"Abhinavagupta's Theogrammatical Topography of the One and the Many," in *Divine Multiplicities: Trinities and Diversities*, Chris Boesel, Ed., New York: Fordham Press, 2014, 85-105.

Abhinavagupta's Theogrammatical Topography of the One and the Many

Loriliai Biernacki

> The unconscious is structured like a language.
>
> --Jacques Lacan

Author's Preface

For much of the world's history, what happens to most of us (that is, the many, the people) has actually been dictated by the one--a singular person as ruler. Countries were ruled by kings and only one could rule; brutal wars were waged over which claimant to the throne could seize the right to rule the many. Moreover, the idea of one to rule the many, monarchy, found its justification in the divine order of things. Just as the model of only one God ruling over the world ensured the stable order of the cosmos, so a single king ruling a people ensured a harmonious society, just as, to use a commonly cited metaphor, the head was ruler of the body's various parts. Even with the absolute sovereignty of a king, there was always, as with the body, a delicate interaction between the one and the many. The many, though ostensibly voiceless and subject to the will of the one, danced a dialectic waltz with the one ruler. A good ruler developed the skill to hear and address the needs of the many.

Yet, as our American forefathers intimately knew, the problem of kingship is that the one ruler too easily neglects the needs and subjective experiences of all those many others. The problem with one voice to rule us all is that no one voice is omniscient enough, expansive enough to address the subjective needs of the many. With this insight, something rather radical happened in the 18th century--the advent of democracy--the idea that all of us, the many, should in fact have a say over what happens to us. Yet even with that profoundly world-altering document of 1776 that stated that, we, the people have a right to a government, by us, for us and comprised of us, the structure of our lives has been slow to shift out of the older model. In most areas of our lives, power devolves to a single person. Not only are most governments structured this way, most corporations as well have a single head, a CEO who calls the shots from high above. The students and employees of schools also follow the dictates of that singular authority, the principal. Ships and platoons in the military demand the subservience of the voices of the many soldiers whose lives are legally forfeit in battle to a single ruling voice, the captain, the general, the admiral. And, although this is changing in the 20th and 21st centuries, historically the family has also been traditionally ruled by one voice, usually the father or patriarch of the family, the sole voice to decide the legal futures of his dependents. The abundance of vocabulary nodding towards the bodily head as authority reveals the indelible traces of our older world model.

Embedded underneath a vocabulary of heads and body parts as the relationship between the one and the many, a deeper drive is revealed, a desire to collapse the many within the one, the one somehow privileged as more true than the many. Perhaps

our theological models and monotheism in particular point to some subtle psychological

wiring in the human brain to prefer the simplicity of the one over the messiness of the

many. Too many voices, like too many cooks, will lead us astray, will spoil the broth. Or

perhaps, we harbor within ourselves a deep-seated fear that any real dominance of the

many will lead to an ethical paralysis; an unwieldy relativism will reign where universal

values will be lost, abandoned. Indeed, it is just this criticism that is leveled by

conservatives in America today against a perceived new multiculturalism, the plurality of

voices making up the many that is America. The call for a return to a patriarchal world,

railing against a public space for voices that were not traditionally heard, those of

women, of minorities, reveals perhaps less a mean-spirited desire to silence the many

very different others in our public space than a palpable yearning for a more secure,

less messy rule by the one. In some sense, the democracies of the 20th and 21st

centuries offer an experiment, a tumultuous rehearsal of the dialectical balance of

power between the one and the many.

The question becomes then, how to find a way of integrating the voices of the

many with our ineluctable pull towards the idea of the one. How might we derive a

subjectivity for the many that can encompass both the lure of the one, with its clear

simplicity, and the complex negotiations that the many demands?

Introduction

Resolving the conundrum of the one and the many has not only been a

compulsive dialectical dance for the Western imagination. Indian thinkers have also

struggled with the divine and the world as orbital reflections instantiating the pendulous

swing between the one and the many. In an Indian philosophical context this dialectic oscillates from the perch of a nondualism that sees only an absolute formless *Brahman* as the sole reality of all existence, to a celebration of the multiplicities of a *Māyā* brimming with a bodied life entangling itself and all of existence in a philosophical Trinity of qualities; again, alternatively, from a loving *bhakti*, or devotion that sees God as the essence and substratum of the creaturely *jīva*, the individual soul, to an irrefragable dualism that mirrors the ineluctable longing and separation of creature and God. Uniting this twain is the skilled provenance of only a few Indian thinkers; one of the most notable is the 11th century Indian philosopher Abhinavagupta. An unwavering nondualist, Abhinavagupta's philosophical speculations underwrite a cosmology that is nevertheless multiple in its iterations and dynamic via his use of the three grammatical persons to bridge the One with the Many.

This essay presents an analysis of the interpenetration of the immanent and transcendent as an instantiation of the problem of the One and the Many in the theocosmological mapping of consciousness that Abhinavagupta proposes. Particularly, I suggest that one finds the mode of interrelation between the transcendent and immanent expressed through a grammatico-theology. We see a structural template underlying this theological cosmology through the modalities of the first, second and third persons of grammar, "I," the "You" and the "It." This paper explores the trinitarian syntax modulating the interpenetration of grammatical person as a means for bridging the boundaries between the One and the Many.

I suggest that the grammatico-theology that Abhinavagupta offers gets to the heart of the problem of the one and the many because language is the very instantiation and genesis of the problem. Language functions as a code, not simply mapping reality, but magically generative of the world. Abhinavagupta's grammatico-theology encodes the dialectic between the one and the many and with this, entails a radical departure from our normal understanding of the relation between subjectivity and objectivity. In his system, subjectivity, associated with the first grammatical person, the "I," functions as the heart of all existence. As the subject shifts from the powerful originary participation in the sense of "I" into the mode of the other as "you" and then into the object as the third grammatical person, the "It," the multiplicity of the world ensues. Abhinava's prioritization of subjectivity as being more real than the mode of objectivity upsets our Western conceptions of the world as objective fact, as Abhinava offers a decentered, language-oriented map of reality.

After introducing the topic, I will give a very brief introduction to the thinker whose system I draw from, the 11th century Indian philosopher and mystic Abhinavagupta, along with a short account of the antecedents of Abhinavagupta's system in the grammar tradition. Following this, I will discuss Abhinava's use of dialogue and the grammatical three persons as a linguistic model for mapping the relation between the One and the Many.

