

PRATYABHIJNA KARIKA

OF

UTPALADEVA

BASIC TEXT ON

PRATYABHIJNA PHILOSOPHY

(The Doctrine of Recognition)

EXHAUSTIVE STUDIES

BY

Dr. R. K. KAW



Lord Shiva broadcasting music of everlasting tranquility & peace

“ नित्यं शिवं शान्ति-सुखं वृणीष्व ”

The book gives an exhaustive study of "*Pratyabhijna Karika* of Utpaladeva", the basic text on "*The Doctrine of Recognition*", which is faithfully interpreted mostly in the light of the author's own *Vritti*, so far as available, and the Notes by the earlier traditional teachers, as given in the printed texts from the marginal notes found in the manuscripts, supported by quotations from the commentaries by Abhinavagupta and Bhaskaracharya. It is furnished with a comprehensive Introduction, prose order of the *Karikas* with short comments, English translation, Foot-notes, etc. *Pratyabhijna Karika* is indeed very difficult for a student of average understanding, so much so that he does not go beyond a few *Karikas* or pages of the book. The available translation by Dr. Pandey too does not seem to be helpful. The main object of this work, is to clarify the original ideas with fidelity to the sense of the *Karikas*, as intended by the teacher.

This work is published with the financial assistance given by the J & K Academy of Arts, Culture and Languages and under the auspices of Sharada Peetha Research Centre, Srinagar.

Price :

Cloth bound Rs. 35.00

Paper bound Rs. 30.00

INTRODUCTION

(A) General

Kashmir Shaivism : Its three main divisions : There are three main divisions of the Kashmir Śaivism corresponding to the division of its literature into three Śāstras : (1) the Āgama Śāstra, (2) the Spanda Śāstra and (3) the Pratyabhijñā Śāstra. A brief history of the development of these Śāstras is given below.

Shaivism is the earliest and the most prevalent cult. Śiva-Śakti cults were in vogue along with the Vedic faith in every part of India from very ancient times, and in Kashmir before the time of Ashoka. The history of the introduction of Śaivism in Kashmir is shrouded in mystery. In fact, it flourished there from the dawn of history. The facts furnished by Kalhana in his *Rājatarangīni*, the chronicle of the kings of Kashmir, indicate the wide prevalence of the Śaiva cult in the valley from an early period, and that it occupied the first place among the Hindu cults of the valley. From time to time various philosophical doctrines reached Kashmir from outside which had their impact on the philosophy that had grown there among the followers of Śaiva cult. Buddhism was welcomed by Kashmiris long before the Christian era, and Kashmir became its stronghold since the time of Ashoka (273—232 B.C.). Here was convoked an Assembly of the Buddhist theologians which recognised the Mahāyāna as superior to Hinayāna school of Buddhist thought. In spite of the phenomenal success of Buddhism in Kashmir for a few centuries, Śaivism continued to be the vital force.

The revival of Shaivism came in Kashmir from the seventh century A. D., and in the 8th and 9th centuries Buddhism gradually disappeared. In the 9th century, it was the sage Vasugupta, who revealed the *Śiva-Sūtras* which form the bedrock of the whole superstructure of

Kashmir Śaivism. The *Śiva-Sūtras* do not only enunciate the fundamental concepts of Kashmir Śaivism, but also show a way to practical realization. This line of thought was developed by two ācāryas Bhaṭṭa Kallaṭa (circa 9th century) and Somānanda (contemporary of Vasugupta, 850—900 A.D.) in two different directions. While Kallaṭa handed down the doctrines as a system of religion, Somānanda supplied the logical reasoning in their support and thus founded a system of Advaita philosophy of the Śaivas on the basis of what was at first taught as a system of faith. This development resulted into the emergence of the three different forms of Kashmir Śaivism: (1) the Āgama Śāstra, (2) the Spanda Shāstra and (3) the Pratyabhijñā Shāstra, corresponding to the three broad divisions of its literature. The whole literature comprising its three divisions is known as *Trika Śāstra*. The Āgama Śāstra is regarded as of superhuman authorship and of eternal existence. It is said that in course of time, Āgama Śāstra disappeared from the world and was revived again by Shrikaṇṭha, the incarnation of Śiva, the promulgator of Shaivāgamas. The sage Durvāsa was inspired to spread the knowledge of the Shaivāgamas which was handed down to the later ages by his three mind-born sons and their successors. The same (Āgama Shashtra) was taught in the later ages by Vasugupta and his successors. The *Śiva Sūtras* revealed by Vasugupta lay down both the philosophical doctrines (*jñāna*) and the practices (*kriya*) of the system as revelations believed to have come down (*āgama*) through the ages, being handed down from teacher to pupil. Generally speaking, the Āgama Shashtra gives the rudiments of Kashmir Shaivism, and shows the path of practical realization by means of the processes of Yoga system, known as *Śaiva-Yoga* or *Śaiva-samāveśā*. The school of Yoga Shaivism prescribes the various yogic methods of *Samyam* (concentration of mind) for achieving lower and higher *siddhis* (occult powers) and the glories of liberated life. These methods are called *Śāmbhavopāya*, *Śāktopāya* and *Āṇavopāya*. The Āgama Shashtra gives an exposition of these three methods of realization which is the main theme of the whole Trika Shashtra. The *Śiva-sūtras* form the most important part of the Āgama Shashtra from the Trika point of view. The Spanda Shashtra, being the second system, was started

by Kallaṭa, the pupil of Vasugupta, who most likely composed the *Spanda Sūtras*. The same was carried on by Kallaṭa's successors, Pradyumna Bhaṭṭa, Prajñārjuna, Mahādeva Bhaṭṭa and Bhāskara. The Spanda Shastra gives a comprehensive exposition of the three Yogic methods of realization (the mystical *upāyas*). The Pratyabhijñā Shastra, being the third system, was started by Somānanda, the author of *Śivadr̥ṣṭi*, and was carried on by the line of his disciples,—Utpaladeva, Lakṣmaṇagupta, Abhinavagupta, and the later teachers. It lays stress on the theoretical method of realization, viz., the pursuit of knowledge and reason alone, necessary for liberation, and relegates the Yogic methods to a subordinate position. It, thus, primarily represents the philosophy proper of the Trika Shāstra.

Agama Shastra : Shaivāgamas - Among the works belonging to Shaivāgama class, there is a number of Tantras, of which the following comprise chiefly the Āgama Shāstra of Kashmir: *Mālinī Vijaya* or *Vijayottara*, *Svacchanda*, *Vijñāna Bhairava*, *Ānanda Bhairava* (lost), *Mṛgendra*, *Matanga*, *Netra*, *Naiśvāsa*, *Svāyambhuva*, *Rudra-yāmala*, *Vidyārṇava* etc. Most of these had existed long before the appearance of the Triks.

Tantra Shastra is mostly Sadhana Shastra. Usually, every Āgama consists of four sections or *Kāṇḍas*: (1) *Vidyā* or *Jñāna Kāṇḍa*, (2) *Yoga Kāṇḍa* (3) *Kriyā Kāṇḍa* and (4) *Caryā Kāṇḍa*. Kashmir Shaivāgamas are mainly dogmatic treatises interspersed with philosophical speculations and logical reasoning. Being mostly devotional, they teach the various methods and practices of Shaiva Yoga, among other theological matters. *Tantrāloka* of Abhinavagupta, an encyclopaedia of Tāntric doctrines, gives the summery of *Advaita Tantras* which existed in Kashmir in the author's time. Tantras are broadly divided into Sadhanā, Siddha and Philosophy.

Malini-vijayottara-tantram is, according to Abhinavagupta, the most important Āgama treatise for the Trika. It is an earlier treatment of the same subjects, more or less, as are dealt with in the *Tantrāloka*. Like the most Āgama texts, it is a conversation between Shiva and Shakti. *Mālinī Vijaya* describes the Shaiva Yoga of the Trika sys-

tem. The Tantra is said to be the briefest resume of a large Tantra called the Siddha-Yogīśvarī-Tantram consisting of nine crore verses interpreting Shaivaistic teachings in the light of Bheda, Abheda and Bhedābheda. Mālinī Vijayottara is stated to be the last part of this Tantra. Like all Tantras, this also treats of incantations, their philosophy, initiation, bodily discipline, etc. It is said that the adorer becomes the adored himself by following the prescribed methods. He comes to feel his close kinship with nature. To him both the animate and the inanimate are glowing with divinity. The world is not an illusion to the Tantric adorer. Mālinī Vijayottara Tantra is the source of the conceptions of the three upāvas (methods of liberation), namely, Ānavopāya, Shāktopāya and Shāmbhavopāya, as dealt in the Shiva Sūtras and also incorporated in the Āgamādhikāra of Pratyabhijñā Shāstra, besides those of different types of creations, like, Vijñānakala, Sakala, Pralayākala, Vidyēśvaras and so on. This Tantra is also the main source of the first eleven Tattvas of the Shaiva system in addition to the twenty-five Tattvas of the Sāṃkhya. The original sources of the contents of this Tantra have not yet been traced by any scholar, in the earlier literature. In Tejopaniṣad we, however, have a reference about "Ānavam Shambhavam Shāktam". About the time of authorship of this Upaniṣad we are not in a position to say anything. At any rate we know that the Upaniṣad does not belong to the older group.

Svacchanda Tantram : This voluminous Tantra consisting of 3780 verses, is a dialogue between Shiva as Svachchanda Bhairava and Shakti as Bhairavi 'Svacchanda' literally means 'own will' and is thus a synonym of 'Svātantrya,' i.e., self-dependence or freedom of will. Like *Mālinī Vijaya* and its offshoot *Tantrāloka* of Abhinavagupta, *Svacchanda Tantra* deals with the same principles as are treated of in the former two works, but in a peculiar strain of its own. In its philosophical parts, it gives an exposition of thirty-six Tattvas not as merely abstract principles but as great cosmic facts, picturing them in symbols and in forms of exquisite poetry and painting them, as it were, on a most gigantic scale, over and against the background of an equally gigantic cosmic canvas. The Tantra prescribes a form

of *Yoga-dhyāna* for the aspirant who is directed to concentrate his mind, in ecstatic meditation, on this awe-inspiring and, at the same time, irresistibly attractive scene, which presents a great drama of life and action, not just in one world and universe, but in countless universes scattered all over boundless space and moving about in equally unbounded time. The whole work pulsates with a profound sense of realization of All-independent will, *Svacchanda*.

Śūnyatā plays an important part in certain schools of Buddhist thought. The Tantra describes the six states of *Śūnyatā* and explains the conception of the ultimate *Śūnyatā* as the Transcendental Being (Anuttara, Para, or Viśvottirṇa), the highest and last Reality, which is, in reality, *Aśūnya*, (*aśūnyam śūnyam ityuktam*), i.e., not 'voidity' or 'emptiness' in the ordinary sense of the term, but a positive being (*Sattā mātra*) from which emerge infinite universes and annihilate into it. It is this Śūnya which contains in itself everything and which materializes itself in the concrete form of this physical and subtle universes (*tatra tatra param śūnyam sarvaṁ vyapa vyavasthitam ; tadeva bhavati sthūlaṁ sthūlopādhi-vashāt priye*).¹ The final reality is both transcendental as well as immanent (*sarvātītam param tattvaṁ sarvaṁ vyāpi vyavasthitam*). Hundreds and thousands of universes as well as all Śāstras, all arts and sciences, all moral and spiritual disciplines, even all magic, are included in the *Tattvas* (*bhuvanāni vicitrāni śataśo'tha sahasraśaḥ, tattvābhyantara-samsthāni śāstrāni vividhāni ca*). While the universe is so vast, the Jīva is infinitely small, like a mathematical point (Lit. a hundredth part of the hundredth part of a tip of hair), but he is capable of infinite expansion.²

Vijnana Bhairava This work is also a text of the Āgama Śāstra, being a conversation between Śiva as Bhairava and Śakti as Bhairavī. *Vijñāna Bhairava* is regarded as the essence of another Tantra, the *Rudra Yāmala*. Its main topic is *Yoga-dhyāna*, of which it prescribes no less than 112 forms. As its contribution to philosophy, *Vijñāna Bhairava* explains how it is due to Śakti that Śiva appears in the forms which

1. A Descriptive Analysis of KSTS, pp. 35—36.

2. See Ind. p. 37 ; *bālāgra-śatabhāgasya, śatadhā kalpitasyatu, tasya sūkṣmataro jīvaḥ, sa cānantyāya kalpate*.

are conditioned by space and time.

Para-Trimshiks : It being a collection of of thirty odd verses taken from the *Rudra Yamala Tantra*, also belongs to the Āgama Śāstra. Its importance lies in the fact that it is perhaps the earliest work on the mystery of the Sanskrit alphabet (*varṇa-mālā*). It is really what may be called the 'cosmic phonetics', and is intimately connected with the doctrine of the four stages in the manifestation of speech, viz. *Parā Paśyantī*, *madhyamā* and *Vaikharī*. Man as *Paśu*, i. e., 'creature in bondage', is ordinarily acquainted with the *Vaikharī*, the physically articulated speech, alone. The three other forms (stages) of speech are hidden in the 'cave' (*guhā*), i.e. heart. The verses give the relation between the articulated speech and the hidden mystery of the inarticulated sound, and its connection with the thirty-six principles of creation (*Tattvas*), treated as *Spandas*, i.e. speeding vibrations.³

Siva-Sūtras : The Sūtras are believed to be a *Rahasyāgamashāstra-saṃgraha*, being the work of Śiva Himself. They, therefore, form a part of the Āgama Śāstra to which is attributed divine authorship. According to tradition, recorded by Kṣemarāja, the Sūtras were found, by the sage Vasugupta, inscribed on a rock at the foot of Mahādeva mountain, about 12 miles from Srinagar.

The *Śiva Sūtras* are a protest, first, against certain later schools of Buddhism, preaching the nihilistic doctrine of 'no Ātman', in direct opposition to the Buddha himself, who nowhere says that 'there is no Ātman'. He, on the contrary, states that to say that 'there is no Ātman' would mean preaching the doctrine of the nihilist (*Uccheda-vāda*). (See *Saṃyutta Nikāya*, Vol. IV, 400-401). Secondly they are a protest against the doctrine of dualism. This explains why the very first Sūtra so emphatically declares that, not only the Ātman most certainly is, but that man's consciousness, in its essential nature, is in itself the Ātman (*caitanya ātmā*) and that the Ātman itself is Śiva, the great Lord, Maheśvara, nothing else (*Ātmaiva Śivaḥ*). While

the *Śiva Sūtras* thus begin with a highly philosophical declaration, they constitute a practical treatise which tells how to realize, in direct experience, the philosophical truths enunciated therein. This practical aspect of the Sūtras is called '*Upāya*', i.e., 'means of approach' and each of the three divisions of the Sūtras gives 'an exposition of a way of approach (*upāya-prakāśhanam*.)'⁴

The basic ideas of the *Śiva Sūtras* are the same as we have in the Āgamas of the Trika, i. e., the unfoldment of the three means of liberation, *Śāmbhava*, *Śāktra* and *Āpaya* the *Malas* (impurities), etc. It is stated that Śrīkaṇṭha, an incarnation of Śiva, appeared once before Vasugupta in a dream and told him, 'There exists a sacred lore under this big stone. Reveal it and teach to those who deserve a favour'. Śiva wished to do a favour to the suffering humanity by the revelation of the traditional sacred lore which unfolds the three means of emancipation: '*dvaita-darśanādhivasita-prāye jīva-loke rahasya-sampradāyo mā vicchedi*.' On awakening, the sage found the Sūtras engraved on a big stone known in kashmir as *Śiva Pala* which is said to exist on the Mahādeva hill with the side, containing the engravings, remaining inverted after they were revealed to Vasugupta. The Sūtras are divided in three sections, dealing with the three means of liberation. Guru Vasugupta taught them to his disciples Kallaṭa and others-Kallaṭa taught them to Kṣemarāja who added a commentary, called *Vimārśinī*, to the Sūtras.⁵

(2) **Sanda-Shastra** : Spanda Kārios These compositions are the earliest and only original texts belonging to the Spanda Shāstra division of the Trika. They constitute the basis on which the entire Spanda literature developed. Regarding their authorship, there are two views one that they are by Vasugupta himself, and the other that Kallaṭa composed

4. Ibid pp. 10—11

5. See, J. C. Chatterji, Kashmir Shaivism ; p. 8 ;

Paranjyoti, Śaiva Siddhānta ;

M. V. T., KSTS XXXVII, Introduction,

If, 20-23, also p. 112 fn 13 ;

P. T. Srinivasa Iyengar, Shiva Sūtra Vimārśinī (Tr.).

them. Utpala Vaiṣṇava, on the strength of the 53rd Kārikā, not found in the recension of Kṣemarāja, attributes their authorship to Kallaṭa, while Kṣemarāja attributes them to Vasugupta, probably on the authority of the 16th verse of the *Spanda Nirṇaya* found in his recension. The Kārikās, seem, in fact, to be the work of Kallaṭa. The *Spanda Sāstra* lays down the main principles, as enunciated in the *Śiva Sūtras*, in a greater detail and in a more amplified form, without giving philosophical reasonings in their support. In fact, the Spanda system owes its origin to the *Śiva Sūtras* and concerns itself with their elucidation and popularisation. The author describes *Spanda* as that power of consciousness which infuses life into the physical senses. An object when sensed has no basis apart from consciousness. *Spanda Kārikās* (verses) are 51 in number in which the fundamental principles of Śaivism, as aphoristically given in the *Śiva Sūtras*, are epitomized. The literature that developed on these Kārikās are (1) *Vṛtti* by Kallaṭa, (2) *Vivṛti* by Rāmakaṇṭha, (3) *Pradīpikā* by Utpala, (4) *Spanda Sandoha* by Kṣemarāja and (5) *Spanda-nirṇaya* also by Kṣemarāja. The idea underlying the *Spanda Śāstra* is that Śiva's *Spanda* (energy) out of its own nature manifests on the background of its own pure Self the whole universe comprising the thirty-six categories from the earth upto Śiva.⁶ According to this doctrine, the world is a play of energy, force or vibration, which is in conformity with modern Science, and not an illusion, the result of error in preception as the Vadāntins suppose; their doctrine that '*viśvam yan na tad eva brahma*,' is rejected.

The discovery of the concept of the '*Spanda*' in the Trika Śāstra is, indeed, most important from the point of view of modern science. The word '*Spanda*' is derived from the root meaning 'to throb', 'to move, and seems etymologically to be the same word as English 'speed', (cf. Dutch, Old English, 'spoed'). But, in the context of the Trika Śāstra, '*Spanda*' means 'speeding with pulsation and rhythm'. '*Spanda*', has the same meaning also in expressions like '*prāṇa-spanda*', i. e., 'life pulsation'. It has been known in India since the Vedic age that

6. The Spanda-Karika, *KSTS* VI,
The Spanda-nirṇaya, *KSTS* XLII, with Eng. Tr.

everything in the universe of objects is only a 'system of ceaseless goings' (*jagati*) (*yat kiñ ca jagatyām jagat—Īsāvāsyopaniṣad* 1). Even the hardest, heaviest, the apparently stand-still, mass of matter, in this physical universe, is just a volume of 'pulsating, throbbing, waving, vibrating flowings' (*Spanda-niḥsyandaḥ*, SK, 19). In these circumstances, the discovery of modern physics that 'matter' is only 'waves of various lengths,—without there being any essentially 'solid, hard stuff in matter'—is really a re-discovery of what the Trika Śāstra conceived centuries ago as the 'Spanda'.⁷

(3) **Pratyabhijña Shastra** : (its emergence) Whereas Vasugupta and Kallaṭa (beginning of the 9th century A. D.) are the promulgators of Āgama and Spanda branches of Trika Shāstra, which stress 'its faith, fact and practice discipline' necessary for realization, Somānanda (towards the close of the 9th century) and Utpaladeva (in the first half of the 10th century) are the founders of the Pratyabhijñā Shāstra, the philosophy proper of the Trika. Abhinavagupta (990-1015 A. D.) combines both the aspects of the Triks, its faith (rituals and practices) and philosophy. He is, indeed, the greatest exponent of the system as a whole. The later teachers, Kṣemarāja, Yogarāja, Jayaratha, Shivopādyaṃya and Bhāskarācārya (1200-1800 A. D.), mostly commentators, follow Abhinavagupta in expounding the various doctrines of the school. The following is the whole of Pratyabhijñā literature given in chronological order (pd. in KSTS—Kashmir Series of Texts and Studies) :-

Śivadr̥ṣṭi (śd) by Somānanda (the first text on the system - 9th cent A. D. KSTS- 54; *Īshvara-Pratyabhijñā Kārikā* (PK) with *Vṛtti* - short commentary (Pvr) by Utpaladeva 10th Cent. (St KSTS - 34); Utpaladeva, had written a *Tikā* (commentary) on his *Pk* which is irrecoverably lost. *Īshvara-Pratyabhijñā-Vimarśini* (Pvi), a short commentary (called also *Laghu-vimarśini*) on Utpaladeva's *Pk*, by Abhinavagupta 11th cent.) (KSTS - 22 & 33); *Īshvar - Pratyabhijñā Vivṛti - Vimarśinini* (Pvi) (called also *Brahvati-vimarśini*), a long commentary on *Pk*

7. Cf. J. C. Chattarji, Art. 'Trika āstra,' *Shāradā*, I, i, 1952.

KSTS-60, 62, 69); *Tantrāloka* (TA) by Abhinavagupta, a voluminous work, (pd with commentary of Jayaratha 1180 A. D. in *KSTS*—in 12 volumes): *Tantra-Sāra* by Abhinavagupta (*KSTS-17*); *Paramartha-sara* of Abhinavagupta (pd. with commentary of Yogarāja 1060 A.D. in *KSTS-7*) *Pratyabhijñā - hṛdaya* by Kṣemarāja 1040 A. D. *KSTS-3*); Besides the above, there are : one chapter, Canto VIII, on *Pratyabhijñā-darśana* in *Sarva-darshana-saṁgraha* (SDS) of Madhavācārya 14th cent. (pd. in the Vidyabhawan Sanskrit Granthamālā No 113, Varanasi); a Commentary of Bhāskarācārya (1780 A. D.) on *Pvi*, ed by K. C. Pandey and K. A. Subramania Iyer, (pd in the Princess of Wales Saraswati Bhawan Texts, Nos. 82 and 83, 2 volumes, Allahabad). Utpaladeva's *Siddhitrāyī*, comprising three treatises: *Īshvara-Siddhi*, *Ajaṇa - pramatṛ-siddhi* and *Sambhandha - siddhi*, (*KSTS-34*) is another allied work on the system.

