

| |

—

Tantrapuṣpāñjali

Tantric Traditions and Philosophy of Kashmir

Studies in Memory of Pandit H.N. Chakravarty

Edited by
Bettina Sharada Bäumer and Hamsa Stainton



Indira Gandhi National Centre for the Arts
New Delhi



Aryan Books International
New Delhi

| |

—

Tantrapuṣpāñjali
Tantric Traditions and Philosophy of Kashmir

ISBN: 978-81-7305-590-4

© Indira Gandhi National Centre for the Arts, New Delhi

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced, utilised in any form or by any means, electronic and mechanical, including photocopying, recording or by any information storage and retrieval system without prior permission of the contributor and the publishers.

Responsibility for statements made and visuals provided in the various papers rests solely with the contributors. The views expressed by individual authors are not necessarily those of the editors or of the publishers.

First Published in 2018 by:

Indira Gandhi National Centre for the Arts
Central Vista Mess, Janpath, New Delhi - 110 001 (India)

and

Aryan Books International
Pooja Apartments, 4B, Ansari Road, New Delhi-110002 (India)
Tel.: 23287589, 23255799; Fax: 91-11-23270385
E-mail: aryanbooks@gmail.com
www.aryanbooks.co.in

Designed and Printed by
ABI Prints & Publishing Co., New Delhi.

Contents

Foreword — <i>Sachchidanand Joshi</i>	v
Preface — <i>Advaitavadini Kaul</i>	vii
Introduction	
Pandit Hemendra Nath Chakravarty: Scholar, Teacher, Sādhaka — <i>Bettina Sharada Bäumer</i>	xiii
Mudrā Photos	xviii
<i>Tantrapuṣpāñjali</i> : Offerings in Memory of a True Pandit — <i>Hamsa Stainton</i>	xxii
List of Contributors	xxix

Section One

TANTRA

1. The Yoga of the <i>Netra Tantra</i> : A Translation of Chapters VII and VIII with Introduction — <i>Bettina Sharada Bäumer</i>	3
2. Svachchanda Bhairava: Blissful Spontaneous Will of Śiva — <i>Advaitavadini Kaul</i>	34
3. The <i>Khacakrapañcakastotra</i> , Hymn to the Five Spheres of Emptiness: Introduction, Edition, and Translation — <i>Mark Dyczkowski</i>	67
4. Vārāhī Worship in the <i>Paraśurāma-Kalpasūtra</i> : A Study of Imagination and Transformation in Kaula Śrīvidyā — <i>Annette Wilke</i>	132

5. The Wisdom of Excess: Guru, Initiation and Practice in an Extreme Tantric Ritual 191
— *John Dupuche*

Section Two

PHILOSOPHY

6. The Body and Consciousness in Early Pratyabhijñā Philosophy: *Amūrtatva* in Somānanda's *Śivadr̥ṣṭi* 215
— *John Nemeč*
7. A Brief Hermeneutical Note on Consciousness in Utpaladeva's Pratyabhijñā Texts 226
— *Navjivan Rastogi*
8. Ontological Hierarchy in the *Tantrāloka* of Abhinavagupta 240
— *Mrinal Kaul*
9. *Pūrṇatā-pratyabhijñā*, The Recognition of Fullness of M. M. Ācārya Rameshvar Jha: An Introduction 271
— *Sadananda Das*
10. Pratyabhijñā Philosophy and the Evolution of Consciousness: Religious Metaphysics, Biosemiotics, and Cognitive Science 288
— *David Peter Lawrence*

Section Three

AESTHETICS

11. The Doctrine of *Pratibhā* in Selected Texts of Abhinavagupta 303
— *Ernst Fūrlinger*
12. Smell: The Sense Perception of Recognition 325
— *Aleksandra Wenta*
13. Poetry and Kṣemarāja's Hermeneutics of Non-dualism 339
— *Hamsa Stainton*

POST-SCRIPTS

14. *Kṣaṇa*: Its Spiritual Significance 371
— *Pt. Hemendra Nath Chakravarty*
15. Posthumous Letter to Panditji Hemendra Nath Chakravarty 377
— *Bettina Sharada Bäumer*

8

Ontological Hierarchy in the *Tantrāloka* of Abhinavagupta¹

Mrinal Kaul

In classical Sanskrit metaphysics a *tattva* is defined as a category (*padārtha*), a true principle (*tat-tva*), a reality (*yāthātathya*), an entity (*śadbhāva*), empirical truth (*yathābhūta*), true nature (*svabhāva*), the essence of a thing (*sāra*), or an essential being (*sat*), and as not the opposite (*aviparīta*).² Literally, *tattva* means ‘that-ness,’ with *tat* standing for ‘that’ and *-tva* signifying ‘ness.’³ It is that aspect of reality which makes itself manifest; in other words it is the ‘state of being that,’ where ‘that’ stands for a potent entity.⁴ This is to say that the existence of an entity is known by the manifestation of its true nature. In other words Earth is a *tattva* but a pot or a house made of earth is not a *tattva*. The commonality existing in a pot, a house and anything made of earth is that all of these things

1. I sincerely thank Professor Alexis G.J.S. Sanderson (All Souls College, Oxford) for the immense help he offered me in studying and understanding Abhinavagupta’s debate on the hierarchy of the *tattvas* as discussed by him in chapter nine of the *Tantrāloka*. All errors or misunderstandings, if any, remain my own. I also thank Professor Bettina Bäumer for offering me an opportunity to pay tribute to the memory of Pandit Hemendra Nath Chakravarty. I thank Dr. Hamsa Stainton and Dr. Shaman Hatley for many suggestions they offered for improving this article.

2. *Nyāyakośa*, p. 309-310.

3. *Aṣṭādhyāyī* 5.1.119: *taśya bhāvas tva-talau* ||

4. There is no standard definition of *tattva* in the Mantramārga scriptures. Even though in Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika a universal (*sāmānya*) and a category (*padārtha*) are absolutely two different entities, in the Tantra there does not seem to be a strong distinction between them. However, terms such as *tattva*, *padārtha*, *prameya* etc. are used synonymously and refer to the same realities.

can be broken down into a basic element called Earth. In the same way a river, ice etc. are all basically the different modifications of the same basic element called Water.⁵ In the cosmogonic discussions of classical India, a *tattva* is characterised as the essence of each stage of the manifestation of this universe, with each stage represented by a *tattva*. Ontologically speaking a *tattva* can be described as a ‘category of being’ and thus be called an ‘ontological category.’ The concept of *tattva* works in two ways: parallel and sequential. On the one hand all the *tattvas* expand as “identical units” and at the same time each one also manifests as another entity—another subsequent *tattva* or a modified form of the same *tattva*.⁶ In reality, whatever we see around us is the grossest form of the same manifestation of the basic elements called *tattvas*.

The concept of *tattva* is absolutely fundamental to the Sanskrit Śāstric systems, so much so that almost all schools of classical Indian philosophy define and enumerate a certain number of *tattvas* according to their own prerequisites. The systematic scheme of the sequence of *tattvas* was propounded by the ancient system of Sāṅkhya. Setting the number of categories (*tattvas*) to be twenty-five, Sāṅkhya greatly influenced subsequent Sanskrit knowledge systems, including the Āgamas/Tantras. Among the Āgamic scriptures belonging to different currents, the Āgamas of the Śaiva Siddhānta also took over the Sāṅkhya model and expanded the components of their own cosmology from twenty-five to thirty-six, adding eleven more *tattvas*.⁷ Both the Śaivāgamas following the dualistic

-
5. Abhinavagupta explains this in his ĪPV (3.1.2): just as mountains, trees and towns belong to the category of Earth (*prthivītattva*) and river, lakes and seas are a modification of Water (*jalatattva*), in the same way a *tattva* is defined as an efficient cause of a categorisation of various collective units that appear to be singular and undivided. The same idea is expressed in ĪPVV, Vol. III, p. 264.
 6. This concept is explained in detail by Rastogi (2012: 222). I have borrowed Rastogi’s use of the term “identical units” here.
 7. It is important to mention here that it is vitally important to investigate how *tattvas* have been understood in the early Mantramārga scriptures. One such attempt has been made by Dominic Goodall (2009), focusing primarily the *Niśvāsātattvasaṅghitā* and the eclectic constructions of the sequence of the *tattvas* derived from this text and used in many later Āgamic scriptures. Another important point to mention here is that the Śaiva Siddhānta modified upon the Sāṅkhya ontology in two ways: “They added principles to the top, demonstrating that the Sāṅkhyas had correctly grasped the nature of only the inferior levels of the universe, and they attempted

doctrine called Siddhānta and the Trika Śaivāgama adhering to the non-dualistic doctrine usually agree on the total number of the *tattvas* to be thirty-six. Though this is true of most post-scriptural Śaiva Siddhānta commentaries, we do come across some exceptions, which I will discuss subsequently. The purpose in the following is to analyse the nature of the *tattvas* as understood by Abhinavagupta (*fl.c.* 975-1025 CE) in his *Tantrāloka* (TĀ) and as understood by his illustrious commentator Jayaratha (*fl.c.* 1225-1275 CE).⁸ I begin with a brief introduction to the textual tradition of Anuttara Trika Śaivism, and particularly the most illustrative manual of this system: the *Tantrāloka*.

Among the many schools of Śaivism that existed in Kashmir, the Trika survived as a major post-scriptural non-Saiddhāntika ritual system of the Mantramārga.⁹ The most defining feature of the scriptures of the Trika was the worship of the three Goddesses Parā, Parāparā and Aparā.¹⁰ The traditions of Tantric Śaivism (the Mantramārga) evolved from their scriptural anonymity into an extensive body of Kashmirian exegesis from the middle of the ninth century onwards.¹¹ During the early medieval period there were two major competing traditions, among which the Trika and the Krama systems belonged to the left-handed course (*vāma-hasta-mārga*) and followed non-dualism, and the authors of the Śaiva Siddhānta, who accepted the orthodox Vedic boundaries of purity and impurity, were on the right (*dakṣiṇa*) side following dualism.¹² The followers of the Trika attacked the ritualism of their contemporaries who adhered to the Śaiva Siddhānta.¹³ It was in opposition to the propitiation of this ritual system

to place worlds inherited from older Śaiva scriptures on the levels of these various principles. The latter change meant that *tattva* in some contexts approximates to a 'reality level' of the universe in which various worlds are placed rather than a constitutive "principle" of the universe" (TAK-III, p. 25).