It has become something of a truism since Benjamin Whorf first proposed the idea in 1941, to suggest that language structures the modalities of identity insofar as it sets boundaries on what we can think.[1] Indeed, even in contexts like this, what we can

say about the divine, about the relationships between the One and the Many are limited

by the language that we use, with built-in predispositions that structure what we can

imagine. We have, on the one hand, an apophatic impulse to resist the boundaries that

language imposes when it comes to thinking about God, and in this, a tradition that

emphasizes that mystical experience and the divine remain ineffable, resilient against

the cataloging onslaught of language. Abhinavagupta, a mystic, nevertheless takes a

view that stands in contradistinction to the idea that the mystical experience eludes our

best attempts to trap it in language. Nor does he envision an idea of spirit as speaking

a divine language in and through the oracular possessions of bodies.

Abhinavagupta's vision of language and the divine is a mystical configuration,

enmeshing the two, language as divinity, language itself as the map of cosmos.

Language affords a mystical creation of cosmos through the word, a *logos*, which is

here *vāc*, speech, and a Goddess, Parāvāk, the Goddess of Speech. The Goddess of

Speech--as speech--does more than simply divide the chaos into being or order the

messy stuff of reality into a coherence. *Vāc* generates new life from within, in a favorite

metaphor, as secret code in the tiny seed of the banyan tree. Like this tiny seed as

code containing a vast proliferation, so language, especially as secret mantra contains

within it the entire vastness of the cosmos.[2]

In the oft-quoted phrase of Jacques Lacan's above, the unconscious is structured

like a language; in Abhinavagupta's system, the divine itself is structured like a

language. No doubt there are implicit homologies in our representations of the divine

and the unconscious; one could read much of Freud, especially his *Future of an Illusion*

as an attempt to make just this link and through it, reduce the idea of the divine to mere mapping of the unconscious. Yet, Abhinavagupta's system turns this reductionism on its head, suggesting that not only is the unconscious structured like a language, but also the conscious and all else in between, the world itself modeled on a vision of language, and language itself is the divine generative power of the universe. That is, not merely is the unconscious structured like a language, but reality itself is enmeshed in and exists as language.

Abhinavagupta

A little bit of background on Abhinavagupta: he lived, from the latter part of the 10th through the middle of the 11th century, in Kashmir in India. Abhinavagupta was a Tantric, and a left-handed Tantric at that, which means that he understood divinity to be immanent and transcendent, as something to be attained here on earth, by humans, as *jīvanmukti*, liberation while still in a human body. It means also that he practiced some transgressive rituals, involving the use of sex rites and illicit substances, such as wine and meat. Indeed, in one of the rare personal depictions of an individual writer in India, we find his pen portrait, penned by Kṣemarāja, his student, depicting him with a cup of wine and women on each side of him.[3] As a Tantric, the sources that he relied upon as scripture were not India's classical *Vedas*. Rather, they were a new set of texts, called the *Āgamas*, a set of new revelations proposing to meet the new challenges of the *kaliyuga*, the age of darkness, an age that spans through the medieval period up to today as well.

While certainly not a requirement for a Tantric, and not even the norm for his

Kashmir of the 10th and 11th centuries, Abhinava was a monist, understanding all of

reality to be encompassed within a single and unified, though dyadic principle, *Śiva-*

Śakti. His philosophy might best be understood as a panentheism articulated in

evolutionary and emanationist terms. The element of *Śakti* in this dyadic principle is

dynamic, involved in the specificity of life, and generative; the element of *Śiva* is

transcendent and free from all change. The two are irreducibly entwined, inseparable,

operating as modalities of each other. Abhinava's incorporation of both the elements of

transcendence and immanence lends to it the framework of a panentheism.

His panentheism carries an evolutionary component precisely because his

philosophy hinges on re-incorporating a dynamism into the notion of the divine via

language as a generative principle. It is, in fact, this element of his philosophy that

enables him to make a link between the absolute divinity as a purely transcendent

being and the messy reality of becoming that ensconces our existence. That is, his

panentheism is what allows him to go beyond the Vedantic nondualism of his earlier

compatriot, the 8th century Śaṁkara, to devise a nondualism that can embrace both

the One and the Many. His philosophy is complex, and I will not have the space to

discuss some of the key ideas of his system, such as *spanda*, the vibratory essence of

the cosmos, a kind of 11th century string theory, or his notion of the rapture of wonder,

camatkāra, that transports us beyond mundane existence. For my purposes here, these

other ideas, the vibrational throb of *spanda* and the capture of the transcendent

through wonder reflect back on the notion of a fundamental identity between the

multiplicity of beings, from us ordinary individuals here at this conference, down to the merest insect,[4] and up to the supreme divine. The glue in his conceptual framework that girds together the divine as One and us as the Many is the grammatology of a magical linguistic transformation that seeps through and links both One and Many through the Word.

Bhartṛhari: The Earlier Theo-grammatical Tradition

The grammatico-theological tradition that I will draw from here derives from Abhinavagupta's understanding of the mystical language of the *mantra*, the tradition of the secret, magical word. However, this tradition begins much earlier than Abhinavagupta and reaches an extraordinary level of sophistication as early as the 5th century CE, with the grammarian Bhartṛhari. In this tradition grammar takes on a profound soteriology, as the *summum bonum* of all spiritual endeavor. As Bhartṛhari tells us, "through recourse to the study of grammar, one attains the supreme state of liberation."[5] Not a modest claim, for this school the study of grammar is salvific precisely because the supreme absolute, *Brahman*, is itself the word, *śabda tattva*. As Bhartṛhari puts it in the opening to his *Vākya Padīya*, one of the definitive texts for this redemptive school of grammatology, "the word is the absolute, Brahman; it is without beginning or end. It is the imperishable essence of being."[6] By understanding grammar, those rules that define the combinations of words, one is able to purify speech. That is, grammar is the cure for maladroit speech, and beyond this, it is through this cure that one finds the door to the final salvation, release from worldly existence.[7]

Notwithstanding the enlightenment promised by Derrida's science of

"grammatology" as deconstruction, dismantling from within--one might venture, a

metaphysical analogue of the movie *Alien*, nevertheless, in India at least, the

enlightenment that grammatology promises is a constructive enterprise. Still, like

Derrida's understanding of identity as inextricably embedded within the

grammatological structure that contains it, the idea of the word as essence in

Bhartṛhari's grammatology is also embedded within. It is immanently implicated in the

construction of the world, via its articulation of the world. The word sets in motion the

process by which the world is created. To continue on with Bhartṛhari's opening of the

Vākya Padīya, he tells us,

> through its existence as meaning it appears to manifest, and from this the world
>
> is set in motion. It [the word] is one alone. This is the teaching. Yet, different
>
> energies (fem.) reside in it. Even though it is indivisible, because of these
>
> energies it appears as divided.[8]

Language then, is both the essence and genesis of being. Moreover, even though it

exists as a singularity, as "one alone," internally, the word contains within it different

energies--and here these energies are understood within the tradition that

Abhinavagupta elaborates upon as Goddesses to whom one would appeal for aid. The

One contains within it the Many, as Goddesses who then generate the multiplicity of the

many that constitutes the world. This grammatological formulation of the word

encapsulates the paradoxical conundrum that we are charged with addressing here at

this conference, the relation of the One to the Many.