Trika Shastra: The texts enumerated above under *Pratyabhijñā Śāstra* mostly include those expounding the so-called *Trika Śāstra*, i.e., which treat of all the three branches of Kashmir Shaivism: *Āgama Śāstra*, *Spanda Śāstra* and *Pratyabhijñā Śāstra*, the philosophy proper of the *Trika*, or those which deal with the three mystical *Upāyas*, practical disciplines necessary for realization, called *Shāmbhavopāya*, *Shāktopāya* and *Ānavopāya* which are initially prescribed for liberation in *Āgama Śāstra*. The *Pratyabhijñā Śāstra* is a 'new approach', easy way or means to the realization of the reality, i. e., the way of knowledge and reason, say, the intellectual pursuit alone, without any supernatural processes practical discipline, i. e., *Śaiva-Yoga* (called also *Śaiva Samāveśa*) to which aspect there is no stress in the *Pratyabhijñā Śāstra* proper, viz. in the works of Somananda and Utpaladeva, the pioneers of the school, although these matters are also incorporated in their works from the *Āgama Śāstra*, but they are relegated to a subordinate position and not treated as an essential part of the *Pratpabhijñā* system which is said to be a new and an easy way (*sugata eṣaḥ mārgo navya*). The works dealing with *Trika Śāstra* also treat of the philosophical aspect of *Pratyabhijñā*, the glimpses of which are given below :

Tantraloka and Tantra-sara: The *Tantrāloka* is the most voluminous work by Abhinavagupta and forms an encyclopaedia of the *Trika*

shāstra. The *Tantra-sāra*, by the same author, is just a brief summary of the *Tantrāloka*. While the *Tantrāloka* is composed in an abstruse language and in a metrical form, the *Tantra-sar* is written in easy prose and is considerably short. The *Tantra-sāra* is, in fact, an excellent introduction to the *Tantrāloka*. Both these works indicate the role of Abhinavagupta as an exponent of *Trika śāstra*. The first chapter of *Tantrāloka*, which is chiefly philosophical, opens with an explanation of the first two Śiva Sūtras and defines the key word 'Caitanya,' saying 'caitanyam iti bhāvāntaḥ śabdaḥ svātantrya-mātrakam' (TA I, 28). Thus *Caitanya* means not any particular state or states of consciousness, but consciousness in general, consciousness as such, free from all limiting conditions, free absolutely from an objective context, viz., anything to depend upon, like the body, the mind, etc. *Caitanya* is just Self-dependence (*Svātantrya - mātra*). It is 'cit - kriyā citi - kartṛtā,' i. e. absolute liberty and autonomy of consciousness, as Utpaladeva says. This *Caitanya* is emphatically declared to be the Ātman, the one nuclear core in every personality, the one central point of reference in each and every experience, the deepest depth of the subconscious in each vividly conscious personal ego. The *Tantrāloka* I gives also definitions and explanations of various other terms. The next four chapters of the work deal, in detail, with the same three *upāyas* (methods of realization), which constitute the three sections of the Śiva Sūtras. According to Abhinavaguptas' view, the three means described are those of *Abheda*, *Bhedābheda* and *Bheda* respectively. Pratyabhijñā has been treated as another way of realization, a way of reasoning (*tarka*), requiring no practice of any kind (*Anupāya mārga*). This, Abhinavagupta says, is the highest of all the methods (*tato 'pi paramam jñānam upāyādi-vivarjitam...anuttaram - ihoc-yati*). The work also deals with various philosophical topics like time, space, the nature and division of the thirty-six principles (*tattvas*), from the principle of solidity (earth) to *śiva*, the one All-benign Lord (*devaḥ sa ekaḥ shivaḥ*), who ever shines through all the principles and their infinite combinations and permutations, - shines in the form of a condensed mass of the supreme spiritual effulgence (*esa anvitam rupam bhāti param prakāsha - nibiḍam*, TA, 9, 1). The two chapters (11 and 12) of the work, deal with the principle of *Māyā* and

its five off-shoots, *Kalā*, *Rāga*, *Vidyā*, *Niyati*, and *Kūla*, which, acting as 'veils', make one all-pervading Śiva appear as divided in the form of each microcosm. Another chapter (13) which is also of same philosophical significance, treats of the conferment of powers (*śakti-pāta*) by Śiva, on his devotees. The rest of the work deals with various ritual practices and forms of worship.

Pratyabhijna-hrdayam : This is a small work by Rājānaka Kṣhemarāja in which the contents of Pratyabhijñā Śāstra are summarised, with a stress on Āgamic tenets of the *Trika* and *Śaiva Samvāṣa* (the *Śāivayoga*). A brief idea of this work is given as follows : *Citi* (consciousness) being absolute or self-dependent (*Svatantra*), is the ultimate cause of this universe. By the power of its own will (*svecchā*), it unfolds the universe upon its own screen (*svabhītu*). This universe is manifold (*nānā*) in consequence of the separation of mutually related objects and subjects (from one another). The subject, whose essential nature is limited *citi* (*citi-saṃkocātman*), is a microcosm. *Citta* (the sense organ) is nothing else than *cit* descended from the stage of *Cetana* and passed into a state of limitation due to the object of perception (*cetya-saṃkocinī*). That *citta* especially constitutes the real nature of the *Māyā-pramāṇa* (limited subject). He is one *Ātman*, being Śiva whose essence consists in *cit*. He is of two-fold form, one as light (*Prakāśa rūpa*) and the other as the limited manifestation (*saṃkocāvabhasavat*). He is three-fold being covered by three impurities (*malas*), *Āṇava*, *Māyīya*, and *Kārma*. He is of four-fold constitution, because he is composed of the void, (*Śūnya*), the life (*Prāṇa*), the subtle body consisting of mind, senses, etc. (*pūryaṣṭaka*) and the body (*Śarīra*). The seven pentads, i. e. the thirty-five *Tattvas* from Śiva to the earth, make up his nature. In consequence of the limitation of the *Śaktis* of the *Māyā-pramāṇa* (*Ātman*), he becomes the *mala*-covered *saṃsārin*, i. e., takes a succession of births. Like the Lord (Śiva), he carries out the five processes of the universe, viz., emanation, (*sraṣṭṛtā*), reabsorption (*saṃhartṛtā*), stabilization (*sthāpakatā*), enveloping (*vilaya-kāritā*) and dispensing grace (*anugrahīṛtā*). Underlying these there exist five other secret processes, viz., manifesting, enjoyment, meditation, seeding and dissolution. To be a *saṃsārin* means being led astray by one's own *śaktis* when one is ignorant of the authorship of the fivefold process. In the following *Sūtras*, the teacher sets forth a meditative process (*Samāvesha*) for achieving divine realization which 'saves during life-time' from *Samāsāra* (cycle of births and deaths). In the process of *Samāvesha* (*Samādhi*) *citta* becomes *citi* by directing itself inwardly to the stage of *Cetana*.

CHAPTER I

PRELIMINARY

Preamble; Evolution of the Studies of the Pratyabhijna Literature; Glimpses of the present study.

Preamble The attention of modern scholars was drawn to what is known as the "*Pratyabhijna System of Philosophy*" very late in the annals of Indological research. Before the literature on the subject, distinguished as "*Pratyabhijna Literature*," was discovered in Kashmir by Dr. G. Buhlar in 1876 A. D., the system had remained sealed in manuscripts or in the hearts of a few traditional Pandits, and was studied but little by modern scholars till very recent times. Among the students of this system of philosophy, J. C. Chatterji, P. T. Srinivasa Iyengar, L. D. Barnett, Reo Emil Baer (German Indologist) and his English translator, F. Kurt Leidecker (American Scholar) and K. C. Pandey get the credit of setting out earlier on their literary expedition and discovering new coasts of knowledge in this domain of study. The information given by these noted scholars, the pioneers of this branch of study serves as beacon-light in the present study.

Evolution of the study of the Pratyabhijna literature **The first notice of Pratyabhijna :** We get the earliest notice about the Pratyabhijna Shastra in the well-known publication, *Sarva-darshana Samgraha* of Madhavacharya, a collection of all the systems of Philosophy, edited by Pt. Ishvarachandra Vidyasagara and published for the first time in the *Bibliotheca Indica* in 1858 A. D. It reviews, perhaps in the gradually ascending order of importance from the Vedanta point of view, the sixteen most Important philosophical systems, including the three Shaiva systems, Nakulisha-Pashupata, the Shaiva system and the Pratyabhijna Darshana current in Southern India in the 14th century A. D. Though not of much importance in itself, it aroused interest among the modern scholars in the so-called minor systems of thought and was translated into English by E. B. Cowell and A. E. Gough. In this work, the Pratyabhijna System appears as the eighth system and the Vedanta system of Shankaracharya as the sixteenth or the final system. The Vedanata

is thus given the highest place among the sixteen systems described.

Discovery of Pratyabhijna literature by Dr. Buhlar Nevertheless, until about the year 1876 A. D. the Pratyabhijna Shastra remained unknown to the modern scholars. In the year 1875 A. D., however, Dr. G. Buhlar who proceeded under the orders of the Government of India on a tour to Kashmir, Rajputana and Central Asia in search of Sanskrit manuscripts discovered in Kashmir the works composed by Kashmiris under the general name "Shaiva Shastra". He collected a number of manuscripts and divided some portions of these referring to the Philosophy of the Shaivas into two classes according to the two great Shaiva Schools of Kashmir: Spanda Shastra of Vasugupta and the Pratyabhijna Shastra of Somananda and Utpaladeva. Dr. Buhlar points out in his Report that the Pratyabhijna system "appears to be pure idealism and an application of Shankaracharya's principles to the Shaiva philosophy." He further brings to notice the remarks of Prof. Gough in his prefatory note to the translation of the Shaiva-dharshana in Sarvadarshana Samgraha, "Prof. Gough has shown that the Kashmirian Shaiva philosophy bears the close resemblance to the Shaivism of the Southern India."

Publication of the 'Kashmir Series of Texts and Studies': The first impulse to the study of the Pratyabhijna literature was given by the publication of "Kashmir Series of Texts and Studies" started by the Kashmir Research Department early in the present century, from 1902 when its activities began. The literature of Kashmir pertaining to the Shaiva School particularly attracted the notice of J. C. Chatterji, the first Director of the Department, who was the foremost scholar to devote himself to its study from 1904. He brought to notice in his first report that 'There is a rich literature in Kashmir belonging to the Shaiva School of Philosophy of which very little is known to the outsider. It is a most interesting school... Manuscripts of this school should be made public by the Department.' Accordingly the Department carried on the editing and publishing of the Shaiva literature and during the period of the last half century brought out 89 volumes of "Kashmir Series of Texts and Studies", which include almost the whole of Shaiva literature. Among the works published by the Department, the following comprise the Pratyabhijna Shastra:- Shivadrshiti of Somananda, the first and the basic work on the system by its originator; Ishvara Pratyabhijna Sutras (or Karikas) by Utpaladeva,

the systematiser of the philosophy, with short Commentary called Vimarshini; by Abhinavagupta, the expounder of the system, in two parts: Part 1 and Part 2; a long Commentary on Pratyabhijna Sutras called Vivratti-Vimarshini by Abhinavagupta, in three volumes: Vol. I, Vol. II and Vol. III; Pratyabhijna Hrdaya; Siddhitrayi and Pratyabhijna Karikavrtti. In addition to these works, the below-mentioned works contain the tenets of the Pratyabhijna school, embedded in a mass of other matters of Kashmir Shaiva cult:- Shiva-sutra-vimarshini by Vasugupta with Commentary by Kshemaraja; Tantraloka, a comprehensive work on diverse subjects pertaining to Tantra Shastra (the scriptures of Shaivas) by Abhinavagupta, with commentary, in several volumes; and Parmarthasara of Abhinavagupta.

Pioneering Studies : This literature began to attract the attention of scholars early in the present Century. In the year 1910 there appeared the Parmarthasara of Abhinavagupta (Sanskrit text and English translation) by L. D. Barnett in the Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland (PP. 707-747) in which we, for the first time, find an English presentation of the principles of Shaiva school of Kashmir. Dr. Barnett observes, in his Introduction to this work, 'In my "Notes on the Shaiva Siddhantam" published last year (in 1909) in Le museum, I called attention to the fact that the living faith of the majority of modern Tamils is in almost every respect, and certainly in all essentials, the same doctrine that was taught in Kashmir about the beginning of the eleventh century by Abhinavagupta; and I endeavoured to indicate what, in my opinion, the links are which join the modern theology of the South to the ancient teachings of the North, and ultimately to the school which is represented by the Shvetashvatara Upanisada. In further illustration of this view I now present the Parmarthasara of Abhinavagupta.'

In the year 1912 was published the translation of Shiva Sutra Vimarshini by P. T. Srinivasa Ayangar. This important work, in the early days of the studies of Kashmir Shaiva Shastra, acquainted the scholars with the system of Shaivism as a form of the Yogic system. In his introduction to the work the scholar calls attention to the fact that Shiva Sutras do not represent any manual of philosophy, since they merely deal with certain forms of Yoga and propound a Tantric creed.

The work, namely 'Kashmir Shaivism' (in English), being a brief

introduction to the history, literature and doctrines of the Advaita Shaiva Philosophy of Kashmir, by J. C. Chatterji, appeared in the 'Kashmir Series of Texts and Studies' in the year 1914. J. C. Chatterji is well known as the author of 'Indian Realism' and 'India's Outlook on Life.' In Kashmir Shaivism, the learned scholar distinguishes the Shaiva Philosophy from a system of Shaiva faith. He writes - 'While Kallata may be said to have handed down the doctrines as a system of religion, Somananda supplied the logical reasoning in their support and made a system of Advaita Philosophy of what was at first taught as a system of faith and thus founded Pratyabhijna Shastra...which is so named after the Pratyabhijna Sutras...'

In the year 1936 appeared the work namely 'Abhinavagupta'—An Historical and Philosophical Study (Ph. D. thesis) by Dr. K. C. Pandey, which gives a brief presentation of the various doctrines of Pratyabhijna Philosophy as expounded by Abhinavagupta in his two commentaries on Ishvara Pratyabhijna Karikas and his other works on the subject. Mention may also be made of the publication of Bhaskari, Vols. I and II, a Commentary on the Ishvara Pratyabhijna Vimarshini of Abhinavagupta, edited by K. A. Subramania Iyer and Dr. K. C. Pandey. This work was greatly needed for the proper understanding of abstruse text and the polemics of abhinavagupta in his Vimarshini, and the credit of discovering this important commentary in Kashmir and getting it published under very difficult circumstances goes entirely to Dr. Pandey. Bhaskaracharya, the author of the commentary lived by about the 18th century, being six generations ahead of his present successor. As regards the Abhinavagupta's contribution to this philosophy, Dr. Pandey remarks in his work mentioned above, "The Philosophical system of Kashmir, with Abhinava's contribution to it, left out of consideration, loses most of its importance ...It is not possible for us to attribute the authorship of any particular theory to Abhinava as we can do to Kant or Hegel." Among all the scholars of this line, Dr. Pandey has devoted himself entirely to the study of Abhinavagupta's Philosophy and Rhetoric. In his scholarly introductions to Bhaskari Vols. I and II, he has taken great pains to bring out some outstanding points of Pratyabhijna philosophy. Volume III of Bhaskari, presenting an English Translation of the Ishvara Pratyabhijna Vimarshini in the light of the Bhaskari (Commentary), with an outline of History of Shaiva Philosophy, by K. C. Pandey, also appeared in the year 1954.

Another work namely 'The Secret of Recognition,' viz. Pratyabhi-

jna Hrdaya, translated into English by Kurt F. Leideckar from its original translation in German by Reo Emil Baer, was published in the year 1938 in Adyar Series No. 18. It contains in its introductory pages a note by S. S. Suryanarayan Shastri on the comparative study of the Pratyabhijna system and the Shaiva Siddhanta of South India. As regards the origin of this line of philosophy in Kashmir the scholar produces the following evidence in his Note No. 36 (in his work): "We might make mention of the tradition according to which Shankara in his travels came near Kashmir. The activity of this greatest of India's monists falls into the first half of the ninth century and comes, therefore, at the same time as the appearance of Vasugupta (cf. Chatterji, K. Sh. P. 23). Hence it is not improbable that he imparted the impetus to the monistic movement in Kashmir (cf. Farquhar, O. R. L. I., P. 198)."

Dr. S. Radhakrishnan devotes a chapter (No. 10) in his 'Indian Philosophy,' Vol II, to the Pratyabhijna system. It is clear that this eminent scholar noticed this as one of the notable doctrines. He remarks that 'the development of Shaivism in the extreme south of the country as well as in the extreme north, that is in Kashmir, is a wonderful example of India's cultural unity'.

In addition to the work done by scholars mentioned above, we cannot afford to ignore the important contributions made to the study of this subject by some writers on Indian philosophy, as for instance, M. M. Gopi Nath Kaviraja who has contributed a few articles on the subject in some leading papers, Prof. Lachhmi Dhar gives a brief description of the Pratyabhijna Philosophy in his book namely, 'The Birth place of Kalidasa.' C. Hayavadana Rao makes casual remark about some of the doctrines of this system in his Introductory Vol. I of the Srikara Bhashya of the Vedanta Sutras.

Object of the present study. It is apparant from the above that the subject has been studied by so many scholars heretofore, but so far no attention seems to have been devoted to a serious study of the origin and development of this system of Philosophy. It is the first attempt to trace the origin of the various doctrines of this school from the philosophic ideas in the Vedic hymns and the Upanishadas and the Buddhist sources. These studies have revealed that the system has evolved, of course, from the same fountain-head where all other schools of Indian Philosophy, the Sankhya, the Vaisheshika, the Vaiyakarana, the Vedanta, and so on, had their origin. With the ex-

ception of its specific differences in some view points from the Buddhist and the Vedanta systems, some additions and alterations made in certain theories existing in the older systems and some tenets and technical expressions derived from the Shaivagamas (scriptures of the Shaiva school), the system is not fundamentally different from the Vedanta.

The earlier studies do not differentiate the philosophical content from the theology or dogmas of the Shaiva School. Attempt has been made for the first time to treat of the philosophical content (or Philosophy proper) of the Pratyabhijna system almost apart from the dogmas of the Shaiva cult. It appears that the system of Philosophy presented in the Pratyabhijna literature has not so far been understood in its proper context. In the present study the various tenets of the system have been properly co-ordinated with great fidelity to the original. In these studies the two lines of development of the system have been noticed, one, the earlier stage represented by the work of Somananada, known as the founder of the school, The second, the later stage as represented by the doctrines taught by Utpaladeva, the disciple of Somananda, and further elaborated by Abhinavagupta.

An attempt has been made to review in brief all the allied philosophic movements in the East and the West, making comparison and contrast of the various doctrines of the Pratyabhijna School with the allied doctrines of other systems to arrive at a clear position which this system of thought occupies in the domaine of Indian and Western Philosophy. It has been brought out that the system has indeed made a radical revision or reorientation of Indian and Western systems of Philosophy.

