.

If the Veda was strictly caste-orientated, there would never have been the possibility of the people of Nepal and Bali becoming descendants of the Vedic tradition. The early South East Asian people were upholding the Veda. Right from Burma down to Indonesia, they were adherents of Indic Tantricism until their embracing of Buddhism. Relics as the Angkor Wat in Cambodia and those as the Borabodor in Indonesia reveal that the SE Asians held a sophisticated Monist ideology, often Vedic-based Monist (*Advaita*) Tantricism. (Even Alexis Sanderson references the Shaiva connections in Angkor Wat in “History Through Textual Criticism the study of Śaivism, the Pañcarātra and the Buddhist Yoginītantras.” In: *Les Sources et le temps. Sources and Time: A Colloquium, Pondicherry, 11-13 January 1997*, edited by François Grimal. Publications du département d'Indologie 91. Pondicherry: Institut Français de Pondichéry/École Française d'Extrême-Orient (2001), pp. 7–8, nt. 5.).

If the Vedic exegetes were upholding caste restrictions or distinctions then these people, who had a variant racial origination to the Indians, would not have been able to hold the Indic Tantric ideology. It is commonly known that Java was a strong Indic Tantric civilization until the Majapahit reign, the last Indic civilization in Indonesia existing in the 13th – 16th centuries.

This invalidates the Orientologists’ biased deductions that Vedic Brahmanism was caste- or race-based.

The correct understanding of the Veda reveals that it was not caste based (vide “Divine Initiation” on the topic of the Dasyus or so-called non-Aryan people). Padoux likes to refer to the so-called non-Aryan people as “lower caste,” or “above all” “aboriginal elements” as playing “a decisive role in the advent of Tantrism,” thereby relegating Tantrism to the practices of the so-called lower classes. He, as usual, down grades Tantrism also by stating that it may have imported “shamanic cult” influences from across the border in Tibet. He even implies that Brahmanism (meaning Vedism) since it developed in India, might have absorbed some of the “non-Aryan” elements

(Andre Padoux, “Vac,” p. 36). Here he exhibits his blatant racism and casteism and lack of understanding of the Vedic and Tantric traditions, as he does not know what to believe. Sanderson also believes in this “brahmanization” or “vedantization” of Tantrism in his classically entitled work “Purity and Power among the Brahmins of Kashmir,” in M. Carrithers, S. Collins, and S. Lukes, eds., *The Category of the Person* (Cambridge University Press, 1985) (cited in Padoux, “Vac,” p. 35 and n. 12).

This cliché of Orientalism that the Vedics were “caste and race obsessed” originated from the earlier “divide and rule” thinking of the racist colonialists. This explanation eradicates Padoux’s view that “One important distinction between Tantrism and Vedism (or orthodox Brahmanism) is that, contrary to the Veda, the Tantric revelation is supposed to be available to all, irrespective of caste or sex. This is something new, in contrast with the Vedas and the Upanishads” (Andre Padoux, “Vac,” p. 35).

Indeed, India and its dynamism was invalidated by colonialism. This explanation also dismisses Padoux’s assertion that, “this egalitarianism does not, however, extend to the social field. Even though Tantrism is especially notable for certain transgressive practices in violation of the regulation about caste and ritual purity, it does not appear at all as socially egalitarian, and still less as revolutionary” (Andre Padoux, “Vac,” pp. 35–36 n. 14). Padoux continues, “Transgression indeed owes its efficacy to the force of the transgressive norm. For the “social” aspect of Tantrism, see T. Goudriaan, *Hindu Tantrism*, p. 32. For its “transgressive” aspect, cf. A. Sanderson’s study mentioned above” (Andre Padoux, “Vac,” p. 36, n. 14). Thus, this idea of transgression or deviation from the norm originates from Sanderson.

Tantrics do not see any “transgression” or “norm” that Padoux, Goudriaan or Sanderson sees, as this so-called norm is not only an error in reading the jargonic presentation of the texts, but also a previous century cultural bias and conditioning originating from past Eurocentric phobias. The word “sex” was enough to set spasms in the minds of the then Victorian prudish population. Are we to still hold to this as a dominant world culture? In this light, Padoux says, “So this attitude of renunciation of early Buddhism and of the Upanishads appears as corresponding to a limited period in time, or rather to one only of the two faces of Indian thought, which seems basically always to have focused on the magical control over the universe. This, I believe, is an ever-present or even underlying

component of Tantric or tantricized Hinduism” (Andre Padoux, “Vac,” pp. 38–39). In fact, there is no such thing as a “tantricized Hinduism.”

This, itself, is a statement emerging from not understanding that the Indic civilization right from the onset had observed practices that were ritualistic, and also Yogic (vide Yajur Veda and Bhagavad Gita). This is also reflective of the Brahmanas of the Veda. The idea of rituals as part of praxis originates from defining creation logically and, to be precise, mathematically (vide Sankhya Darshan of Sage Kapila). This is also denoted by Pythagoras, a Latinized adaptation of the Indic Bhaskara, from whom the notion of mathematically accounting for Creation originates. Therefore, the assertion on a “tantricized Hinduism,” a view that believes in Tantra as alien to the Veda and the Indic culture as having layers of development, is as invalid as the idea of an Early Buddhism (vide “Third Eye of the Buddhist”).

The terms “renunciation” and “householder (*grhastha*)” that Padoux has borrowed from the Vedic Upanishads and Buddhism (see “Vac,” pp. 37–49) are not to be so easily and simplistically read. They are Vedic and, hence, Buddhist terms that are to be read after understanding the jargon of the Veda and, therefore, Buddhism. These terms explain the two principle approaches of these spiritual sciences. Thus, of course, the clichéd innuendo, “two faces of Indian thought, which seems basically always to have always focused on the magical control over the universe” (Andre Padoux, “Vac,” pp. 38–39) is an insubstantial theory based on the colonial bias. Moreover, this statement reflects Padoux’s or Orientology’s preoccupation with the colonial idea of magic and power, especially as rituals were abhorrent to the colonial mind and even to the mindset of today. Ironically, many of these scholars’ writings reveal that they are consumed with dysfunctional power. Thus, Padoux argues that Tantrics have a “quest for power together with (or sometimes rather than) liberation,” “the liberated-while-living of Tantrism attains not only self mastery but mastery over the universe; he is man-god” (Andre Padoux, “Vac,” p. 38). So now Padoux demotes Tantrism to not even seeking liberation but power. This view stems from Padoux’s idea that sexual enjoyment is a sin, as he clearly thinks that Tantrics favour enjoyment (*bhukti*) and supernatural powers over liberation (*moksha*) (ibid. “Vac” p. 39). He even states categorically that they reach the divine by “transgressive practices where immersion in impurity means gaining access to power” (ibid. “Vac,” p. 41). He cannot handle even that Tantra has sex, for Padoux it is only symbolic sex and he categorically denies “divinized eroticism” (ibid. “Vac,” p. 46). For Padoux, eroticism could never be divine and he dismisses

it off as symbolism. He doesn't like female power either as he says: "the pursuit of deliverance will in the main consist of tapping and using (not to say manipulating) this energy" (*shakti*) (ibid. "Vac," p. 41). He further says, "the Goddess of Hinduism is generally experienced as closer to her devotees, more concerned with their daily problems than the masculine Godhead" (ibid. "Vac," p. 45). Presumably, according to Padoux, the male Godhead is more powerful than the Goddess. And he says, "Emanating from the primal Energy, those divinized energies are each, like her, associated (and more often than not metaphysically subordinated) to a male partner of whom she is the consort" (ibid. "Vac," p. 45). These passages are more an insight into Padoux than Tantra. For Padoux, renunciation would be acceptable but the reconciliation of *moksha* (liberation) with *bhoga* (enjoyment) in the Tantras is for Padoux the pursuit of "power and control."