Śabdatattva is literally the principle, or archetype (*tattva*) of the word (*śadba*). In this sense, one discovers a resonance with the Western idea of the *logos*, even as the multiplicity of gendered energies strikes a dissonant chord with the Western formulation of the *logos*. A plethora of Goddesses as energies, undifferentiated in the indivisible unity of the One might seem untoward, even blasphemous, in the framework of the *logos*, yet in this context, these energies function as the powers of the One, which enable its freedom and capacity to unfold into the diversity that is the world. In this, there is both identity of these energies and the One that is the word, and the elaboration, the sequential articulation of the word as it transforms into ordinary speech, enacting an evolution (*pariṇāma*) of language and of the world.

Abhinavagupta's Theo-grammatology

Abhinavagupta expands upon the earlier tradition of the Grammarians, to fit it into his own Tantric world, rife with the complex coding of *mantras*, magical words that are repeated over and over in a ritual context with the goal of granting the reciter supernatural powers. *Mantras* are foundational for Tantric rites, forming the central basis of nearly every ritual occasion. *Mantras* were understood to be the sonic body of the deity; functioning performatively, they instantiate the power of the divine to effect physical transformations in the mundane world, causing the rains to come, warding away illness, granting one wealth.

The text that I primarily draw from here, the *Parātriśikā Vivaraṇa* represents Abhinava's synthesis of the grammar tradition into a theology that melds grammar and Goddess. This text is approximately a hundred pages in Sanskrit; it is a commentary by

Abhinavagupta on a very short Tantric scripture, the *Parātriśikā,* thirty-seven verses

revealing the secret essence of the Trika, the three Goddesses. The root text of thirty-

seven verses is framed as a dialogue between the fierce Tantric God Bhairava and the

Goddess (*Devī*). In this root text, the Goddess asks Bhairava to teach her the highest

secret (*mahāguhyam*), by which one achieves magical powers, through a particular

Tantric teaching called the teaching of the Clans (*kaulika*). Bhairava gives her the

teaching, the secret highest knowledge of enlightenment, known as "*anuttaram*,"

literally, "the unsurpassed" including the secret *mantra*, [9] the magical formula

associated with this teaching of the *Trika*. Abhinavagupta relates this teaching of the

Trika, literally "the Three," as the teaching of Parāvāk, the Supreme Goddess of Speech

seen through a modality of three perspectives, where deity unfolds into the three

grammatical persons of speech, the I, the You and the It.[10]

Abhinavagupta's one hundred page commentary takes us far beyond what is

apparent on the surface in this very short thirty-seven verse root scripture. He

understands the text through the lens of language and he uses the dialogue as a way

into his own profound philosophical contemplations on the interpenetrations of

language in the world and the divine. Language in his exegesis is the intermediating link

between the One as the divine and the Many as the world. In this he outlines four

levels of language: 1) spoken words that we commonly understand as speech

(*vaikharī*); 2) speech on a more subtle level, which is not spoken but which forms in the

minds of speakers (*madhyamā*); 3) speech that is not yet articulated, but rather seen

(*paśyantī*), and which operates as a conceptual structuring modality. This level of

speech might be in some respects analogous to Judith Butler's understanding of

language as structuring the very possibilities for our identities, or Benjamin Whorf's idea

that language limits the possibilities for what we can think.[11] 4) The highest and most

subtle level of speech (*parā*, also *Parāvāk*, the Goddess), which is the essential

condition for not only communication, but even for sentience.

Elsewhere[12] I have argued that within an Indian context, *mantras* operate as a

powerful, primogenial and performative language, analogous in some respects to the

performative coding functions of DNA, or computer code in our world. Like the transfer

of information with DNA and computer code, this coding information acts as a template

to effect the structures of our physical world. There is a performative aspect to the

mantra, which makes things happen. In Abhinava's view, it is, in fact, the articulation of

language as it operates on the objective plane of physical reality that actually causes

the physical manifestation of the world. Yet *mantras* differ in one respect from binary

and biochemical codes; they do not follow a merely impersonal operation of the laws of

physics and biochemistry or mathematical computation. One finds, in addition in the

idea of the *mantra,* also an intentional agentive element. That is, language works

because the Goddess of Speech, Parāvāk, Parāśakti, intertwines and penetrates into the

essence of being and of beings, and generates the capacity for the transfer of

information, for meaning to arise. As Abhinava notes,

> that [Goddess] resides as the essence of what is known as hearing. By her own
>
> freedom she gives a sense of coherence as a meaningful whole to what is
>
> otherwise a collection of letters vibrating as a mass in a confused formless

sequence. Without that, even as one hears the particular words, the words are submerged in a confused noise causing one to say in common parlance, 'I don't hear.'[13]

The Goddess as speech becomes the subject hearing speech and when she chooses, then words convey meaning; they have coherence. Not an automatic process, Abhinava's system entails a theological immanence at the heart of the process of communication.

This immanence is what makes it possible for the divine, as the One to reflect itself in a variety of positions, as subject and as object. The structure of language as grammatological system reflects the division of the one into the multiplicity that becomes the subject, the object and the relationship between them as the syntax of the sentence. Abhinava's idea of language, along with the dualisms imbricated in any linguistic system, itself undergoes a rich metamorphosis into the living performative language of *mantra*, the magical word. Language naturally expands and evolves into the multiple positions that make up grammatical syntax. As such it is both the essence and genesis of being. For our purposes, Abhinava's understanding helps us to rethink the relation between the One and the Many as a dialectic of language.

The Dialogue

As I mentioned earlier, as a nondualist Abhinavagupta's philosophy posits a single divine substratum for all of reality. Nor does he, like his earlier compatriot Śaṁkara, take the position that the multiplicity of the world is an illusion. Rather he uses language to mediate between the multiplicity and the One. In this case, the

context of his exegesis on these thirty-seven verses offers for him a way to unpack this apparent paradox of the singularity of the divine required by a monist world-view in the face of the multiplicity of the world. In fact, the very structure of his scriptural source, these thirty-seven verses framed as a dialogue, demands the incorporation of multiplicity, the other as conversation partner. That is, from the outset, revelation posits an unavoidable duality in the very mode of the revelation, the dialogue.