From the earlier studies it has been noticed that some of the opinions of scholars do not accord with facts. It is not possible to agree with Doctor Pandey in holding that the great Shankaracharya, the expounder of the Vedanta system, had any share in the preaching or practice of Tantric Philosophy; not to speak of its having an influence on the Pratyabhijna system. The statement of Dr. Paranjyoti that Shankaracharya was an adherent of the Shakta sect or that his Advaita system is influenced by Tantric theory is far from true. The view held by Dr. Lachmi Dhar that the Pratyabhijna system was known to Kalidasa and that Abhijnana Shakuntala is an allegorical representation of this philosophy has no bearing on the facts. The attempt made by the learned scholar in attaching philosophical

significance to some common words and ideas occurring in Kalidasa's *Shakuntala* is rather far-fetched. It has been established on textual evidence that the Pratyabhijna system of philosophy originated in the ninth century A. D., which is, beyond any doubt, posterior to Kalidasa's date by a period of four centuries. All such controvertial view points have been discussed at proper places in this work.

And lastly, the writer has also sought to understand the scientific values of the Pratyabhijna metaphysics which, in its essence, is a deep study of man possessing highest potentialities and supreme inheritance. Human soul (Atman), according to the Pratyabhijna system, is endowed with creative power, viz. powers of comprehension and action and sovereignty of will. It is absolutely free (Svatantra) in creating a world for itself. The system does not only interpret the world as it is, as all other systems of philosophy generally do, but its point is to change it and to change it into a new world, a better and happier world for mankind. It has laid an emphasis on the need of "recognition" (Pratyabhijna) of 'Self' (Atman), viz. the supreme inheritance of man. The more we realise in ourselves the supreme and free nature of 'Self' (Atman), by taking aid of certain processes of intuition, moral discipline and spiritual training in addition to experience and reason, the more powers of knowledge and action (Jnana Shakti and Kriya Shakti) we manifest and exercise through our mind and body. The necessity of supersensuous experience for Self-realization is recognised owing to the limitations of man's sense and reason. The modern psychologists have also admitted: "the conscious Self of each of us...does not comprise the whole of consciousness or of the faculty within us. There exists a more comprehensive consciousness, a profounder faculty within us, which for the most part remains potential only." (Human Personality, by F. W. H. Myers P. 13). According to the system, Pratyabhijna, 'recognition' of Self-the profounder faculty within us, is prescribed for the service of man as a means of attaining all that is of highest value".....

जनस्याप्युपकारमिच्छन् । समस्तसंपत्समवाप्तिहेतुं तत्प्रत्यभिज्ञामुपपादयामि ”

(Ishvara Pratyabhijna Sutras—I, i).

Thus the system lays down the psychological basis for the elevation of human personality.

Pratyabhijna Philosophy has also been understood as a correct interpretation of the Indian Philosophy, or in other words, a proper

evaluation of Indian culture. It will be noticed that Indian culture is indeed human culture. The Pratyabhijna system has laid a great emphasis on "Freedom" (Svatantrya) of man, and "Freedom" and human culture are considered one and the same thing. It has revealed the law of humanity and the essentials of human society, viz. Liberty, Equality and Fraternity. The doctrine of human equality and universal brotherhood has originated from all the religious schools. The Christian doctrine basis its ethics on the notion: 'God is the father of human race, men his children, owe Him an account of their acts... Love of God, the father of all men, is to be translated into the accomplishment of the law of neighbourly love, that is to say, the love of all men.' Likewise the Muslim doctrine teaches the universal brotherhood and the love of ones's fellow men. The same doctrine of universal brotherhood and world peace is taught in the Sikh religion. Buddhism has its dogma of universal love, altruism and non-violence. The Pratyabhijna Philosophy, which is indeed a revaluation of Indian Philosophy, has also recognised universal brotherhood and equality of all men, as it has aptly established the fact that it is one Universal Soul which lives in all mankind. These truths are now admitted as the essentials of human culture. The highest objective of the Indian Philosophy is the peaceful existence and welfare of the whole human race. This is best expressed in the Ishavasyopanishada 6 & 7 :

यस्तु सर्वाणि भूतान्यात्मन्येवानु पश्यति । सर्वभूतेषु चात्मानं ततो न विजुगुप्सते । ”

यस्मिन्सर्वाणि भूतान्यात्मैवाभूद्विजानतः । तत्र को मोहः कः शोक एकत्वमनुपश्यतः ।
(He who sees all creatures in himself, himself in all creatures, does not show abhorrence to any one 6.) (Knowing all living beings to be one's own self, seeing the unity of mankind, how can there be delusion, suffering or sorrow ? 7). Lasting peace of mankind (Vishva-shanti) is the *summum bonum* of the Upanishadas which is also the aim of every religious doctrine. In the words of Dr. S. Radhakrishnan, what we need is "a recognition of those supreme ends of life to which science and organization, discipline and obedience are to be harnessed." Human culture that the Indian philosophy teaches is 'an evolution of man towards his emancipation, his liberation from material dangers, his advance to a state in which all the sublime germs of which he is the chosen vessel may develop — Art, Science, the social idea, the philosophic idea'. It is therefore a mistake to suppose that Indian Philosophy is in contradiction with all the causes of human progress, Science, Technology and the idea of Society. The recent events have shown that Indian

Philosophy or Indian culture has done the greatest service to mankind otherwise all humanity would have been menaced with destruction. It is, in fact, leading the world to real peace and progress.

The major part of this work is primarily based on the direct study of the texts on the subject. The earlier works by various scholars have been drawn upon firstly for supplying the needs of the general readers and secondly for a critical and comparative examination of different views held.

Glimpses of the present Study :—The main body of the treatise is divided into three parts, Part I—"Origin and Development of the Pratyabhijna System", Part II—"Exposition of its doctrines" and Part III—"Its place in Indian and Western systems of Philosophy."

Part I (Origin and Development) :—At the very outset of this part, the controvertial view points of some scholars are discussed with reference to (1) the name of the system, (2) the time of the existence of the Pratyabhijna Philosophy, according to Dr. K. C. Pandey, (3) the time of the existence of the system, according to Dr. Lachhmi Dhar, (4) The connection of this Philosophy with Shankaracharya's school of Vedanta and (5) a tradition in Kashmir about the differences between the Pratyabhijna Philosophy and the Vedanta system. All these discussions bring out the following results :—

(i) **The name of the system :—**Dr. Pandey prefers to call this system 'Trika' as he says, in his book "A'bhinavagupta" (An Historical and Philosophical Study), "It is a misnomer to call this system of Philosophy 'Pratyabhijna' or 'Spanda' as much as it would be to call India 'Calcutta' or 'Bombay'." Dr. Pandey does not seem to be differentiating the 'Pratyabhijna' as 'Philosophy proper of the Trika system' (as Pt. Madhusudan Koul puts it in his perface to *Ishvara Pratyabhijna Vimarshini* Vol. I); Trika is the name of the non-dualistic system of Shaiva cult of which 'Pratyabhijna' is the Philosophical part. It is the latter part only which can be called the "Pratyabhijna Philosophy," but the whole Trika system cannot be called the "Trika Philosophy," Sixty four systems of the Shaiva cult have been enumerated in the Shaiva scriptures which include Trika as one of them. These are all the religious systems but not the philosophical schools. Praytabhijna is the name given by Utpaladeva to this philosophical system which is treated of by him in his work "*Ishvara Pratyabhijna Karikas* (Sutras)." But before Utpaladeva

gave this name to the system, it appears to be called "Shaiva Darshana" as is apparent from the title of the Somananda's work "Shivadrshiti." This system must have been known as Pratyabhijna system in the later ages as it is so called by Madhavacharya in his Sarvadarshana Samgraha in the 14th century A. D. Dr. S. Radhakrishnan also calls it the Pratyabhijna system in his 'Indian Philosophy' (Vol. II) for the said reason. Dr. Pandey brings to notice elsewhere that the system is also known as Svatantraya-vada and Abhasavada, but these are the names of the various doctrines of the system and as such can not be the names of the whole system. The system is also generally called "Kashmir Shaivism", the name given to it by J. C. Chatterji, because all writers on it belonged to Kashmir. It is however, concluded that the system, which we mean a philosophic system, cannot be called by any other name, Trika, Spanda, Svatantryavada or Abhasada or a more general name Shaiva system, except the Pratyabhijna system.

(ii) **Emergence of Pratyabhijna School** :—The Pratyabhijna system arose in Kashmir in the second half of the ninth century A. D. Somananda was the founder of this school, as he, for the first time, briefly laid down its main doctrines in his work 'Shivadrshiti.' Utpaladeva, the disciple of Somananda, who lived in the tenth century A. D., was the systematiser of the Philosophy. He formulated the doctrines taught by his teacher in his Ishvara Pratyabhijna Karikas (or Sutras). The well-known Abhinavagupta, who flourished towards the eleventh Century A. D., made this philosophy intellegible in his two commentaries (one short and the other long) on Pratyabhijna Karikas, namely the Vimarshini and the Vivrti-vimarshini. He, therefore, occupies the same position in this realm of thought as the expounder of the system like the great Shankaracharya in the domain of Vedanta.

(iii) **Its connecton with other systems of Indian Philosophy** :— The Kashmir Shaivas claim that the system, which they generally call by the name "Trika" is the highest monistic system based throughout on the sacred authority of Shaivagamas, to which they ascribe divine origin and eternal existence. They do not at all recognise the authority of the Vedic scriptures ; but they aim at refuting the view points of the Vedanta and other systems evolved from the Vedic sources. They assign superiority to the Pratyabhijna system which, in their view, is the only perfect and correct sytem transcending all other systems of philosophy, It will be clear from the following pages that in its main doctrins the Pratyabhijna

system is not fundamentally different from the Vedanta, as initially set forth in the Upanishadas, which are the fountain-head of all the systems of thought in India, the Sankhya, the Vaisheshika, the Vaiyakarana (the Gremmarians' School), the Buddhist, and the Vedanta and so on. It will be observed that there is a common theme in all these philosophical systems in India. The same is the central theme in the Pratyabhijna system, or, as a matter of fact, of any other Shaiva system in India. These systems, however, differ from one another in holding different points of view, in propounding some new doctrines of their own and also adopting different nomenclature, viz. technical terms. The Shaivaists, the originators of the system, have incorporated most of the ideas from the Sankhya, the Vaiyakarana, the Buddhist and the Vedanta systems and have presented their various doctrines in a technique of their own, based upon certain tenets derived from Shaivagamas. which distinguish the Pratyabhijna system from the other systems.

Religious and Philosophical Background :- Part I of the work further gives a study of the religious and philosophic background which brought about the emergence of Pratyabhijna school in Kashmir. The evidences show that there existed in Kashmir in very ancient times a polytheistic religion, which included, among many other primitive types of worships, the worship of the aboriginal deities such as God Shiva, Vinayaka, Various Vedic and Puranic Gods, and even the worship of the Buddha as an Autar. We learn that Shiva worship occupied the first place among the Hindu cults of the valley from the earliest times. While a number of old cults and religious practices flourished in Kashmir, at times, various religious and philosophical doctrines reached there from outside its boundaries. Buddhism, a historic movement, spreading far and wide, was also welcomed by Kashmiris near about the time of Ashoka (273-232 B. C.). Kashmiris became active participants in the Buddhist ideology since that time. Nagasen (150 B.C.), the reputed author of Milinda-Panha, is said to be a Kashmirian. Kumaralabdha, one of the four luminaries of Buddhism, is also known to be a Kashmiri. Nagarjuna, a native of Berar, stayed to study in Kashmir for long. 'Ashvagosha is said to have been brought by Kanishka (78-102 A. C.) from Patliputra to Kashmir to function as the Vice-President of the Great Buddhist Council held in the Kundala-Vana-Vihara (near about the present Harwan water reservoir) in Kasmir.' (Research-I P. 4). Dr. Pandey writes that 'Buddhism had a strong-hold in Kashmir since the time of Ashoka. It was in Kasmira that Kanishka

convoked an assembly of the Buddhist theologians.....Its existence was particularly felt by the Shaivas when Kanishka made a gift of Kasmira (Kanishka-puram) to Buddhist church and Nagarjuna came to power and began to spread Buddhism. The aggressive attitude of Nagarjuna is referred to by Kalhana and by Varadaraja in his *Shiva-sutra-vartika*. (History of Philosophy, Eastern and Western, Vol. I, Chapter by Dr. Pandey, P. 381) Buddhism and Brahmanic cults, however, existed peacefully side by side in Kashmir for centuries before Kalhana's time (cf. Chronicle of the Kings of Kashmir, Introduction P. 9). Heun Tsang who, visited Kashmir during the years 630-645 A.D., and Ou-Kong, who visited the valley during 759-763 A. D. witnessed Buddhism flourishing in the country and being patronised by the rulers. Inspite of the phenomenal success which Buddhism had in Kashmir, Shaivism continued to be a vital force from the past. A revival of Shaivism, however, came in Kashmir from the seventh century A. D. Shankaracharya (780-812 A. D.) is said to have visited Kashmir to give a final blow to Buddhism there. Eighth and ninth centuries of the Christian era seem to have witnessed a religious upheaval in the valley of Kashmir (Introduction to Ishvara-Pratyabhijna Vimarshini, P. I.), as a result of which Buddhism appears to be disappearing and the old Hinduism, particularly Shaivism, taking hold of the people. Consequently, Kashmir was the meeting-ground of the various philosophical currents at the time of the rise of the monistic Shaivism (History of Philosophy Eastern and Western, Vol. I, P. 381, Chapter by Dr. Pandey). In the ninth century A. D., there existed a concourse of various religious and philosophical ideas as professed by Buddhists and the followers of other orthodox creeds: the Vaidyakas, the Shaivas, the Shaktas, the Vaiyakaranas (Grammarians), the Sankhyas, the Naiyayikas, the Vedantins and upholders of the Yoga systems. It was from all these prevailing ideas that the Pratyabhijna system of Philosophy emerged in the Shaiva-fold in the valley of Kashmir. The work further gives a brief survey of the earlier speculations and philosophical doctrines in the Vedas, the Upanishadas and the Buddhist sources and also in the various systems of philosophy prevailing in the valley before the emergence of the Pratyabhijna school. From these studies it is concluded that the origination of the Pratabhijna school was, in fact, nothing new but only a logical development of the philosophic and religious ideas already existing in Kashmir.

Development of the Pratyabhijna system :- Part I of the work further gives a brief history of the development of the Pratyabhi-

jna system on the basis of the Shaiva literature. It distinguishes the two stages of its development viz., (1) the earlier stage as revealed in the teachings of Somananda in his work *Shivadrshiti*, (The name of the Somananda's system appears to be still "Shiva Dharshana" by which any Shaiva System was generally called in ancient days. Somananda refutes all the older systems, not only of Vaidyikas but also different schools of Shaivas and Shaktas and introduces in his work new trends of thought and view-points which were later on systematised by his pupil Utpaladeva.) and (2) The later stage of its development in the final form as formulated by Utpaladeva in his work, the *Ishvara Pratyabhijna Karikas* or *Sutras*. These were expounded by Abhinavagupta in his two commentaries, one short, called *Vimarshini*, and the other long, called *Vivrtti Vimarshini*. At the later stage Utpaladeva evidently names the system as the "Pratyabhijna Darshana" indicated by the title of his work "*Ishvara Pratyabhijna Sutras*." The work gives next a brief history of the pioneers of the system and their attainments and works.

Part II "Exposition of its Doctrines":- In this part attempt is made to expound the various tenets of Pratyabhijna system from the first-hand study of the original texts. The doctrines of the system in the earlier and the later stages of development are separately treated in two different sections. A free translation of the ideas given in the relevant texts, *Shivadrshiti* and *Ishvara Pratyabhijna Karikas* and *Vimarshini*, etc. has been given in proper context for a faithful representation of various doctrines of the system. All these doctrines are put together in the present work in such a manner as to form a compact whole of the Pratyabhijna Philosophy. No attempt has been made to give the literal translation of the *Sutras* or the commentaries. On the other hand, clear exposition of the doctrines is aimed at by interpreting as much of the comprehensive and difficult texts as possible. It may be stated here for the information of the readers that the English translation of the *Ishvara Pratyabhijna Vimarshini* by Dr. K. C. Pandey has already appeared in "The Princess of Wales Saraswati Bhawana Texts." (as No. 48)

Brief idea of Somananda's doctrines:- Somananda's work *Shivadrshiti* consists of 7 chapters (*Ahnikas*), the purport of which is as follows:- Chapter I of the work explains why and how the Ultimate Cause Shiva materializes in a concrete form of the universe consisting of diverse

animate and inanimate objects. Shiva constitutes the 'essence and identity' (Self) of every being; He abounds in bliss and consciousness and is all-pervasive. (आत्मैव सर्वभावेषु स्फुरन्निर्वृतचिद्विभुः ।) He is an unrestrained stream of 'Will' (free will) and a spontaneous flow of 'Cognition' and 'Activity'. (अनिरुद्धेच्छाप्रसरः प्रसरद् दृक् क्रियः शिवः) (Shivadrshiti—1, 2) This benign principle - Shiva-Tattva, the Ultimate Reality, is eternal and endless. (शिवतत्त्वं नित्यमनन्तकम्) From his native characteristics bliss (Nirvrti) and consciousness (Chit), comprising his transcendental state, stream forth sovereignty of 'will' and powers of 'knowledge' and 'Action', (Iccha shakti, jnana shakti and kriya shakti), From them emanate thirty six Tattvas (the principles of creation) from which evolves the whole universe consisting of diverse creation. Somananda, like Schopenhauer, the German Voluntarist, postulates the doctrine of "Will as the (first) cause of everything", 'Will' as a force of spontaneity (urgency), instinct and spring of life. Power of 'Will' (iccha shakti) is the initial or the basic power, the root cause of all creation. Schopenhauer holds that the chief place in Philosophy belongs not to the intellect, but to the 'will'—

"A motion and spirit that impels
All thinking things, all objects of all thoughts,
And rolls through all things,"

In this doctrine of 'sovereignty of will' Somananda represents the voluntaristic tendency of thought. The teacher next explains Shiva's *Transcendence* and *Immanence*. His *Transcendence*, called *Para* or *Annutara dasha*, is that state in which He exists in the plenitude of his powers (shaktis) of will, cognition and action. His *immanence*, called *Apara dasha*, is that state in which He transforms Himself in diverse limited objects of the universe. Somananda further describes the first process of creation and its subsequent processes and the final process of diversified creations. In this doctrine a controversy is raised and Somananda answers all the objections.

In Chapter II of the work, Somananda enunciates and refutes the theory of Vaiyakaranas (Grammarians) according to which the Pashyanti Vak (the Transcendental word) is the ultimate cause of the universe. This chapter gives a long controversy with the Grammarians regarding this doctrine in which are brought out the essential characteristics of the Ultimate Cause, viz. the powers of will, knowledge

and action, which make it potent to evolve the creation. The Gram-marians' theory, Shabdbrahmavada, is thus refuted. According to Somanada, the Para, the primordial state of Pashyanti Vak is the Ultimate.

In Chapter III of Shivadrsti is rejected the view upheld by the Shaktas viz. Shaktyadvayavada, according to which Shakti (Power) independent of Shiva as Shaktiman (One possessing Power) is the Supreme Cause. Attacks are also directed against Dualistic Shaivas and the followers of Yoga Philosophy. In Chapter IV of his work Somananda criticises summarily a number of other systems, such as, the various schools of Buddhism and the monistic Vedanta, the Jainism, the Sankhya, the Nyaya, the Vaishehika and so on. He thus distinctly refers to the various schools of thought prevailing in his time, all of which he considers illogical and unsound, and makes a rationalistic approach to the problem concerning the Ultimate Reality according to the points of view of the School of the Monistic Shaivas which he represents. In Chapter V, Somananda demonstrates the identity in nature of all animate and inanimate objects in this diverse world and gives proofs in support of the Monistic doctrine. Somananda brings here a controversy. An objection is raised : if we admit all that exists is one Shiva, there arise the impossibilities of practical life. Somananda explains that, notwithstanding every thing in nature being identical, all the acts of practical life are real since they proceed from the self-dependent power (Svatantrya Shakti) of the Ultimate Being (Lord) who materialises himself in the form of all the created beings. There arises no question of violating the practice of the world and our duties with regard to it. It cannot, therefore, be assumed that virtue (dharma) and vice (adharma) cannot affect pure Shiva in the form of Jiva; the books and teachers are not necessary for imparting knowledge to omniscient Shiva in the form of a disciple ; and so on. All these essentials of practical life are real and not useless (Shivadrsti III). Just as a Yogin does not get himself divided in the various bodies created by him by his power of Tapas, the Lord does not undergo division by the various objects of superior, middle and inferior classes created by him like an ocean by ripples and waves (Shivadrshi III 36 & 37). In canto VI of the work Somananda considers all other systems objectionable, being faulty or deficient. In the last Chapter of his work, he gives the summum bonum of his system, stating that Recognitive realization (Pratyabhijna) only enables a person to attain extraordinary powers and ultimately

leads him to final beatitude. The Recognition is the means of realizing Shiva as immanent in the universe by the process of simultaneously perceiving (drashta) and recalling (smarna) the characteristics existing eternally in Him and not unrealised before (Nananubhutam) (Ibid. IV, 118, 119 & 120.)