Not surprisingly, Professor Hugh B. Urban, a scholar of Assamese Tantra, shares the same view as Padoux and Sanderson. Thus he states that "Tantric ritual involves a systematic transgression of the normal laws of purity in order to release the dangerous power that lies bound up with impurity and violence. As such, Tantra was naturally very attractive to many of Assam's kings, enmeshed as they were within the dangerous, often impure world of statecraft, military struggle, and the inevitable violence of political power." Further, it is suggested in the below abstract that his work "The Path of Power: Impurity, Kingship, and Sacrifice in Assamese Tantra" offers a fresh approach to the study of Assamese Tantra (vide <http://jaar.oxfordjournals.org/cgi/content/abstract/69/4/777>). However, this is unlikely given his adherence to the aforementioned ideologies of Padoux and Sanderson. The very title of Urban's work suggests that he too is obsessed with the notions of impurity and power. The similarity in the views of these scholars suggests the lineage of systematic oppression of the pure knowledge of the Tantras (vide *Journal of the American Academy of Religion* 2001 69(4):777-816; doi:10.1093/jaarel/69.4.777 © 2001 by American Academy of Religion).

The Tantras, which are of the Vedic exegetes, are organic spiritual sciences that offer precise principles of metaphysics. They are based on logic (*Nyaya*), and mathematics (*Ganita*). They do not at any time revel in magic, miracle (vide "Divine Initiation"), or politics.

The beliefs of Orientology are epitomized in this passage by Padoux, "This, I believe, is an ever-present or even underlying component of Tantric or

tantricized Hinduism: even for escaping the cycle of births its follower practices rites that give him supernatural powers (*siddhis*), or at least goes through a stage of where those powers are offered him by the deities he must propitiate in order to attain liberation” (Andre Padoux, “Vac,” p. 39).

The term “Siddhis” does not mean any supernatural powers as understands Padoux, Sanderson or Orientology. It is a term relating to the Siddhanta exegetes and refers to an aspect of metaphysics of the Siddhantins (i.e. Shaiva Siddhanta and an aspect of the Tibetan Buddhists). By relinquishing all identities, that is, all notion of false identity, even in their very neophyte stages, in the process of *diksha* or initiation or empowerment, the Siddhantins traverse the path towards spiritual liberation. In their quest, they relinquish not only egohood (*Ahamkara*) but also all association with gross realities. By relinquishing and disassociating from the temporal (*Samsara*), they gain empowerment or *Siddhi*, an empowerment that affirms their mastery of the self towards the quest of spiritual liberation. There is then no question of “supernatural powers” as Padoux alludes. This passage of the Paratrishika Vivarana that Padoux refers to is discussing the metaphysics of the Siddhantins but Padoux didn’t understand this.

Padoux believes, as does Orientology, that the so-called dichotomy that exists in the Vedic and Upanishadic texts, regarding the renunciate versus the householder, also persists in the Tantras: “I, for one, am tempted to see at play, in this search for liberation and powers, two tendencies—antagonistic in some respects, complementary in some others, but above all fundamental—of the Indian Soul. This is one of the inner tensions (rather than conflicting elements) of Tantric Hinduism—where there are others too, as we shall see, notably one, of general character, between the householder and the renunciate” (Andre Padoux, “Vac,” p. 39). Of course, such views originate from not understanding that the Veda holds a Monist ideology and that the distinction between the Tantras and their source, the Veda, is merely metaphysical.

If one understands the Monist view of the Veda, then one can realize that the Tantras, due to their emphasis on the worship of the Goddess, have at times a variant account of metaphysics and philosophy to the Veda.

There is not, as alludes Orientology, a primitive Vedic culture and an evolved Tantric one.

Therefore, the following statement of Padoux is invalid: “For Tantrism too, not withstanding its quest for powers, does have its renunciates, and even to the highest degree. Whence would have emerged Tantric sects, with their initiatory lineages, if not from groups of renunciates first gathered around a master, then transmitting the teaching from master to disciple (*guruparampara*)? Tantric sects have always been first of all small groups of initiated ascetics, even though, with time becoming more respectable, more “brahmanized,” they did accommodate *grhasthas* [householders]” (Andre Padoux, “Vac,” p. 39).

In fact, Tantrics, be they Trika Shaiva exegetes, Shaktas or Vaishnavites, do not believe in “powers” as Padoux alludes. Their understanding alludes to the fact that the highest principle is inherent of the Shakti or the Yin aspect (both terms describe the Feminine). This is again not a quest for “powers.”

Energy or Shakti emanates Creation. However, She is not ever Creation. She is an *essential* aspect of God (Shiva to the Shaivites, Vishnu to the Vaishnavites or even Buddha to the Buddhists).

It is a fallacy of reasoning in any spiritual science to take Shakti as Creation. And if one understands the Veda and its Monist ideology, then it is easy to see that the Agamas and the Tantras are a variant interpretation of the Veda.

As this is the case, there is no question of evolution or transformation in the Indic tradition as conjectures Orientology. Similarly, there is no question of Brahmanism in the Tantras or, conversely, Tantrifying any Vedic exegete. Indeed, the Veda had always been involved with rites and ritual and there is no question of any later day Tantric innovation.

Likewise, the Tripura Rahasya [the esoteric essence of the three realms] of Bhaskara Raya is not accommodating any external innovation to the Tantras, but merely presenting another valid interpretation of the Veda in consideration with the astrological notion of time. Since at the apt moment the Veda turns Tantric, the Vedic exegetes acknowledge this.

Thus, the Mahanirvana Tantra says that the Tantras are revealed at the dawn of every *Kali Yuga* (vide blogroll for online Mahanirvana Tantra, Introduction, The Ages). There are four *yugas* or cycles, *Satya*, *Treta*, *Dvapara*, and *Kali*, the one we are in now. The last, or Kalki Avatara, has

yet to come and rides a white horse as does the rider of the Apocalypse (Bible, Chapter Six, Revelation).

Since this is the case, Tantras and Tantrics are never outside the fold of the Veda. To think that Tantrics are not Vedic is definitely to err. Similarly, to assume that Vedics can't be Tantrics is also to err.

It is due to this that the Vedic Bhaskara Raya tradition, the Kamakoti Pitham in Kancheepuram in Tamil Nadu (<http://www.kamakoti.org>) and the Shringeri Pitham in Karnataka (<http://www.sringeri.net>) were all Tantric traditions in the past, though some would dispute this.

The reverse is true of the Svachchanda Tantric Shaivas, as they are also descendants of the Vedic civilization. In traditional accounts, even the Buddhist Tantrics are a variant of the Vedics (vide “Third Eye of the Buddhist”) and not alien to the Vedic tradition as errs Orientology or present day Buddhist Orthodoxy.