In his exegesis Abhinavagupta tells us that the form of language as dialogue is the unfolding of language through the four levels, evolving from its original unity within the Goddess as pure subjectivity, the "I" (*aham*). For communication to occur in conversation, in dialogue, there needs to be some point of contact, of unity. This point for Abhinava is the unity of consciousness as divinity, the "I" (*aham*) of the Goddess on the level of speech as *parā*, the highest, most primordial and undifferentiated level of speech. It entails a universality which is the essence of sentience and which is the secret link as Goddess that connects us all, allows us to communicate with each other. This speech, which is none other than a Goddess, evolves to the grosser differentiated levels of speech through an act of grace, to *paśyantī* down to *vaikharī*, the level of gross physical speech, allowing the actual words of the text's dialogue. Thus, the dialogue is the unfolding of speech to the mundane level as an act of grace, which becomes the context for revealing the scripture's secret teaching, the revelation of *anuttara*.[14]

With this explanation, Abhinavagupta plays upon a pun. The secret revelation is the doctrine of *anuttara*, the "unsurpassed." Meanwhile, the revelation itself takes the

form of a dialogue, of question and answer, as Abhinava notes, "*praśna-uttara.*"[15] The

Goddess asks the "question," *praśna*, and the God Śiva replies with the answer, the

Sanskrit "*uttara.*" The answer is the revelation of the secret teaching, "*anuttara.*"

Anuttara means the highest knowledge, and it also happens to be the negation of the

word *uttara*, as the prefix "*an*" in Sanskrit negates the word it precedes, just as in

English, the prefix "un" negates what it precedes, as in "unavoidable." Thus Abhinava

points out that the pun in the word *"anuttara"* indicates that this secret teaching is in

fact, literally a "non-answer." The "non-answer" to the dialogue, he tells us, signifies a

shift to a nondualism. As Abhinava explains, both the question and its answer are

contained within the Goddess, who is pure consciousness, an encompassing awareness.

At the core, the give and take of dialogue gives way to a unity of the One that

precludes the need for an answer; it is a "non-answer" since it contains within itself

both question and answer.

At the same time, even as it remains the One, Abhinava points out that the use

of "*anuttara*" as the idea of the supreme also carries with it the implication of two

because the very form of the word is the comparative. Here, Sanskrit grammar forms

the comparative by adding the suffix *-tara*, which we see at the end of the word "*anut-

tara.*" It would have been possible to instead use the superlative, the *-tama* suffix, in

the word "*anut-tama*," which would also mean the "unsurpassed," in the superlative.

This is like the difference between the English words "greater" and "greatest," where

the *-er* suffix is the comparative and the *-est* suffix is the superlative.

Abhinava discusses at some length the choice that the scripture of the Goddess

of Speech takes to dub the highest secret teaching with a comparative form rather than

a superlative form. This comparative form in the word "*anuttara*" indicates the presence

of the other, since the very form by virtue of comparison inherently implicates the

presence of a second, to whom the first is compared. Not so with the superlative form,

he tells us. The superlative remains alone, the very form of the superlative lacks the

other, as rival or counterpart.[16] Even with this, Abhinava is at pains to make it clear that

the singularity of the One that the superlative implies is in no way missing from the use

of the comparative. In this way, the grammatical form of the word "*anuttara*" implicates

both the idea of the One and of Two. Perhaps we might profitably use here a maxim

that Abhinava employs elsewhere--the eye of a crow--to understand him here. The

comparative form in a sense functions like the eye of a crow, which oscillates back and

forth between two distinct representations.[17] This, for us, odd figure of speech, derives

from a bit of Indian folklore that supposes that a crow has only one eye, which moves

alternatively from one socket to the other, back and forth, to encompass two very

different perspectives via dialogue and comparison.

This sophisticated exegesis of grammar presupposes a kind of faith in the power

of grammar to signify more than a merely conventional usage. In fact his use of a pun

is not mere word play, but carries as well an instantiation of this doctrine of language

as the structuring basis of the cosmos in this grammatico-theology. The pun

demonstrates the power of words to reveal in their basic forms, as letters and syllables,

the underlying order and meaning of the cosmos. Words are a template for reality, they

act to convey the code of life, a kind of linguistic DNA. Their forms, grammatical and syllabic, carry profound clues to reveal the underlying nature of the universe. More than this, by knowing the secret syllabic codes which map the universe, one is able to manipulate the topography, to effect changes in the universe, since this code is capable of generating the shape of our physical reality. We will see this play out more precisely later with his mapping of the cosmos onto the alphabet.

Generativity

We should note one more point in Abhinava's explication of *anuttara*. Even as this secret highest teaching, the "*anuttara*" is a "non-answer" to the question, since it signifies the singularity of the One, at the same time in an exuberant exegetical maneuver, Abhinavagupta demonstrates the generative power of language. In a gesture resonant of Barthes, indeed a kind of Barthean *S/Z* on steroids, Abhinavagupta gives us sixteen different meanings of the word "*anuttara*." These range from understanding "*anuttara*" as that perspective beyond which nothing is, because it is the unbarred, expanding, delight of wonder (*camatkāra*) in one's own self;[18] to the understanding that there is no liberation, enlightenment, because the world itself is not really in a state of bondage; to understanding "*anuttara*" as embedded in the essence of the mundane existence of everyday affairs; to understanding "*anuttara*" as that which cannot be limited or separated; to understanding "*anuttara*" as a timeless state in which there is no suggestion of motion or sequence.[19]

For our purposes here, we can glean from his treatment of "*anuttara*" an idea of language in this grammatico-theology as affording a bridge, seamlessly shifting

between the one and the many, between a transcendent timeless vision and the

mundane world. Language is inherently generative and perspectival, he demonstrates in

his extravagant multiplication of meanings for words. Furthermore, he employs this

technique throughout this text, again with the word "*kaulikasiddhi*" and with the word

"*mahābhāgā*," the word "*sadyaḥ*" among many others, indeed, even for the word

"*devī*", "Goddess." There is no single right way of interpreting a word. Instead, he

offers a prism of meanings, each reflecting a different perspective. Together they form

a richly dynamic and ever expanding production of meaning. Language indeed, as

Goddess, as we might expect from a Goddess,[20] is profoundly generative. The Goddess

of Speech multiplies things. She causes the world to unfold precisely because she

contains within her a generative power. As Abhinava tells us, "the highest secret

(*anuttaram*) is the one from whose womb billions of infinite creations flow forth. As it

has been said, 'from which this whole proceeds . . . .'"[21]

The Three Persons

        The expansion from the One into the vast multiplicity, this infinite number of

creations which is the universe, occurs through the generativity of language. Moreover,

the structure of language mirrors in its grammar the structure of the cosmos. In the

structure of language as three grammatical persons, the "I" the "You" and the "It," we

find the whole of the universe contained. Quoting from the *Tantrasamuccaya*,

Abhinavagupta tells us, "the whole universe exists always, in every way immersed in

the three grammatical persons, in the activities of the all-knowing down to the daily

routine of worms."[22] Describing the essence of the Trika philosophy, Abhinava

explicates.