Somananda says, whether Shiva is realized or unrealized, there is no cessation of His nature. Whether fire is known or not known, it will not cease to give light and heat; if a piece of gold remains unknown, it will not change into a piece of stone. (Shivadrshiti VII, 1—2) But if the nature of fire is known that it gives light and heat, its knowledge enables us to make proper use of it for lighting our houses and other purposes. वह्निर्यद्यपि विज्ञातः प्रकाशादि करोत्यसौ तथापि योजितो युक्त्या प्रकाशमधिकं गृहे । (Ibid. 10-11.) Similarly by knowing the value and the qualities of the gold we can make proper use of it. Thus if the nature of Shiva-Atman (Self) is known, proper use of His powers—iccha, jnana and kriya—will enable us to accomplish our desired objects. According to Somananda, in the words of Dr. Pandey, the realization consists 'not in the actualization of the potential; nor in the attainment of something new; nor in knowing what was unknown before; but in penetrating through the veil, that makes the Maheshvara appear as the individual, of which every one is immediately aware, and in recognising the Maheshvara in the individual. He holds that the individual is essentially free; freedom is the inner being of the individual. But it is hidden by the veil of ignorance. The ignorance has to be removed to recognise it, to realise it as identical with the Reality, (Dr. Pandey, Introduction to Bhaskari, Vol. II pp. v and vi)

Utpaladeva's approach to the Pratyabhijna Philosophy : Utpaladeva's work—Ishvara Pratyabhijna Karikas (Sutras)—is divided into four sections—Adhikaras. The first section—Jnanadhikara deals with Cognition; the second section—Kriyadhikara treats of Activity; the third section—Agama-dhikara discusses the 36 principles (Tattvas) of Shaiva school; and the fourth section—Tattvarthasamgraha-dhikara relates to the essential nature of the Supreme Being and recapitulates the doctrines expounded in the foregoing Adhikaras. In all 16 Ahnikas (cantos) of the work cover all the four sections.

In Ahnika I of Section I of the work, Utpaladeva follows his teacher in attributing the powers of Action and Cognition, or the same

in reverse order, to the Self, the Ultimate Cause (called in his system Meheshvara) as His two primary powers. Later he assigns the Sovereignty of Will (माहेश्वर्य) also as another primary power to the Ultimate Cause. All creation from an atom to a mountain, all that lives or can be said to exist in any form, in the form of sentient or insentient object, microcosm or macrocosm, is endowed with these two characteristics (यो हि जानाति च करोति च सजीवति) In the Introductory verse (I, 1) of his work Utpaladeva says, "...Wishing to help men I set forth the Pratyabhijna Philosophy which is the means of attaining all that is of highest value". (The original line is quoted on P. 7). On this point the teacher introduces a discussion. The Purvapakshin questions, when Atman (Self) is the self-luminous Maheshvara, the Ultimate Being, Actor and the Knower, where arises the occasion for His Recognition or realisation? All talk of establishing or rejecting the existence of such an eternal and conscious Being is in vain.

(कर्तरि ज्ञातरि स्वात्मन्यादिसिद्धे महेश्वरे । अजडात्मा निषेधं वा सिद्धिं वा

विदधीतकः 1, 2.) The Uttarapakshin, the teacher, answers the question : although Atman is self-luminous, yet His real nature is not manifest due to His own deluding power (माया विमोहिनी शक्ति). It, however, becomes manifest by his own perceiving power (दृक्क्रियात्मिका शक्ति) which remains hidden from awareness due to his innate delusion. It is the Recognitive insight (Pratyabhijna) which revives this perceiving power. (किंतु मोहवशादस्मिन्दृष्टेऽप्यनुपलक्षिते । शक्त्याविष्करणेनैव प्रत्यभिज्ञोपदर्श्यते

1 3.) The Purvapakshin questions again, the perceiving power can be possible with regard to sentient beings only ; how is it to be assigned to insentient objects? The teacher answers the question : the existence of insentient objects depends upon sentient beings, for it is an admitted fact that the life of all living things comprises 'Knowledge' and 'Action.' Thus in their very manifestation the insentient objects are also endowed with these two characteristics. Again, the Purvapakshin questions, how is the existence of Knowledge and Action as two primary powers of Atman to be proved? The teacher says, Out of these two, Knowledge is self-established (स्वतः सिद्धम्) whereas Action (which is also self-established स्वतः सिद्धा) is associated with a body (क्रिया-कायाश्रितासती) and is thus perceptible to other perceivers ; and it is through Action that others' Knowledge can be inferred. In this

manner all the objections with regard to Recognition are waived. (Ref. Pratyabhijna Sutras 1, 4 and 5.)

In the next two Ahnikas (Cantos 2 & 3) the teacher introduces another discussion to refute the theory of Buddhist Saugatās, according to which the perceiving Self is not a permanent being. The theory of the Saugatās is based on their doctrine of General Momentariness. Utpaladeva rejects the theory mainly on the ground of the phenomena of remembrance, and establishes the existence of permanent Self. He says, if we do not admit a persisting Self, the settled order of the world will not be possible. In the state of General Momentariness, even perception is impossible, since the three notions occurring in this experience viz. 'I', 'awareness' and the 'object', belonging to three different moments of time, can not be joined together in one identical relation. The Buddhists have no reason to suppose that these three notions do not involve three successive stages. On the other hand, we are conscious of our identity that we persist in all our changing states of consciousness, and though our ideas are continuously changing with the changing objects, we remain unchanged all the same, and this shows that in knowing ourselves as pure 'awareness', we are successively connected with the changing objects. The existence of a permanent entity persisting in the changing states of consciousness is established as a matter of our common experience, as it is this persisting entity Self which, in the later state of remembrance, remembers an object which he perceives in the previous state. On this point the Purvapakshin states that 'it is the residual trace or impression (Samskar) that causes remembrance. Therefore, it is unnecessary to assume the existence of another superfluous entity, Atman'. Utpaladeva replies this point saying that one perception, say, the perception of sight differs from another, say, the perception of taste. As stated by the Purvapakshin (Bauddha), remembrance of previous perception arises from the residual trace or impression (Samskar) which is supposed to be the common ground of perceptions without recourse to a persisting self. By such an assumption it follows that one impression (Samskar), say, the impression of sight-perception should cause the remembrance of a different perception, say, taste-perception and vice versa. This evidently leads us to impossibilities, unless we admit the existence of a persisting Self Who experiences different states of consciousness.

After proving the existence of a permanent Self (Atman), called

Mahesvara, Utpaladeva states that He is endowed with three powers, viz. the power of Remembrance (Smarana Shakti), the power of Knowledge (Jnana shakti) and the power of Differentiation (Apojana shakti) which are the three forms of Cognitive Power (Jnatratva shakti), the first Primary power assigned to the Self. The Power of Remembrance (Smarana Shakti) is that power by virtue of which Atman who experiences the perception of an object in one state, remembers the same in another state. In the latter state the Self is rememberer (smarata). In the absence of remembrance also the self still exists possessing the power of Remembrance (Smarana shakti), as one of his powers or faculties. The power of remembrance is fully discussed in Ahnika 4. The power of Knowledge (Jnana shakti) functions in making objects manifest externally in the form of their perceptions which existed within in the form of self-consciousness. By virtue of this power the Self takes out for separate manifestation only certain things from the unlimited mass which lies merged in it (स्वरूपादुन्मग्नमाभासयति). The real nature of objects, according to the system, is Prakasha (manifestation) (प्रकाश एव अर्थानां स्वरूपम्) which is innate in Jnana shakti. From this point of view objects are real against the Vijnana-vadin's theory that they are the transformation of our Vasana (desires) and do not have separate real existence. The processes (Vrtis) of mind (Antah Karana) viz. will (iccha), Knowledge (Jnana) and action (Kriya) function by the power of Knowledge (Jnana shakti). The power of Knowledge is explained in detail in Ahnika 5. The power of Differentiation (Apojana shakti) is that power of Self which enables Him to manifest one object, say, a jar (ghata) different from any other object, non-jar (aghta), or the appearance (Prakasha) of an object different from its disappearance (Aprakasha). The doctrine concerning the power of differentiation is expounded in Ahnika 6. After explaining the functions of these three powers, Utpaladeva proves that they rest in one substratum, the lasting Self (Atman), the Maheshvara. This is established on logical grounds in Ahnika 7. Maheshvara is assigned the sovereignty of will (माहेश्वर्य) or Volitional power (Iccha shakti) as its another Primary power. Somananda has treated this as the first or basic power in Shivadrsti I. This power, माहेश्वर्य, is explained by Utpaladeva in Pratyabhijna Sutras (Ahnika 8) in a novel way. Here he introduces two new theories, (1) Svatantrya-vada and (2) Abhasavada which are explained elsewhere in this chapter.

Section 2 (Kriyadhikara) of the work deals with Kriya-shakti (the power of physical Activity), the second primary power of the Ultimate Reality. The whole creation or, in other words, manifestation is the result of the Kriya shakti; as under the operation of its three laws, viz. the law of Divison (भेदाभेद), the law of perception (मान तत्फल मेय) and the law of Causation (कार्य कारण) it turns into a constituent power (निर्माण शक्ति) which brings into existence the whole cosmos. In section I of Kriyadhikara, Utpaladeva discusses the nature of Kriya-shakti. In regard to this, the Purvapakshin questions: Kriya involves succession (krama) causing plurality which is contrary to the nature of Self Who is, in essence, devoid of plurality, according to the Monistic Doctrine of Shaivas. The Utrapakshin, teacher, answers as follows:—Action (Kriya) involves plurality on account of the function of काल शक्ति (principle of time). Plurality is the result of perception of an object at different moments of time:— कालः सूर्यादि संचारस्तत्तत्पुष्पादि जन्म वा । शीतोष्ण वाथ तल्लक्ष्यः क्रम एव सत्त्वतः । Self possessing the Kriya-shakti as one of His primary powers is unaffected by Kala-Shakti and is thus free from the nature of plurality. The teacher explains plurality also by the theory of Manifestation (Abhasa-vada), which is a quite new theory in the Praytabhijna Philosophy. According to this theory, Atman or Maheshvara (Lord) is the Manifester of diverse manifestations (चित्राभासकृत-प्रभो) in the form of various objects of this universe. The Kala Shakti of this Lord (Atman) differentiates various manifestations at different moments of time as distinct entities. By this theory of manifestation (Abhasavada) are also explained the relations of Plurality and Unity (Bhedabheda), the relation of 'Subject,' 'awareness' and the 'object' (Pramata, Pramana and Prameya) and the relation of Cause and Effect (Karana karaya), in conformity with the doctrine of Monism (Advaita). Ultimately there exists Unity in Plurality (Bhedabheda). This is the first or the fundamental law of Kriya Shakti of which the other two laws, the law of Perception and the law of Causation, are derivatives or corollaries. These three laws are comprehensively discussed, in three separate sections of Kriyadhikara, in Utpaladeva's work. Thus in this system One Lord is both the Manifester subject (Aham) and the manifested object (Idam). The manifested world is analysed into thirty-six Categories (or principles of Creation) called Tattvas, from Shiva, the highest principle, to the earth, the principle of solidity.

Part III, Agamadhikara, of Utpaladeva's work treats of different supernatural elements as derived from the dogmas of the Agama-shastra. After describing the thirty-six Categories of Abhasa-vada, it gives the pure and impure creation of perceivers (Pramatas); the bondage (Samsara) and freedom (Svatantrya); the impurities (Malas)—Anava (the innate impurity), Mayiya (the impurity caused by the principle of limitation—Maya) and Karmiya (impurity in the shape of lack of knowledge of right and wrong actions); the different states of perceivers, viz. Jagarat (waking), Svapana (dreaming), Sushupti (dreamless sleep), Turya (fourth state) and Turyatita (beyond the fourth state); released souls (Pati) and the other perceivers (Pasu); common creation; the two classes of Samsarins (worldly men); four methods of realisation for liberation (freedom), Shambhavopaya, Shaktopaya, Anavopaya and Anupaya and so on. (The fourth and fifth states given above are those of the Yogin's intuition).

Part IV, Tattva-samgrahadhikara, the last part of the Utpaladeva's work, recapitulates all the important doctrines of the Praytabhijna system as discussed in the first three parts of the work and explains further the essential nature of the Highest Being which is the Self of all living beings (स्वात्मैव सर्व जन्तूनामेक एव महेश्वरः). The *summum bonum* of this system is to 'recognise' the supreme and free nature of Self realizing that all this world is one's own creation (सर्वो ममायं विभव इत्येवं परिजानतः). Thus fully knowing one's Self and its highest potential powers of Cognition and Action, one thinks and acts in a right manner to see all his desired objects accomplished. (एवमात्मानमेतस्य सम्यग्ज्ञानक्रिये तथा । जानन्यथेप्सितान्पश्यञ्जानाति च करोति च ॥) (Ishara Pratyabhijna Sutras IV, 1.) The gratification one feels by realizing one's self as supreme and free soul is best described by Utpaladeva by the example of the proverbial maiden (in Ahnika IV, 2) of the work: 'A certain damsel, hearing of the many good qualities of a particular gallant, fell in love with him and agitated by her passion and unable to suffer the pain caused by his absence from her, wrote to him a love letter describing her condition. He at once came to her; but when she saw him, she did not recognise in him the qualities she had heard about; he appeared much the same as any other person and she found no gratification in his society. Soon, however, as she recognised those qualities (in him) as her companion now pointed them out, she was fully gratified. Similarly one cannot get

the real happiness unless one recognises the nature of Supreme Self in one's individual self.' (तैस्तैरप्युपयाचितैरुपनतस्तनव्याः स्थितोऽप्यन्तिके । कान्तो लोकसमान एवमपरिज्ञातो न रन्तं यथा । लोकस्यैष तथा...) When one recognises one's profounder Self, he feels that he has attained what is of highest value, as he will not be wanting anything because of his former inferiority complex, since he finds that his own profounder faculties, now-recognised, are there to provide him what he wants and to lead him to final beatitude. Utpaladeva says, at the end, that he has set forth this Ishvara Pratyabhijna "in order that common man may have the transcendental power (Siddhi) without much effort." (जनस्यायत्नसिद्धयर्थम्.....इश्वरप्रत्यभिज्ञे यमुत्पलेनोपपादिता)

Part III "Place of Pratyabhijna in Indian and Western systems of Philosophy":- This part of the work reviews the allied philosophical movements in India and the West as represented by (1) the Shaiva systems of India; (2) The Vedic and Buddhist Systems of Indian Philosophy; and (3) the Western Schools of Philosophy. A comparison and contrast is made between the various doctrines of the Pratyabhijna system and the allied doctrines of other schools to indicate the distinctive features of this system and in what respects it transcends the other systems.

Philosophic Movements in India and the West :- In the development of philosophical thought in India there arose two main movements, the Vedic and the non-Vedic. The Vedic movement grew within the ambit of Vedic scriptures and the non-Vedic movement developed from the Shaivagamas, Shaiva scriptures. The former movement started sometime between second and third millinium B.C. when Aryans settled in this country and produced their literature, known as the Vedic literature. Some hymns of the Rig-veda, the oldest of the Vedas, and the later Vedic literature the Upanishadas indicate that various speculations were held by the Vedic Indians regarding the origin and nature of creation. The Shaiva movement in India dates from centuries earlier than the Vedic movement. The inscriptions of Mohenjo-daro and Harappa have revealed that the Shaiva cult was in vogue as far back as 3000 B.C. Sir John Marshall says, "Amongst the many revelations that Mohenjo-daro and Harappa have had in store for us, none perhaps is more remarkable than the discovery that Shaivism had a history going back to the Chalcolithic age or perhaps even farther still. The philosophical specula-

tions seem to have also been growing among the Shaivas who lived side by side with Vaidyakas and Bauddhas long before the Christian era. In Europe, the philosophic conceptions started in Greece with the question 'what constitutes the primordial natural force-principle,' from about 600 B. C., when Thales declared water to be the first principle—the Universal Substratum, *Prima Materia* of all things, of which the other bodies are mere modifications." Thales was followed by other Greek philosophers, Anaximender, Anaximenes, Pythagoras and so on who in the beginning held materialistic conception of the Universal Substratum or the *Prima Materia* of all things. It is said that Philosophy has its origin in the Greek race; but the Greeks themselves supposed their early teachers to have imbibed wisdom at the eastern fount.

Indian Philosophy (Vedic and Buddhist) :- It is difficult to indicate with any degree of certainty the different stages in the development of thought in India. But it is certain that long before the composition of the hymns of the Rig-veda, Indo-Aryans had outstripped the primitive simplicity of thought and had developed the conception of gods as forces behind the natural phenomena. From the cosmogonic hymns, or the hymns of creation, which we find in the tenth Mandala of the Rig-veda, it is evident that the Vedic Indians produced deep philosophical lucubrations expressing their growing curiosity to know the origin and nature of creation. N. Mukharji, the author of "A Study of Shankara" is justified to state, "It is therefore that the question that man has asked in all ages and in every clime, has found expression in the hymns of the Rig-veda not in its primitive simplicity but with timeless and universal moulding that the vision of a poet or seer could give it." In the words of the Vedic seer को अद्वा वेद क इह प्रवोचत् कुतः आजाता कुत इयं विसृष्टिः (Who knows truly? Who shall here declare, whence it has been produced; whence is this creation?) we find the primitive inquiries made in the hoary ages regarding the Ultimate Cause of this creation, which are indeed the beginnings of the philosophical thinking in India. In the Vedic movement, in fact, various tendencies or currents of thought appear growing and changing, Naturalism, Anthropomorphism, Monotheism and finally Monism. The Vedic thinkers were led to suppose that there is one divinity, one superior power, which they called by various names and spoke in various ways: इन्द्रं मित्रं वरुणमग्निमाहु रथो दिव्यः ससुपर्णो गुरुत्मान् । एकं सद्विप्रा बहुधा वदन्त्यग्निं यमं

मातरिश्वानमाहु । "Such monotheistic ideas later gave rise to various speculations about the nature of this divinity or Godhead, the Ultimate cause of life and existence in an individual (microcosm) and in the universe (macrocosm) around, as we find in the upanishadas, the later literary product of the Vedic age, which are the fountain-head of the Monistic doctrines. It is from this ultimate source that Shankara's system of Vedanta and the Pratyabhijna Philosophy developed in the Vedic and non-vedic folds respectively.

It is said that the philosophic spirit grew in India from the age of the Buddha, before the country had developed any philosophy proper on rational basis ; It is, however, apparent that Philosophical speculations had already grown in the Vedic age as indicated by some philosophic hymns in the Rig Veda and the Upanishadas. Rational thinking originated when Buddhists questioned about the different speculations of the Vaidyikas. The earliest philosophic doctrines, such as Vijnana-vada and Kshanika-vada evolved from Buddhists. Later on the speculations of the Upanishadas assumed different forms in various systems of philosophy which developed in post-Vedic ages. Definite doctrines and different philosophic theories evolved from various schools of thought, such as, Dvaita (Dualism), Advaita (non-dualism), Vishishtadvaita (modified non-dualism) and Dvaitadvaita (Unity in difference). The last theory ultimately culminated in the non-dualistic doctrine of Shankracharya.

Shaivistic Philosophy : It has been stated above that the Shaiva cult was in vogue as far back as 3000 B. C., centuries earlier than the Vedic age. The history of Shiva-worship in India shows that it is of pre-Aryan origin. There are numerous references in Vedic literature which show that worship of Shiva was in vogue in the country in the Vedic age. Some of the references clearly indicate that this form of worship was gradually borrowed by Aryans from non-Aryans. Round this Shiva-worship there grew a mass of literature belonging to Shiva-shakti cults, which is known as "Agamas and Tantras". It developed through ages side by side with and possibly independent of the Vedic scriptures. Shaivas seem to have borrowed most of the ideas from the scriptures of the Vaidyikas. Consequently, in a place like India, where different schools of thought had grown in the Vedic fold, development of similar schools within the ambit of Shaiva fold was but inevitable. Shri S. G. Sakharpekar mentions, in his address on "Shaivagama",

delivered in the Seventh All-India Oriental Conference (1933), that before the arrival of Shankaracharya on the religious stage, the Agama-vadins of the Shaiva School were separated into different schools, viz. Mahapashupatas, Shaiva Siddhanta, Nipala-Pashupatas, Kashmira Shaivas and Vira Shaivas. These different Shaiva sects also held varied philosophical theories, such as Dvaita (Dualism), Advaita (Non-dualism), Dvaita-dvaita. (Dualism-cum-monism) and so on, like the similar schools of the Vedic fold. The non-dualistic trend of thought in the Shaiva movement finally culminated in the form of the Monistic System of Pratyabhijna Philosophy.