Since the Tantras, like the Agamas, offer a variant interpretation of the Veda, and a good inquiry reveals that the principles of the Tantras are always inherent in the Veda, there is no question of any small group of ascetics forming secret “Tantric sects,” as says Padoux. Again, as the Tantras are only offering a variant reading of the Veda, the Vedic exegetes always had observed the Tantras and Tantric culture and practices whenever apt (vide Kancheepuram and Shringeri Pithams) [a *pitham* is a Gnostic nucleus that manifests the philosophy and place of esoteric learning]. In the same parlance, is the Kama Rupa temple in Assam. The question of it being a Left or Right-hand Tantric temple is a metaphysical one. [*Vama*, or the esoteric praxis, is jargonically the Left-hand and the exotic praxis or *Daksha* is jargonically the Right-hand]. If the metaphysics necessitated the modulation of sexuality, then it was observed carefully and sacredly. Many other societies also modulated sexuality as part of their spiritual tradition and these cultures are lingering on (e.g. Taoists, Kabbalists, Geishas and Sufis). Even the Song of Songs (Bible) references sexuality. In any case, the Indic tradition (India, Nepal, Java, Bali, Pakistan, and so on) always observed the Veda and also always observed the esoteric science or, what is, in Sanskrit, known as the Tantras.

All legitimate spiritual traditions have an esoteric interpretation. In this light, the whole of India indulged in the Tantras when necessary. There never was

the case of, “Tantric sects have always been first of all small groups of initiated ascetics,” as says Padoux (Andre Padoux, “Vac,” p. 39).

There is ample number of hymns in the Veda associated with sexuality. All spiritual sciences teach us to live a full life, and especially the Veda. It is only the misreading of the ancient spiritual sciences (inclusive of the Bible and the Hinayana Buddhists) that led us to believe in a false notion of purity (i.e. sexual abstinence as a virtue that gains us entry to Heaven). This is merely a naïve interpretation of spirituality. Indeed, it is a dysfunction that Sigmund Freud highlighted.

Reveling in his own sense of powercentricity, Padoux says, “This will to rule over the world, as important here, brings us to another aspect of Tantrism, which in itself and because of its consequences is probably its cardinal feature” (Andre Padoux, “Vac,” p. 40).

This is an absurd statement. Tantrics do not “will to rule over the world” but rather disassociate from the world and attain the grace of the Divine Shakti and eventually merge in Absolute Consciousness or *Para Samvid* or the Divine She. Padoux, erring in his view about Shakti as Creation and not the Ultimate Divine, believes that a Tantric adept is interested in magically controlling the world. (These statements reveal Padoux’s faithfulness to his forebearers as Weber and Max Muller and their Social Darwinian ideology. Like them, Padoux believes that humankind, being felicitous to overwhelming natural forces, supplicated to higher forces as Divinities. This was a central doctrine and tool of the colonial Orientologists to extirpate other cultures.) To Padoux and many others, Tantra is nothing more than magic. This is also the case with the monograph on Tara called “The Cult of Tara: Magic and Ritual in Tibet” by Stephen Beyer. Beyer too, believing in the bias of the miracle, subsumed Tara’s culture and worship under the title of magic. It is no coincidence, therefore, that one of his mentors, Kees W. Bolle, pays tribute to Max Muller as one of the greatest of religious historians (Stephen Beyer, “The Cult of Tara: Magic and Ritual in Tibet,” Introduction, p. xii).

This bias surfaces whenever conservative scholars with latent Christian values deal with the spiritual sciences of “others.”

As the Veda is presented in jargon, Orientology could not understand that the Veda is the legacy of “all humankind.”

Not realizing this, many Orientalists as Padoux, asserting on a false sense of supremacy, allocate the term “magic” to Eastern sciences and reserve the term “miracle” for Western religion.

Even Mircea Eliade could not conceal his Romanian puritanical Catholic bias (Mircea Eliade, “Yoga: Immortality and Freedom,” first published in French in 1933 and then in English in 1958).

His book, “Yoga: Immortality and Freedom” is nothing more than a Catholic justification on Yoga and the Tantras. That is, there is nothing wrong with original Catholicism but the lay Catholic ideology is childishly beset with fears and consequently guilt.

The study of Uttara Shaivism began with the collation of texts within the state of Kashmir before India’s independence. It was collated under the auspices of the body known as The Kashmir Series of Texts and Studies (KSTS) that began publishing in 1911 (vide Muktabodha Online Library at <http://www.muktabodha.org>).

Many texts were edited by the then scholar Madhusudhana Kaul Shastri. They were academically analyzed under the auspices of Dr. Buller and also Dr. K. C. Pandey.

However, they were not clearly explicated then. It was not until the present era, when the late Swami Lakshman Joo shared certain specific points of interest with his students that the science, as it is now known to the world, became within reach of a person uninitiated in Traditional learning. This came as a breakthrough in the study of the Agamas and Tantras.

Following in the footsteps of Jan Gonda, Lilian Silburn, a French scholar, studied this Agama with Swami Laksman Joo of Kashmir. Jan Gonda, a Dutch scholar, was one of the first to initiate this unprecedented move of approaching Traditional Indian Pandits or scholars to assist him with his research. Consequently, the quality of his research is superior to many scholars of his day.

In his work “The Triadic Heart of Shiva,” Paul Muller-Ortega mentions that Lilian Silburn learned under the late Swami Lakshman Joo (vide Paul

Eduardo Muller-Ortega, “The Triadic Heart of Shiva,” p. 21, Shri Satguru Publications, Delhi, 1997).

Lilian Silburn also happened to be Padoux’s predecessor and mentor in the research of this spiritual tradition. Indeed, the Swami’s contribution was the erudition of the notion of *Tattvas* (facts). This led Orientology towards a new direction in the understanding of the research of the Agamas, Tantras and also Vedism as a whole.

In the south of India, another French speaking woman named Helen Brunner-Lachaux came to India and commenced working in the Institute Francais d’Indologie in Pondicherry. With the help of esteemed pandits like N. R. Bhatt, she learned not only the Sanskrit language but also the rudiments of the Dakshina Agama, which is popularly known as Southern Shaivism.

The Agamas, as all Vedic literature, are clothed in jargon (vide “Divine Initiation” or “Third Eye of the Buddhist”) and are illegible to those that are uninitiated. Indeed, they can be understood only if one is initiated in the Vedic science. It is due to this that Orientology is ambiguous. Helen Brunner was not only taught by N. R. Bhatt but also several other Shastris or Pandits (traditional scholars employed by the Institute Francais de Pondicherry). Apart from this, she also used to frequent the Kapaleeshvar Temple in Mylapore, a suburb within the city of Chennai. She also learnt from the Shastris or traditional scholars of Kumbakonam, a place of Traditional learning in Thanjavur (formerly Tanjore) in South India. With the support of all these Shastris or Traditional scholars, she translated and annotated the text known as the Soma-Shambhu-Paddhati. It is this contribution that took Orientology to more serious queries of the Agamas.