> Indeed, everything in the world has the nature of the Three, of *nara* (the
>
> human), *Śakti* (the Goddess) and *Śiva* (the God). This is the form of the *Trika*,
>
> the Three. There, whatever is alone in its own nature situated solely in the form
>
> of insentience, that is chiefly the nature of *nara*, as for instance, in the
>
> statement, "a jar is standing [here]." This refers to the third grammatical person
>
> only, leaving aside (the first and second grammatical persons). When, however
>
> some thing is addressed with the word "you," even though it is still a thing, a
>
> "this," separate from the person calling it, then the feeling of "this" is veiled,
>
> covered over by the "I" feeling of the person addressing it. That is the form
>
> related to *Śakti*, the second grammatical person, as in "you are standing [here]."
>
> And here the meaning of the word "you," the second grammatical person is
>
> indicated in the process of address. That is, one gets the idea, "just as I am
>
> standing [here], so in the same way, this other also is here [hence, an idea of
>
> two]." With this, the freedom of wonder in the unbroken feeling of "I" is the
>
> form of the first person speaking. In the sentence "you are standing [here]," the
>
> one who is addressed assimilates to the wonder of the unbroken "I" of the
>
> speaker. This he points out by the second grammatical person with the meaning
>
> of "you." This is the Goddess Parāparā, the Goddess of differentiation. Again,
>
> when there is the unbroken sense of wonder in the apprehension of the "I,"
>
> complete in its freedom, without any dependence on another, as in the sentence,

"I am standing [here]", that is the first grammatical person, which is the highest

Goddess Parā.[23]

That is, Abhinavagupta's conceptual framework for classifying the various entities in the

world divides along three categories of *Śiva*, *Śakti* and *nara*, which are the grammatical

first, second and third persons. Each of the three grammatical persons marks a degree

of subjectivity, thus generating a scale from the pure subjectivity of the first person to

the condition of being an object designated by the third grammatical person. Sentience

or life itself in this framework is the function of the subject, the first grammatical

person. In a sense, one can see a similar notion in Descartes' *cogito ergo sum*, "I think

therefore I am." Descartes comes to be convinced of the reality of his own existence

only by ultimately appealing to his experience of subjectivity. The "I am" derived from

the subjective experience of hearing himself think is not such a far cry from

Abhinavagupta's location of sentience in the unbroken sense of wonder that arises from

the feeling of "I" (*aham bhāva*).

Yet the interesting irony of it is that Descartes' conceptual scheme, linked as it is

with the scientific revolution then enabled a systematic shift to a prioritization of the

objective pole of experience. The method of science is a reduction of the other to

object. The "objectivity" that guarantees the universality of science works also to

destroy the innate life of the other precisely by making it into object. In contrast,

Abhinava's privileging of the subjective pole of experience, the "I" as the "highest

Goddess Parā," generates a mystical science, of ritual symbolic identifications. In this

perspective, language does not simply describe reality. Rather, it creates reality through

the power it engenders by subjectivity. The subjectivity inherent in the use of magical

language of mantra is the method for a shift into the multiplicity, the multiple

instantiations of empathy as the "I" takes on the perspective of a wider world,

enlivening the self and the world through the generativity that language enables.

The sense of "I," the first grammatical person, is in fact for Abhinava the very

essence of what it means to be alive, to be conscious. It is subjectivity writ large. This

sense of the first grammatical person is more than our quotidian understanding of

grammar. Here, it entails the rapture of wonder and is none other than the highest

Goddess, the Goddess of Speech in her first stage as she evolves out of herself the

creation of the world.

Grammar drives the system. In Abhinavagupta's formulation the linguistic

comprehension of the world takes priority over any sort of non-articulated objective

fact. That is, there is not a world "out there" to which language corresponds, a mapping

of words onto a reality. Rather, the primary locus of reality stems first from the

linguistic frame. Words are primary, the more real phenomenon, and the objective

world of things--what we usually think of in our factually dominated and fact infatuated

world as reality--this is for Abhinava less real, precisely because it drifts away from the

sense of subjectivity.

Yet, even with this demarcation of subject and object, the positions are not

fixed. When we refer to a jar as "it," the jar takes on the position of the object.

However, as Abhinava notes above, when the other, whether jar or person, is

addressed as "you," then that other takes on some of the life of the "I-feeling" of the

person talking. The "you" stands at an intermediate point, when differentiation is beginning, but where there is both the presence of subject and object. Nor is this process confined only to clearly sentient beings, humans, like ourselves. Abhinava tells us, "Even the lifeless third person, if it sheds its lifeless form can take on the first and second person forms. [For example,] 'listen, o stones' and 'Of mountains, I am Meru.'"[24] Here the stones, by being addressed in the second person take on the life of second person address. The second example he gives, "Of mountains I am Meru" is spoken by the God Krishna to the warrior Arjuna in the classic Indian text of the *Bhagavad Gītā*; here Abhinava tells us, the mountain takes on the "I" feeling of the first grammatical person, transforming it from object to subject. With this, its essential reality shifts from lifeless object to sentient subject.

Even though the "you" indicates the duality of two and a degree of separation, it displays only a partial separation. It also partakes of a sense of the rapt wonder that is the condition of being the subject. As such, both the "I" and the "you" sustain a freedom that comes with consciousness, a freedom that resists relative distinctions of bigger or smaller. This innate consciousness of the "I" and the "you" affords them a measure of universality. "He," "she" and "it" of the third grammatical person encode a gender in their grammatical forms, but not the first and second grammatical persons. The "I" and the "you" are both genderless; that is, they can partake of both genders.[25]

Elsewhere Abhinava notes that the first grammatical person also correlates to the singular. Unlike English, which contains only the singular and the plural, Sanskrit contains the singular, the dual and the plural. Following an intuitive logic,

Abhinavagupta explains that the second grammatical person, the "you," is correlated to

the dual, and the third person is related to the plural. This classification again reflects

the evolution from the One to the Many, with the singular associated with the One and

the plural with the Many. Again, demonstrating the process that we saw above where

the third or second person become absorbed in the rapt wonder of the "I" feeling of the

first person, grammatically when the first person and the second or third person are

together in a sentence, as in "you and I are standing here," the verb form (in Sanskrit)

assimilates to the first person, (with "standing" in the 1st person in Sanskrit). That is,

the "I" has the capacity to absorb into its own rapturous delight whatever it touches. As

Abhinava reminds us again and again, "nevertheless, by contact with the strength of

the Self, a person becomes equal to that [Self]."[26] That is, the subjectivity of the "I" has

the power to transform whatever it contacts, bestowing life on the mere object or

stone, through a participation in the life of the subject. [27] The power of the Self is in

fact, its position of subjectivity.