Western Philosophy:- The earliest Greek speculators, like the first Indian thinkers, were the physical philosophers, who assigned the Cause of the universe to various original substances like elemental water, air, fire, or all the four elements, or atoms. Some assigned it to abstractions like numbers or 'One' as the beginning of all things, or one God or one Finite or Infinite being and so on. Various other schools conceived the Ultimate Cause as pure Being, the one universal essence; subjective conception; or the totality of thought. Fichte, Schelling and Hegel finally represent the three idealistic movements of the later Western Philosophy. Fichte's Subjective Idealism explains that the object-tree and its image is the modification of my mind; Schelling's Objective Idealism states that both the ego and object (tree) are existences equally real but they are nothing less than manifestations of the Absolute; and lastly Hegel's Absolute Idealism explains that the only thing really existing is the idea—the relation. The ego and object (tree) are but two terms of the relation and owe their reality to it. These idealistic trends in the Western philosophy were followed by the later rationalistic speculations and gradually the Schools of Positive Philosophy and the Scientific Philosophy came into existence. The criterion of philosophical quests was realized as is put in the words: "Knowledge of the lowest kind is the ununified knowledge; Science is partially-unified knowledge; Philosophy is completely-unified knowledge." In this conception, philosophy is the 'knowledge of the highest degree of generality' which is its definition in the simplest and the clearest form. The end of Philosophy was thus understood the achievement of the unification of knowledge. Further scientific inquiry into various physical

phenomena revealed certain primary truths, or general laws of nature, such as, 'the Indestructibility of Matter', 'the Continuity of Motion' and 'the Persistence of Force' of which the last is the Ultimate and the others derivative. The truth that force can neither arise out of nothing nor lapse into nothing was also observed and it was found that all phenominal changes are direct or indirect results of the 'Persistence of Force'. But this truth can never be more than partially proved. Herbert Spencer who represents this trend of thought in the Western Philosophy, however, felt the existence of some Unknown Reality of which Matter, Motion, and Force are but symbols. The force was ultimately accepted as the beginning and the first cause of things, the matter and motion being the other symbols of the same Unknown Reality. Why he names this as some Unknown Reality, it is because of this deepest, widest and most certain of all facts—that the power which the universe manifests to us is inscrutable. While generalising all phenominal changes under one 'Unknown Reality', he thinks that Spirit and Matter are its two aspects. He says, "... though the reality of subject and object renders necessary to us these antithetical conceptions of spirit and matter, the one is no less than the other to be regarded as but a sign of the Unknown Reality which underlies both". According to him 'the universe, whether physical or psychical, whether as mind or matter, is a play of force ; mind, life and matter being each varying aspects of the one cosmic process from the first cause'. Thus we find, in the Western Philosophy, two contending problems, the Idealism and the Realism, the earlier and the later trends in the Philosophy.

Pratyabhijna's Approach to the problem of the Ultimate Cause :—

As stated above the monistic currents of thought grew in India from the Vedic movement. The doctrine of Monism is for the first time established beyond any dispute in the principal Upanishadas, which are agreed to one root Principle Brahman. Though absolute unity was aimed at in them in a general way, there was difference of opinion as to the nature of this one Ultimate Reality. It was difficult to grasp the real idea of unity in view of all our knowledge of the universe resting on duality in opposition to unity. But this universe was viewed in three different standards by three classes of philosophers who followed different schools of thought in the later ages. In the technical terms used by J. C. Chatterji in his "Indian Realism", the

Nyaya-Vaisheshika systems viewed it in the 'Realistic Standard', the Sankhya-Yoga systems in the 'Psycho-dynamic Standard' and the Shankara's School of Vedanta in the 'Polyo-nymic Standard'. While the first two classes of philosophers represented the two stages of realistic thought, the third school followed the idealistic philosophy of ever-changing names and forms. The first class of thinkers was that of physical philosophers like Gotama and Kanada, similar to those we meet in the Western philosophy in Thales, Anaximenes and Leucipus ; and the second class is that of practical psychologists like Kapila and Patanjali. The first class believed in the existence of external realities constituting the universe and the second named the Conscious and Dynamic principles as 'Purusha' and 'Prkrti' from which all creation is evolved. The third class of philosophers which is represented by Shankaracharya aimed at the Upanishadic Monism by teaching absolute Idealism. They attempted to identify subject and object and prove the phenomenal character of the world thus reducing the facts of life to unreal manifestations. Corresponding to this thought in the Indian Philosophy we have the School of Neo-Platonists in the Western Philosophy. It is first from Kashmir that opposition was levelled against Shankara's Idealism or Illusionism. The Pratyabhijna Philosophy set out to correct the irrational tendency of Shankara's Philosophy by uprooting its cause in the earlier doctrines of the Buddhist systems, like Kshanika-vada and Vijnana-vada. In this school the conception of the Ultimate Reality, Maheshvara, changed from that of Brahman of Vedantins symbolising only pure Universal Consciousness. The Ultimate Reality in the Pratyabhijna System included Prakasha and Vimarsha as its two aspects, which symbolise respectively the Universal Consciousness and Physical or Material Activity. In the Spinoza's system in the Western Philosophy, there is but one infinite substance that is God, 'the cause of all things'. Viewed under the attributes of infinite substance, God is "*natura naturans*" ; viewed as a manifestation, as the modes under which his attributes appear, He is "*natura naturata*". He has two infinite attributes 'extension' and 'thought'. Extension is visible thought and thought is invisible extension. They are the objective and the subjective phases of which God is the identity. Everything is a mode of God's attribute of extension ; every 'thought', wish, or feeling, a mode of His attribute of thought. Prakasha and Vimarsha represent in the Pratyabhijna Philosophy the

two aspects of the Ultimate Reality symbolised in Spinoza's system in terms of thought and extension. Thus to translate the Ultimate Reality called Maheshvara in terms of 'Universal Consciousness', as Dr. K. C. Pandey has done, is not correct, as it denotes only one of its two aspects—Spirit or Subject, but not the other—Matter or Object. The Pratyabhijna conception of the Absolute Reality is that which includes both Subject and Object or Spirit and Matter. The various animate and inanimate beings, subjects and objects, thought and physical activity, mind and body, and the world around us are all real in the Ultimate Being. Shankara's system is not realistic in regard to the physical aspect of this universe which he declares as unreal or illusive, admitting pure Consciousness (Chit) alone to be real. The Pratyabhijna system transcends the earlier systems in making distinction between subjects and objects as two kinds of sentient and insentient waves in the ocean of the Ultimate Reality.

Specific doctrines of Pratyabhijna :- Svatantrya-vada or the Universal Voluntarism is the chief doctrine of the Pratyabhijna system. It means the doctrine of 'self-dependence' or the 'sovereignty of Lord's will' which 'imparts the impetus to the process of the world'. In the earlier systems three main theories are propounded to account for the process of the creation, viz. (1) the Realistic or Creationist view (Arambhavada), (2) the theory of transformation (Parinama-vada) and (3) the theory of Manifestation (Vivarta-vada). The Pratyabhijna Philosophy proves them unsound. According to the first theory there exist nine classes of realities out of which everything in the universe is formed. It does not give any reason how Effect comes out of the cause in which the former does not exist before it comes into existence. According to the second view Cause brings out Effect, after it undergoes complete destruction. For instance, milk is transformed into curds after it no longer exists in that form. Seed changes into plant after it is completely merged in the soil. Milk is the transformation of the grass consumed by cattle. But when the Parinama-vada strictly postulates that Effect appears only after the destruction of its Cause, it has failed to explain the following instances. The birth of a babe takes place not after the destruction of its Cause, the parent; the creation and multiplication of bacteria do not involve the destruction of the former bacterium. According to the third theory, Vivarta-vada,

which is upheld by Shankaracharya, all effects are the product of Maya, the Nescience, and not real. On the basis of this theory, the world is superimposed on the only Reality which is Brahman, and is thus supposed to be phenomenal, illusive and dreamlike in character. According to the Pratyabhijna Philosophy, the theory is the result of irrational and unscientific thinking. It is absurd to think all the facts of experience as the product of the fictitious principle, Maya. Pratyabhijna, it may be remarked here, vehemently argues against the Shankara's theory of Mayavada (Idealism or Illusionism) and holds it fallacious. Pratyabhijna makes a realistic and rational approach to the problem and postulates a new theory Svatantrya-vada to replace the earlier theories which are held all objectionable. On the basis of this new theory it is due to the sovereignty of the Lord's Will that Effect evolves from Cause. It is the Lord's Self-dependent Power (Svatantrya-shakti) that multiplies effects from a single cause without destroying itself (the cause). The production of species from parents, expansion and growth of cells from a single cell, creation and multiplication of bacteria from the first bacterium,—all these are examples of the Svatantrya-shakti of the Supreme Cause. The Universal Voluntarism is the only explanation that rational thinking can give to the wondrous creative power in Nature. It may be pointed out that Fichte's idealism in the West is, in the first instance, distinctly marked by the doctrine of Will. By this doctrine Fichte sought to convince Germans that in will lay man's divinity. Schopenhauer's doctrine of "Will as the cause of everything"—Will as a force of spontaneity and sense of effort, an impulse, instinct and spring of life, a supernatural power, however, exactly corresponds to Svatantryavada of the Pratyabhijna system,

Another theory the Abhasavada, the theory of Manifestation, allied to the Svatantryavada, has also been coined in this system for the explanation of the Doctrine of Monism. This is not in fact much different from Shankaracharya's Vivarta-vada. Almost similar to Vivarta-vada, Abhasavada also holds the world-objects as manifestations or Abhasas. The only difference between the two theories lies in the point that the Abhasas in the Pratyabhijna Philosophy are real in nature, whereas those in the Shankara's System are fictitious and illusive or dreamlike and hence unreal. The system holds that it is the very nature of Parama Shiva, the Supreme Cause, to manifest Himself in

diverse forms of the universe. We cannot question why the fire burns. To burn is the very nature of fire. So we cannot question why Shiva manifests himself in the form of the universe. It is incorrect to say that the Lord transforms Himself into various objects of the world, for such an assumption involves the division of the Lord into parts which leads to many objections. So the theory of Manifestation (Abhasa-vada) postulates that as to burn is the very nature of fire, so to manifest externally what lies within is the very nature of the Self. The manifested objects are real as they exist in the Supreme Reality. The manifested world appears on the background of Self (Svatmabhitti). Thus we have two aspects of the Supreme Self, Prakasha and Vimarsha. The one stands as the substratum of the manifestations and the other is the process of manifestations going upon this substratum. The latter aspect is also known as Svatantrya Shakti because it does not depend upon anything else, but represents the principal power of the Supreme Self (Parama Shiva). The change in the Ultimate Reality is a different arrangement of the ever-existing material in the Self. The transcendental state (Para or Annuttara avastha) of the Supreme Self is pure Consciousness unaffected by material change and his immanent state (Apara-avastha) is that which is visible in the changing world : (विश्वमयः प्रसरः विश्वतीर्णश्च संवित्). Abhasa-vada (the theory of Manifestation) appears as one of the elaborate doctrines having its own specific features in the Utpaladeva's system, similar to Vivarta-vada in the Shankar's system. Both the theories are the later development in the Indian philosophy. It will be observed that Bhadarayana, the author of the Vedanta Sutas, as well as Somananda, who were the original thinkers, made a realistic approach to the problem of the universe. Both of them prove the world to be the actual transformation of the Supreme Reality (Maheshvara or Brahman) by instances like clay changing into pots or gold into ornaments and so on. Another example of the creation of the world like the creation of a Yogin or an individual in dreams, as produced in both the systems of Somananda and Bhadarayana to illustrate the emanation of the universe from the Absolute Reality, cannot prove that idealism is first thought in them. It simply illustrates that the Ultimate Being possessing wonderful powers undergoes change in various ways and yet remains one changeless and eternal Supreme principle. The idealism is the later growth in the Vedanta system and the

Pratyabhijna Philosophy, as Shankaracharya as well as Utpaladeva and Abhinavagupta appear to have been under the influence of the Buddhist Phenomenalism. It may be possible that Utpaladeva and Abhinavagupta were directly under the influence of Shankara's philosophy as has been noticed by Dr. Buhlar and Dr. Gough.

Bhadarayana and Somananda, the founders of the earlier Vedanta and Pratyabhijna systems, even admit the diversity (Bheda-bhava) in the nature in respect of diverse objects, sentient and insentient, as well as the absence of diversity - non-dualism (Abheda-bhava) - in relation to One Ultimate Reality being the only principle of life and growth in all the created beings. The Upanishadas which are admittedly the common reservoir of both the systems impress this very fact that one Universal Self is immanent in the cosmos consisting of great elements, luminous planets, etc. and in every form of life and growth and the subtle powers of seeing, hearing and so on.

The doctrine of Tattvas is another important doctrine which occurs in the Pratyabhijna System. It is given also in other forms of Shaivism with slight variations in its interpretation. As already stated above the earlier systems of thought in India, like the Sankhya, the Vaisheshika and the Yoga systems made a realistic approach to the problem of the Universe. The Sankhya system enumerates twenty-five Tattvas, categories of creation. These are, of course, mentioned originally in scattered forms in the various Upanishadas and are picked out by the Sankhya philosophers and put in a connected system. These are incorporated in total by the Shaivas in their system, who further added eleven more Tattvas to bring the total number of Tattvas to thirty-six. This is the advance that Shaivas have made in inventing all the essential principles of creation. The atomic theory of the Vaisheshika System is the result of a still deeper analytical treatment of the objective reality, the matter, the grosser Tattva. On the other hand the Yoga School pursued its explorations in the direction of the study of the nature of the Spirit.

The doctrine of Tattvas is one of the interesting doctrines of the Pratyabhijna Philosophy, which is concerned with the ultimate constitution of this universe. The Parama Shiva (the Ultimate Reality) stands above all the categories (Tattvas). It is the Transcendental state of the Ultimate, the Supreme Consciousness (Para samvit), free from qualities

(Nirguna) and beyond all the categories (Tattvatita). It contains in itself the power of Manifestation (Its Prakasha aspect) in which state it is called *Shiva Tattva*. The whole universe from microcosm to macrocosm imbibes the Cognitive power (Jnana Shakti or Jnatratva Shakti) from the Prakasha aspect of the Parama Shiva or the Shiva Tattva. It also contains in itself the power of Perception. (Its Vimarsa aspect) in which state it is called *Shakti Tattva*. This Tattva implies the Power principle or Energy which transforms into matter. The universe imbibes the power of physical activity (Kriya shakti or Kartratva Shakti) from the Vimarsha aspect of the Parama Shiva or the Shakti Tattva. In the third Tattva, the *Sadashiva Tattva*, the internal state of pure knowledge (Jnana) is manifest in predominance without any taint of activity and change (Kriya). This Tattva represents the Satta aspect of Shiva, hence also it is called *Sadakhya Tattva*. In the fourth Tattva, called the *Ishvara Tattva*, the external state of Kriya Shakti (power of activity) becomes predominant. *Ishvara Tattva* implies the 'opening out' (bahir unmesha). It is called *Unmesha* as the world evolves from it, i.e. becomes externally manifest while the *Sada-shiva Tattva* represents the 'closing in' (Nimesha), i.e. in which the universe dissolves itself, or in which all manifestations merge. The fifth Tattva, the *Shudavidya Tattva* (True or pure Knowledge) is the principle of correlation in the universal experience. It is in essence the state of pure knowledge in which there is no distinction between subject and object. This state of experience is also called *Parapara*, i.e. the state of unity of the Transcendental (Para) and non-Transcendental (Apara) states (*Parapara dasha*). These five Tattvas are known as the five principles of subject object.

The next Tattva is called the *Maya Tattva*, the principle of Limitation and Differentiation. The *Maya Shakti* dissolves *Prakasha* and *Vimarsha* aspects of the Parama Shiva and the perception of the world now becomes distinct in the process of evolution. The *Maya Tattva* represents the experience or power that differentiate objects from subjects. The next five Tattvas which are the offshoots of *Maya Tattva*, are called respectively *Kala* (कला), *Vidya*, *Raga*, *Niyati* and *Kala* (काल) which cause limitation to the universality of action, Knowledge, interest, place and time in relation to various jivas (individuals). The *Maya Tattva* is in itself the connecting link between Omnipotence and limited action, Omniscience and limited knowledge, perfection and limited interest, Omnipresence and

limited place, and eternity and limited time. Thus Kala (कला) represents in various limited beings (individuals) the limitation in regard to authorship, or the faculty of doing things, or accomplishing arts; Vidya the limitation with regard to knowledge of particular objects (faculty of Knowing and thinking of objects); Raga the limitation in regard to interest, that which attributes qualities to perceivers (Pramatas) and objects perceived (Prameya); Niyati the limitation in regard to presence in space, that which causes restriction by confining a perceiver to a particular space; and Kala (काल) the limitation in regard to presence in time, that which fixes the durations in the acts of perceivers.

The following twenty-five Tattvas are those which are given in the Sankhya system. *Purusha* and *Pradhana* (प्रकृति) are respectively the individual subject and the limited individual object. The latter is the root cause of all subsequent division into capacities (Karanas) and objects (Karyas). The thirteen capacities (Karanas) consist of the three capacities of mental operation - *Undetermined thought* (मन), *Determined thought* (बुद्धि) and *Self-arrogation* (अहंकार); the five powers of sense preception - *Hearing* (श्रोत्रम्), *Feeling of touch* (त्वक्), *Sight* (चक्षुः), *Taste* (रसना) and *Smell* (घ्राणम्); and five capacities of Action - *Expression* (वाक्), *Handling* (पाणि), *Locomotion* (पाद), *Rejecting refuse* (पायु) and *Sexual function* (उपस्थ). The ten Karyas are the ten material elements which consist of five physical factors or great elements namely: *Vacuity* (आकाश), *Air* (वायु), *Fire* (अग्नि), *Water* (जल) and *Earth* (पृथ्वी) and the five subtle elements (तनमात्रा) - *Sound* (शब्द), *Touch feeling* (स्पर्श), *Colour* (रूप), *Flavour* (रस) and *Odour* (गंध).

From the above it is clear that the doctrine of Tattvas gives an elaborate analysis of the Universal Energy, "Primordial natural force-principle" or the *Prima Materia* of all things which is transformed into various principles (Tattvas) that bring about the whole creation. This is indeed a definite advancement in the Scientific Philosophy of the West as represented by Herbert Spencer. V. S. Naravane has, in one of his articles on the subject in the Monthly "Kashmir", pointed out that the list of categories may not sound very convincing now, in the light of modern scientific advances. But the entire conception

is highly dramatic'. Reference is invited to the chart facing P. 35 for the easy grasp of the doctrine of Tattvas.

The Pratyabhijna, a Monistic system, is indeed a realistic school of thought as it has condemned outright the Shankara's idealism and the nihilistic doctrines of Bauddhas and all such theories in the various forms of escapism and negation. Dr. K. C. Pandey brings into notice (in his Introduction to Bhaskari Vol II) that the system is the synthesis of the realistic, idealistic, voluntaristic, absolutistic and mystic currents of thought then prevailing in Kashmir. This diverse approach emphasizes that Reality is many-sided. Why so many approaches are made to understand the underlying principle of life is because the problem baffles the thought of the man as he tries to know more of it. N. Mukherji explains, in the Introduction to his work "A Study of Shankara", why it is necessary to study the problem as a whole from various points of view, "The life or the universe is synthesis and any comprehensive view of either must be in the form of a synthesis. The Darshanas, therefore, attempted to understand the nature of man and his relation to the universe as a whole and accepted no arbitrary, conventional or limited application. Again, the whole is not a mere mathematical aggregate of parts and it is not possible to have a conception of the whole merely by knowing the separate parts. In the case of the universe, even the parts can never be known exhaustively. If, however, the whole is comprehended, the parts are comprehended. If the concept of man is comprehended, each individual man is comprehended. To know the whole truth about the smallest atom of matter - the scientist must know the infinite self in whom all things eternally are. To know the whole truth about the subjective self the philosopher must know the objective world as it is in itself. To know the whole truth about the Infinite self the ecclesiast must comprehend the Finite in whom the Infinite finds his expression. In fact Science, Philosophy and Religion are three phases of fundamentally inseparable human thought and experience. For Truth is the fundamental thing sought by Science, Philosophy or Religion from its particular standpoint and is the same in every case, so that one form of truth cannot be antagonistic to another without stultifying itself.. Darshana a term more comprehensive than philosophy - implies a search for the deepest truth - an inquiry after the permanent underlying reality of all phenomena...".

To sum up, the Indian Philosophy has not been understood in its true sense owing to the predominance of the idealistic trend of thought later on introduced into it by Shankara's school of Vedants. But it can be understood correctly, as a realistic branch of Philosophy, in the light of the Pratyabhijna system which is indeed free from any irrational thinking like Mayavada or Adhyasavada (Illusionism).