In Varanasi or Benares, Orientologists also learned from the famous North Indian scholar Gopinath Kaviraj, who was a disciple of a famous Shakti Ma known as Anandmayi Ma. He contributed greatly to the fund of knowledge in the study of the Agamas and Tantricism.

Other scholars from the Benares Hindu University too were engaged in research, as Dr. Pandey, Navjivan Rastogi and Vrajavallabha Dviveda, and they all contributed to the understanding of the Agamas and Tantras.

Mark Dyczkowski, an American Orientologist, got his fund of knowledge from the Benares Hindu University, as he studied there.

Even as early as the seventies, the popular Tantric practitioner Nik Douglas pays tribute to Dyczkowski as helping with source material for his book “Sexual Secrets: The Alchemy of Ecstasy” (Nik Douglas and Penny Slinger, Destiny Books, 1979).

However, Andre Padoux and Alexis Sanderson (vide Padoux’s writings) seem to be saying that they hold the key to the knowledge of the Agamas and Tantras. Padoux almost wants us to believe that if not for Alexis Sanderson, from the All Souls College of Oxford, the Indians would not know their spiritual science. Furthermore, it is only Sanderson that has any erstwhile knowledge. At least, this is what Padoux is saying about Sanderson.

Alexis Sanderson’s claim to the knowledge of the Agamas and Tantras, itself, lies in his specialty in reading the Sharada Script. This script is allegedly scarcely read by the native people of Nepal or India. Indeed, Sanderson, previous to his taking office at the All Souls College at Oxford, was studying in India for almost a decade and taking notes privately in Benares and also from Swami Lakshman Joo in Kashmir.

However, Padoux wants us to believe that it is Orientology that brought to life a lost tradition. Unfortunately, the works of Orientology reveal their lack of knowledge on many aspects of the Indic science and it is a wonder that they believe that nobody else would understand this science.

Since Orientology holds all the conferences and publishes all the journals and books that meet their “standards of methodology,” it seems probable that it is only them who have any understanding of this science. Padoux’s desire to be crowned as a great scholar, the saviour of Agamas and Tantras, necessitates that he crowns Sanderson. However, all concepts so far released by Orientologists can be traced back to either Swami Lakshman Joo in the North or Pandit N. R. Bhatt in the South.

Another source of Orientology’s information is from the Vaishnava temples of Shri Ranganam near Thiruchirapalli (Trichy) in Tamil Nadu (<http://www.srirangam.org>). The scholar Sanjukta Gupta gleaned her

information from these Vaishnava Acharyas or teachers and she acknowledges this in her translation of the Lakshmi Tantra.

However, Orientologists pride themselves on their ability to “scan and stack” the ancient works with their Darwinian supremacist ideology.

This is exemplified by the following words of Padoux, which are representative of not only himself and Helen Brunner, but also the mainstay of Orientology, “The question may be raised as to whether it was speculations or rites that appeared first in the Agamas, Tantras, and other such texts. One may presume it was rites: such is H. Brunner’s opinion with respect to the Agamas” (Andre Padoux, “Vac,” pp. 52–53 n. 50). Brunner was convinced of Darwinism and she utilized it as a tool in not only interpreting the texts and their doctrines, but also when dealing with fellow colleagues in the Institute Francais de Pondicherry in India.

All Indians understand what a mandala is but the late Helen Brunner implies that she rediscovered mandalas (vide Gudrun Buhneman, “Mandalas and Yantras in the Hindu Traditions,” Brill). A mandala simply implies a constellation and a universe or cosmos. For Indians, the Yantras and Mandalas are not theories, as believes Orientology, but the actual “DNA” of the world reality and, of course, they know that it is basing on these mandalas that the Temple structures of India are built. Even as early as 1946, the late Stella Kramrisch, gleaning her information from the Pandits of Orissa and Bengal, presented a book on analogous ideas entitled the “Hindu Temple.”

In the culture of Indology, it seems that the influence of one scholar dominates the whole field. The influence of Sanderson can be seen extensively in Padoux’s works. Sanderson’s influence on his students’ writings is also visible. Dominic Goodall has edited the Kirana Agama in the last few years. His other student Somadev Vasudev has published his doctoral thesis on the Malini Vijaya Uttara Tantra through the Institute Francais de Pondicherry in 2004, which is currently directed by Goodall. They appear to be scrupulously great and conscientious works but, unfortunately, being again reliant on the theories of Sanderson, they are nothing more than speculations.

Somadev, like Padoux, has verbatim taken Sanderson’s ideas far too seriously. Indeed, assuming that the Veda (Rg, Yajur, Sama and Artharva) is

an antiquated mass of literature with no import, Sanderson and, therefore, Somadev presupposes that it is only the Malini Tantra that makes its debut as a Monist or *Advaita* text, and that too barely.

As quips Padoux, “The distinguishing of three main phases in the historical development of the Trika is due to A. Sanderson: he describes this in “Śaivism and the Tantric tradition,” in S. Sutherland et al. (eds.), *The World’s Religions* (London: Routledge, 1988, pp. 660–704) (Andre Padoux, “Vac,” p. 64, n. 82). Sanderson’s theory is that he sees three distinct phases before the Uttara Shaivites, or the popularly known Kashmiri Shaivites, become Monist or *Advaitins*.

Of course, following in the footsteps of his predecessor at Oxford, Max Muller, Sanderson sees evolution within the Shaiva texts! Therefore, he sees interpolations in the texts by the Uttara Shaiva exegetes, especially Shri Bhagavan Abhinava Gupta.

The entire world’s Spiritual science is presented in jargon and so is the Trika science of India. Only after understanding this jargon, can one see the relevance of the literary presentations of the ancient world (vide “Divine Initiation” and “The Third Eye of the Buddhist”).

Indeed, not realizing that the earliest of scriptures, the Veda, is, in fact, presented in jargon and is a Monist science, Sanderson, like Max Muller, fails to comprehend the history of Vedic philosophies. Likewise, Sanderson’s students carry forth this incomprehension of the Indic science as “the mark of Oxford’s authority in the field of Indology!”

As the Parama Artha Sara is a reconsidered work based on the ancient Adhara Karika and this is openly avowed by the Shaivite exegetes, it is easy for Sanderson to assume that there could be a similar instance with the core Shaivite text the Malini Tantra.

Basing on such simplistic suppositions, Sanderson seems to have embarked boldly on his claim of seeing Monist or *Advaita* “forced readings” in the Malini Tantra. This is absurd because the whole of Sanderson’s scholarship merely relies on chance.

Although his colleague Padoux has cited a whole chapter of possible *Advaitin* interpretations of the Veda, in the first chapters of “Vac,”

Sanderson seems to have taken a strong punt that the Veda must be only the babblings of a primitive lot! (see Wendy O’Flaherty). Since this is the *raison d’être* of Indologists, they have erred.

Therefore, every line of interpretation of the Orientologists is nothing but baseless speculations (cf. “Divine Initiation” and its sequel “Third Eye of the Buddhist”). Since these two monographs, albeit from the Traditional quarters, prove that the Veda is Monist or *Advaita*, it takes one to a completely variant reading of the Agamas and Tantras. This reading is unique to the ancient world!

Now we will examine the writings of Alexis Sanderson as published on his website (<http://alexissanderson.com/default.aspx>).