8. An earlier attempt to study the first 49 verses of the ninth chapter of the *Tantrāloka* was made by Dr. Keith Allen (2003) in his unpublished master's dissertation. While Allen focused only on the first 49 verses with detailed and comprehensive exposition of both the *Tantrāloka* and the *-viveka* commentary thereupon, I focus here on the broader theme of the *tattvas* in the TĀ.
9. See Sanderson 1988: 690 and 2004: 5.
10. See Sanderson 1988: 673 and also Sanderson 2007a: 370-371.
11. See Sanderson 1988: 690ff.
12. See Sanderson 1995: 17ff.
13. See Sanderson 1988: 692.

propounded by the Siddhānta that Abhinavagupta endeavoured to establish a system emphasizing the significance of knowledge (*jñāna*), the absence of which is taught to be the true cause of impurity (*mala*) and bondage.¹⁴ Abhinava established his Trika on the basis that it is the removal of this impurity rather than the performance of ritual that can lead to liberation.¹⁵

The post-scriptural Anuttara Trika has perhaps a single author and that is Abhinavagupta, since it is only his works on the Trika that constitute the literature available in the Trika proper or Anuttara Trika. Alexis Sanderson has thrown ample light on Abhinavagupta and his works as the author of the Krama and Trika-based Krama, and also discussed him separately as the author of the Trika.¹⁶ Abhinavagupta's texts to be considered in this pool of Anuttara Trika are the *Mālinīśloka-vārtika*, *Tantrāloka*, *Tantrasāra*, *Tantroccaya* and *Parātrīśikāvivaraṇa*. Abhinavagupta chose the *Mālinīvijayottara* (MVUT) as the foundation of all his writings on the Trika. In fact the TĀ, which is an exposition of the Anuttara Trika Śaivism, is an exhaustive commentary on the MVUT.¹⁷ Abhinavagupta holds that the scriptures of the Trika contain the essence that animates all the branches of the Śaiva canon. The MVUT was a fitting base to formulate this position for the Trika.¹⁸ Even though Abhinavagupta tells us that he bases the

14. See Sanderson 2007a: 372.

15. This of course does not mean that there is no ritual practice prescribed in the Trika of Abhinavagupta. But the idea here is that the path of following ritual was understood as inferior because there were other superior means, such as meditation and imaginative visualisation. Cf. Sanderson 2007b: 114-115.

16. See Sanderson 2007a: 352ff.

17. TĀ 1.17-18: *na tad astiḥa yan na śrīmālinīvijayottare | devadevena nirdiṣṭaṃ
svaśabdenātha liṅgataḥ || daśāṣṭādaśavasvaṣṭabhinnam yac chāsanam vibhoḥ |
tatsāraṃ trikaśāstraṃ hi tatsāraṃ mālinīmatam ||*

18. Sanderson (2007a: 376) suggests two reasons for this argument: "The *Mālinīvijayottara* was a fitting base for this project for two principal reasons. The first is that it offers a bridge from the Śākta ground of this exegesis to the Siddhānta since it shows striking continuities with the latter system. The second is that the 18th chapter of *Mālinīvijayottara* could be read as formulating the view that while the hierarchy of revelation leads upwards to culminate in the Trika, the highest revelation within the Trika itself, to be found in this chapter, transcends transcendence by propagating the position that all forms of Śaiva practice, including that of the Siddhānta, are really valid provided they are informed by the nondualistic awareness enjoined here."

TĀ on the MVUT, he also draws on a wide range of other scriptural texts of the Śaiva Mantramārga, from Trika scriptures including the *Siddhayogeśvarīmata*, *Triśirobhairava*, *Devyāyāmala*, *Tantrasadbhāva*, and *Trikasadbhāva* to the Krama scriptures such as the *Kālikula* and *Brahmayāmala* and to other Saiddhāntika scriptures.¹⁹ In other words Abhinava developed a Śaiva system that, on the one hand, adheres to the features of earlier Śaiva scriptures and, on the other, simultaneously emerges as a distinct Śaiva system with unique features. It is this system of Abhinavagupta that I intend by the expression Anuttara Trika Śaivism.

In the *Tantrāloka*, Abhinavagupta dedicates Chapters 9 and 10 to the study of the *tattvas*. In Chapter 9, Abhinavagupta finds an opportunity to explain away the fact that the Śaiva scriptures are not in absolute agreement with each other on the order of the manifestation of the *tattvas*, besides explaining the nature of all the thirty-six *tattvas*. In Chapter 10 he mentions further categorisation of the *tattvas* grouped into fifteen and viewed through seven knowing subjects (*saptapramātr*).²⁰ Our primary focus here will be the relevant parts of Chapter 9 of the TĀ and the TĀV. The ninth chapter of the *Tantrāloka* is entitled *Tattvaparakāśāhnikā* and describes the nature and hierarchy of ontic-levels (*tattva-krama*) as accepted by the Trika system. Abhinava begins the chapter with a detailed discussion on the Śaiva theory of causality. The first six verses discuss the definition of *tattva* and verses seven to forty-eight discuss causality and its various aspects. Verses forty-nine onwards deal with the ideas of 'longing' (*lolikā*), 'impurity' (*mala*), *vijñānakevalin*, *pralayākala* and ultimately the nature and order of the *tattvas*. In this paper I am limiting my discussion only to the five *tattvas* belonging to the pure universe (*śuddhādhvan*).

But why does Abhinava, instead of going straight into the discussion on the order of *tattvas* as in his root text the MVUT, first choose to have a philosophical enquiry into the nature of causality and only then turn to the main subject matter of this chapter? He begins Chapter 9 with a discussion on causality as part of his endeavour to rationalise philosophically the traditional lore of the Trika

19. See Sanderson 2007a: 374.

20. The seven knowing subjects (*saptapramātr*) are Sakala, Pralayākala, Vijñānākala, Mantra, Mantreśa, Mantramahēśa and Śiva. See KSDK-II, p. 424, for more details on *saptapramātr*. For the role of *saptapramātr* in the *tattvakrama* see Vasudeva 2013: 216-217. Abhinava describes the *tattvabheda* in the TĀ 10.1-2. See TAK-III, p. 26, for how thirty-six *tattvas* are associated with the seven knowing subjects.

scriptures. Another example of Abhinavagupta's philosophical rationalization of Trika ritual and scriptural doctrines is, for instance, his treatment of the theory of knowability (*vedyatā*), prior to discussing the nature of and relationships between the seven knowing subjects (*saptapramāṭṛs*) and seven objects of knowledge (*saptaprameyas*) in Chapter 10 of the TĀ.²¹ On somewhat similar lines, he also offers an analytical account of the theory of reflection in Chapter 3²² of the TĀ before discussing the doctrine of phonemic emanation (i.e., the genesis of sound/language), since eventually he has to prove that the creation becomes manifest when the syllable 'a' of the Sanskrit alphabetic system divides itself into component parts of itself, without losing the essence of the energy of consciousness of 'a'.²³ By following this process of philosophical rationalisation, Abhinava is gradually moving himself into a position to explain the inconsistencies in the Śaiva accounts of the order of *tattvas* (*tattvakrama*) that still existed in earlier Śaiva scriptures. Once he has achieved that goal and constructed the rational-philosophical backbone of his otherwise stumbling system, he moves on to his principle subject matter of defining and explaining each *tattva* following the earlier Agamic scriptures.

But we have more compelling questions to answer: Why is the order of the emergence of the *tattvas* important for Abhinavagupta at all? What sequence do the *tattvas* follow? How many *tattvas* are there actually? Which *tattva* emerges from which? For each of these questions, scriptures offer a variety of different answers.²⁴ For Abhinavagupta, scriptural discrepancies may be allowed for as far as the valid performance of ritual prescribed by scriptural revelation, but there should be unanimity at the doctrinal level. The job for a traditional commentator like Abhinavagupta or Jayaratha was to draw attention away from inconsistencies and to emphasise the doctrinal harmony of Śaiva scriptures. This was indeed a

21. For more details on this topic see Allen 2011.

22. For more details on this topic see Kaul 2016.

23. See Padoux 1990: 223 for more details on the topic of phonemic emanation in the Tantric scriptures.

24. Cf. TAK-III, p. 25: "But there is no consensus in the scriptures about 1) how many *tattvas* there are; 2) what their order is; 3) exactly what they are—in some cases they are better rendered "principle," in others "reality level," and in the case of the *tattva* of the bound soul and the uppermost *tattvas* of the pure universe neither of these translations is adequate—and 4) which worlds (*bhuvana*) belong in which *tattvas*."

challenging task. Even though Abhinava and other post-scriptural commentators would maintain the doctrinal unity of the Śaiva canon, this was not always the case. The sequence (*krama*) of the emergence of the *tattvas* was one such area that required careful hermeneutical attention. In the remainder of this paper we shall focus on how Abhinavagupta and his commentator Jayaratha address these questions.

Abhinavagupta's *tattva* scheme is largely based on the Śaiva Siddhānta model. In the Śaiva cosmology the entire creation exists within the four cosmic spheres (*aṅḍacatuṣṭaya*): the sphere of Energy (*śaktyaṅḍa*), the sphere of *māyā* (*māyāṅḍa*), the sphere of Nature (*prakṛtyaṅḍa*) and the sphere of Earth (*prṥhyāṅḍa*). These spheres contain within themselves an infinite number of *bhuvanas*. To these cosmic spheres are also connected the three series²⁵ of *kalās*, *tattvas* and *bhuvanas* according to which the *śaktyaṅḍa* has five *tattvas*, viz. *śakti*, *śadāśiva*, *īśvara*, *śuddhavidyā* and *mahāmāyā*. Within the *māyāṅḍa* there is *māyā*, *kalā*, *vidyā*, *rāga*, *kāla*, *niyati* and *puruṣa*. In the *prakṛtyaṅḍa* there are *tattvas* from *prakṛti* to *jala*, and in the *prṥhyāṅḍa* there is only the *prṥhvī tattva*. The *prṥhyāṅḍa* is contained within the *prakṛtyaṅḍa* and the *prakṛtyaṅḍa* is contained within the *māyāṅḍa*. In the same way the *māyāṅḍa* is contained in the *śaktyaṅḍa* and the latter is contained in the *Anuttara*. *Anuttara* is beyond all the spheres, *tattvas*, *bhuvanas*, etc., and it contains all of them within itself at the same time. Even though the definitions and numbers of the *tattvas* and *bhuvanas* vary in different Āgamas, our focus here is the *Tantrāloka*. The *tattvas* pervade the *bhuvanas* and the *bhuvanas* are classified as being within the *tattvas*. Furthermore, as far as the concept of five *kalās* is concerned,²⁶ the first, *nivṛttikalā*, is formed of *prṥhivītattva* and 16 *bhuvanas*. The second, *pratiṣṭhākālā*, is made of

25. For details on *ṣaḍadhvan* see Padoux 1990: 330ff. and also Dwivedi 2000: 387. In the Āgamic scheme of the *ṣaḍadhvan*, the *tattvādhvan* (the path of the *tattvas*) constitutes one of the three 'ways' in the *deśādhvan*, the other two being *kalā* and *bhuvana*. The *kālādhvan* constitutes the triad of *varṇa*, *pada* and *mantra*. The *deśādhvan* falls under the category of *vācaka* or *śabda* and the *kālādhvan* is categorised under *vācya* or *artha*. However, in the highest stage of manifestation the *vācya* and the *vācaka* are one. Here I focus only on the *tattvādhvan*.

26. TĀ 11.8-9b: *nivṛtṭiḥ prṥhivītattve pratiṣṭhāvyaktaḥ | vidyā niśānte śāntā ca śaktyante 'ṅdam idaṃ catuḥ || śāntātītā śive tattve kalātītaḥ paraḥ śivaḥ |* For more details on *kalā* see TAK, Vol. II, p. 71 under note 6.