A birds'-eye view of pratyabhijna metaphysics :- The chart facing this page gives a graphic representation of the central doctrine of the Pratyabhijna Philosophy, the whole cosmogonic theory taught in the system, bringing its scientific value to a pointed notice. In this the Maheshvara—Supreme Being, the Ultimate Cause, is compared with nutritional fluid in the earth which transforms itself into the tree of cosmos and which runs as sap through its every branch, leaf, flower, fruit, etc. This is called Shiva-rasa or Chit-rasa. And what makes it to grow into this Cosmos? Pratyabhijna gives the answer :- It grows by the 'Sovereignty of His will', technically called Maheshvarya (माहेश्वर्य) or Svatantrya Shakti, which is the force that impels, the force of spontaneity (urgency), instinct and spring of life. The Creative power of Maheshvara has a two-fold nature,—Prakasha, the power of manifestation, and Vimarsha, the power of perception. Prakasha, represented by Shiva, and Vimarsha, represented by Shakti, constituting two-fold nature in Shiva-rasa, shoot forth first into a common stalk and further sprout into two branches, the former growing into the branch of Cognitional power (Jnatratva Shakti) and the latter into that of power of Action (Kartratva Shakti). The two branches distinguish one as subjective branch, perceiving or thinking subject and the other as objective branch, what is external to the mind. These two branches correspond respectively with Universal Consciousness and Universal Energy in the universe around us. The subjective branch of Cognitional power (Jnatratva Shakti) further shoots forth into three distinct branches, one the power of Remembrance (Smarna shakti), second the power of Knowledge (Jnana shakti) and third the power of Differentiation (Aphana shakti). This gives the psychological expansion of Jnatratva Shakti of Maheshvara, viz. the Universal Consciousness.

The objective branch, the power of action (Kartratva Shakti), is operated upon or governed by three laws of Relation,—one the Law of

OBJECTIVE BRANCH (WHAT IS
EXTERNAL TO THE MIND)

3 LAWS OF RELATION
OPERATE IN KRIYA
SHAKTI

- LAW OF 1. DIVISION मैदा मैदा
PLURALITY AND
- LAW OF 2. PERCEPTION मान तत्फल
PERCEPTION AND
- LAW OF 3. CAUSATION कारण कार्य
CAUSE AND

PHYSICAL EXPANSION OF SHAKTI
REPRESENTING UNIVERSAL ENERGY

GRAPHIC REPRESENTATION OF PRATYABHJNA PHILOSOPHY

(SHOWING THE UNITY OF LIFE IN MACROCOSM
AND MICROCOSM)

शक्ति (UNIVERSAL ENERGY)

विमर्श
(POWER OF PERCEPTION)

कर्तृत्व शक्ति
(POWER OF ACTION)

प्रकाश
(POWER OF MANIFESTATION)

शिव
(UNIVERSAL CONSCIOUSNESS)

ज्ञानत्व शक्ति
(COGNITIONAL POWER)

SUBJECTIVE BRANCH
(PERCEIVING OR THINKING SUBJECT)

PSYCHOLOGICAL EXPANSION OF
SHIVA REPRESENTING UNIVERSAL
CONSCIOUSNESS

TWO-FOLD NATURE OF CREATIVE POWER IN MAHESHWARA

महेश्वर
MAHESHWARA OR PARAMA SHIVA
(SUPREME BEING)

ULTIMATE CAUSE
COMPARED TO NUTRITION IN THE EARTH
(शिव-रस)

IT GROWS INTO THE TREE OF COSMOS BY SOVEREIGNTY OF HIS WILL (महेश्वर-विराट्)
WHICH IS THE FORCE THAT IMPELS, FORCE OF SPONTANEOUS INSTINCT AND SPRING
OF LIFE

1. स्मृति शक्ति = REMEMBRANCE
POWER OF

Division, the relation of Plurality and Unity (Bhedabheda), second the Law of Perception, the relation of Perceiver, 'awareness' and the object perceived (Mana tat phala meya) and third the Law of Causation, the relation of Cause and Effect (Karya Karana). The power of Action (Kartratva shakti or Kriya Shakti) now turns into Constituent power (Nirmana shakti). The Division in Kriya shakti is caused by the time factor (कालशक्ति) which is also one of the powers of Maheshvara. The objective branch, having grown into Constituent power (Nirmana Shakti), now shoots forth thirty six branches i. e. Tattvas (categories) or principles of creation. All these have already been explained in the foregoing pages. This gives the Physical expansion of Shakti or Kriya Shakti of Maheshvara, the Universal Energy. From these evolved Tattvas emanate the whole universe consisting of innumerable subjects and objects, sentient and insentient beings, suns and moons, stars and planets, rivers and mountains, trees and plants, flowers and fruits, and what not. This emanation of the Universal Being (Maheshvara) into the cosmos is the function of His power of Will (Tat samarthyam svatantryam). It is this image, visible body of the Lord Maheshvara, Bhairava (formidable) having wonderous powers, as represented by the chart, which the Shaiva adorer worships in the following verse: आश्रयाणं चिद्रसस्यौघं साकारत्वमुपागतम् । जगत रूपतया वन्दे प्रतित्तुं भैरवं वपु ।

Turning away first from the macrocosm to look at the microcosm, which exists everywhere around us and within us, there exists a permanent Self (Atman), or soul, in every individual being which is endowed with the three potential powers (Shaktis) of will, cognition and action (इच्छा, ज्ञान and क्रिया). The first power is technically called Svatantrya Shakti (Sovereignty of his Will) which is the impetus behind all his creative thought and activity. The soul is also the substratum of the powers of Remembrance (Smarna shakti), Knowledge (Jnana-shakti) and Differentiation (Apohana shakti). All these powers in man collectively comprise human personality; and all human progress depends upon the elevation of human personality in respect of the said powers.

In relation to the macrocosm, i. e. the universe around the individual beings, the said powers are indispensable to all creative activity in Nature outside. This creative activity on the part of the Universal Being permeating the universe, accounts for the emanation of infinite sentient

and insentient beings from its two aspects, Shiva (the Supreme Consciousness) and Shakti (the Universal Activity, force or energy). The latter materialises in the form of the Ultimate Substance of which the physical universe is constituted. And this emanation is explained as due to the Sovereignty of Will attributed to the Supreme Being, known technically as Maheshvarya (माहेश्वर्य), which in relation to an individual being is generally called Svatantrya Shakti. The Pratyabhijna assumes all volitional, cognitive and conscious-physical acts at the empirical level as essential for the existence of the universe. It will thus be seen that the conception of the macrocosm in the system is based on a very deep study of the microcosm.

It is evident from the above that the position of Pratyabhijna is perhaps unique in the treatment of spirit and matter as two distinct realities presenting in the universe in innumerable forms of animate and inanimate objects or, in other words, sentient and insentient entities. These two realities, however, ultimately unify and resort to a single Reality, the Absolute Being (Maheshvara), of which these are two aspects. Thus the diversity in the cosmos as emanating from unity is apt to fit in with this Monistic system. Spirit and matter are both dynamic in this system, as the spirit is characterised by knowledge and matter by activity or presentment of force (Kriya or Shakti). Will is the static centre of all activity of the soul, while intellection and physical activity are its dynamic aspects.

The Pratyabhijna Philosophy, it may be remarked, probes deeply into the nature of things in the universe both in regard to its psychological and physical aspects. It has gone to the extent of establishing not only that plants and trees are endowed with life just like all kinds of living beings, but soil and water out of which they grow, nay even all kinds of matter, which according to the modern science are but unconscious and dead, also possess a continuous life-force or conscious life-activity. The valuable studies of astronomers, mathematicians and physicists have revealed the foundation stones and the dimensions of the universe and have thus enriched mankind by their demonstration of the power and sweep of the human intellect. But all such scientific investigations have remained practically wanting in this aspect of study—the study of life in the universe. It is only recently that attempts have been made to explain 'life'. The main emphasis of science is now changing from

the study of the elementary forces and simple particles to the complexities of living textures. The Philosophy started its quest mainly in the direction of the study of life. While tracing the beginning of Philosophy (in the Introduction to the History of Philosophy, Eastern and Western) Maulana Azad has brilliantly explained the objective for which the Philosophy has stood from time immemorial. He says, 'Philosophy is the quest for finding out the meaning of life and existence'. He further adds, 'Two questions arose in the mind of man, as soon as he began to think, what is the meaning of his life; and what is the nature of the universe he sees all around. The beginning of systematic speculation marked the birth of philosophy. The pilgrims of philosophy did not succeed in securing the object of their quest but they have in the course of their journey obtained something else of great value: in their search for philosophy they discovered science. Science has brought to man new power but has not given him peace...' The Maulana, therefore, suggests: 'The time has now come when philosophy should turn its attention towards the problems of human peace.' It will, however, be noticed that Indian Philosophy, if properly understood in the light of Pratyabhijna system, has already revealed a knowledge of paramount importance conducive to the human peace and progress. A proper study of the Pratyabhijna system will perhaps lead to a better understanding of 'man's nature' or, in other words, revaluation of man's estimate of himself.

Human values and cardinal virtues according to Pratyabhijna :— Pratyabhijna is mainly a school of Spiritual Pragmatism which has seriously taken up the cause of the mental, moral and spiritual elevation of humanity. All its doctrines - spiritual, epistemological, ethical and moral - have a practical bearing upon human interests. It has also in a way sought the material advancement of human beings with the sole objective of making them prosperous and happier. It has taught, on such a rational and scientific basis, *the unity of life in the universe, the unity of all living beings and the unity of mankind* (स्वात्मैव सर्वं जन्तूनामेक एव महेश्वरः). It has laid emphasis on *equality and universal brotherhood of mankind*, irrespective of diversity of caste, creed, colour and nationality and has recognised '*freedom*' (Svatantrya) and *superiority and dignity of human being*. All these essentials are indeed the ideal of a modern democratic society. Dr. S. Radhakrishnan has brought to

pointed notice the fact that 'our religions have proclaimed from the very beginning that *each human individual is to be regarded as a spark of the divine*'. This is mainly the teaching of the Upanishadas as well as the sermons taught by the Buddha.

The Pratyabhijna is ultimately a means of accomplishing the fulfilment of one's all the desired objects. Man's desires are different ; one aspires to higher things in his life, other to purely spiritual satisfaction and raptures. There are still others whose sole ambition in life is to attain what is of highest value to man. The Pratyabhijna is meant for all. "Svatantrya" (freedom) in the system is the sole avenue to all those things, viz. the fulfilment of all the aspirations of man. Pratyabhijna, however, lays stress on the awareness of the highest ideal or real progress a man should seek to attain, the ignorance of which is indeed the main cause of human misery and suffering. We are often mistaking what is really not progress, for progress. To quote the words of our saint Rashtrapati Dr. Rajendra Prasad : 'We are apt to be carried away by many things...on account of their glamour and their shine. And we are very often misled into thinking that all that glitters is gold. But that is not always so. I believe we have really to define what is progress, and I personally do not always feel that what we call progress is always progress. I sometimes wonder if in speaking of progress, we are not mistaking what is really not progress, for progress'. Pratyabhijna reveals what is of highest value to man ; and *what is of highest value to man is what is conducive to the good and benefit of one and all.*

The ideal of liberation in the system is quite different from that of other Indian systems ; to a Pratyabhijna philosopher it means 'freedom' (Svatantrya) : '*The individual is essentially free, freedom is the inner being of the individual*'. So also does the law of Karma play a different role in the Pratyabhijna ethics, as the school has recognised 'Sovereignty of Will' (Iccha shakti) and 'Action' (Kriya shakti) as means of accomplishing all the desired objects. It does not believe in the fate of man being rigid and unchangeable. It condemns those who do not stir to bring a change in their lot for better and happier life. It does not recognise disinterested action (nishkama karma) as a way or aim and object of Self-realization, as it denotes 'want of will' which is contrary to success. The philosophy of 'action' taught in the system, which perhaps accords with

the Socialist idea of "action", is unique in the whole domain of Indian Philosophy. In accordance with the Western ideal, it does not also recognise a life of non-attachment to or renunciation of the world as it is considered to be too ascetic and other-worldly to be of any good to humanity.

The system believes in some ethical matters like non-violence or non-injury (Ahimsa). The supreme value and importance of non-violence for our moral life have of-course been insisted upon in the same strain as has been done in other Indian systems of thought. Ahimsa is one of the basic principles of fellow-feeling and reciprocity on which morality must be based. Of all the vices that may pollute the life of a man, cruelty and killing are perhaps the worst. The sooner this fact is admitted and Ahimsa recognised as a cardinal virtue by people all the world over, the better for mankind. From the days of Upanishadas our country not only taught the essentials of human culture, like liberty, equality and fraternity of all mankind, but also recognised non-violence (Ahimsa) as its first essential. Buddhism preached Ahimsa as the highest virtue. *Any kind of exploitation of man by man, treated as himsa, is condemned by the system as a sin.* To exploit others is, in its view, to exploit one's own self.

Though Pratyabhijna believes in the unity and equality of human beings, it is equally conscious not only of their inequalities but also of their limitations and infirmities. Men are not all equally intelligent, or equally good, or equally trustworthy. Men have limitations of sense and reason and suffer from inferiority complex. Their infirmities are not few but many, such as 'injustice, intemperance, cowardice and ignorance' (as is pointed out by Plato) and all kinds of wickedness and baseness,—“vileness, wildness and cussedness in the nature of man” as Dr. S. Radhakrishnan points out, which bring about their destruction. Pratyabhijna brings into awareness these limitations and infirmities of man (Pashubhava), which it calls the *man's fetters* (Pashas) or *impurities* (Malas) to bring him to the path of righteousness by absolving himself from these which is, in its view, the way to immortality and liberation. Pratyabhijna has recognised 'the supremacy of the moral law, the law of truth and love' (in the Gandhiji's words). The world stands in need of a soothing philosophy like Pratyabhijna, in these days of material crisis; for, in the prophetic words of Dr. S. Radhakrishnan, "... within each incarnate soul dwells the good-conscious-

ness which we must seek out and awaken. When mankind awakes to the truth, universal brotherhood will follow,...One whose life is rooted in the experience of the Supreme, spontaneously develops love for all creation. He will be free from hatred for any man...He will boldly work for a society in which man can be free and fearless...He will oppose terror and cruelty...He will give voice to those who have no voice..." At another place Dr. Radhakrishnan says, "Men must use the instruments of science for the improvement of the conditions of life, for the fault is not in science and technology. What is demoniac is in the nature of man. If we wish to cure this element of vileness, wildness, cursedness, in the nature of man, it is essential for us to mobilize the great spiritual resources of mankind. The cure for that is to restore the truths of the spirit to the central place in the minds of men. Let those truths of the spirit sway the minds of men, transform the lives of men. *The truths of the spirit are liberality, understanding, freedom.* ... Let us, therefore, send out...a message to this groping, uncertain, discontented world: *that love and not hatred, that freedom and not fear, that faith and not doubt,* have in them the healing of the nations. If we carry out these principles in our daily life and in our international relations, out of the anguish of the world will be born a *new unity of mankind*, a unity in which the ideals of the spirit will find safety and security." *Pratyabhijna has indeed shown to mankind a new way (Navo-marga) to human peace and freedom.*

Role of Religion and supernatural in Pratyabhijna :- The West has its philosophy almost distinct from its religion, while in India we do not have philosophy separate from theology. Zeller says, "Indian Philosophy never lost contact with religion and never became independent". In this country religion has led to philosophy, and for this reason the technical terms employed for metaphysical principles are the words which are commonly used in religious literature as names of gods and goddesses. *Shaivism* or *Shaiva Darshana* (Shaiva Philosophy) as the very word indicates, is an outgrowth of Shaiva religion which recognised Shiva as the highest God. It will be admitted that the originators of the Pratyabhijna Philosophy were the devotees of God Shiva (Maheshvara) and his consort Shakti and naturally they employed the various names of these divinities to represent the different metaphysical principles in the Pratyabhijna system. Thus, we find the term *Maheshvara* applied for the

Ultimate Reality, *Maheshvarya* for 'the Sovereignty of Will' ascribed to the Ultimate Being (Maheshvara), *Shiva* stands for the Cognitive Power and *Shakti* for the power of action and so on. It may also be noticed that in the Vedanta system the Ultimate Reality is named *Brahman* by the originators of the school, since they were the worshippers of God Brahma, the creator or the God of Knowledge (Vedas). The word Brahman is used by the Vedantins for the Ultimate Reality in the neuter gender, while the Shaivas use the word Maheshvara for the same principle in the masculine gender. This system of nomenclature in any school of Indian Philosophy is unlike that in the Western Science or Metaphysics in which we find the technical terms often used after the names of the scientists who discovered certain scientific principles and laws of nature. For instance, in Electrical Science, the terms: *volt* for an unit of electro-motive-force, *ampere* for unit quantity of electrical energy flowing in an electrical circuit, *watt* for the unit of power, *ohm* for the unit of resistance in any medium and so on are used after the names of the scientists conspicuous for their discoveries in this branch of Science. There is, of course, a number of other technical terms employed in the system taken from a stock of common words, not necessarily used in religious nomenclature. For instance, *Prakasha* is used in the particular philosophic sense as Self-manifestation or Self-consciousness in which the objects are merged in Self and *Vimarsha* as power of perception in which objects have distinct reality of their own.

Although it is not possible to set any form of Indian Philosophy free from the dogmas of religion, in the pratyabhijna system metaphysics plays a primary role, and theology or religion is relegated to a subordinate position. It may, therefore, be pointed out that though the Pratyabhijna system is a purely philosophical system founded on reason and scientific values, it has not totally divorced itself from theological matter. The main work on the System entitled "the Pratyabhijna - Sutras" includes one Section, Section III Agamadhikara, which deals with the dogmatic and theological matters of the Trika cult, such as pure and impure creations, devine hierarchy, bondage and release, impurities (Malas), common creation, creations called Vijnanakevala, Pralayakala, Sakala, Vidheshvaras, two classes of Samsarins, the different states and mystical methods of liberation (Shambhavopaya etc.) (see below) and so on as incorporated in the system from Agama Shastra. It will, however, be noticed that

philosophical interpretations have been given in the system to these supernatural matters.

The Shaiva Yoga :- According to the metaphysical point of view the *Pratyabhijna* (Recognition) leads a person to become aware again of the fact that the individual being (Pashu) is identical with the Universal Being (Pati, Shiva or Maheshvara) or, in other words, to know the supreme nature of 'self'. In the Vedanta and other schools of Indian Philosophy knowledge (Jnana) of the identity of the individual soul (Atman) and the Universal Soul (Brahman) is generally considered the highest ideal. In the *Pratyabhijna* system Parama-shiva, the Ultimate Being, who is aware of His Transcendental nature in that state, while adopting the limited form of an individual being (Pashu-bhava) by the sovereignty of His will (Satantrya Shakti), forgets (loses the awareness of) His real nature by His own deluding power (Maya Vimohini Shakti) and becomes limited in his powers of thought and action thus turning into an inferior being (Pashu). The *Pratyabhijna* enables him to recognise his own supreme nature already known to him before his individuation and thus restores in him his higher and deeper powers already innate in him. "*Recognition*" (*Pratyabhijna*) is distinguished from "*knowledge*" (Jnana) in the sense that in the former state the identity of the individual being and the Supreme Being (or, in other words, the knowledge of the supreme nature of 'self') is not, in reality, unrealised before (Nananubhutam) but is only forgotten; and this is revived in the state of "*Recognition*"; while realization in the form of mere "*knowledge*" (Jnana), according to the point of view of the Vedanta system, is lacking before its attainment. This is one important point of difference between the *Pratyabhijna* and the Vedanta system.

The state of realization said above, according to the point of view of the Trika system, of which the *Pratyabhijna* Shastra is a manual of Philosophy, cannot be achieved without recourse to a supernatural process (experience) known in the system by a general name the "*Shaiva Yoga*" or "*Shaiva Samavesha*." Trika system prescribes various Yogic methods of Samyama (intuition) i. e. 'intense concentration, contemplation and meditation' to attain the '*Pratyabhijna*' realization or the '*Recognitive*' insight which is the means of all the highest human achievements (समस्त संपत् समवाप्ति-हेतुम्) These are variously called

Shambhavopaya (or Icchopaya), Shaktopaya (or Jnanopaya) and Anavopaya (or Kriyopaya). These methods develop in the Yogins (respectively) the powers of will, thought and physical activity. Although the Pratyabhijna system lays down the basis of this intuitive experience, viz. the system of Yoga, yet it claims to have ultimately revealed another new method (Navo margo) of intellectual pursuit, i. e. the pursuit of knowledge and reason at the empirical level, which it calls Anupaya (a processless method), that is, which does not need any Yogic - physical and mental - processes at all. The Yogic methods have, indeed, been incorporated in the Pratyabhijna system from the Trika Shastra and have been considered by the great authorities like Abhinavagupta as indispensable for realization. Abhinavagupta was himself a born Yogin (Yoginibhu) who constantly practised Shaiva-samavesha in his life.