Alexis Sanderson commenced his study in Indology in the seventies. As he says in his lectures on “The Lākulas: New evidence of a system intermediate between Pāñcārthika Pāśupatism and Āgamic Śaivism” (Ramalinga Reddy Memorial Lectures, 1997): “The spark that ignited my first interest in Saivism was a lecture on the Kashmirian poetician Mahima Bhatta given by your fellow-countrywoman Dr. S. S. Janaki in 1970 when I was an undergraduate at Oxford preparing for a B.A. in Sanskrit and she was completing her doctoral thesis.”

So Sanderson ventured into India to learn more, as he says inspired first by the Kashmirian poet Mahima Bhatta and later by the Dhvanyaloka and especially its commentary by Abhinava Gupta in the final year of his B.A in 1971.

Thus, he says, “In 1971 I completed a B.A. course in Sanskrit at Oxford. During the last year of the course I had strayed beyond the syllabus to read the Dhvanyaloka of the Kashmirian poetician Anandavardhana and after studying the learned commentary on that classic by Abhinavagupta began to take an interest in that Śhaiva author’s theological and philosophical writings. Fascinated by what I found there I decided to devote myself to research in this area. Being conscious of the difficult and technical nature of the literature I saw the desirability of being trained by a Kashmirian scholar well-versed in this tradition and after discovering the existence of Swami Lakshman Joo from the publications of others who had studied with him [i.e.

Lilian Silburn] I traveled to Kashmir in Feb 1972 at the age of 23 with the hope that he would accept me as a pupil. Provided with a letter of introduction I approached him with my request. He asked me what text I wished to study with him and when I replied that I wished to read all the extant literature, he asked me to return a week later for his answer” (“Swami Lakshman Joo and His Place in the Kashmirian Śaiva Tradition.” In: *Samvidullāṣah*, edited by Bettina Bäumer and Sarla Kumar, New Delhi: D. K. Printworld, 2007, p. 93).

At least as says Sanderson, “I had the funding from my college to pursue my studies in Kashmir for three years and I had the hope of more to come before I would have to look for a full-time teaching post. Nevertheless, it seemed to me to be inappropriate to ask Swami Lakshman Joo to work with me in the manner of traditional Sanskrit teacher, reading through text after text, line by line. I therefore suggested that I would read on my own and bring my questions to him for discussion. He approved and thereafter we met for this purpose once or twice a week [Swami Lakshman Joo was a relentlessly giving person and Sanderson admits this in his article]. In this way we covered [or I learned how a Spiritualist approaches the texts] the greater part of the literature that had been published in the Kashmiri Series of Texts and Studies, devoting particular attention after my preliminary reading to the study of Abhinavagupta’s *Tantraloka*, his compendious analysis of the *Malini Vijaya Tantra*” (op. cit. (meaning “in the work cited above”), p. 94).

Then to assert on his superiority through association with the highest Kashmirian exegete, he says, “I was blocked only when my scepticism was applied to the metaphysical doctrine of his tradition’s non-dualism. But it was inappropriate of me to venture into that territory since the purpose of my pupilage was to attempt to understand his understanding of the texts of Abhinavagupta and those texts themselves; and when I forgot this I was halted not by dogmatism but by the sincere expression of hope that I would come in time, perhaps in a future life, to assent to this position and so open the way for myself through direct experience to what was for him no less than the ultimate goal of human existence. It is all the more remarkable in the light of this evident limitation of my approach to the study of his path that he was willing to devote so much time on education” (op. cit., p. 95).

Sanderson, after establishing that he learned from an unparalleled authentic Tantric (of the highest order in India, at least as he would have us believe),

asserts that his acumen as an academician is far superior to that of Swami Lakshman Joo.

Thus he says, “The attentive reader will have noticed that I have distinguished here between the texts of Abhinavagupta and Swami Lakshman Joo’s understanding of them, and will hope for my assessment of the accuracy and completeness of that understanding. For the two teachers are separated by approximately a thousand years. There was, of course, no doubt in the assertion of Swami Lakshman Joo’s devotees that Abhinavagupta’s Shaivism had reached them complete and unchanged; and when I asked Swami Lakshman Joo himself for his view of this matter he confirmed their faith” (op. cit., p. 95).

Sanderson maintains, “But systems of religious knowledge and practice such as this, which are rooted in the belief that they have been transmitted intact through an unbroken lineage of Gurus are more subject than most to the depredations of time [or, rather, most readings in India that are lingering on are based on a more accurate and broader interpretation of the scriptures]” (op. cit., p. 95).

It is not only time, but also the effects of colonization that erased the continuity of the traditions. The enslaving of humankind and the two world wars were responsible for the breakdown in the traditional transmission of spiritual knowledge. Spiritualists, in their attempt to preserve their science, are left with only fossils.

Darwinism did not help either as it relegated the study of spiritualism as nonsensical babblings.

Therefore Sanderson’s statement, “The Kashmirian Śaiva Tradition has certainly not been immune in this regard” (op. cit., p. 95) is partially true. The sadness of Swami Lakshman Joo and his followers is that they too had succumbed to reading their texts without the basis of the Veda. This approach then offers a scanty view of even the Trika perspective: a view analogous to that of Sanderson and the rest of the Orientologists (e.g. Teun Goudriaan, Padoux and Brunner). As can be ascertained from the words of Sanderson on Swami Lakshman Joo and also the works of Jaideva Singh, Swami Lakshman Joo’s student, one understands that the Swami became localized and did not understand the link of the *Trika Sampradaya* (tradition of the *three* goddesses or perspectives with its other esoteric *three*, so the

school is also known as *the half of six*) with its parent, the Veda, and therefore the gap or lacunae. That is to say, the works of Jaideva Singh often reflect disrespect towards Patanjali (vide Pratyabhijnana or Vijnana Bhairava) or the Vedic tradition.

Unfortunately, the teachings as expounded by these Shaiva exegetes (i.e. Swami Lakshman Joo and Jaideva Singh) are limited excepting for some highlights that assisted Orientology in moving forward. As mentioned earlier, the principles offered by Pandit N. R. Bhatt and Swami Lakshman Joo assisted Orientologists in understanding Shaivism better compared with those who did not study with the Orthodoxy (vide Agehananda Bharati, “The Tantric Tradition”).

In “History through Textual Criticism...,” Alexis Sanderson commits to a blueprint of analysis. Here, as usual (like all other Orientalists), he believes that the ancient works need not be first rate as they originate from an alien culture. Here he, due to incomplete knowledge of the Vedic tradition (inclusive of the Agamas and Tantras), attempts to reveal the incongruity and errors of the tradition to mark himself as a modern academical superiority (Alexis Sanderson, “History through Textual Criticism in the study of Śaivism, the Pañcarātra and the Buddhist Yoginītantras.” In: *Les Sources et le temps. Sources and Time: A Colloquium, Pondicherry, 11–13 January 1997*, edited by François Grimal. Publications du département d'Indologie 91. Pondicherry: Institut Français de Pondichéry/École Française d'Extrême-Orient (2001), pp. 1–47).

Although his blueprint is only 47 pages, we can get a summary of his ideas from the following paragraph.