23 *tattvas* from *jala* to *prakṛti* and contains 56 *bhuvanas*. The *vidyākalā*, which is the third, contains seven *tattvas* from *puruṣa* to *māyā* and 28 *bhuvanas*. The fourth, *śāntākalā*, has three *tattvas*: *śuddhavidyā*, *īśvara* and *sadāśiva* and 18 *bhuvanas*, and finally the fifth, *śāntātītākalā*, has only two *tattvas*, viz. *Śiva* and *Śakti* and there are no *bhuvanas*. *Paramaśiva* is beyond all the *kalās*. We see here that a given sequence of *bhuvanas* corresponds with particular *tattvas*²⁷ and we must remember that in the hierarchy of the *tattvas* the succession cannot be denied in view of the cause and effect relationship (*kāryakāraṇabhāva*) between them. So each *tattva* is related to the other by a cause and effect relationship, and depending on the type of the sequence whether it is the *sṛṣṭikrama* or the *saṃhāarakrama*, the subtlest *tattva* Śiva is on the top and the grossest Earth is at the bottom.²⁸ That being so, there do exist higher and lower *tattvas*, the higher being subtle in nature and more intrinsic and the lower being relatively gross and more extrinsic. Each higher *tattva* permeates and pervades the succeeding ones, with the highest and most subtle pervading and permeating all the *tattvas*. This makes it clear that each successive lower *tattva* exists in and draws its sustenance from the successive higher *tattvas* which are also its material cause. Here the two important concepts emerging in the study of *tattvas* are *vyāpyavyāpakabhāva*²⁹ and *kāryakāraṇabhāva*. We will come back to these topics shortly.

According to Abhinavagupta, there is no constant causal nature of the *tattvas* defined in the earlier Āgamas. Commentators on the Śaiva scriptures offer different explanations for the discrepancies between how various Āgamās present the hierarchy of the *tattvas*. For Abhinavagupta, the relation of cause and effect is really that of an agent and the act.³⁰ He points out that mere succession

27. TĀV 9.1: *bhuvanānirūpaṇāntaram tadanuyāyinām tattvānām nirūpaṇasya prāptāvasaratvāt* |

28. *tattvas* manifest in two ways: *sṛṣṭikrama* and *saṃhāarakrama*. Cf. TP: verses 67-68. Texts that follow the *sṛṣṭikrama* include the *Parāpañcāśikā*, *Saubhāgyasudhodaya*, *Tattvapraśāsa* and *Yoginūhṛdaya*, and texts that follow *saṃhāarakrama* include the *Tattvasaṃgraha*, *Bhogakārikā*, *Virūpākṣapañcāśikā*. See Dwivedi 1983: 196, n. 3. Also, cf. *tattvakrama* in the TAK-III, p. 28.

29. *vyāpyavyāpakabhāva* is discussed in TĀ 9.306-314 and the *kāryakāraṇabhāva* is discussed in TĀ 9.7-48.

30. In his commentary on TĀ 9.13 Jayaratha quotes a verse from ĪPK 2.4.2 emphasizing the principle argument of the Trika in this context: *jaḍasya tu na sā śaktiḥ sattā*

does not constitute causality³¹ and introduces the concept of succession saying, “Let the insentient have a variegated form successively (through the sequence of time), but then what contradiction is there in this?”³² There is not some thing in addition to the nature of things. They are just the form of our perception. So if the thing is successive or non-successive there is nothing added on to the thing itself. He explains that these two, successive and non-successive, are just the perceiving of things in these ways. Abhinava explores the diversity of the teachings on *tattvas* to prove his own special point: causality is just an ultimate analysis appearing in one way or the other. As a result of this, in the scriptures, causality is not fixed and constant. Abhinava looks at it from two ways using an earlier tantric scheme of the *prakriyāsāstra*³³ and the *sārasāstra*. The *prakriyāsāstra* means the teaching of hierarchy, the standard Śaiva doctrine in which religion means ascending

yadasataḥ sataḥ | kartṛkarmatvatattvaiva kāryakāraṇatā tataḥ || “The inert could have no power to bring the non-existent into being, therefore the relation of cause and effect is really that of agent and act.”

31. TĀ 9.13: *bijam aṅkura ity asmin satattve hetutadvatoḥ | ghaṭaḥ paṭas ceti bhavet kāryakāraṇatā na kim ||* “So if the cause and effect is seed and sprout then why should not there be a causal relation between a pot and cloth. Mere succession, in other words, does not constitute causality.”
32. TĀ 9.17ab: *krameṇa citrākāro 'stu jaḍaḥ kiṃ nu viruddhyate |*
33. For more on *prakriyā*, see TĀ 8.5: *tatrādhvaivaṃ nirūpyo 'yaṃ yatas tatprakriyākramam anusaṃdadhad eva drāg yogī bhairavatāṃ vrajet |* Jayaratha clarifies the definition further: *prakriyākramam iti kālāgnyāder anāśritaparyantaṃ tathātathānupūrvyeṇāvasthānam |* This distinction of the *prakriyāsāstra* and the *sārasāstra* is also discussed by Bhāskaraṇṭha, whose aim is to describe the nature of the *tattvas* in the *prakriyāsāstra*. For more details, see Torella 2002: 189 fn.2. Also cf. Bhāskaraṇṭha, ĪPVVyā 3.1.3, p. 222: *yady api sārasāstreṣu śakter eva spandatvam uktaṃ tathāpiha prakriyāsāstre proktanīyā sadāśivāder uktam | śaktiśivayor eva hīha śāstre paramārthasvarūpatvaṃ na paraśivasyety alam |* Translation by Sanderson: “Although in the Essence Teachings (*sārasāstram*) it is Śakti that is said to be Vibration, here it is Sadāśiva and [Īśvara], this [text, the *Īśvarapratyabhijñākārikā*] being a *prakriyāsāstram*. For in this text it is merely Śiva and Śakti that are the ultimate reality, not [as there] Paramaśiva [the non-dual reality whose ‘power’ (*śaktiḥ*) or ‘vibration’ (*spandaḥ*) is seen as manifesting itself as all the thirty-six *tattvas* of the system texts, from Śiva and Śakti down to Earth].” (This translation was personally communicated to me by Sanderson in a letter dated 29 October, 2014).

the cosmic ladder, while the *sārasāstra*, which is essentially a Śākta concept, emphasises ‘expansion’ rather than ‘hierarchy.’ But the *sārasāstra* transcends the *prakriyāsāstra* and follows the scheme of gradual expansion. This concept of gradual expansion is not really present in the *prakriyāsāstra*, as can be seen from the fact that it is not present in the Siddhānta, which is the doctrinal basis of the *prakriyāsāstra*. To further clarify this, the manifestation of the universe is not considered to be the expression of the Lord’s nature. He remains transcendent and his involvement with the world is indirect. He does not himself stimulate *māyā* with his *śakti*, this function being delegated to Ananta. Abhinava follows the model of the *prakriyāsāstra*, but in the background the other model of the *sārasāstra* is operative all the time and this esoteric view keeps arising abruptly at several occasions. Abhinavagupta fails to conceal it and repeatedly suggests the *sārasāstra* model, which transcends the hierarchy of the *tattvas*. When Śiva is seen as the thirty-sixth *tattva* he is perceived as being at the summit of this hierarchy transcending the universe (*viśvottīrṇa*). When one sees him from the *sārasāstra* point of view, the thirty-six are in fact his expansion, and then one can see that totality, seeing Śiva in his *viśvamaya* aspect (all-embracing expanded form), which is sometimes called Bhairava,³⁴ the thirty-seventh *tattva*.

DEFINING *TATTVA*

The Śaiva Siddhānta believes in two classes of *tattvas*: three eternal *tattvas* called *Pati*, *Paśu* and *Pāśa*³⁵ and the thirty-six transitory *tattvas*. The thirty-six secondary *tattvas* are dependent on the three primary *tattvas*. Accordingly, Śiva, Śakti, *Sadāśiva*, *Īśvara* and *Śuddhavidyā* reside in *Pati*, *Puruṣa* resides in *Paśu* and the *tattvas* from *kalā* to *pṛthvī* reside in *Māyā* or *Pāśa*. The five *tattvas* from Śiva to *Śuddhavidyā* are the pure categories (*śuddha-tattvas*),³⁶ the seven *tattvas* from *Māyā* to *Puruṣa* are both pure and impure (*śuddhāśuddha-tattvas*)³⁷ and the

34. MVV1.658: *tattve tattve svecchayā devadevaḥ* || *sarvāṃ sarvāṃ bhūmim ālambamānaḥ* || *pūrṇaikātmā pūrṇasaṃvitsvarūpaḥ* || *śrīmāñ śāstre bhairavo niruktaḥ* ||

35. TP 5: *śaivāgameṣu mukhyaṃ patipaśupāśā iti kramāt tritayam* | *tatra patiḥ śiva uktaḥ paśavo hy āṇavo’ rtha pañcakaṃ pāśaḥ* ||

36. TP 21: *śuddhāni pañcatattvāny ādyāṃ teṣu smaranti śivatattvam* | *śaktisadāśivatattve īśvaravidyākyatattve ca* ||

37. TP 22: *pumso jñakarṭṛtārthaṃ māyāstattvapañcakaṃ bhavati* | *kālo niyatīś ca tathā kalā ca vidyā ca rāgaś ca* ||

twenty-four *tattvas* from *prakṛti* to *pṛthvī* are impure (*aśuddha-tattvas*) because of being insentient (*jaḍa*).³⁸ The Siddhānta defines a *tattva* as that which lasts till the destruction of the whole world, unlike a body or a pot, and which acts as a means of experiencing [reality] for all beings.³⁹ The principle *tattva* amongst all the *tattvas* is regarded as that which is invisible, devoid of qualities, and has nothing to reject and nothing to seek. It is of imperceptible form and is said to be content. It is volition (*icchā*) that is filled with its qualities and characteristics; it is the power emanating out of it.⁴⁰ In his *Paramārthasāraṭīkā* Yogarāja offers three etymological definitions of the *tattva*: that where all is expanding (*tanyate*), that which is extending till the dissolution of the world (*tanānāt*), and the state of being that (*tasya bhāvaḥ*).⁴¹

But what does *tattva* mean in reality? This is a very important question because usually Śaiva systems define and explain the *tattvas*, but after discussing their ‘ontological hierarchy’ they seem to regard this as ‘artificial.’⁴² This is because in reality, as Abhinava justifies, Śiva is the most competent agent of his creation⁴³ and the principle of causal relations is projected forth by the will of Śiva alone. In other words, from the absolute point of view, Śiva alone is the supreme *tattva* pervading all the other *tattvas*. This is also the view of Siddhānta.⁴⁴ In Trika this ‘absoluteness’ of the autonomy of Śiva is defined by the fact that it modifies individual consciousness on many different levels. It is

38. This is not, for instance, the case with the *Svāyambhuvāgama* that regards all the *tattvas* as impure (*aśuddha*) except Śiva, which is the only pure (*śuddha*) *tattva*.

39. TP 73: *āpralayaṃ yat tiṣṭhati sarveṣāṃ bhogadāyī bhūtānām | tat tattvaṃ iti proktaṃ na śarīraghaṭādivat ||*

40. Quoted by Jayaratha at TĀV-1.274 from the Kularatnamālā: *adr̥ṣṭaṃ nirguṇaṃ yac ca heyopādeyavarjitam | tattattvaṃ sarvatattvānām pradhānaṃ paripaṭhyate || adr̥ṣṭavīgrahaś caiva sa śānta itī gīyate | tasyecchā nirgatā śaktis taddharmaguṇasamyutā ||*

41. PSV, p. 363: *tanyate sarvaṃ tanvādi yatra tat tattvam, tananād vā tadāpralayaṃ, tasya bhāva itī vā tattvam |*

42. I am borrowing the word ‘artificial’ for ‘*kalpita*’ from Somadeva Vasudeva. See his treatment of the subject in Vasudeva 2013: 213.