In this context, one gets the sense that the operative paradigm is contagion. Like

the epic story of Rāma whose mere touch, his toe stubbing the stone that is the cursed

wife Ahalya, causing her to come back to life, the rapt wonder of the "I" feeling

powerfully slides into anything it can reach, granting life in the process. This idea is

pervasive in the Indian context, illustrated especially in the pan-India concept of

darśana, or vision of the deity. In daily Indian religious life, one goes to the temple to

take the vision or *darśana* of the deity or one takes the *darśana* of a holy person. The

mere vision entails a kind of contagious exchange by visual contact that transforms the person.[28]

For Abhinava, the transformation from lifeless object to sentient subject is possible precisely because "everything has the nature of everything"[29] This central maxim of his philosophy encapsulates the flow of consciousness, a flow that always proceeds from the point of grammatical subjectivity, which is the generative matrix. This map of the world is one where the "I" is the genesis that unfolds into the world. Language is what facilitates this, via the Goddess of Speech, Parāvāk.

Indeed, this Goddess of Speech, Parāvāk is herself the "I," as the powerful performative language of *mantra,* in Sanskrit, *aham*. So we see,

> The powerful *mantra* of this visible world is the Goddess of Speech, Parāvāk. She
> is the *mantra* "*aham*," ("I"). Her innate and spontaneous essence is the rapture
> of wonder (*camatkāra*). As it is said, 'all visible phenomena rest in the Self, which
> is the "I"- feeling.' This is a secret beyond all secrets.[30]

Encoded in the *mantra* "*aham*," the "I," which is the Goddess of Speech, is the grammatical architecture of cosmogony. A kind of linguistic DNA, each of the letters of *aham*, the "*a*," the "*ha*," and the "*m*" encapsulate, and indeed generate the unfolding of the world. The "*a*," the first letter of the alphabet, signifies the power of transcendent Śiva, again recapitulating the first grammatical person. The "*ha*" signifies the second grammatical person. The letter "*ha*" in Sanskrit, called *visarga*, literally means "emission" and in this theogrammatical cosmology points to the emission of the world. This correlation derives from pronunciation. If one tries to say "*ha*," one notices the

breath coming out, standing in as the microcosmic equivalent of the macrocosmic

creation of the world. In this case, the "*ha*," which is the "you" designates the shift

from subject as the subjective sense of I moves away from the self into the duality of

the other, just as our breath, which is life, escapes our bodily form when one

pronounces "*ha*." The letter "*m*" constitutes the third grammatical person, the objective

pole of experience. In the "*m*" rests the objectified essence of the other, the

crystallization of the many as inert object.

  Moreover, the idea of "I" operates on more than one level. In its pristine

consciousness as Goddess of Speech, the "I" enfolds within itself the whole that

manifests as the world. It encompasses this whole as modes, the modes of subject, of

subject as object in the notion of "you" and of mere object. The "I" exists as latent or

manifest form in all of the three grammatical persons; whether the subjective pole or

the objective pole predominates depends upon the mode.

  On the level of the microcosm, within the individual person, the process also

operates as a replication, a kind of fractal repetition of the cosmic creation. Each

moment every individual divides up and maps the world using these three grammatical

persons. When an individual rests within the rapture of the "I," there is the sense of the

fullness of wonder, a state of bliss and a kind of momentary enlightenment.

  On the less pristine level, the level of ordinary egoity, which is not in this system

(and perhaps not in ours either) considered such a good thing, the merely egoic "I,"

(*ahaṃkāra* --"I-doing" rather than rather than *ahaṃbhāva*--"I-feeling") becomes a split

self that mistakes the objective element, the third person in the letter "*m*" for the first

person in the letter "*a*." In this case, the small-minded egoity of the *aham*, the "I" is

constituted through the transformation of the initial pure subjectivity of the letter "*a*" in

through the duality of "*ha*" and then into the objectified condensation of self into the

"*m*," as *aham*, resulting not in the whole as harmonious release of creative proliferation

of the world as the multitude, but a constricted confusion of the subject and the object.

Thus, the word itself as *mantra*, *mantra* which is the Goddess of Speech, as the

"I," *aham*, itself figures and effects the sequence of cosmogony, beginning with the first

grammatical person and flowing outward into the proliferation of multiplicity that is the

nara, the third grammatical person, the many that constitutes the world. The world is

created essentially linguistically, as an expansion outward from the position of

subjectivity into the multiplicity of the object that is the world. This happens on both a

cosmic level, as the action of Gods and on the individual human level in every moment

of thought, indeed, as we saw above, even for a mere worm. "*Aham*," spoken or

recited, encapsulates and performatively re-enacts this process. This is a great secret

for this Tantric tradition, one linked to a ritual and performative exercise. It is also a

great secret because it gives a code, the underlying mechanism that explains the

grammatical constitution of the world as subject and object, linking creativity and even

sentience to the grammatical relationship between subject and object.

Mapping the Alphabet

The understanding of the alphabet as map and code of the cosmos figures all the

way down to earth and water and the other elements, to sound and the ear, to the

mind, the intellect, to time, and desire, up to the highest deity, Śiva. The letters of the

alphabet function as a kind of secret linguistic code of reality, a kind of DNA that can be manipulated through mental repetition--which is to tap into the subject mode--to then effect changes in the material world, which exists in the mode of object.

Mapping the alphabet onto the world is no doubt a structuralist venture; the quest for the master code that can explain and generate all of life. Interestingly, Abhinavagupta's understanding of the system entails an already sophisticated displacement of the hubristic reductionism implicated in a structuralist map of the cosmos. As he maps the alphabet onto the categories of what exists, earth or sound or time, he draws in again a perspectival approach, based upon the four levels of language. What on one level correlates a particular letter, the "la," for instance, with the limiting power of time, on another level corresponds to the sense of taste in a counter-reflection. This can occur because, as we saw earlier, "everything is the nature of everything." The very nomenclature, *bimba*, which means "reflection" and "*pratibimba*" which translates as "counter reflection" deflects away from a kind of positivist summary of the world. In this view, there are only reflections and counter reflections. This moves towards a perspectival appreciation where the mode of subject is the only real origin. As language evolves through the levels of speech, from the highest level to the level of gross speech, and as the mode of awareness shifts from subject to object, the perspective shifts, generating the multiplicity that is the world. Running through the whole as the thread giving life on every level as she shifts from mode to mode is the Goddess of Speech, who is the "I," the position of the subject.