Sanderson maintains, “These parallels are of great value to the study of the Kubbikamata since they enable the critical reader to determine which of the various readings transmitted in this highly contaminated recension go back to the time of redaction. It is unfortunate that the editions of the Kubbikamata, though accepting that their text was the borrower, did not use this means of improving their edition of the text. Here I shall propose two such improvements to the text where the Kubbikamata has taken in corrupt readings from its source, in order to illustrate the point that when dealing with a scriptural literature of this kind we must abandon the common assumption of the textual critic that the history of a text begins from an original that is free of errors and meaningful throughout. Sometimes a new

dependent scripture came close to this ideal, its redactor approaching the standards of original authorship in his concern to make perfect sense of his sources, incorporating unchanged only what seemed to be sound and passing over whatever was puzzling in the exemplar or revising it in an honest attempt to restore coherence. But text-production often proceeded at a much lower standard of scholarship. In these cases we can see redactors who out of incompetence, indifference, or both, used their sources without recognizing or attempting to remedy the manifest defects of the manuscripts through which they had access to them. The result is that the readings established by comparing the borrower with its source maybe sound only in the sense that they are the original readings sanctioned by the redactor. In themselves they may be gibberish. The first of my examples is in the following verse (*Kubjikamata* 25–34 [*Tantrasadbhava* 15. 6]):

Yad yad aabharanam tasya yad va vadaati vaacaayaa/
Saa caryaa Kathitaa tasya mantras caiva na
Samsayah// "

(Alexis Sanderson, “History Through Textual Criticism in the study of Śaivism, the Pañcarātra and the Buddhist Yoginītantras,” p. 33).

Even for argument’s sake if we follow Sanderson’s rationale, it is only his opinion that the earlier manuscript is correct. Why can’t the scribe be earlier but copying another manuscript altogether or even recording just very ancient oral hand-me-downs. Furthermore, dating of manuscripts as offered by even Abhinavagupta can not be taken as factual, as why can’t somebody else aspiring to include their own date in to their manuscript commit mistakes of recording history? All these reasons are not addressed by Sanderson’s theories and contradict his theories. In other words, he just offers his opinion only.

However, even if we spare all these speculative ideas, his most important editing rationale too is faulty. Sanderson’s misinterpretation arises from his own example of the so-called gibberish or nonsensical verse. This is, in fact, the most crucial point of Sanderson’s rationale of editing Sanskrit texts. The following is his own citing, translation and rationale:

“Both transmissions read *aabharanam* (‘ornament’). This yields no satisfactory sense in the context and is, I propose, a corruption of *aacharanam*. The two aksharas *ca* and *bha* are easily confused in early post-

Gupta North Indian scripts and the result of the emendation is that sense replaces nonsense. We now have the meaning:

His observance [caryaa] and his Mantra are whatever he does [yad yad aakaranam tasya] and whatever he utters. Of this there is no doubt.

The verse, in keeping with the spirit of the chapter, provides an inner meaning beyond the particularities of ritual for an element of rule-bound observance, in the case of *caarya* through a semantic analysis that reduces *caarya* to the meaning of the verb *car* ‘to do’ that underlies it” (op. cit., p. 34).

However, this is far from true. The Kujjikamata, a Tantric text in keeping with traditional learning, adheres to the language of the Veda. This is the unique lingo of the ancient Vedic culture (vide “Divine Initiation” and “Third Eye of the Buddhist”). The word “*aabharanam*” is not an anomaly as caused by the accidents of any scribe but is jargon and is meaningful too.

Here, the Kujjikamata Tantra, in keeping with the traditional lingo, uses the word *aabharanam* in the sense of ancillary adornments. These adornments form Her description.

These ancillary adornments are not “accidental” or “incidental decking” as Orientology understands today but are reflective of the characteristics of the particular Goddess. That is, they are traits of the Goddess presented as adornments or *aabharanam* in the Sanskrit language.

These adornments or *aabharanam* are composed of her ancillary or *anga mantras*, coiffure, attire and ornaments. [The *anga mantras* are defined by the *rishi mantras* and are the six or five *anga mantras* of the body and the hands or *kara-nyasa*, and so on according to the definition of the Divinity. This forms Her body or *anga*.]

Indeed, the adornments do retain, originate and reflect the praxis of the worshipper. This is what these verses or *shlokas* of the text convey. Certainly, there is no scribal error in this context and Alexis Sanderson, not knowing the Vedic jargon, errs. This mistake of Sanderson renders his entire theory to oblivion.

In fact, all Sanderson's works are reflective of his adherence to Theology's textual criticism as the means to dissect texts. This methodology reverberates in every article as in the above-cited "History Through Textual Criticism..." and in the article on "Swami Lakshman Joo and His Place in the Kashmirian Śaiva Tradition..." and in the article "The Doctrine of the Mālinīvijayottaratantra." In *Ritual and Speculation in Early Tantrism. Studies in Honour of André Padoux*, ed. T. Goudriaan. Albany: State University of New York Press (1992). He clearly asserts his superiority in the following statement: "The attentive reader will have noticed that I have distinguished here between the texts of Abhinavagupta and Swami Lakshman Joo's understanding of them, and will hope for my assessment of the accuracy and completeness of that understanding. For the two teachers are separated by approximately a thousand years" (Swami Lakshman Joo and His Place in the Kashmirian Śaiva Tradition...p. 95). Likewise, he asserts on his position as the supposed "world authority" on Trika philosophy in the following statement: "Like many other Tantric texts the Malinivijayottara [MVT] is inadequate in this respect. Nowhere does it assert openly that it is or is not dualistic. This of course, is itself strong prima facie evidence of its being dualistic. For a non-dualistic Śaiva text is one that must explicitly negate dualism, grounding the categories of the dualistic tradition (souls, *maya* and Śiva] in a higher unity" ("The Doctrine of the Mālinīvijayottaratantra." In *Ritual and Speculation in Early Tantrism. Studies in Honour of André Padoux*, p. 299).

However, there is no validity in dissecting the texts anymore. One has to interpret them only with the knowledge of the jargon.

This is also the case with the rest of Orientology, whose ideas are based on an unfounded precedent that they are still following. There are very few Orientologists not influenced by Sanderson in the study of Agamas or Tantricism.

Mantra as Formula

Next Sanderson, as is usual of Orientologists, not realizing that no one is copying and that the ancient manuscripts are an amplification of the Vedic mantras, believes that the Pancaratras, being more abundant in Southern India, must have copied the Trika exegetes or their texts that Sanderson has

dated and seemingly understood (“History Through Textual Criticism...” pp. 35–39).

Next Sanderson, not knowing that the traditionalists in these Agamic texts are upholding the jargon of the Vedic tradition, does not realize that they are only developing formulae.

These formulae or mantras or hymns, if understood, reveal the blueprint of each tradition or perspective or denomination or *Sampradaya*.

Therefore, the seeming incongruities and differences are unique to the tradition. At times, specific traditions are developed in analogous concepts and these concepts are nothing different but variant (*bhedha abhedha*). They are, therefore, apparently copy works to a neophyte or one who is a non-initiate.

The word *bhedha abhedha* should be read as variant but not different. This definition is derived at after understanding the whole content of the traditional texts and teachings and not patchy interpretations as Orientology indulges in.