43. TĀ 9.8ab: *vastutaḥ sarvabhāvānām karteśānaḥ paraḥ śivaḥ |*

44. TP 33: *tattvaṃ vastuta ekaṃ śivasarijñāṃ citraśaktiśatakacitam | śaktivyāpṛtibhedāt tasyaite kalpitā bhedāḥ ||*

always grounded in self-awareness and that self-awareness is always present. There is no differentiation in that and it is always the same dynamic force which is perceived as just conscious and it freely manifests its own contraction.

The causality principle of Trika works in two ways⁴⁵: from the absolute point of view (*pāramārthika*) and from the point of view of something that is created (*sṛṣṭa*). Here *sṛṣṭa* should be understood in the sense of *kalpita* (artificial). Criticizing the Buddhists' reductionist view of causality, Abhinavagupta says: "The essence of the situation in which some thing comes into existence upon the existence of something else is nothing but dependence."⁴⁶ With this statement he attacks the famous Buddhist theory of dependent origination (*pratīyasamutpāda*) that asserts that "phenomena are happening in a series and we see that there being certain phenomena there becomes some others."⁴⁷ The causal formula of this system is: 'This being, that arises' or 'Depending on the cause, the effect arises' (*asmin sati, idaṃ bhavati*). Thus every object of thought is necessarily dependent and because it is dependent, it is neither absolutely real nor absolutely unreal. Abhinava challenges this idea of the Buddhists and asks, "How can this theory be true in the case of things that are independent of each other inasmuch as they are self-contained?"⁴⁸

TATTVA ACCORDING TO ABHINAVAGUPTA

Navjivan Rastogi argues that Abhinavagupta's notion of *tattva* is also influenced by the Naiyāyika idea of universals (*sāmānya*), the Sāṃkhya theory of *satkāryavāda*, and the idea of *śabda-śakti* propounded by the philosophers of language like Bhartṛhari, in addition to the discussions on *tattvas* in the earlier Āgamic scriptures like the *Mataṅgapārameśvarāgama*.⁴⁹ According to Rastogi, Abhinava purposely uses the word *sāmānya* in the ĪPVV, which also signifies

45. TS 8, p. 69-70: *tatra eṣāṃ tattvānāṃ kāryakāraṇabhāvo darśyate sa ca dvividhaḥ || pāramārthikaḥ sṛṣṭeś ca || tatra pāramārthika etāvān kāryakāraṇabhāvo yad uta kartṛsvabhāvasya svatantrasya bhagavata evaṇvidhena śivādidharāntena vapuṣā svarūpabhinnena svarūpaviśrāntena ca prathanam ||*

46. TĀ-9.11ab: *tasmīn sati hi tadbhāva ity apekṣaikajīvitam |*

47. Dasgupta 2004: 84ff.

48. TĀ 9.11cd: *nirapekṣeṣu bhāveṣu svātmaniṣṭhatayā katham |*

49. See the chapter titled 'padārtha' in Rastogi 2012: 219-232. Also cf. Vasudeva 2013: 214.

the Naiyāyika influence of *sāmānya* on the idea of *tattva*.⁵⁰ A *tattva* is the reality that pervades a certain class.⁵¹ Abhinava also thinks of *tattva* like the ‘universal-universal’ (*mahāsāmānya*).⁵² In the TĀ, Abhinavagupta paraphrases the MPĀ while offering the definition of the *tattva*.⁵³ Jayaratha quotes Abhinava’s source from the MPĀ:

tattvaṃ yad vasturūpaṃ syāt svadharmaprakāṭmakam |
tattvaṃ vastupadaṃ vyaktaṃ sphuṭāmnāyadarśanāt || 3 ||
yad acyutaṃ svakād vṛttāt tataḥ śāktavaśaṃ jagat |
tatam anyena vā yat syāt tat tattvaṃ tattvasantatau || 4 ||⁵⁴

While interpreting Abhinavagupta, Jayaratha says that in Śaivism the one reality which pervades the plurality, which consists of the worlds and so on, and which has as its nature earth and so on, is said to be the *tattva*. For that very reason, *tattva* means the state of being (-*tva*) of those (*tat*-) things, namely Earth and so on. And it is this very singular reality that envelops the whole universe and therefore is named Parama Śiva, the thirty-seventh *tattva*. The fact that this universe is manifest is nothing but the effulgence of that one *tattva*.⁵⁵ Like

50. ĪPVV, Vol. III, p. 264: *iha tasya bhāvas tattvam iti vargāṇāṃ viśeṣarūpāṇām ekikaraṇanimittaṃ sāmānyam ucyate mṛtpāśānadārvasthimāmsādīnām pṛthivī, saritkūpasaraḥsamudrādīnām jalam iti |* Also cf. Rastogi 2012: 220.

51. ĪPV 2.3.2: *bhinnānāṃ vargāṇāṃ varaḡikaraṇanimittaṃ yad ekam avibhaktaṃ bhāti tattattvam |*

52. In his *Tantrasāra* Abhinavagupta offers another clear definition of *tattva*. TS p. 69: *yad idam vibhavātmakam bhuvanajātam uktam garbhīkṛtāntavicitrabhokt rbhogyam, tatra yad anugataṃ mahāprakāśarūpaṃ tat mahāsāmānyakalpam paramaśivarūpaṃ | yat tu katipayakatipayabhedānugataṃ rūpaṃ tat tattvam |* Vasudeva 2004: 191 also notes that Abhinavagupta understands a *tattva* as similar to the common property (*sāmānya*) present in all members of a superset (*mahājāti*).

53. TĀ 9.6cd: *śrīmataṅgaśāstrādau tad uktaṃ parameśinā ||* Cf. Vasudeva 2004: 190-191: “Abhinavagupta’s understanding of *tattva* is based upon that of the *Mataṅgapārameśvara*, which he cites with approval. In the *Tantrāloka* he defines a *tattva* as that which is recurrent or pervasive in all of the members of its class. The term used by Abhinavagupta to describe the nature of this presence is *anugāmin*. By this he is adopting a key-term (also syn. *anuyāyin*) used in Śāstric discourse to define a generic property (*jāti*).”

54. MPĀ (VP) 5.3-4.

55. TĀV 9.2ab: *idaṃ hi nāma pārameśvare darśane “tattvam” ity ucyate—yad ekam eva rūpaṃ ayabhicāreṇa anekatra bhuvanādāv anugāmi syāt, tac ca*

Yogarāja,⁵⁶ Jayaratha also maintains that *tattva* means *the state of being that* (supreme form) which pervades everything.⁵⁷ To clarify things further, Jayaratha hypothesises an opponent asking how that *tattva* could exist severally if this universe is something whose only reality is the all encompassing single light of consciousness. He answers this implicit question by saying that when plurality has become completely manifest from Śiva's domain owing to his spontaneity, then that dynamic reality does not have different modes of pervasion. In other words, the process of “manifesting” is a singular spontaneous dynamic process and as we did observe Abhinavagupta often saying it is nothing but Śiva who himself pervades as the light of consciousness. But in the mode of plurality the same term is used to refer to different modes of pervasion.

Abhinavagupta himself offers the following definition of a *tattva*:

tatsvātantryarasāt punaḥ śivapadād bhede vibhāte param ||
yad rūpaṃ bahudhānuḡāmi tad idaṃ tattvaṃ vibhoḥ śāsane || TĀ 9.2cd ||

“According to the Lord's teaching, a *tattva* is that reality which pervades variously (*bahudhānuḡāmi*) once plurality (*bhede*) has become completely manifest (*vibhāte*) from the state of [*parama-*]śiva due to the savour of his (*tat-*) autonomy.”

Here the idea of pervasion (*anugati*, *vyāpti*, *anusyūti* or *anuvṛtti*) is important and Rastogi makes this point clear. Rastogi maintains that even though this

prthivīdyātmakam anekaparakāram, ata eva tasya—prthivyāder bhāvaḥ “tattvam”
tathā vyapadeśanimittam ity uktam, tac ca samanantarāhnikokteṣu nānāprakāreṣu
bhuvaneṣu yad etat prakāśaikaghanam paraṃ tattvaṃ prakāśamānatānyathānup
apattyanūyāyi bhāsate sa nikhilaviśvakroḍīkāreṇa dyotamānaḥ, tasyaiva hy ayaṃ
sphāro yad idaṃ viśvaṃ nāmāvabhāsate |

56. See note 41 above.

57. We observe a slight awkwardness with Jayaratha's interpretation here. He says that it is *tat* which is the supreme nature (TĀV 9.2ab: *ata eva ca tanotī sarvam iti “tat” paraṃ rūpaṃ, tasya bhāvas tattvam – ity arthaḥ ||*), but Abhinava does not seem to mean it in this sense. For him *tattva* and not *tat* is the supreme nature (TĀ 9.2cd: *yad rūpaṃ bahudhānuḡāmi tad idaṃ tattvaṃ vibhoḥ śāsane ||*). It seems that Jayaratha here has made the mistake of pressing too close in his analysis and ended up producing something implausible, which Abhinavagupta himself has avoided. Other examples of Jayaratha's clumsiness are pointed out by Sanderson (2007b: 96ff). Bansat-Boudon and Tripathi (2011: 105, n.434) have also referred to this problem of the etymology of *tattva*.

scheme of pervasion is not standard in Śaivism, it still can be categorised into three: viz., the pervasion of material cause in effect, the pervasion of parts in a collection, and the pervasion of a universal in an individual. If an entity fulfils the above criteria, it can be called a *tattva* by a Śaiva ontologist.⁵⁸ Each *tattva* is covered by each subsequent *tattva*. Each prior, lower *tattva* is a *vyāpya* and the immediately following higher *tattva* is *vyāpaka*.⁵⁹ The *tattvas* sequentially existing above each other have their qualities as pervasive (*vyāpaka*) and the lower *tattvas* have their qualities pervaded (*vyāpya*).⁶⁰ For instance as *Śaktitattva* is 'pervaded' by *Śivatattva*, in that case *Śivatattva* is 'pervasive'.⁶¹ In the same way, all the causal *tattvas* are pervasive and the effect *tattvas* pervaded. Abhinavagupta explains that the *prthivī tattva* is found from *kālāgnirudrabhuvana* up to the *vīrabhadrabhuvana*⁶² because of the manifestation of its constant characteristics, which are firmness (*dhṛti*), rigidity (*kāṭhinya*) and weight (*garimā*).⁶³ And one should explain it in the same way in the context of the *tattvas* water etc. up to *Sadāśivatattva*.⁶⁴ Abhinavagupta's hypothetical opponent is in disagreement and contends that just as cow-ness pervades because of the pervasion of a dewlap in the individual species of cows, one should understand that this also is the case with bodies or worlds. To this Abhinava answers, "A *tattva* is that which extends by virtue of its pervasive state of being and remains in the manner of a universal to its own effects. These are, in due order, earth, individual soul and Śiva etc.