Conclusion

What does it mean to understand grammar as the template, the code defining reality? It places us in a very different relationship to the world than we are used to in a 21st century Western existence. It pulls us away from a positivist view of reality, into something more akin to a kind of virtual reality, where our mental states and mental constructions of reality lead the way. This grammatical metaphysics might be profitably compared with some postmodern thought, for instance, the post-foundational decentering of positivism that Derrida suggests. Yet, this view comes with an unexpected theological twist that reinstates a kind of structuralist, and incongruently magical view of the world. The priority that Abhinavagupta gives to the subjective pole of experience as a universal point of origin certainly offers a radically different center, yet it does not devolve into a relativism. We find instead a vision where speech begins as the One, as a Goddess whose essence is subjectivity, the "I," and yet this One is able to both generate and link to the Many through subjectivity, since as Abhinavagupta tells us, "there is no speech that does not reach the heart."[31]

_____

Notes

1. Benjamin Lee Whorf, "" in *Language culture and personality: Essays in Memory of Edward Sapir*, eds. Leslie Spier, A. Irving Hallowell and Stanley Newman, Reprint (Santa Barbara, California: Greenwood Press 1983), 197-214. Also online at: http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Benjamin_Lee_Whorf#External_links

2. Abhinavagupta, *Parātrimśikāvivarṇa*, downloaded from S.D. Vasudeva's Indology E-text webpage: http://homepage.mac.com/somadevah/etx/PaTriViv.txt, p. 275: PaTrim24ab: yathā nyagrodhabījastha śaktirūpo mahādrumaḥ / PaTrim24cd: tathā hṛdayabījasthaṃ jagad etac carācaram //

3. Kanti Chandra Pandey, *Abhinavagupta: An Historical and Philosophical Study*, 2nd ed. (Varanasi: Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series Office, 1963), 21.

4. Abhinavagupta, *Īśvara Pratyabhijñā Vivṛti Vimarśinī* (IPVV), ed. Paṇḍit Madhusudan Kaul Shāstrī, 3 vols. (Delhi: Akay Reprints, 1985), IPVV 3:260: When those [beings] belonging to *Māyā*--even down to an insect--when they do their own deeds, that which is to be done first stirs in the heart." "Māyīyānāṃ kīṭāntānāṃ svakāryakaraṇāvasare yat kāryaṃ purā hṛdaye sphurati."

5. Bhartṛhari, *Vākya Padīya*, 1:22: "tad vyākaraṇaṃ āgamya paraṃ brahmādhigamyate." Downloaded from GRETIL - Göttingen Register of Electronic Texts in Indian Languages and related Indological materials from Central and Southeast Asia via "Yves Ramseier's page on Bhartṛhari and other South Asia and

sanskrit documents: http://www.sub.uni-

goettingen.de/ebene_1/fiindolo/gretil.htm.

6. Bhartṛhari, *Vākya Padīya* 1.1: anādinidhanam brahma śabdatattvaṃ yad

akṣaram | vivartate ʼrthabhāvena prakriyā jagato yataḥ || 1.1 ||."

7. Bhartṛhari, *Vākya Padīya*, 1.14: "tad dvāram apavargasya vāṅmalānāṃ

cikitsitam." "That (grammar) is the door to the final state, the end of

transmigration; it is the cure for the impurities of speech."

8. Bhartṛhari, *Vākya Padīya*, 1.1b-1.2: "vivartate ʼrthabhāvena prakriyā jagato

yataḥ || 1.1 ||

ekam eva yad āmnātaṃ bhinnaśaktivyapāśrayāt | apṛthaktve ʼpi śaktibhyaḥ

pṛthaktveneva vartate || 1.2 ||." See also *Padīya*, 1.120, where Bhartṛhari tells us

that the world evolves from the word--this the "wise" (*amnāyavido*) know.

9. The mantra here is "*sauḥ.*"

10. These three levels are Śiva, the highest God, Śakti, the Goddess and Nara,

the human.

11. Indeed this idea of speech is resonant with Bhartṛhari's understanding of

speech as foundational to the identities and consciousness of beings, "the inner

consciousness of beings, acting both inside and out . . . without the word, things

would be like a stone or piece of wood, without life." See Vākya Padīya, 1.126-

127. See also Natalia Isayeva's discussion of Bhartṛhari in Natalia Isayeva, *From

Early Vedanta to Kashmir Shaivism* (Rochester, NY: State University of New York

Press 1995), 110-119. It is, of course, the condition of sentience itself which

characterizes the highest level, *parā* that makes the third level more consonant

with the thought of Butler or Whorf.

12. Loriliai Biernacki, "Words and Word-Bodies: Writing The Religious Body" in

Rethinking Gender in a Transcultural World: The Religious Body, forthcoming.

13. Abhinavagupta, *Parātriṃśikāvivaraṇa*, downloaded from S.D. Vasudeva's

Indology E-text webpage:

http://homepage.mac.com/somadevah/etx/PaTriViv.txt, p. 210: śravaṇākhyayā

sattayā tiṣṭhantī śravaṇasaṃpuṭasphuṭakramika svaspandamaya varṇarāśi

niṣṭham aikātmyāpād anarūpasaṃkalanānusaṃdhānākhyaṃ svātantryam / tena

hi vinā kalakalalīnaśabdaviśeṣam śṛṇvann api na śṛṇomīti vyavaharati pramātā /

14. Abhinavagupta, *Parātriṃśikāvivaraṇa*, downloaded from S.D. Vasudeva's

Indology E-text webpage:

http://homepage.mac.com/somadevah/etx/PaTriViv.txt, p. 190-191.

15. Abhinavagupta, *Parātriṃśikāvivaraṇa*, downloaded from S.D. Vasudeva's

Indology E-text webpage:

http://homepage.mac.com/somadevah/etx/PaTriViv.txt, page 190-191.

16. Abhinavagupta, *Parātriṃśikāvivaraṇa*, downloaded from S.D. Vasudeva's

Indology E-text webpage:

http://homepage.mac.com/somadevah/etx/PaTriViv.txt, page 196: evaṃ tāvat tu

syāt, avivakṣite pratiyogiviśeṣe tamapprayogaḥ, pratiyogiviśeṣāpekṣāyāṃ tu

tarap / "However, it should be understood in this way: the superlative suffix -

tama is used without a specific counterpart, an other that mutually defines it.