Thus Sanderson’s charge that the Lakshmi Tantra is an imitation of the Trika is baseless. This is even less likely the case with the Pancharatras. The Pancharatras and, therefore, their Samhitas, Ahirbudhnya, Satvata, Jayakhya, and so on, and their Tantra, the Lakshmi Tantra, are not copies of the Trika but originally developed notions unique to their tradition or *Sampradaya* (op. cit., pp. 35–39).

The idea that it is imitation arises due to lack of knowledge of the parent literature and its content the Veda. Orientalists are trapped in the Darwinian ideology and hence Western supremacy. They cannot see more than the trappings of Narcissism, hence the Aryan Migratory Theory and the view that everything intellectual must arise from the West. Succumbing to nineteenth century Social Darwinism (the idea that competitiveness between people and nations leads to social evolution or “survival of the fittest”), Orientologists assume that the Veda is mere primitive babblings (cf. “Divine Initiation”). Social Darwinism need not be the yardstick to measure the world. After all, it is only a theory. It fails miserably in the case of the Vedic texts and traditions and also the world of religion.

It is in the aforesaid light that the Buddhists too develop their ideology. Due to this, there are many similarities between Vedic and Buddhist Divinities. The goddess Tara, herself, is a classical example. She implicitly appears in the concepts of the Rg Veda and explicitly in the Taittiriya Aranyaka and also the Mahayana Buddhist tradition. Tara is an esoteric Goddess in the Vedic tradition and has not many explicit accounts. However, as the Buddhists developed their metaphysics, they presented this Goddess Tara explicitly according to their ideology. Similarly, the Taoists in China have Kuan Yin. This does not mean any copy or imitation. It happens within the conceptual ideologies of the respective canons or Traditions or *Sampradaya*. This idea is of course alien to Orientology.

An Analysis of “The Doctrine of the Mālinīvijayottaratantra.” In Ritual and Speculation in Early Tantrism. Studies in Honour of André Padoux, ed. T. Goudriaan. Albany: State University of New York Press (1992), pp. 281-312, by Alexis Sanderson from a Traditional Viewpoint

Attempting to prove that Monism (or *Advaita* ideology) is a single, late, isolated occurrence in the Shaiva Tantras (around the turn of the tenth and eleventh centuries), Sanderson attempts to relegate ritual in his work, “The Doctrine of the Mālinīvijayottaratantra...” to the Dualists as he sees them. Thus he says, “Naturally, because Impurity is no longer a substance but merely the unawareness of a self-contracted consciousness, then the non-dualists must see the function of ritual quite differently.” He continues further to say, “Knowledge alone, immediately intuitive or initially discursive, may liberate without relying on the symbolic activities of ritual. Ritual has been validated; but it has been demoted to admit the authenticity of purely Gnostic gurus (*jnaninah*) who have achieved liberation and deserved authority without being processed by ritual and who are capable of perpetuating their spiritual lineages by liberating others through oral instruction or inspiration alone” (Alexis Sanderson, (“The Doctrine of the Mālinīvijayottaratantra.” In *Ritual and Speculation in Early Tantrism. Studies in Honour of André Padoux*, pp. 290–91). Obviously, it is Sanderson’s personal belief that Dualism exists in the ancient works and that the practice of rituals is inferior to the intellectualizing of the Trika. Unfortunately, the whole Vedic corpus of literature, inclusive of the variant i.e. the Agamas and the Tantras, is Non-dualist or Monist or *Advaita*.

Sanderson, after establishing his purview that the Siddhantikas and the Tantras outside the Abhinavagupta school are Dualist, relegates the entire

Vedic philosophy (supposedly Dualism) to a second class (unintellectual) status compared with the Non-dualists as he sees them.

He, then, states that the Tantras of the Siddhanta follow the Dualistic doctrine and any deviations, apart from one notable exception, from this are merely redactions from the Tamil-speaking region of the South (op. cit., p. 291). He, therefore, implies that the Tamil-speaking Indians are lesser because they are Dualist. This, however, is all based on Sanderson's inability to read the textual material correctly as he does not understand the jargon of the parent Veda.

In his works, Sanderson is implicitly adhering to his mentors' supremacist ideology, like all other Orientologists. Thus, Sanderson, not understanding a word of the Śaiva Siddhanta and wanting to perpetuate the old idea of Social Darwinism, says, "It is generally true that the Tantras of the Siddhanta follow the dualistic doctrine, seeing Śiva, souls and *maya* as coeternal essences. Such deviations as there are from this norm occur, with one notable exception, in texts that bear the names of listed Siddhantatantras, but have certainly been redacted, if not entirely composed, at a much later period, and in the Tamil-Speaking region of the South: the nondualism of these texts reveals the influence of the South Indian Vedantic currents that affected the Tamil Śaiva Siddhanta" (op. cit., p. 291).

However, not being able to reconcile this with his theory, he quips, "The one evident exception is the Sarvajnanottara. This work is cited frequently by South Indian neo-Saiddhantikas in support of their unscriptural nondualism; but temptation to assume that it too is a late South Indian addition is prevented by the existence of an early Nepalese manuscript of the text" (op. cit., p. 291).

In order to relegate the Tantras, he attempts to prove that the Malini Vijaya Uttara Tantra is Dualistic (op. cit. pp. 292–7)

Sanderson has found two verses in the Malinivijayaottara to prove his acumen as a scholar even though in the commentary of the Tantraloka, Abhinavagupta has expounded its full Monist implications. Nevertheless, Sanderson, not knowing how to read an esoteric material, fell into speculating. The Tantras are esoteric as they are defined as *Rahasya Shastra* or *Sampradaya* and they necessitate initiation and correct reading. This is possible only if one understands the jargonic presentations of the Veda.

Sanderson next says, “Nonetheless it appears that there was a strong temptation to strengthen the case for non-dualistic exegesis by tampering with the text itself” (op. cit., p. 306). This is an almost blasphemous statement by Sanderson.

There are no “tamperings” or “forced readings” (Sanderson’s terminology) or “squeezed” (another of his favourite terminologies, op. cit., p. 305) in either the Malini or the Tantraloka, but jargonic renderings that appear unfathomable to non-initiates, who do not read these texts with the knowledge of the Veda.

Furthermore, Abhinavagupta did not intend to use the word *linga* as “idol” and also, in the Sanskrit language, *linga* is not a mark as Sanderson proclaims (op. cit., p. 293 referring to MVT 18.2b–4b). This is how Sanderson, to suit his theories, speculates.

Not understanding that each definition of the *linga* marks the ontology in jargonic representation unique to the Vedic science, Sanderson says, “The duality to be transcended here therefore may be no more than that which arises between outward worship and internal awareness when the former is done without the latter. As Abhinavagupta says [in the *Malini Vijaya Vartikka* or *Commentary on the Malini Vijaya Uttara Tantra*] [MVV 2.66], paraphrasing the *Malinivijayottara* itself: “It is in vain that men resort to the worship of external idols, if their awareness lacks the knowledge of this [internal] idol. Their action is nothing more than physical exertion. It can have no effect” (op. cit., p. 293).

Mistaking the text’s usage of the term and import, Sanderson quips, “this sort of nonduality, that of resorting to the inner (signified) alone or of resorting to the external only as the sign of the inner, does not entail ontological nondualism” (op. cit., p. 293).