The Yogic system was known in India from remote ages, not only as the means of developing human personality, but also as a wonderful aid to scientific observation. It is well-known that our great thinkers of the past entered deeply into the very core of things by means of Yogic processes. This yogic system has proved of greater value in attaining to heights in the sphere of knowledge than the modern scientific methods of "well-trained and keen sense-observation, experimentation and inductive thinking" having claim for the achievements of today. By practising the threefold Yogic method taught in Trika Shastra a person is said to manifest his profounder faculty and to get *omniscience*, all-penetrating grasp, along with many other supernatural powers. The following powers are mentioned by Patanjali in his Yogasutras (Chapter III) which a Yogin can and does manifest :- 'Knowledge of the past and future' (Psychometry and premonition) (Sutra 16), 'Knowledge of one's previous births' (18) 'Understanding of other people's minds' (Telepathy) (19) 'Disappearance (Invisibility of the body)' (21), 'Knowledge of the worlds' (26) 'the Knowledge of the starry regions' (27) 'mastery over the elements' (28) and so on.

Yoga is now generally understood as a method of attaining occult powers or magical power, because its right significance is lost in our time. For this reason even the value of Shaiva Yoga (Shaiva Samavesha) dealt with briefly in the Pratyabhijna Shastra cannot be understood

now. It is difficult to follow even the comprehensive exposition of Shaiva Yoga and the Yoga technique given by Abhinavagupta in the different chapters of *Tantraloka*, under the headings: Anupaya, Sham-bhavopaya, Shaktopaya, Anavopaya, Chakrodaya, Kalatattva, Deshadhva, etc. The Kashmir school of Yoga Shaivism is still an obscure subject. No investigation seems to have been made in this direction by modern inquirers. Even none of the scholars has made any attempt to translate the *Tantraloka* of Abhinavagupta which comprehensively deals with the methods of Shaiva Yoga. It will be desirable if some scholar takes up an intensive and extensive study of the Yoga system of Kashmir Shaivism and sets himself to the task of translating completely the particular literature on the subject, viz. *Tantraloka* and *Tantrasara* of Abhinavagupta which are already published in several volumes in the Kashmir Series of Texts and Studies. Attention of the scholars is drawn to the "Preliminary Note on Yoga" by Dr. L.D. Barnett prefixed to the well-known work *Lalla-Vakyani* (Asiatic Society Monographs, Vol. XVII, published in 1920) which gives the general account of the tenets of the Yoga system. The following is the brief information on the Yoga system based on the Dr. Barnett's Note.

"In Yogic theory the human body is conceived as a miniature copy or replica of the world without it; the forces by which this microcosm is controlled at the same time operate upon the macrocosm outside, and thus by certain physical and mental processes the Yogi can win for himself not only supernatural powers over his own body and mind but also a miraculous control over the universe, culminating in the complete translation of his soul into the highest phase of Being, the Absolute (usually conceived as Supreme Shiva) for ever and ever." In the human body there are numerous nadis (nerves) among which three are of supreme importance, Sushumna, Ida, and Pingala, which descend from the brain into the pit of the abdomen. It is stated that between the pudendum and naval is a 'bulb' (Kanda), into which the nadis debouch. These three nadis are in immediate conjunction, Ida being on the left hand of Sushumna, and pingala on the right. Sushumna rises vertically from the pelvis region along the vertebral column as far as the Brahma-randhra (the upper extreme of Sushumna and of the inner nadi enclosed in Sushumna); there it bends round the right of the Ajna circle (see below) and passes up into the

left nostril. In the centre of Sushumna is a nadi called *chitra*, ... There are six chakras or circles, which are conceived as being of the form of lotuses, attached at intervals to Sushumna. In the abdomen is situated the first circle called *Muladhara*, or simply *Adhara*, and is imagined to be a lotus of four digits in width, situated two digits above the anus and two digits below the penis. In the pericarp of this lotus is a triangular space on which dwells the *Kula-Kundalini* (or simply *Kundalini*), who is the *Shakti* or *Chit-Shakti*, the power of spirit, the creative force of the universe. A little distance above *Muladhara*, at the base of the penis, is the second circle, *Svadhishthana*. The third circle is *Manipura*, by the naval. The forth circle is *Anahata*, situated in the heart. Above *Anahata*, and situate in the throat, is the circle *Visuddha*. The sixth circle is *Ajna* situated between the eye-brows, which contains the mystic force called *akshara-bija*. Above all these circles is the highest of all, *Sahasrara*, situated at the base of the palate. The object of Yogic contemplation is to absorb the *Kundalini* in the microcosm, representing the macrocosmic Energy, into *Sahasrara* typifying the absolute ... In order to effect this transit of *Kundalini* through *Sushumna* and the *Brahma-randhra* into *Sahasrara*, the nadis must, by the exercise of *pranayama*, be blocked up with air introduced into them by inspiration (*puraka*) and retained in them (*kumbhaka*). The final expiration of this retained air is called *rechaka*. By performing the mystic exercises, the *Kundalini shakti*, i.e. the power of spinal cord is roused in its six centres (chakras); thus the *Sadhaka* (Yogi) attains supernatural subtle powers of soul. When the *Kundalini* is stimulated to a supreme effort by long Yogic exercise, the soul enters into the realm of the Absolute, in which it is merged into the infinite bliss of *Parameshvara*. It has been suggested that the chakras and other terms of Yogic anatomy correspond more or less to real parts of the human body, and the following identifications are proposed :- *Sushumna*: the spinal cord; *Ida*: the left sympathetic cord; *Pingala*: the right sympathetic cord; *Chitra*: the grey matter of the spinal cord; *Brahma-randhra*: the central canal of the spinal cord; *Muladhara*: the sacral plexus; *Manipura*: the epigastric plexus; *Anahata*: the cardiac plexus; *Vishddha*: the laryngeal or pharyngeal plexus; *Ajna*: the cavernous plexus; *Sahasrara*: the Medula oblongata. For details of the Shaiva Yoga, see the Dr. Barnett's Preliminary Note on Yoga referred to above; *Shakti*

and Shakta by woodroffe and Vatulanatha Sutras.

Recently some Psychologists have started the study of man and his spiritual nature with the modern scientific method. This has given rise to a new branch of Psychology, known as Parapsychology which is indeed one of the youngest sciences. It deals with the deeper and supernormal nature of man. It originated in the great movement, known as Psychical Research. Psychical Research is a scientific investigation into such rare, odd and strange phenomena which defy human intellect. Much progress has not been recorded as yet in the study of occult powers attained by man by practising Yogic methods.

It was in 1882 that a Society for Psychical Research was formed in England to investigate into the nature of such phenomena with the help of purely scientific method. As a result of the work of this society we are in possession of a vast scientific knowledge which throws a flood of light on the deeper nature of man. Psychical Research is now both a field and a laboratory science. There are Departments and Chairs of it in some well-known universities of the world, such as Cambridge in England and Duke in America. Psychical Research or Parapsychology has penetrated human nature more deeply than any other science, pursuing the modern scientific method, has so far done, although human nature still remains vastly unexplored. The achievements of the society and of the individual investigators in their inquiries into the abnormal phenomena, such as Telepathy or Clairvoyance, Retrocognition, Precognition or Premonition. Telekinesis etc. are indeed the mere beginnings of Parapsychology. Supernatural powers achieved by a Yogi need a thorough and deeper investigation. Modern Psychologists and Scientists cannot afford to neglect their investigation in this direction. 'A comparative study of Indian Psychology and Western Psychical Research is really overdue', says Dr. B. L. Atreya (of Benaras Hindu University) in his paper (Presidential Address) read in the Psychology Section of the Indian Philosophical Congress, 1951. Emphasising the great purpose of "Comparative study of Western Psychical Research and Indian thought" for the service of mankind today, Dr. Atreya, while concluding his address, aptly remarks, "we have arrived, I venture to say, at such a juncture in the history of civilisation that a comparative study of Psychical research and Indian thought should be pursued in right earnest. It will, I think, unite the East and the West, the past and the present, science and religion, more than any other activity of mankind has so far done."

CHAPTER II

SOME CONTROVERSIAL VIEW POINTS

Pratyabhijna System indigenous to Kashmir; the name of the System; the time of its existence; its connection with Shankaracharya's School of Vedanta; and its differences from the Vedanta System.

In this chapter we shall take up some controversial view points with regard to the Pratyabhijna system and bring out its distinctive features.

Pratyabhijna System Indigenous to Kashmir :- Dr. Pandey presumes that Pratyabhijna Philosophy was not indigenous to Kashmir but was introduced and developed by the two ancestral lines which came to Kashmir from outside. He says, according to the ending verses of Shiva-drashti, the Shaivagamas were brought to Kashmir by Samgamaditya, the fourth ancestor of Somananda who is stated to have come there from Kailasa. It is also stated by Dr. Pandey that Atrigupta, the renowned Shaiva philosopher of Kanauj and the earliest known ancestor of Abhinavagupta, was brought to Kashmir by king Lalitaditya sometime after 740 A.D. On the basis of these two references Dr. Pandey is of the opinion that "for building a monistic system of its own Kashmir needed men and material which were supplied by the two ancestral lines which came to Kashmir from outside." This finding of Dr. Pandey is hardly acceptable in view of the fact that Kashmir was from ancient times the seat of learning and the philosophic knowledge was no innovation there. The Pratyabhijna system was only a logical development of the philosophic ideas prevailing in Kashmir at the time of its origination.

To those who think that the Pratyabhijna or Trika Darshana and its teachers were brought to Kashmir from outside, it may be questioned that before its emergence in Kashmir where else did it originally exist wherefrom it was brought to Kashmir by the ancestors of Somananda and Abhinavagupta. So far as the mythological origin of Shaivagamas

from Shrikantha or Bhairava in Kailasa (the abode of Shiva) and their spread in Kashmir by the fourth ancestor of Somananda are concerned, it may be noted that these are not the historical facts but are intended to give sanctity to Shaivagamas. Actually we have no trace of the system outside Kashmir before Somananda's time.

On Page 11 of his work "Abhinavagupta" Dr. Pandey accepts, on the authority of Tantraloka, Commentary, III, 194, that Abhinavagupta learnt Trika Darshana from Lakshmanagupta, a native teacher of Kashmir, and not from any outsider or his descendent or disciple. This is also corroborated by the statement of Pt. Madhusudan Koul in his Introduction to Ishvara Pratyabhijna Vimarshini, Vol. II, P. 7, (quoted by Dr. Pandey in his "Abhinavagupta", P.5) who says: 'He received instruction in the Pratyabhijna Shastra from his father Lakshmanagupta...' Dr. Pandey objects that 'Lakshmanagupta, though undoubtedly a teacher of Abhinava in Pratyabhijna, was certainly not his father' and therefore he says that it 'requires correction'. In this remark Dr. Pandey himself admits that Lakshmanagupta did not belong to Abhinavagupta's immigrant ancestral line but was born from some other native family of Kashmir. It is however certain that Lakshmanagupta, the teacher of Abhinavagupta, learnt the Pratyabhijna system in Kashmir and not outside. Jayaratha, the commentator of Tantraloka, states in clear terms in the following verse, that the Pratyabhijna Darshana (the Monistic system of Kashmir) emerged and flourished in Kashmir, and it is from this country that it spread in other parts of India :-

श्रीसोमानन्दपादप्रभृति-गुरुवरादिष्ट-सन्नीतिमार्गो

लब्ध्वा यत्रैव सम्यक्पटिमनि घटनामीश्वराद्वैतवादः ।

कश्मीरेभ्यः प्रसृत्य प्रकटपरिमलो रंजयन्सर्वदेशान्

देशेऽन्यस्मिन्नदृष्टो घुसृणविसरत्सर्ववन्द्यत्वमाप ॥

In this verse it is explicitly stated that the originators of this monistic system were the natives of Kashmir, namely Somananda and others. Just as saffron is indigenous to Kashmir, so is this system of philosophy. It was not to be found elsewhere before its origination in Kashmir (देशेऽन्यस्मिन्नदृष्टो). While it spread from Kashmir (कश्मीरेभ्यः प्रसृत्य) it was received and held in high esteem by the people of other countries as an unique thing like saffron. (Refer in this connection Dr. Pandey's "Abhinavagupta" Pages 83--84)

The name of the system :- Attention is drawn to para 4 under the same heading on the foregoing pages 9 and 10, in which it is concluded that the system, by which we mean a philosophic system, cannot be called by any other name, Trika, Spanda or Shaiva system, except the Pratyabhijna system. Dr. Pandey, however, prefers to call the system as 'Trika'. He has given the various reasons why the system is called the Trika, "As stated in Paratrimshika, the system as a whole is called the Trika in Shaiva literature since it deals with the triple principle Shiva, Shakti and Anu; or Pati, Pasha and Pashu; or Nara, Shakti and Shiva; or Para, Apra and Parapara; or it is called Trika for the reason that its chief authority is the triad consisting of the three chief Agamas-Siddha, Namaka and Malini (Tantraloka 1, 36), or for another reason that it included all the three systems broadly speaking Bheda, Abheda and Bhedabheda. It is also called Trika for the reason that it teaches the three-fold method of Agamic realisation-Shambhavopaya Shaktopaya and Anavopaya." As is apparent, in this wider sense it is not possible to say that Trika is a system of philosophy. It is true that Pratyabhijna and Spanda are parts and very important parts of the Trika system, but severally they do not present the whole of what Trika represents. If there is any part which can be said to be of philosophical import in the true sense, it is the Pratyabhijna Shashtra, not any other branch of Trika system, Spanda etc. This part can be called the "Pratyabhijna Philosophy", but Spanda Shashtra cannot be called the "Spanda Philosophy", nor, as a matter of fact, the whole system as "Trika Philosophy". Dr. Pandey again states, in the Introduction to "Bhaskari", "This monistic system of Philosophy is called the Pratyabhijna Darshana on the basis of the title 'Ishvara Pratyabhijna' which Utpalacharya gave to his Karikas. But before Madhavacharya gave this title to the system in his Sarvadarshana Samgraha, it was known as Svatantrya-vada, a name by which it is referred to by Abhinavagupta in his Vivrti Vimarshini." (I.P.V.V., Vol I, P.9) Svatantrya-vada could not have been a popular name of the system as it is only one of the doctrines included in the Pratyabhijna Philosophy.

Again, J.C. Chatterji has stated that "on the Trika there were many treatises each of which was called a Shashtra, but these works do not represent so many different systems but only treatises on the various aspects of the same system of thought". Evidently J.C. Chatterji

could not differentiate the Pratyabhijna Philosophy from the whole system represented by the 'Trika Shastra.' Dr. Kurt F. Leidecker also states in his Notes to the Translation of Pratyabhijna Hrdaya that 'the Trika, Spanda as well as the Pratyabhijna are the designations of one and the same system and that distinction made by Dr. Buhler between the Spanda and the Pratyabhijna is erroneous'. The learned doctor is not only incorrect to suppose that Trika, Spanda and Pratyabhijna represent one and the same system, but also fails to notice that Pratyabhijna is the only 'Philosophy proper of the Trika', whereas Trika is the name of the whole system of religious cult with different branches, evolved from Tantric and Agamic dogmatism. It may be pointed out that Spanda branch of Trika has for its main subject matter the three mystical ways to the realization of the divine Shakti, viz. the Shambhava, the Shakta and the Anava. They are mere dogmatic statements of the fundamental principles of the Spanda system. The Spanda literature which grew on the basis of Shiva Sutras do not represent any manual of philosophy as the Pratyabhijna Shastra does. Metaphysical reasoning is the essence of a philosophical system. It is to this philosophical content of the system that Utpaladeva gives predominance in his whole work (Karikas) and treats of the Agamic tenets in a few Sutras only of Agamadhikara (part III of his work), thus relegating the religious dogmatism to a subordinate position.

This system of philosophy is also commonly known as "Kashmir Shaivism." Shaivism or Shaiva system is a more comprehensive term representing all the dualistic, non-dualistic and dualistic-cum-non-dualistic systems evolved from Shaivagamas and Shaiva Tantras. Shaiva system means any system based on Shaiva Tantras or Agamas. Sixty - four systems of the Shaiva cult are mentioned in the Shaiva scriptures of Kashmir which include Trika as one of them. Pratyabhijna is the philosophical content of the Trika, as it is so-called by Utpaladeva the originator of the system.

The time of its existence :- (*Dr. K. C Pandey's view :*) Dr. K. C. Pandey states, in his Introduction to "Bhaskari" Volume II (P. iv), that "Somananda represents himself to be the 19th descendent of Tryambaka...Therefore, if we follow the traditional method of allowing twenty-five years of each generation, we will have to admit that a period.

of four hundred and fifty years intervened between Tryambaka, the propagator of the monistic Shaivagamas, and Somananda (who lived in the 9th Century A.D.)." It may be admitted that the Agamic tenets, which are included by Somananda in his Shivadrsti amidst the philosophical contents, are derived by him from the earlier monistic Shaivagamas, said to have been first propagated by Tryambaka, as such their traditional knowledge indeed goes back to the hoary past; but it is not possible to agree with Dr. Pandey's conclusion: "the philosophic tradition, therefore, which Somananda systematises (represents), goes back to about the end of the 4th Century A.D.". Dr. Pandey, however, admits that "Somananda is the first to make a definitely rationalistic approach to the problem of the Ultimate Reality. He distinctly refers to the various prevailing schools of thought and rationally proves the unsoundness of their theories." He indeed refutes and criticises so many systems by contradicting their various theories and puts in nutshell his own new philosophical viewpoints and thus brings a radical change to the prevailing philosophical thoughts of the time. We can, therefore, say that it is Somananda who laid the foundation-stone of a new system, known as the Pratyabhijna School of Kashmir and not the particular Philosophic tradition existed before his time.

Prof. Lachhmi Dhar's View :- Prof. Lachhmi Dhar attempts to prove, in his book entitled the "Birth - Place of Kalidasa," that the Pratyabhijna Philosophy existed in Kalidasa's time' (in the 5th Century A.D.). Firstly, according to him, 'Shaivism followed by Kalidasa is a Monistic Philosophy which is no other than the Pratyabhijna Philosophy of Kashmir.' Secondly, as he says, 'Kalidasa propounded the Philosophy of Pratyabhijna in his works, particularly Shakuntala...which is the allegorical representation of this philosophy.' The reasons given by Prof. Lachhmi Dhar need be examined with reference to these two points. There is no evidence in Abhijnana Shakuntala or any other work of Kalidasa to show that the Pratyabhijna system existed in his time, nor any reference to the doctrines of the system in his works.

It can be admitted that Kalidasa was a worshipper of Shiva and followed Shaivism of non-sectarian type, but there is no reason to agree with Dr. Lachhmi Dhar's remark: "We shall find that the

type of Shaivism represented by Kalidasa is the same that Madhavacharya describes as the 'Pratyabhijna Darshana' or Recognitive System, which is the Kashmirian Shaivism." Pratyabhijna as a distinct system with a name to it originated in the ninth century, A. D. being then taught for the first time by Somananda and his disciple Utpaladeva and not by any earlier teacher at the time of Kalidasa or before him as supposed by Prof. Lachhmi Dhar. Kalidasa lived in the fifth Century A.D. five centuries earlier than Somananda. Prof. Lachhmi Dhar says that the Pratyabhijna system was known to Kalidasa, because "the Shaivism of Kalidasa was essentially monistic in its character." It may be noted that it is the monistic doctrine of the Upanishadas which was known to Kalidasa and by which he was influenced as is stated by Dr. Hiller Brandt and some other scholars, and not by the Pratyabhijna system.

The next point which Prof. Lachhmi Dhar tries to make in his book is that there was no 'total dearth of ancient monistic Agamas in Kashmir'. This point does not go to prove that the system of Pratyabhijna Philosophy existed in Kalidasa's time. The only work which can be said to be a monistic Agama that has come down to us is the Shivadrshhti of Somananda and this did not exist in Kalidasa's time. But even assuming that there existed various ancient Shaivagamas, monistic or any other kind, the existence of any connected system of philosophic thought such as the Pratyabhijna, earlier to Somananda, directed against the rival theories of other schools of thought, such as the Buddhists, the Vedantins etc. is not proved. Somananda was the first to collect together all the philosophic thoughts from the various systems as well as the agamas and give it a skeleton form of a distinct philosophy which was later on systematised by his pupil, Utpaladeva.