However, the comparative suffix -*tara* implies a counterpart, an other."

17. Abhinavagupta, *Īśvara Pratyabhijñā Vivṛti Vimarśinī*, v.3: 312: "iti

kākākṣivat."

18. Abhinavagupta, *Parātriṃśikāvivaraṇa*, downloaded from S.D. Vasudeva's

Indology E-text webpage:

http://homepage.mac.com/somadevah/etx/PaTriViv.txt, page 193: svayam

anargalānapekṣaprathācamatkārasāratvāt

19. Abhinavagupta, *Parātriṃśikāvivaraṇa*, downloaded from S.D. Vasudeva's

Indology E-text webpage:

http://homepage.mac.com/somadevah/etx/PaTriViv.txt, page 193-195. His

exegesis on this single word, giving sixteen different meanings takes two full

pages of Sanskrit text. The number 16 is also significant, symbolic of the full

moon, and with this the idea of completion.

20. Loriliai Biernacki, *Renowned Goddess of Desire: Women, Sex and Speech in

Tantra* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007), 129.

21. Abhinavagupta, *Parātriṃśikāvivaraṇa*, downloaded from S.D. Vasudeva's

Indology E-text webpage:

http://homepage.mac.com/somadevah/etx/PaTriViv.txt, page 215:

garbhīkṛtānantasṛṣṭyādikoṭiśato yasmāt prasṛta etad eva tad anuttaram / yad

uktam/ yataḥ sarvam

22. Abhinavagupta, *Parātriṃśikāvivaraṇa*, downloaded from S.D. Vasudeva's

Indology E-text webpage:

http://homepage.mac.com/somadevah/etx/PaTriViv.txt, page 214 /

śrītantrasamuccaye 'pi

Q: naraśaktiśivāveśi viśvam etat sadā sthitam /

Q: vyavahāre krimīṇāṃ ca sarvajñānāṃ ca sarvaśaḥ //

23. Abhinavagupta, *Parātriṃśikāvivaraṇa*, downloaded from S.D. Vasudeva's

Indology E-text webpage:

http://homepage.mac.com/somadevah/etx/PaTriViv.txt, pages 211-212:

naraśaktiśivātmakaṃ hīdaṃ sarvaṃ trikarūpam eva / tatra yat kevalaṃ svātmany

avasthitaṃ tat kevalaṃ jaḍarūpayogi mukhyatayā narātmakaṃ ghaṭas

tiṣṭhatītivat / eṣa eva prathamapuruṣaviṣayaḥ śeṣaḥ / yat punar idam ity api

bhāsamānaṃ yadāmantryamāṇatayā

āmantrakāhaṃbhāvasamacchāditatadbhinnedaṃbhāvaṃ

yuṣmacchabdavyapadeśyaṃ tac chāktaṃ rūpaṃ tvaṃ tiṣṭhasīti / atra hy eṣa eva

yuṣmacchabdārtho āmantraṇatattvaṃ ca / tathā hi yathāhaṃ tiṣṭhāmi tathaiva

ayam apīti tasyāpy asmadrūpāvacchinnāhaṃbhāvacamatkārasvātantryam

avicchinnāhaṃcamatkāreṇaivābhimanvāna āmantrayate yuṣmadarthena

madhyamapuruṣeṇa vyapadiśati / seyaṃ hi bhagavatī parāparā / sarvathā punar

avicchinnacamatkāranirapekṣasvātantryāhaṃvimarśe ahaṃ tiṣṭhāmīti

parābhaṭṭārikodayo yatrottamatvaṃ puruṣasya /

24. Abhinavagupta, *Parātriṃśikāvivaraṇa*, downloaded from S.D. Vasudeva's

Indology E-text webpage:

http://homepage.mac.com/somadevah/etx/PaTriViv.txt, page 212: narātmāno

jaḍā api tyaktatatpūrvarūpāḥ śāktaśaivarūpabhājo bhavanti, śṛṇuta grāvāṇaḥ [\cf Mahābhāṣya 3.1.1; \cf Vākyapadīya 3 Puruṣasamuddeśa 2], meruḥ śikhariṇām ahaṃ bhavāmi [Bhagavadgītā 10.23].

25. Abhinavagupta, *Parātriṃśikāvivaraṇa*, downloaded from S.D. Vasudeva's Indology E-text webpage:

http://homepage.mac.com/somadevah/etx/PaTriViv.txt, page 212: vicchedito 'pi yuṣmadartha evam eveti / ata eva aliṅge yuṣmadasmadī gīte /. "Even though the meaning of "you" also contains an idea of separation, it is like [the "I"]. As it is sung, 'the you and the I are genderless.'"

26. Abhinavagupta, *Parātriṃśikāvivaraṇa*, downloaded from S.D. Vasudeva's Indology E-text webpage:

http://homepage.mac.com/somadevah/etx/PaTriViv.txt, page 198: Q: api tv ātmabalasparśāt puruṣas tatsamo bhavet [Spandakārikā 1.8].

27. Abhinavagupta, *Parātriṃśikāvivaraṇa*, downloaded from S.D. Vasudeva's Indology E-text webpage:

http://homepage.mac.com/somadevah/etx/PaTriViv.txt, page 213.

28. See Diana Eck, *Darśana: Seeing the Divine Image in India* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1998).

29. Abhinavagupta, *Parātriṃśikāvivaraṇa*, downloaded from S.D. Vasudeva's Indology E-text webpage:

http://homepage.mac.com/somadevah/etx/PaTriViv.txt, page 212: sarvaṃ hi sarvātmakam iti.

30. Abhinavagupta, *Parātriṃśikāvivaraṇa*, downloaded from S.D. Vasudeva's

Indology E-text webpage:

http://homepage.mac.com/somadevah/etx/PaTriViv.txt, page 204: prakāśasya hi

svābhāvikākṛtrimaparavāṅmantravīryacamatkārātma aham iti / yathoktam Q:

prakāśasyātmaviśrāntir ahaṃbhāvo hi kīrtitaḥ / [Ajaḍapramātṛsiddhi 22cd] iti /

tad eva guhyam atirahasyam.

31. Abhinavagupta, *Parātriṃśikāvivaraṇa*, downloaded from S.D. Vasudeva's

Indology E-text webpage:

http://homepage.mac.com/somadevah/etx/PaTriViv.txt, page 214: na

hṛdayaṃgamagāminī gīḥ.