58. Rastogi 2012: 221.

59. Also see TĀ 8.186 and 8.189.

60. TĀ 9.310: *yo hi yasmād gunotkṛṣṭaḥ sa tasmād ūrdhva ucyate | ūrdhvatā vyāptṛtā śrīmanmālinīvijaye sphuṭā ||*

61. TS 8, p. 90: *asmīṣ ca tattvakalāpe ūrdhvordhvaguṇaṃ vyāpakaṃ nikṛṣṭaguṇaṃ tu vyāpyam ||* TS 8, p. 91: *sa eva guṇasya utkarṣo yat tena vinā guṇāntaraṃ na upapadyate tena prthivītattvaṃ śivatattvāt prabhṛti jalatattvena vyāptam evaṃ jalaṃ tejasā ityādi yāvaca chaktitattvam ||*

62. In the *prthavyaṇḍa* there are said to be 16 worlds (*bhunavas*) from *kālāgnirudra* to *vīrabhadra*.

63. TĀ 9.3: *tathāhi kālasadanādvīrabhadra *purāntakam em. SANDERSON] purāntagam Ked. | dhṛtikāṭhinyagarimādyavabhāsād dharātmatā ||* Also cf. TS 8, p. 69: *yathā prthivī nāma dyutikāṭhinyasthaulyādirūpā kālāgniprabhṛtīvīrabhadrāntabhuvaneś ādhiṣṭhasamastabrahmāṇḍānugatā ||*

64. TĀ 9.4ab: *evaṃ jalādītattveṣu vācyam *yāvatsadāśivam conj. SANDERSON] yāvatsadāśīve Ked.*

So there is no question that it will apply to bodies or worlds.”⁶⁵ Therefore, the supreme *tattva*, which is Parama Śiva, is the radiant, all-encompassing reality pervading all these different *tattvas*.

DIVERSITY OF CAUSALITY WITHIN THE SCRIPTURAL ACCOUNTS

As mentioned earlier, Abhinavagupta in his TĀ makes note of diversity within Śāstric accounts of causality. This diversity, he asserts, is present not only in scriptural accounts but also in the exegetical literature, where two commentators while commenting on the same text can still have two different interpretations. But as far as Abhinava’s own interpretation of causality is concerned, it is simply a matter of the way that the all-encompassing consciousness presents itself in the form of various things, and therefore this accounts for the inconsistency of the Āgamic interpretations of the arising of the *tattvas* in the process of creation. Thus, Abhinava uses metaphysical principles to interpret the historical diversity in the accounts of cosmology found in Śaiva scriptures. There are different ways in which the causality is made manifest and Abhinavagupta uses a metaphysical model to explain away what other commentators on some of the Tantras say. In fact, he seems to think that his system is under strain and he makes his best possible effort to reconcile and make sense of the inconsistency present in the scriptures. He does not simply choose to ignore this problem, but he finds a brilliant solution by rationalising his tradition and making sense out of the inconsistent accounts about causality both in the scriptural and exegetical accounts. Since causality has a diverse character and it appears in one way or the other,⁶⁶ it is for this very reason, Abhinava seems to suggest, that it makes sense that there are various opinions in the scriptures concerning the essential

65. TĀ 9.4cd-6ab: *svasmīnkārye’ tha dharmaughe yadvāpi *svasadṛggāṇe em. SANDERSON] svasadṛggūṇe Ked. | āste sāmānyakalpena tananādyāpṛbhāvataḥ || tat tattvam kramaśaḥ pṛthvī pradhānam pumśivādayaḥ || 5 || dehānām bhuvanānām ca na prasaṅgastatto bhavet | Sanderson’s emendation is also supported by Abhinavagupta himself in TĀ 9.54 where he says mantrā iti viśuddhāḥ syur amī pañca gaṇāḥ kramāt | svasmin svasmin gaṇe bhāti yad yad rūpam samanvayi || It is very likely that the scribe who has just written dharmaughe in the preceding line bears in mind that dharma means guṇa and writes guṇa instead of gaṇa.*

66. TĀ 9.44cd-45ab: *tata eva svarūpe’ pi krame’ py anyādṛśī sthitiḥ || śāstreṣu yujyate citrāt *tathābhānasvabhāvataḥ conj. SANDERSON] tathābhānasvabhāvataḥ | Ked.*

nature and the order of manifestation of the *tattvas*. Jayaratha further helps us in understanding Abhinava and says that just as mind is sometimes referred to as an organ of the mental faculty and sometimes classified with the *antaḥkaraṇa*, so it is perfectly acceptable that the scriptures should give different accounts of things both as to their nature and as to the order of their appearing.

To explain his position further, Abhinava offers illustrations: one example of causal discrepancy is from the scriptures and the other from the natural world.⁶⁷ First, he explains the apparent discrepancy between two views on the origins of *prakṛti* in the Śaiva ontology. One interpretation, he says, is based on the *Rauravasūtrasaṃgraha*, which claims that from *māyā* come two products, namely *prakṛti* and *kalā* (power of limited agency). Another is based on the MVUT, and maintains that *prakṛti* comes out of *kalā*.⁶⁸ Jayaratha further elaborates upon Abhinava by introducing the causal discrepancy at the exegetical level. He quotes the relevant verses of the *Rauravasūtrasaṃgraha* (2.4.14-15) and identifies this interpretation as that of Bṛhaspati (c. 650-750 CE), who in his *Rauravavārttika* on the *Rauravasūtrasaṃgraha* says that the word *tataḥ* in *avyaktam ca tataḥ* means “from *māyā*.” In contrast to Bṛhaspati’s interpretation, Sadyojyotis (c. 675-725 CE) took a different line. He, in his commentary *Rauravasūtrasaṃgraha-vṛtti*, understood *tataḥ* to mean “next.” In fact, Bṛhaspati and Sadyojyotis differed precisely on this fundamental point.⁶⁹ Jayaratha explains that in this interpretation the pronoun *tataḥ* in *avyaktam ca tataḥ* is understood to mean “thereafter” rather than “from that,” i.e., *māyā*, and he attributes this view to the

67. TĀ 9.39cd-40ab: *ata eva tathābhānaparamārthatayā sthiteḥ | kāryakāraṇabhāvasya loke śāstre ca citrate* || “Since for this reason it is established that the relation of cause and effect is an ultimate analysis appearing in this way or that way. Because of that it takes many forms both in the worldly domain and the causality maintained by scriptures.”

68. TĀ 9.40cd-41ab: *māyāto’vyaktakalāyor iti rauravasamgrāhe || śrīpūrve tu kalātattvād vyaktam iti kathyate* |

69. This debate is explained in detail in Sanderson 2006: 48-51. He also refers to TĀ 9.217 where Abhinavagupta gives another view of the same passage: *nanu śrīmadrauravādau rāgavidyātmakaṃ dvayam | sūte kalā hi yugapat tato ’vyaktam iti sthitiḥ* || “Surely in such texts as the *Raurava* the position is that Kalā simultaneously creates the pair Rāga and Vidyā and thereafter Avyakta” (Trans. Sanderson).

author of the *vr̥tti*, Sadyojyotis.⁷⁰ This clearly shows that the diversity in relation to causality is present both in the scriptural and the exegetical accounts. In case of the exegetical interpretations, as we just saw above, one says that *avyakta* is the effect of *māyā* and another says that it is a product of *kalā*. But the explanation of the inconsistency, namely that *prakṛti* has come forth from what is called *nīśā* or *māyā tattva* after becoming *kalā* is completely implausible. However, Abhinava resolves this apparent contradiction by saying that both positions are true. Even though he maintains that *prakṛti* comes directly from *māyā* after *māyā* first turns itself into *kalā*,⁷¹ yet it is clear to his readers that he seems to try and make exegetical accounts consistent rather forcefully.

Abhinava offers a second example from the natural world. He uses the example of a scorpion,⁷² saying: “.....[I]n the world a scorpion can come out of cow-faeces, from another scorpion, from imagination, from memory, from the desire of a Yogi, from such factors as the power of certain substances and mantras.”⁷³ Abhinava has also used this example as a maxim supporting his theory of causation in the case of a Yogi. A thing produced by a Yogi is accepted to be similar to something that is produced naturally. To clarify, he further says that this is unlike the case of a scorpion that is produced out of natural birth as opposed to the one produced from cow-faeces.⁷⁴ What Abhinava is arguing here is that even if a scorpion produced out of a natural birth is not similar to the scorpion produced from cow-faeces, yet the idea that it is a scorpion is the same. Jayaratha elaborates the same argument of Abhinava, answering the hypothetical opponent, saying that if they consider a separate scorpion to be actually there because of some specific quality as a result of some specific cause, then surely there is some personal difference of place, time, form etc. in these various scorpions that have come forth from a scorpion or faeces etc. Each one

70. Cf. Sanderson 2006: 49ff.

71. TĀ 9.41cd-9.42ab: *tata eva nīśākyānāt kalībhūtād aliṅgakam || iti vyākhyāsmad ukte 'smin sati nyāye 'tinīṣphalā |*

72. See Rastogi 1984: 35ff. for more details on *vr̥ścikagomayādisaṃbhūtavr̥ścikādinyāya*. Abhinavagupta also uses this analogy in his ĪPV 2.4.11.

73. TĀ 9.42cd-43ab: *loke ca gomayāt kīṭāt saṃkalpāt svapnataḥ smṛteḥ || yogīchāto dravyamantraprabhāvādeś ca vr̥ścikaḥ |*

74. ĪPV 2.4.11: *yogīchāpi sarvathā tādr̥śam eva na tu vr̥ścikagomayādisaṃbhūtavr̥ścikād inyāyena kathamcit rasavīryādīnā bhinnam kāryam janayati |*

of them has some specific characteristics pertaining to themselves, as a result of which they are different from each other. In spite of that, they always remain scorpions (the idea of being a scorpion is the same in all of them). That each is 'a scorpion' is always constructed as 'scorpion' through *parāmarśa*. So it is not wrong to teach variety in consistency of effects, both with respect to what they are, their definition and then the order of their appearance.⁷⁵

DEBATE ON THE SEQUENCE OF *TATTVAS*

If causality with respect to the *tattvas* is diverse, so too is the order and the number of *tattvas*. How many *tattvas* are there and what exactly is their sequence or their order of manifestation? Dwivedi (1982) has discussed this problem systematically in the case of the Purāṇas. As far as the Āgamic notions are concerned, as we saw above, the Supreme *tattva* is one alone and the generally accepted number of *tattvas* according to the Āgamas is thirty-six, yet the latter topic remains problematic. Here we should keep in mind that Abhinava does speak of two additional *tattvas*, i.e., the thirty-seventh and the thirty-eighth *tattvas*. These two *tattvas* are a demonstration of the deep esotericism of the Trika of Abhinavagupta.⁷⁶

After having appropriated the diversity of causality within the scriptural accounts, Abhinavagupta remarks on the diversity of the sequence of the *tattvas* as taught in various Āgamas. He paraphrases relevant passages from some important Āgamas to illustrate his stand. He mentions, for instance, that the order of the *tattvas* followed in the *Sarvajñānottaratantra* is *puruṣa* (individual), *rāga*⁷⁷

75. TĀ 9.43cd-9.44ab: *kāmaṃ kutaścīt svaviśeṣataḥ || sa tu sarvatra tulyas tatparāmārśaikyam asti tu |*

76. For more on the thirty-seventh and thirty-eighth *tattvas* see TAK-III (p. 26): "The thirty-seventh is called *paraśiva* (TĀ 11.21ff.), and, as opposed to the thirty-sixth, which is emptier than empty (*śūnyātīśūnya*), this represents Śiva as identical with and inseparable from the universe (*sarvāvibhāgātman*) and autonomous (*svatantra*). The thirty-eighth, mere consciousness, is distinguished by its being unlimited and/or contiguous (*anavacchinna*). In TĀ 5.314 the lotus-seats of the goddesses are at the thirty-seventh principle."

77. For the Śaivas *rāga* is that craving of the soul by virtue of which it always wants something. It is not an attachment to a particular thing; rather, the soul is constantly driven by *abhilāśa* (desire). It is by virtue of *rāga* that it is attached to sense objects. Individual consciousness is contaminated by *rāga*.