Sanderson, ignorant of reading an esoteric text, goes on to explain that in the meditation process of the *Malini* there is no concept of Non-dualism (op. cit., pp. 294–97). Furthermore, lacking the ability to read the root terms of Sanskrit as employed by the “Kashmirian” *Uttara Shaivas*, he misinterprets and misreads the whole passage (op. cit., p. 293 referring to MVT 18; 32. 40 in the KSTS or Kashmiri Series of Texts and Studies). It is vital, therefore, to understand Vedic Monism to correctly interpret Indic texts.

He further says that the Tantric texts and the MVT are inadequate (i.e. “there is no compelling reason to accept Abhinavagupta’s interpretation...” op. cit., p. 298). “Therefore, to determine a Tantra’s metaphysical orientation, it is not enough to consider the implications of the forms of the rituals and meditations it enjoins. What one requires for that purpose are unambiguous statements of doctrine (*jnanam*, *vidya*) outside the contexts of ritual (*kriya*), observance, (*carya*), and meditation (*yogah*). Like many other Tantric texts the Malinivijayottara is inadequate in this respect. Nowhere does it assert openly that it is or is not dualistic” (op. cit., pp. 298–99).

Not surprisingly, Sanderson has little understanding on the philosophy of external worship, which he sees as originating from dualism.

Furthermore, it did not occur to Sanderson that these texts are written in a formulaic fashion and they are accurate and extensive commentaries of the Veda. But these are ambiguous if one is unaware of the jargon of the Vedic *Advaita* or Non-dual philosophy.

Sanderson believes he establishes the Malini’s Dualism, in his article, in the following statement: “The officiant is to assert that he *is* Śiva not because the text subscribes to non-dualism but because he is to qualify himself for the ritual by believing fervently in the doctrine that it is not he that is about to liberate the soul of the initiand but Śiva residing in his person and working through him. This doctrine is attested by all the Tantric Śaivas without distinction; and all require this act of identification.

The Malinivijayottara, then, is dualistic in its view of the relation between the individual soul and Śiva. The same conclusion is unavoidable on that other great point of dispute, the nature of *maya*” (op. cit., p. 300).

Then Sanderson, believing in his mistaken interpretations, trapped by his own ignorance of not knowing how to read esoteric materials, continues the same passage on and says, “The Malinivijayottara defines *maya* as follows [MVT. 1. 26]: [*Maya*] is one (*eka*), all-pervasive (*vyapini*), imperceptible (*sukshma*), partless (*jagato nidhih*), without beginning or end (*anadyanta*), indestructible (*vyayahina*), baneful/unconscious/ Śiva less/Non- Śiva (aŚiva), [but] able to act (*isani*). This ability to act (*isanatvam*) is realized when *maya* is activated at the beginning of each period of cosmic activity (*srstih*) by the powers of Ananta, the Lord of Mantras [mantrarāt]. Ananta holds his office at the command of Śiva, who acts directly only in the Pure

Universe (suddho ‘dhva) above *maya*. When *maya* has been activated by Ananta it emits (srjati) the thirty impure *tattvas* and the submayaic worlds (*bhuvanam, puram*), so that souls once more may possess the means and locations of experience” (op. cit. 300–302).

“This definition of *maya* contains no trace of nondualism. Indeed, it agrees entirely with parallel passages in the dualistic scriptures and exegesis of the Saiddhantikas. And like them it upholds of the doctrine that as Śiva is of the nature of consciousness he can be only the efficient cause (*nimittakaranam*) of the universe, and that the stuff of which the universe consists, its material cause (*upadanakaranam*), must be a source outside Śiva’s nature” (op. cit. p. 302).

In the above passage, he also reveals his lack of knowledge of the notion of *maya* and especially the art of reading the jargonic presentation of the Vedic tradition as a whole. Thus, he sees in *maya* a distinction. This reading of a distinction emerges from his earlier colonial predecessors’ attempts at reading the Veda within the lines of the evolutionist ideas of Social Darwinism, a “forced reading” that led to a distorted view of Vedism.

He further says, “Of course, it was not beyond the ingenuity of Abhinavagupta and his commentator Jayaratha to subject this apparently dualistic interpretation of *maya* to a nondualistic reading” (op. cit., p. 303).

Indeed, not being able to reconcile the jargonic presentations in the Malini, Sanderson reads an irresolvable equation that he sees in the presentation of Ananta as a Dualist doctrine. This is not so, the entire passage can be accurately read within the Non-dualist or Monist or *Advaita* science (vide “Divine Initiation”).

Apart from this, as stated above, the term *bhedha abhedha* (op. cit., p. 300) merely refers to a variant interpretation and not Dualism as opposed to Non-dualism. Indeed, there are several ways of reconciling the philosophy of *Advaita*. The Uttara Shaivas and the Dakshinas differ here. Here is also the distinction of the Buddhists and Vedics.

It does not mean that the other traditions are lesser nor are rivals as is maintained by the current Judeo-Christian culture and its conservative descendants, popularly termed by psychologists as the Western Anglo-Saxon person (i.e. WASP).

The correct reading of the notion of *maya* still retains its primary text the MVT to be Non-dualist. This reading of a distinction has been also the issue with Kapila's Sankhya philosophy system and the Sankhya-Karika treatise by Ishvara Krishna. Neophytes and those uninitiated in the Vedic science do not have the acumen in reading the jargon of the Veda and therefore merely speculate.

Likewise, the Siddhantas or the Dakshina Shastras or any Shastra of the Indic world is never Dualist but only Monist. In fact, the entire scriptural texts are Monist. So Sanderson's words, "If, then, any doctrine may be said to represent the mainstream of the Śaiva Tantras it is dualism" (op. cit., p. 308), only reflect his lack of knowledge of the universal jargon.

Non-dualism, Sanderson says, is from the era of the Kaulas (op. cit., p. 308). There is no necessity of holding that it is the Kaulas only who are Non-dualists. How or what rationality does Sanderson hold? The Kaulas are replete with ritual practice – how does he then reconcile this?

In his own words, "If then, any doctrine may be said to represent the mainstream of the Śaiva Tantras it is dualism. Nondualism takes over only at the Kaula fringe, to be superimposed by scholastic artifice on the rest of the non-Saiddhantika literature. Certainly dualism is more natural to the Tantras considered in the primary character as a system of rites and meditations. Nondualism, I suggest connotes, just as it does in orthodox Hindu thinking about the Vedic revelation, an undermining or subordination of the ritualism that inspired these systems. It is a metaview of a complex of practices that suggests their ultimate superfluity and therefore is hardly likely to have been the basic theoretical attitude of those who elaborated the mainstream tradition" (op. cit., p. 308).

Not understanding the metaphysical and philosophical meaning in the practice of rituals and meditation, and not realizing the jargonic renditions of the Vedic texts (inclusive of the Agamas and Tantras), Sanderson believes "that Hindus," clinging to rituals, would not want to see *Advaita* supercede (as Non-dualism or *Advaita* is the fold of only the elite race).

© Copyright July 2008. All rights reserved.

Bhagavan Shri Shanmukha Anantha Natha and Shri Ma Kristina Baird.