(desire), *vidyā* (limited power of cognition), *kalā*⁷⁸ (power of limited action), *kāla* (time), and *māyā*⁷⁹ (material cause of the world). There is no mention of *niyati* there and the order of sequence followed is of re-absorption from bottom to top. On the other hand, he further adds that in the *Svāyambhuvasūtrasaṃgraha*, *niyati* is said to be above *kalā*. The pair *kāla* and *niyati* is above the three, namely *puruṣa*, *rāga* and *vidyā*. Quite contrary to this, the *Kiraṇātantra* teaches the order to be *kalā* first and then *māyā*⁸⁰ while the order Śiva has taught, according to Abhinavagupta, in the MPĀ starts with *puruṣa* in association with *niyati* and then *kāla* along with *rāga*, *vidyā* and *kalā*.⁸¹ Jayaratha identifies and quotes the appropriate sources of Abhinavagupta. In his commentary Jayaratha cites from the *Svāyambhuvasūtrasaṃgraha*, saying that the *kāla tattva* is below *māyā tattva*

78. Cf. ĪPV 3.1.9: *kalā kiñcitkartṛtvopodvalanamayī kāryam udbhāvayati kiñcij jānāmi kiñcit karomīti* | Abhinavagupta discusses *kalā* in detail in the eleventh chapter of the *Tantrāloka*. See TĀ 11.3-4, 8. He also gives definitions for the five *kalās* in his TS, p. 109-110.

79. *Māyā* is a sort of super *prakṛti*, non-differentiated, eternal, all pervasive and unconscious. It is called *māyā* because everything fits into it. For different definitions of *māyā* in the Tāntric exegesis, see Vasudeva 2004: 181-184. Also see TĀ 9.149-152 for the definition of *māyā*. For more detailed accounts of *māyā* in both dualist and non-dualist systems of Śaivism, see Sanderson 1992: 282ff.

80. TĀ 9.46cd-47ab: *pumrāgavit trayād ūrdhvaṃ *kālanīyatisaṃpuṭam* em. SANDERSON] *kalānīyatisaṃpuṭam* Ked || *kalā* em. SANDERSON] *kālo* Ked *māyeti kathitaḥ kramaḥ kiraṇāśāstragaḥ* || According to Sanderson the two words seem to have been wrongly inverted by the manuscript tradition. But Jayaratha makes it clear in his commentary that he himself thought through this problem and proposed an emendation. However, it is evident that the editors of KSTS did not take pains to understand the commentary. See TĀV Vol. VI, p. 46: *atra ca kālo nīyatisaṃpuṭaḥ, kalety evam ātmaiva jaratpustakadr̥ṣṭaḥ pāṭho grāhyaḥ, anyathā hi kairāṇo' rtho visamvadet* | So Jayaratha has proposed the reading *kalā* which he found in certain old manuscripts. This proves that there were still manuscripts around in his time which had the correct reading, for otherwise, as he himself suggests, the reading of the *Kiraṇāgama* would be in disagreement with this passage in the TĀ.

81. TĀ 9.45cd-9.48ab: *pumrāgavītkalākālamāyā jñānottare kramāt* || *niyatir nāsti vairiñce kalordhve nīyatīḥ śrutā* corr] *śratā* Ked | *pumrāgavitrayād ūrdhvaṃ kālanīyatisaṃpuṭam* || *kalā māyeti kathitaḥ kramaḥ kiraṇāśāstragaḥ* | *pumānnīyatyā kālāś ca rāgavidyākālānīyāḥ* || *ity eṣa krama uddiṣṭo mātanige pārameśvare* |

and *niyati* stays in-between them and then follow *kalā* and *vidyā*.⁸² According to him, the *Kiraṇāgama* holds that *puruṣa* is the guardian of the house of *prakṛti* and then follows *rāga tattva*, which arouses impure knowledge and deludes lower beings. *Rāga tattva* is followed by *kāla* and *niyati*, which are said to be mutually dependent. In this scheme of the *Kiraṇāgama*, *kalā* comes into being from *kāla* and *māyā* stays above both of them.⁸³ According to MPĀ, the order taught begins by *puruṣa* followed by *niyati* and then comes *kāla* along with *rāga*, *vidyā* and *kalā*.⁸⁴ Once again Jayaratha identifies and quotes the relevant passages from the MPĀ that Abhinava is referring to.⁸⁵

As pointed out earlier, Abhinava bases his TĀ on the MVUT. It is only after he debates the diversity of causality within several Siddhānta scriptures and the heterogeneity of the sequence of the *tattvas* therein that he comes back to the

82. There are three variant readings of this verse. One is from the KSTS edition [Ked] of the *Tantrāloka-viveka* (TĀV Vol.VI, p. 46.). The second is from the Mysore edition [Med] of the *Svāyambhuvasūtrasaṃgraha* (*adhvapatālaṃ* 26cd-27ab), and the third is from the Pondicherry I.F.I. Transcript [Ped] No. 39 (35-28): *māyātattvāt Ked] māyādhaḥ Med, māyāthakṣā Ped. kālatattvaṃ Ked] kālatattvan tu Med, kālatadvastu Ped. samsthitaṃ Ked Med] samsthītās Ped. tatpadadvaye | samsthānyasminkalā tadvad vidyāpyevaṃ Ked] niyatiścāpare' nyasmin kalāvidyā Med, niyatis ca parenyasmin kalā vidyā Ped. tataḥ punaḥ ||*

83. Here I am only quoting the verses referred to by Jayaratha in his commentary. *Kiraṇāgama* (VP) 8.125: *tatraiva puruṣo jñeyāḥ pradhānagrhapālakaḥ | rāgatattvāt tu vidyākhyam aśuddhaṃ paśumohakam ||* 8.128a: *tataḥ kālaniyatyākhyau samputau vyāpya lakṣadhā |* 8.130b: *kālatattvāt kalā jñeyā lakṣyutaparicchadā ||* 8.133a: *tadūrdhvaṃ tu bhaven māyā koṭim vyāpya sthitā hy adaḥ ||*

84. TĀ 47cd-48ab: *pumānniyatyā kālās ca rāgavidyākālānvitāḥ || ity eṣa krama uddiṣṭo mātaṅge pārameśvare |*

85. Here I am only quoting the verses referred to by Jayaratha in his commentary. MPĀ (VP) 9.2a: *kṣobhito 'nantanāthena granthir māyātmako yadā |* 9.15a: *tadvanmāyānusamyogād vyajyate *cetanā Ped] cetanā Ked. kalā |* 10.1: **athānoḥ Ped] ity aṇoḥ Ked. kalitasyāśya kalayā prāgjagannidheḥ | kalādhāre 'nu vijñānaṃ *bubhukṣor Ped] bubhutsor Ked. vidyayā abhavad ||* 11.2: *tasmād evāśayādrāgaḥ sūkṣmarūpo 'bhijāyate | yenāsau rañjitaḥ kṣipraṃ bhogabhugbhogatatparaḥ ||* 12.1: *atha *kālaḥ kramātpṛptaḥ Ped] kālakramapṛptaḥ Ked. kañcukatrāyadarśanāt | yenāsau *kalpyate Ped] kalpyate Ked. sūkṣmaḥ śivasāmarthyayogataḥ ||* 13.1: *athedānīm munivyāghra kāraṇasyāmitadyuteḥ | śaktir nīyāmikā puṃsaḥ *saha tattvena Ped] satattvena Ked. *sarpitā Ped] samarpitā Ked. ||* 14.1ab: *atha puṃstattvanirdeśaḥ svādhiṣṭhānopa*sarpataḥ Ped] sarpitaḥ Ked. |*

teachings of the MVUT.⁸⁶ Here he interprets the nature and functioning of the *tattvas* along with their mutual causal relations and sequence according to Trika Śaivism. According to the doctrine expounded in the MVUT, Abhinavagupta demonstrates in the TĀ the five-fold division with which Parama Śiva manifests himself. There arises a set of five *tattvas* called *Śiva*, *Śakti*, *Sadāśiva*, *Īśvara*, and *Śuddhavidyā* as a result of the coming into full vividness of one or other of the five powers of Parama Śiva.⁸⁷ Parama Śiva, being of the nature of autonomous consciousness overflowing with the five powers, is categorised into five *tattvas* through the division manifested by his own autonomy. This autonomous consciousness of Parama Śiva does not need anything else in order to accomplish what it accomplishes. In that sense it is truly autonomous, needing nothing else for its operation. But what are these five powers of Parama Śiva and how do they operate in the Trika ontology? According to Trika Śaivism, from *cit śakti* arises the *Śivatattva*, from *ānanda śakti* comes the *Śaktitattva*, from *icchā śakti* comes forth the *Sadāśivatattva*, from *jñāna śakti* emerges the *Īśvaratattva* and from *kriyā śakti* arises the *Śuddhavidyātattva*.⁸⁸ This distinction is based on predominance and is also clearly articulated in Abhinavagupta's TS.⁸⁹ For instance, one cannot think of *cit* without the other four. The power of Parama Śiva is that which is able to manifest this play of predominance within its totality. So where *cit* is the predominant element in Parama Śiva's autonomous nature

86. TĀ 9.48cd-49ab: *kāryakāraṇabhāvīye tattva itthaṃ vyavasthite || śrīpūrvasāstre kathitāṃ vacmaḥ kāraṇakalpanām |*

87. TĀ 9.49cd-50ab: *śivaḥ svatantraḍṛgṛpaḥ pañcaśaktisunirbharaḥ || *svātantryabhāsitaḥidāḥ conj. SANDERSON] svātantryabhāsitaḥidhā Ked. pañcadhā pravibhajate |*

88. TĀ 9.50cd-9.51cd: *cidānandeṣanājñānakriyāṇām susphuṭvataḥ || śivaśaktisadeśānavidyākhyam tattvapañcakam | ekaikatṛpi tattve 'smin sarvaśaktisunirbhare ||*

89. TS 8, p. 73-75: *tatra parameśvaraḥ pañcabhiḥ śaktibhiḥ nirbhara ity uktam sa svātantryāt śaktiṃ tāṃ tāṃ mukhyatayā prakāṣayan pañcadhā tiṣṭhati | citprādhānye śivatattvam ānandaprādhānye śaktitattvam icchāprādhānye sadāśivatattvam icchāyā hi jñānakriyāyoḥ sāmānyarūpābhyupagamātmakatvāt jñānaśaktiprādhānye īśvaratattvam kriyāśaktiprādhānye vidyātattvam iti | atra ca tattveśvarāḥ śivaśaktisadāśiveśvarānantāḥ brahmeva nivrtau eṣāṃ sāmānyarūpāṇām viśeṣā anugatiṣayāḥ pañca tadyathā śāmbhavāḥ śaktāḥ mantramaheśvarāḥ mantreśvarāḥ mantrā iti śuddhādhvā |*

(*svātantrya*) that is regarded as *citśakti*; when *ānanda* is predominant that is *ānanda śakti*. So *Śivatattva* is where *cit* is predominant. As pointed out earlier, from the Saiddhāntika point of view, which is mostly adopted in such exegesis in terms of hierarchy, there is contraction as we go from *cit* to *kriyā*. Moreover, in each of these *tattvas*, though each one is full, each one is in fact replete with all these *Śaktis* and each of these distinctions are taught to be the various divisions on the basis of predominance of one over the other.⁹⁰

A brief summary of how Jayaratha explains the position of Abhinava further helps us understand this better. Reiterating Abhinava's thesis, Jayaratha comments that it is clear that Śiva, being supreme and fully expanded, is regarded to be of the nature of nothing but Consciousness according to the Trika system. Even though, he adds, Śiva is without desire because of his fullness, nonetheless, by virtue of the greatness of his autonomy, there arises a desire within him to project himself externally. As a result of this he shines forth, entering the state of Śakti first by representing himself as *I (aham)*. This comes about through a gradual intensification of the relish of his total bliss (*ānanda*). This state of Śakti that is represented by *I* is the first contraction of *citśakti*. Immediately after this he projects the two branches of self-reflexive re-apprehension which are *I* and *this (aham-idam)*, where *I* can see its own reflected-self as *this*. In other words, it is like Śiva is able to see his own reflected image in a mirror, but both the mirror and the image reflected within the mirror belong to the same homogenous consciousness as that of Śiva.⁹¹ With that projection of Śiva there arise two possibilities which further manifest into two *tattvas*: *Sadāśiva* and *Īśvara*. In both cases the state represented is: *aham-idam*. In both cases the supreme Lord is manifested in *this* aspect (objective aspect) represented by *idam* along with the *I* aspect (subjective aspect) represented by *aham*. However, at the *Sadāśiva* level *I* is principle and *this* has a subordinate position while at the *Īśvara* level, *this* has a principle position and *I* is at a subordinate place. The ground of the *aham* aspect is nothing but pure consciousness. In *Sadāśiva tattva*, urge (*icchā*) is predominant because that

90. TĀ 9.51cd: *tat tat prādhānyayogena sa sa bhedo nirūpyate* |

91. For a detailed discussion on how the theory of reflection functions in the system of Abhinavagupta, see Kaul 2016.

is underdeveloped while in *Īśvara tattva* knowledge (*jñāna*) is predominant. At the *Sadāśīva* level, Śīva is supposed to take as his object the mass of phenomena which are like a picture of which the mere outline has been drawn and that takes the form *aham-idam* (the *aham* element is predominant). But when the mass of phenomena has become fully vivid, and he submerges the *I* element within the *This* element which has that mass of phenomena as its basis, then there arises *Īśvara tattva*. Therefore, according to Abhinavagupta, although there is no difference of the *I*-awareness, there is a difference in the cases of *Sadāśīva* and *Īśvara* in accordance with the vividness and non-vividness of the *idam* element. The last in the pentad of the pure-universe (*Śuddhādhvan*), the *Śuddhavidyā tattva* arises when *kriyā śakti* is predominant and when there is the awareness *aham-idam* where both *aham* and *idam* are in perfect equilibrium. This occurs when for *Īśvara* the *I* element flashes forth as grounded in pure consciousness and when there is the manifesting of the *I* element in the midst of the mass of phenomena in which duality is now fully developed. The supreme Lord Śīva has this single undiluted potency, nonetheless, just as his activity becomes *Śakti tattva* through extraversion, so also for *Sadāśīva* and *Īśvara* there is *Śuddhavidyā tattva*.⁹²

Furthermore, corresponding to the five powers of Śīva mentioned above, Abhinava introduces five kinds of supersensuous beings called *Śāmbhava*, *Śaktija*, *Mantramahēśvara*, *Mantrēśvara* and *Mantra*, according to the five powers of Śīva predominant in each one of them. Here it is worth mentioning that three, namely *Mantramahēśvara*, *Mantrēśvara* and *Mantra*, are basically an adoption from the Śaiva Saiddhāntic system and it is for the purpose of his exegesis that Abhinavagupta introduces *Śāmbhava* and *Śākta* beings also.⁹³ Following the scheme of the MVUT, Abhinava counts these five experients as belonging to the pure realm with their corresponding *tattvas*. Whatever nature is manifest is inseparably connected with these five categories of beings and the *tattva* in these beings is defined as whatever nature is manifest in each of these classes of

92. TĀV, p. 49-51.

93. Vasudeva 2004:152ff. has carefully looked into the problem of experients in general and the five pure experients in particular.

beings. Just as earth is the substance of experience of *kālāgnirudra* and others,⁹⁴ so those experiencing at the highest level are called *Śāmbhava* (*Śiva tattva* is the substance of their experience), and the same thing applies at all subsequent lower levels right down to the earth. The *prthivī tattva* is also pervaded by a hierarchy of beings. These beings are said to be the Rudras and the lowest of the Rudras within the *prthivī tattva* are supposed to govern the fire of the eon.⁹⁵

At this stage in the text, Abhinavagupta comes back to the concept of *kalās* that we discussed earlier. He comes back to it in reference to the hierarchy of the *kāraṇa* deities and the *kāraṇas* are correlated with the *kalās*. Most of the Śaiva texts accept five *kāraṇas*⁹⁶ while the system of Svachchanda added *Anāśritabhṭāraka* as a sixth representing Śiva in a purely transcendent form. As far as the five *kalās* are concerned, Brahmā is said to rule *nivṛtti*, Viṣṇu rules *pratiṣṭhā*, Rudra rules *vidyā*, Īśvara rules *śāntā* and Sadāśiva rules *śāntātītā*, while *Anāśrita Śiva* is beyond hierarchy. The topic comes up when Abhinava's opponent makes an objection

94. As mentioned earlier Abhinavagupta explains that the *prthivī tattva* is found from *kālāgnirudra-bhuvana* up to the *vīrabhadra-bhuvana* because of the manifestation of its constant characteristics, which are firmness (*dhṛti*), rigidity (*kāṭhinya*) and weight (*garimā*)

95. TĀ 9.53cd-55ab: *śāmbhavāḥ śaktijā mantramahēśā mantranāyakāḥ || mantrā iti viśuddhāḥ syur amī pañca gaṇāḥ kramāt | svasmīn svasmīn gaṇe bhātī yadyadrūpaṃ samanvayai || tadeṣu tattvam ity uktaṃ kālāgnyāder dharādīvat |*

96. For a detailed account of the concept of *kāraṇas* in the Tantric traditions, see TAK II, p. 90-91. "In the Siddhānta, these are the five deities Brahmā, Viṣṇu, Rudra, Īśvara and Sadāśiva. They are the overlords of the five *kalās*, and so of the entire *tattvakrama* divided up (variously by different texts) into five branches (Parākhyā Tantra 14.75-76). In the body of the practitioner they have their seats in the five *granthis* that are located along the course of the breath (*cāra*), Brahmā being in the heart, Viṣṇu in the throat, Rudra in the palate, Īśvara between the brows, and Sadāśiva at the tip of the nose (Sārdhatrīśatikālottaravṛtti 23.9c-12b; Kiraṇāgama 58.32-45). Svachchanda Tantra (11.19ff) gives another set of five deities as the five *kāraṇas*, identified with Brahmā, etc.: Anāśrita, Anātha, Ananta, Vyomarūpin and Vyāpin (see also Svachchanda Tantra on 11.18). However, Svachchanda Tantra 11.48ff. lists a set of only three *kāraṇas*, homologised with Brahmā, Viṣṇu and Śiva; *māyātattva*, *vidyātattva*, and *śivatattva*; Raudrī, Vāmā and Jyeṣṭhā; *jñāna*, *kriyā*, and *icchā*. The Tantrasadbhāva (9.458) speaks about six *kāraṇas* in the context of *varṇas*, which reach up to the level of *samanā* and are to be abandoned by the practitioner in order to attain dissolution (*laya*) in the seventh state."

asking: “How come Brahmā, the Lord of *nivṛtti*, is not counted as a separate *tattva*, but *Sadāśiva* and the rest are counted as separate *tattvas*?”⁹⁷ Abhinava makes a distinction between the *tattva* and the *kāraṇa devatā*, and says that just as the king who rules the country is not a separate *tattva*, so too these lords of the various *kalās* (*kāraṇas*) should not be regarded as separate *tattvas*.⁹⁸ *Nivṛtti* is the lowest of the *kalās* into which Śaivas divide the *tattvas*.⁹⁹ Brahmā is the lord of *nivṛtti*, the lowest of these *kalās*. Since the causes are not counted as *tattvas*—the *tattva* is simply the substance of their experience—and since the substance of Brahmā’s experience is in fact *prthivī tattva*, the opponent’s objection is regarded as out of place. Moreover, there is no direct agent other than the will of Śiva by which the division has been manifested.¹⁰⁰ What Abhinavagupta says is that the only factor here that does the work is the will of Śiva and it is this that manifests the difference between *kāraṇas*. Nothing else makes that differentiation appear in consciousness, so there is no extrinsic factor here causing the unity of Śiva to break up into five levels.

Abhinava is then asked by a hypothetical objector that if it was the will of Śiva that made the pure universe manifest, then who is the lord of the impure universe? In answer to this, Abhinava says that it is the Lord *Aghoreśa* (= *Ananta*) who creates the impure universe in order to divide the plurality of consciousness in those classes of conscious beings who crave sense experience, and it is he who has been stimulated by the will of the Lord.¹⁰¹ Here Abhinava speaks the language of the *Saiddhāntikas*, but uses the terminology of the MVUT, where *Ananta* becomes *Aghoreśa*. *Ananta* is the highest of the *Vidyēśvaras* and in the *Saiddhāntika* doctrine Śiva does not contaminate himself by directly acting on *māyā* to bring about the manifestation of the impure universe. This is done by

97. TĀ-9.56.cd: *brahmā nivṛttyadhipatiḥ prthaktattvaṃ na gaṇyate* ||

98. TĀ 9.59: *yathā prthivyadhipatir nṛpas tattvāntaram nahi | tathā tat tat kaleśānaḥ prthak tattvāntaram katham* ||

99. For more on *kalās*, please see note 26 above.

100. TĀ 9.60: *tadevaṃ pañcakamidaṃ śuddho’ dhvā paribhāṣyate | tatra sākṣācchivecchaiva kartryābhāsītabhedikā* ||

101. TĀ 9.61: *īsvarecchāvaśakṣubdhabhogalolikacidgaṇān | saṃvibhaktumaghoreśaḥ sṛjatīha sitetaram* || (“So Aghoreśa creates this impure universe in order to differentiate all souls whose craving for experience has been stimulated by the force of Śiva’s will”).

the foremost of the *Vidyēśvaras*. *Ananta Bhaṭṭāraka*, reflecting on the will of Śiva, animates *māyā* with his power and this stimulates *māyā* to produce *kalā tattva* and so forth.

While the distinction between the pure universe (*śuddhādhvan*) and the impure universe (*aśuddhādhvan*) according to Śaivism is fundamental for understanding the Śaiva cosmology and the ontic-hierarchy functioning within its paradigm, in this article I have limited myself to talking only about the five *tattvas* constituting the pure universe (*śuddhādhvan*). I have studied Abhinavagupta's position as an exegete who pursues a resolution of the problem of the *tattvas*. He uses the scheme of causality to rationalise the ontic-hierarchy in the Trika. He notes inconsistency in the hierarchy of the *tattvas* in his source texts of Siddhānta Śaivism and attempts to explain the ontological model versus the metaphysical model of the *tattvas*. He notes that the sequence of the *tattvas* is not historically accurate, but he seeks to introduce ontological accuracy therein. However, a study of the *tattvas* falling under the realm of the impure universe (*aśuddhādhvan*) remains a future desideratum. Having said that it is important to note that there are other significant dimensions attached to the Trika idea of *tattva*. For instance, how does the process of *tattvabhedana* and *tattvajaya*¹⁰² work in the yogic parlance and what is the role played by the seven experients (*pramātr*) therein? On the other hand it would also be important to look more closely at the concept of causality in the TĀ, taking help from Abhinavagupta's *Pratyabhijñā* literature.¹⁰³ Abhinava's system does not work in isolation. The multi-layered textures that his works are embedded with can be challenging even for advanced scholars. The understanding of his deep esotericism and archaic mysticism needs a thorough grounding in the multi-layered textures spread across the domains of *Pratyabhijñā*, Aesthetics, and Tantra-Āgama, both dual and non-dual, which are often ignored. This is also true of Abhinavagupta's concept of *tattva*. We also need to have a clearer understanding of the functioning of *tattva* in the context of Abhinavan aesthetics. But as I said above, this remains a task for the future.

102. See Vasudeva 2004 for more details on *tattvabhedana* (p. 203ff) and *tattvajaya* (p. 293-295).

103. Abhinava discussed *kāryakāraṇabhāva* in the ĪPV 2.4.1-21.

ABBREVIATIONS

conj.	Conjecture
corr.	Correction
em.	Emendation
ĪPV	<i>Īśvarapratyabhijñāvimarśinī</i>
ĪPVV	<i>Īśvarapratyabhijñāvivṛtivismarśinī</i>
ĪPVVyā	<i>Īśvarapratyabhijñāvimarśinīvyākhyā (Bhāskarī)</i>
Ked	KSTS Edition
KSDK	<i>Kāśmīraśaivadarśanabrhatkośa</i>
KSTS	Kashmir Series of Texts and Studies
MPĀ	<i>Mataṅgapārameśvarāgama</i>
MVUT	<i>Mālinīvijayottaratantra</i>
MVV	<i>Mālinīvijayavārttika</i>
Ped	Pondichéry: Publications de l'Institut français d'indologie
PSV	<i>Paramārthasāravṛtti</i>
TĀ	<i>Tantrāloka</i>
TAK	<i>Tāntrikābhidhānakośa</i>
TĀV	<i>Tantrālokaviveka</i>
TP	<i>Tattvaparakāśa</i>
TS	<i>Tantrasāra</i>
VP	<i>Vidyāpāda</i>
Med	Mysore Edition of <i>Mataṅgapārameśvarāgama</i>

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary Sources

- Bhāskarī, Vol II: A Commentary on the Īśvarapratyabhijñāvimarśinī of Abhinavagupta.*
 Edited by K.A. Subramania Iyer and K.C. Pandey, Allahabad, 1950.
- Īśvarapratyabhijñārikāvṛtti* of Utpaladeva. See TORELLA 2003.
- Īśvarapratyabhijñāvimarśinī* of Abhinavagupta, Volume II. Edited by Madhusudan Kaul Śāstrī. KSTS 33. Bombay, 1921.
- Īśvarapratyabhijñāvivṛtivismarśinī* of Abhinavagupta, Volume III. Edited by Madhusudan Kaul Śāstrī. KSTS 65. Bombay, 1943.
- Kāśmīraśaivadarśanabrhatkośaḥ*, Vol. 1. Project Director & Commentator Dr. Balajinnātha Paṇḍita. Jammu (Jammu & Kashmir): Sri Ranbir Kendriya Sanskrit Vidyapeetha. 2001.

- Kāśmīraśaivadarśanabṛhatkoṣaḥ*, Vol. 2. Project Director & Commentator Dr. Balajinnātha Paṇḍita. Jammu (Jammu & Kashmir): Rashtriya Sanskrit Sansthan, 2005.
- Kīraṇāgama. Il Kīraṇāgama: Testo e traduzione del vidyāpāda*. Edited and translated by Maria Pia Vivanti. Supplemento n.3 to ANNALI, vol. 35 (2). Istituto orientale di Napoli, 1975.
- Mālinīvijayottaratantra of Abhinavagupta*. Edited by Madhusudan Kaul Shastri. KSTS 37. Bombay, 1922.
- Mālinīvijayavārttikam of Abhinavagupta*. Edited by Madhusudan Kaul Shastri. KSTS 31. Srinagar, 1921.
- Mataṅgapārameśvarāgama Vidyāpāda, avec le commentaire (vṛtti) de Bhaṭṭa Rāmakaṇṭha*. Edited by N.R. Bhatt. Pondicherry: Institut français d'Indologie, 1977.
- Nyāyakośa or Dictionary of Technical Terms of Indian philosophy*. Compiled by Mahāmahopādhyāya Bhīmācārya Jhalakīkar. Revised and re-edited by mahāmahopādhyāya Vāsudev Śāstrī Abhyankar. Poona: The Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, 1978.
- Svāyambhuvasūtrasaṅgraha*. Institut français d'Indologie, Transcript 39. Pondicherry.
- Svāyambhuvasūtrasaṅgraha*. Edited by Veṅkaṭasubrahmaṇya Śāstrī. Mysore: Mahīśūradharmasamsthāna, 1937.
- Tantrāloka of Abhinavagupta with the commentary (-viveka) of Rājānaka Jayaratha*. Edited by Mukund Ram Shastri and Madhusudan Kaul Shastri, 12 vols. KSTS 23, 28, 29, 30, 35, 36, 41, 47, 52, 57, 58, 59. Allahabad and Srinagar, 1918-1928.
- Tantrasāra of Abhinavagupta*. Edited by Mukund Rām Śāstrī. KSTS 17. Bombay, 1918.
- Tāntrikābhīdhānakośa II: Dictionnaire des termes techniques de la littérature hindoue tantrique. A Dictionary of Technical Terms from Hindu Tantric Literature*. Edited by H. Brunner, G. Oberhammer, and A. Padoux. Beitrage zur kultur – und Geistesgeschichte Asiens Nr. 44. Vienna: Verlag Der Osterreichischen Akademier der wissenschaften, 2004.
- Tāntrikābhīdhānakośa III: Dictionnaire des termes techniques de la littérature hindoue tantrique. A Dictionary of Technical Terms from Hindu Tantric Literature*. Edited by Marion Rastelli and Dominic Goodall. Beitrage zur kultur – und Geistesgeschichte Asiens Nr. 76. Vienna: Verlag Der Osterreichischen Akademier der wissenschaften, 2013.

Editions with Translations and Other Secondary Sources

- Allen, Keith Maurice. 2003. "Causality in Kashmiri Śaivism: A Translation and Study of Abhinavagupta's Tantrāloka, Chapter Nine, Verses 1-49 and Jayaratha's Commentary." M.A. thesis, The University of Texas at Austin.
- Allen, Keith. 2011. "Being Known According to Abhinavagupta." Ph.D. diss., University of Oxford.
- Bansat-Boudon, Lyne and Kamalesha Datta Tripathi. 2011. *An Introduction to Tantric philosophy. The Paramārthasāra of Abhinavagupta with the commentary of Yogarāja*.

- Translation, introduction, notes, critically revised Sanskrit text, appendix, indices by Lyne Bansat-Boudon. Routledge Studies in Tantric Traditions. London: Routledge.
- Dasgupta, Surendranath. 2004. *A History of Indian Philosophy, Volume I*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.
- Dwivedi, Vrajavallabha. 1982. *Kaṭi Tattvāni* pp. 3-13, in *Tantra-Yātrā: Essays on Tantra-Āgama Thoughts and Philosophy, Literature, Culture and Travel*, Ratna Publications, Varanasi.
- , ed. 1983. *Luptāgamasamgraha, Part II*. Yogatantra-Ratnamala 10. Varanasi.
- , ed. 1988. *Aṣṭaparakaraṇam*. Yogatantra-Ratnamala 12. Varanasi.
- . 2000. *Tantrāgamīya Dharma Darśan, Vol. I*. Varanasi: Shaiva Bharati Shodha Pratishthanam.
- Goodall, Dominic. 2009. *On the tattvas in the Nīśvāsātattvasamhitā*. Handout of the presentation given on July 20, 2009 at Pondicherry. Second International Workshop on Early Tantra (20-31 July, 2009), Ecole française d'Extrême-Orient.
- Kaul, Mrinal. 2016. "Abhinavagupta's Theory of Reflection: A Study, Critical Edition and Translation of the *Bimbapratibimbavāda* (verses 1-65) in Chapter III of the *Tantrāloka* with the commentary of Jayaratha." Ph.D. diss., Concordia University, Montréal.
- Padoux, André. 1992. *Vāc: The Concept of Word in Selected Hindu Tantras*. Translated by Jacques Gontier. Sri Garib Dass Oriental Series No. 155. Delhi.
- Rastogi, Navjivan. 1984. "Some More Nyāyas as Employed by Abhinavagupta." *Annals of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute* 65: 27-42.
- . 2012. *Abhinavagupta kā Tantrāgamīya Darśan - Itihās, Sanskr̥ti Saundarya aur Tattva-cintan*. Sāgar: Viśvavidyālaya Prakāśan.
- Sanderson, Alexis. 1988. "Śaivism and the Tantric Traditions." In *The World's Religions* edited by S. Sutherland, L. Houlden, P. Clarke and F. Hardy, pp. 660-704. London: Routledge.
- . 1992. "The Doctrine of the Mālinīvijayottaratantra." In *Ritual and Speculation in Early Tantrism: Studies in Honour of André Padoux*, edited by T. Goudriaan. Albany: SUNY Press.
- . 1995. "Meaning in Tantric Ritual." In *Essais sur le Rituel III: Colloque du Centenaire de la Section des Sciences religieuses de l'Ecole Pratique des Hautes Etudes*, edited by A.-M. Blondeau and K. Schipper, pp.15-95. Bibliothèque de l'Ecole des Hautes Etudes, Sciences Religieuses. Louvain-Paris: Peeters.
- . 2004. "An Introduction to Śaivism." A handout of the lecture delivered in the University of Kyoto on December 10, 2004.
- . 2006. "The Date of Sadyojyotis and Bṛhaspati." In *Tantra and Viśiṣṭādvaitavedānta*, edited by Marzenna Czerniak-Drożdżowicz. Cracow Indological Studies Vol. 8. Cracow: Księgarnia Akademicka.
- . 2007a. "The Śaiva Exegesis of Kashmir." In *Mélanges tantriques à la mémoire d'Hélène Brunner / Tantric studies in memory of Hélène Brunner*, edited by Dominic Goodall &

- André Padoux, pp. 231-442 and (bibliography) pp. 551-582. Collection Indologie n° 106. Pondicherry: Institut français de Pondichéry/École française d'Extrême-Orient.
- . 2007b. "Swami Lakshman Joo and His place in the Kashmirian Śaiva Tradition." In *Samvidullāsaḥ, Manifestation of Divine Consciousness: Swami Lakshman Joo, Saint-Scholar of Kashmir Śaivism*, edited by Bettina Bäumer and Sarla Kumar, pp. 93-126. New Delhi: D.K. Printworld.
- Torella, Raffaele, ed. and trans. 2003. *Īśvarapratyabhijñārikāvṛtti of Utpaladeva with the Author's Vṛtti, Critical Edition and Annotated Translation*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.
- Vasudeva, Somadeva. 2004. *The Yoga of Mālinīvijayottaratantra. Chapters 1-4, 7, 11-17. Critical Edition, Translation and Notes*. Collection Indologie 97. Pondicherry: Institut français de Pondichéry/École française d'Extrême-Orient.
- . 2013. "The Unconscious Experienter: Bhokṛtva in the Pramāṭṛbheda of the Trika." *Journal of Indological Studies*, No. 24 & 25 (2012-2013): 203-230. Kyoto, Japan.