Here is an important point that needs consideration. Apparently Prof. Lachhmi Dhar is correct to say, on the basis of the verses Nos. 1270-1274, 1283-1286 and 1294-1295 of Nilamata Purana as quoted by him in note No. 123 given in his book "The Birth-Place of Kalidasa", "Now whatever may be the original form of Shaivism in Kashmir, it cannot be denied that in very early centuries Monistic Shaivism ... representing the Pratyabhijna doctrine is already existent in the Nilamata (Purana) which in its present form is assigned the date sixth or seventh centuries A.D., at any rate earlier than the revival of Vedantism by

the great Shankara". The central idea underlying these verses is briefly given as follows: "Brahma admonishes Indra that he must recognise (अभिज्ञातोसि) Shiva as the only Supreme Lord (सर्वेश्वर), Cause of all causes (कारणकारणम्); this great Lord (महेश्वर) is the supreme Actor (omni-potent) and the supreme Knower (omni-scient) (स एष सर्वकर्ता च सर्वज्ञश्च महेश्वर); who by His free will, creates the universe consisting of sentient and insentient beings (यदिच्छया जगदिदं वर्तते सचराचरम्) Whose, i.e. of the Lord (प्रभो), 'Creeper of power (शक्तिलता) blooms forth (पुष्पिता) and manifests itself as the universe... (यस्य शक्तिलता सेऽयं...जगद् भासयते भवात्); 'you and I (Indra and Brahma) act (stand) under His command'; (त्वमहं चाभियस्यैव शासने समवस्थितौ) From Indra's prayer to Shiva in Nilamata as quoted by the Scholar in his book, the following relevant points may be given: Indra says, that the Lord of Lords sustains the three worlds by his Maya Shakti (meaning the 'wonderous power of the Lord') (मायाधृत जगत् त्रय). He has no motive for his acts of creation other than his own innate desire (तव कार्यं न विद्यते). Moha or Delusion is produced by Shiva's own Shakti, Maya Shakti; and so on. The question arises, - Do these ideas only comprise the main doctrine of the Pratyabhijna philosophy? We admit that these ideas play a prominent role in the system, but they represent not only the central theme of the Pratyabhijna philosophy but also that of the Vedanta system. If such is the case, what are the distinctive features of the two systems of Philosophy by which they differ from one another? Perhaps it escaped the notice of Prof. Lachhmi Dhar. All these ideas are initially taught in the Upanishadas, and it is from this fountain-head that these ideas are incorporated in the Nilamata Purana as in the Vedanta and Pratyabhijna systems. There is nothing new in the ideas given in the above-mentioned verses of Nilamata which existed earlier than the emergence of the Pratyabhijna system. These ideas are not the distinctive features of the Pratyabhijna philosophy which, besides, is essentially something more and somewhat different from them. In reference to the central theme common in the Pratyabhijna system and the Vedanta, readers' attention is drawn to Chapter III, part ii (Survey of the earlier speculations and doctrines), in which most of these common ideas are traced in the Vedas, the Upanishadas and other earlier philosophic literature grown from Vedic and Buddhist thought. Therefore, to denote the full implication of the Pratyabhijna in these ideas which existed

earlier, is not quite sound. These ideas have possibly been incorporated by shaivas in some shaivagama texts from the Vedic sources and also by Kashmirians in the Nilamata, either directly from the shaivagamas or from the vedic sources. It will be shown in this work that the system while incorporating these ideas undoubtedly made some additions and alterations to the earlier doctrines of the upanishadas and thus made a radical revision or reorientation of the Vedanta system. Regarding this the reader's attention is drawn to the last topic dealt with in this chapter.

Prof. Lachhmi Dhar's point that Shakuntala is an allegorical representation or dramatisation of Pratyabhijna Philosophy :- Prof. Lachhmi Dhar has also tried to prove in his book (The Birth - Place of Kalidasa) that 'Kalidasa propounded the Pratyabhijna Philosophy of Kashmir' in his works, particularly Shakuntala. He says, 'Kalidasa was a follower of the ancient Pratyabhijna Philosophy of Kashmir and that the beautiful drama of love between Dushyanta and Shakuntala is also a beautiful allegory on the tenets of the Pratyabhijna Philosophy of Kashmir...' He further says that : 'in order to popularise this Pratyabhijna Philosophy' in its early days of promulgation, Kalidasa hits at the happy device of writing an allegory on the basis of the love story of Shakuntala in the Mahabharata'. We shall now try to discuss how far Prof. Lachhmi Dhar's view stands.

We find that the learned Prof. has strained the specific philosophical ideas in some of the common words occurring in Shakuntala which are used in technical sense in the Pratyabhijna system and twisted the tenets of the system in the various love incidents of the drama. In support of this he has given neither positives nor parallels. There is no evidence in Abhijnana Shakuntala or any other work of Kalidasa to show that he wrote Shakuntala as an allegorical representation of the Pratyabhijna Philosophy with the specific object of popularising it 'in its early days of promulgation'. From some words, such as 'Abhijnana' etc. used by Kalidasa, we have no reason to infer that Shakuntala is an allegory on the tenets of this philosophy. For instance, Kalidasa did not use the word 'Abhijnana' to denote any philosophic significance as we find in the technical term 'Pratyabhijna' used in the system. Prof. Lachhmi Dhar, however, says, "The word 'Abhijnana' or 'Pratyabhijna

which occurs so frequently in the drama, should be taken in its philosophic sense. The poet has given us an important suggestion in using the word 'Abhijnana in such a prominent place as the title of the book itself-Abhijnana Shakuntalam which should signify in its philosophic sense the drama dealing with the 'recognition of Divine Shakti' or, in other words, realization of God". In this connection we may remark that the word 'Abhijnana' or 'Pratyabhijna' in ordinary sense means 'Recognition'. The word represents the experience in which direct perception (drshta) is associated with memory (Smarana), and ordinarily the word is used with this meaning in our every-day life. * For instance, we say 'here is Devadatta; I recognise him to be the same person whom I met some years ago in Burma'. Recognition takes place by perceiving some sign which recalls the memory of the object previously perceived. In the drama of Shakuntala, the recognition of the heroine by the sign of the finger - ring no doubt plays an important part; hence the word 'Abhijnana' is used by Kalidasa in the title of the book to denote this implication. But this word 'Abhijnana' as used in Shakuntala cannot convey the philosophic significance of the term 'Pratyabhijna' occurring in this system of philosophy. In this case also 'Pratyabhijna' means 'Recognition' in which the association of direct perception (Anubhava) with memory (Smrti) is necessary, but these two processes relate to the realization or 'recognition' of Divine Shakti. † So to attach this significance to the word 'Abhijnana' is evidently far-fetched.

We shall now follow how Prof. Lachhmi Dhar twists the Philosophy of Pratyabhijna in amongst the love incidents of Shakuntala. He writes, "it is highly probable, that the idea of allegorical representation of the Pratyabhijna tenet on the basis of a *love story*, was suggested to the mind of Kalidasa by a *love-metaphor* of a similar character

* स्मरणानुभवारूढा सामानाधिकरण्याधीः

संस्कारेन्द्रियजन्या च प्रत्यभिज्ञा प्रकीर्तिता ।

(I. P. V, Vol I, P. 20 Foot-note)

† तस्य महेश्वरस्य प्रतिभिज्ञा—

प्रतीपमात्माभिमुख्येन ज्ञानं प्रकाशः प्रत्यभिज्ञा ।

(I. P. V., P. 19-20)

दृष्टस्मरणयोरैक्ये स्थिते तदुपपद्यते ।

तथा सा प्रत्यभिज्ञानात्स एवायमिति स्थितिः ॥

(Shivadrshti IV, 119-20)

that might be current among the teachers of the Pratyabhijna Philosophy in his day and employed to illustrate the novel point of the Pratyabhijna, as we note that the *metaphor of love*, was employed by Utpala who re-affirmed the Pratyabhijna doctrine and who might have borrowed that love metaphor from the ancient sources and traditions of that philosophy in Kashmir, as previously known to Kalidasa." It may be questioned why Kalidasa did not make any explicit reference, in *Shakuntala* or any other work, to the Pratyabhijna Philosophy which he intended to popularise? If he knew this Philosophy and deliberately invented the allegory in *Shakuntala* on the basis of its tenets, he should have clearly declared it in the drama, and preferably at the outset of it. Prof. Lachhmi Dhar presumes that the incidence of the recognition of the heroine by the perception of the finger-ring bringing to the mind of Dushyanta the recollection of his former love, indicates that Kalidasa must have known the Pratyabhijna Philosophy in which the 'Recognition' of the Divine Shakti is similarly caused by the direct perception (*Anubhva*) of some of its aspects associated with the recollection (*Smrti*) of its other aspects. † But this supposition is baseless, as there can be no motive in his remaining silent about the system of thought which Kalidasa meant to propagate in *Shakuntala*. From the coincidence of a love metaphor in the Pratyabhijna Philosophy and that of a similar character in *Shakuntala*, with the distinct incidence of Recognition, it cannot be concluded that the latter is borrowed by Kalidasa from the ancient sources and traditions of that philosophy in Kashmir, and has not originated from his mind. It is moreover presumed by Prof. Lachhmi Dhar that the same love-metaphor was employed by Utpaladeva in the tenth century A.D. to illustrate the novel thought of the Pratyabhijna as it might have been current among the teachers of the philosophy from the days of Kalidasa † or even

Compare —

† तैस्तैरप्युपयाचितैरुपनतस्तन्व्याः स्थितोऽप्यन्तिके

कान्तोलोक समान एवमपरिज्ञातो न रन्तु यथा ।

लोकस्थैष तथानवेक्षितगुणः स्वात्मापिविश्वेश्वरो

नैवालं निजवैभवाय तदियं तत्प्रतिभिज्ञोदिता ॥

(I. P. V Vol II, P. 273-4)

किन्तु अभिज्ञानाभरणदर्शनेन शापो निवर्तिष्यते

..... अथवा ईदृशोऽनुरागो-अभिज्ञानमपेक्षते

कथमिवेतत् । त्वया प्रत्याभिज्ञातमात्मानं पश्यामि ।

(*Shakuntala*)

before him. The learned Professor has profusefy compared the incidents in Shakuntala with many different ideas in the Pratyabhijna philosophy, such as the comparison of the dramatic 'Shrishti' with the universe stated to be 'the expression of divine love', Dushyanta and Shakuntala (the hero and the heroine) with Shiva and Shakti, Shakuntala appearing 'big with child' with Shakti carrying and developing the seed of Shiva's iccha (desire) to create the universe and so on, and on the basis of mere analogies concludes that Shakuntala is the dramatisation of this philosophy. But it may be noted that the philosophy of Pratyabhijna can hardly be woven into a drama by such comparisons.

All the above proves that the Pratyabhijna System which appeared in Kashmir in the ninth century A. D. as a distinct School of Monistic philosophy did not exist in Kalidasa's time, in the fifth century A. D., as there is no positive evidence to show that this philosophy was known to Kalidasa. On the other hand he is known to be an Advaita-vadi Vedantin as is affirmed by some scholars like Hiller Brandt who are of opinion that he was influenced by the philosophy of the Upanishadas and Bhagvata Gita which existed long before him. † Dr. Keith also remarks in his History of Classical Literature (P. 10) that "much more ingenious is an effort to fix his (Kalidasa's) home in Kashmir and to trace in his poetry an adumbration of the Pratyabhijna Shastra of that Land....." We must, however, admit that in Kashmir, where Kalidasa is supposed to have been born and bred up, there already existed various doctrines of the Shaivas, the Buddhists, the Sankhya, the Vedantins and other schools that gave an impetus to the development of a tendency of thought from which emerged the Pratyabhijna system with distinctive features of its own, in the ninth century A.D. That this system is indeed the Logical continuum

† "In spite of being a devotee of the Muse, Kalidasa shows a thorough acquaintance with the Darshanas or systems of Indian Philosophy. His writings are saturated with profound devotion for his favourite deity, Shiva and other gods of the Indian mythology..... Even a cursory view of his works will show that he was influenced by the philosophy of the Upanishadas and the Bhagvatgita. He was an Advaita-vadi Vedantin, though he recognised the value of other systems of Philosophy as far as they harmonised with his own. Kalidasa appears to be a monotheist than monist...."

(Hiller Brandt's "Vaishnavism and Shaivism"
V. I, P. 169)

of the earlier philosophic tendencies of the thinkers of the Land is indicated by a mention of numerous prevailing schools of thought in Shivadrshiti of Somananda who does not agree with their points of view.

The connection between the Pratyabhijna System and the Shankaracharya's School of Vedanta:- There are two versions of the connection between the Pratyabhijna Philosophy and the Shankaracharya's system. One is according to Dr. Buhler's "Report" which says: 'This system (Pratyabhijna) does not appear to be older than the end of the ninth century A.D. and because it is of so late a date, it seems to me most probable that its resemblance to Shankaracharya's doctrines cannot be purely accidental. The connection between Shankaracharya's school and the Pratyabhijna points also to a Kashmirian tradition which asserts that the great Acharya of the South came to Kashmir and was vanquished in a disputation by the chief exponent of Pratyabhijna doctrines.' Thus, according to Dr. Buhler's point of view, it is possible that Shankaracharya's System of Vedanta may have somewhat influenced the Pratyabhijna School. Another version of the incident may be read from Dr. K. C. Pandey's account in his thesis: "Abhinavagupta" (An Historical and Philosophical Study, pp. 88-90). He writes that the decline of Buddhism had started in Kumaril Bhatta's time (750 A.D.). 'Shankaracharya visited Kashmir some time in the second decade of the ninth century A.D. after giving his final blow to Buddhism in the rest of India. The influence of Shankara's Tantric philosophy on the Trika is so great...This visit of such a great person (Shankara)...purged the local faith of its Buddhistic element and strengthened the position of the new Tantric creed.' (Ref. Shankara Digvijaya Chapter XVI, 54-80.)

We come to know from Dr. Buhler's account that Shankaracharya visited Kashmir and held a discussion with 'the chief exponent of Pratyabhijna doctrines (Abhinavagupta)' in which the former was vanquished. According to tradition in Kashmir, Shankara preached his idealistic philosophy as expounded in his Vedanta Sutra Bhashya wherein Maya-vada or Adyasavada is one of the prominent doctrines. But this philosophy did not appeal to Kashmirian philosophers like Abhinavagupta. Further investigation in this connection establishes that this supposed discussion between Shankaracharya and Abhinavagupta never actually took place because the former flourished in 778-820 A.D., while the

latter lived towards the eleventh century A.D. But even if the supposed disputation took place between Shankaracharya and some one else, the only bearing that it has on our subject is that, according to tradition, the superiority of Kashmir Shaiva Philosophy had to be admitted by Shankaracharya. But, there exists no internal evidence to this effect in any of his main works. According to the Shankara Digvijaya of Madhava, which is noticed under a slightly different name "Sukshma Shankara Vijaya" in Dr. Aufrecht's catalogue, we have a different account of the disputation between Shankaracharya with some person named Abhinavagupta outside Kashmir who was a Shakta contemporary of Shankaracharya. This namesake of Kashmirian Abhinavaguptacharya belonged to Kamarupa (Assam). He was a great opponent of the monistic theory of Shakara. He is stated to have engaged Shankaracharya in a controversial discussion (Shastrartha) when the latter reached Assam in the course of his Digvijaya. In that he was defeated and so he became a disciple of the victor. This information is given by Dr. Pandey in his book "Abhinavagupta," p 2. But regarding these accounts we have got no reliable evidence. It cannot also be supposed that it is this account which somehow became current in Kashmir under different circumstances.

From Dr. Pandey's version of the connection between the two systems, it is evident, not that Shankaracharya's Philosophical thought was rejected or refuted by Kashmirian Philosophers, but his Tantric Philosophy, which he propagated in Kashmir, influenced the Trika System. In this connection it may be remarked that the well known historical Shankaracharya, the expounder of the Vedanta Sutras and the Upanishadas, never upheld, preached or practised any kind of Tantric Philosophy in his System (Darshana). The internal evidence from his main works, the Brahma Sutra Bhasya and the Upanishada Bhashya, shows that neither the Tantra technique, nor the Tantric doctrine was ever known to Shankaracharya, the great Vedanta Philosopher. The occurrence of some philosophical ideas and technical terms as common in Shankaracharya's Dakshinamurti Stotra (D.M.S.) and Ishvara Pratyabhijna Vimarshini (I.P.V.), as pointed out by Dr. Pandey in certain quotations from both these works on pages 88-89 of his thesis on "Abhinavagupta," do not show the influence of any Tantric philosophy on Pratyabhijna, as we are familiar with these ideas and terms in the early Upanishadas

and also in Bhadarayana's Brahma Sutras. It is not understood what specifically Tantric is in these ideas which represent more or less the Vedantic thought.

The common idea underlying D.M.S., S. 2 and I.P.V., I, 182 * is that "the object world is manifested (Prakashyte) by Chidatman (the Supreme Soul) by the power of his will (Ichha vashat) like the creation of a Yogin without any extraneous substance." This evidently is a doctrine of the Upanishadas which is incorporated by Badarayana in his Vedanta System in Brahma Sutra II, i, 25 -- "देवादिवर्षलोके" Shankaracharya in his commentary on the sutra, explains that creating the world, in the case of Brahman, is the same as the creation of Gods, Yogins and others in their ordinary experience from mere will (Sankalpa). There is nothing specifically Tantric in the terms Maya, Sveccha, Chidatma and Iccha, The common idea contained in D.M.S., Commentary (2), S, 13 and I.P.V., I, 39 † is that the Supreme consciousness (Chetana) is endowed with Knowledge (Jnana) and Activity (Kriya). These are the very life of the universe, or, in other words, are potent to create the universe. This idea is initially found in Shvetashvatara Upanishada, "परासिंशक्तिर्विविधैव श्रूयते स्वाभाविकी ज्ञान बल क्रिया च" Sv. Up. VI, 8. As regards the common expression "Satta

* बीजस्यान्तरिवाङ्कुरो जगदिदं प्राङ्निर्विकल्पं पुन-

र्माया कल्पित देश काल कलना वैचित्र्याचित्रीकृतम् ।

मायावीव विजृम्भयत्यपि महायोगीव यः स्वेच्छया

तस्मै श्री गुरु मूर्तये नम इदं श्रीदर्शण मूर्तये ॥

D. M S., S.2, and

चिदात्मैव हि देवोन्तः स्थितमिच्छा वशाद्बहः ।

योगीव निरुपादानमर्थजातं प्रकाशयेत् ॥

I.P.V., I, 182

† ज्ञानक्रिये जगत् कृतपतौ दृश्यते चेतनाश्रये

D.M.S., Comm(2), S.13 and

ज्ञानं क्रिया च भूतानं जीवतां जीवनं मतम्

I.P.V., 1,39

sphuratta" found in D.M.S. commentary (2), S. 13 and I.P.V., I, 207 ‡, it may be remarked that in Weber's Indica Studien IX, Page 163, we find that 'Satta' (existence) occurs in Nrsimha Tapani Upanishad and Ramatapani Upanishad 287. 'Sphuratta' in the sense of 'manifestation' is often used in Vedantic texts. Finally the common idea underlying D.M.S., Commentary (2), S. 50 and I.P.V., I, 29 § that Knowledge (Jnana) and Activity (Kriya) are innate in the Supreme Being, occurs in Shvetashvatara Upanishad, as already shown in the item 2 above.

From these quotations given by Dr. Pandey, it is rather evident that there is a close resemblance between the doctrines of the Vedanta and Pratyabhijna systems, as has also been observed by Dr. Bühler in his 'Report'. It may be pointed out that Tantra Shastra has incorporated a large stock of doctrines and technical terms from the Vedic and Agamic sources, which seems to be the possible basis of Dr. Pandey's observations. It appears certain that the doctrines and technical terms mentioned in the quotations referred to by Dr. Pandey are borrowed by Tantra Shastra from the Upanishads which are definitely the earlier source of the Vedanta and other systems, not that these doctrines are initially taught in Tantras. Besides, Tantras mainly teach Tantric processes by virtue of which they represent a distinct school, but Dr. Pandey has not been able to trace any such doctrine either in the Shankara's Vedanta or the Pratyabhijna System. In fact, he quotes no reference from the Shankaracharya's main works, about the occurrence of any Tantric idea or expression. This want of internal evidence from his works shows that he never preached any kind of Tantric Philosophy, not to speak of the influence of that over pratyabhijna.

‡ तस्मात् सत्ता स्फुरत्ता च सर्वत्राप्यनुवर्तते

D.M.S Comm. 2, S. 13

सा स्फुरत्ता महा सत्ता देशकालाविशेषिणी

I.P.V., I, 207

§ ज्ञातृत्वमपि कर्तृत्वं स्वातन्त्र्यं तस्य केवलम् ।

D.M.S, Comm. (2), S. 50.

कर्तारि ज्ञातारि स्वात्मन्यादिसिद्धे महेश्वरे

I.P.V., I, 29

The reference to a verse from Saundarya Lahari to prove that Shankaracharya accepted the authority of Tantras does not appear satisfactory for the reason that there is doubt regarding the Adi-Shankaracharya's authorship of this Stotra. Saundarya Lahari is a devotional poem, addressed to the Goddess, abounding mainly in the rhetorical descriptions of her sublime beauty and Tantric and Yogic ideas with the exception of a few verses containing some common Vedantic thoughts. It appears that these ideas are not at all the product of a philosophic genius like Shankaracharya. According to A. Avalon, the translator of "Ananda Lahari" (Wave of Bliss), Shankara's authorship of such like Tantric works is a hotly discussed point among scholars which is still unsettled. (Refer to the Introduction to 'Ananda Lahari'). A. Avalon does neither favour nor refute the point that "Adi-Shankara", the Vedanta Philosopher, was also the author of the Tantric works. He says, 'Amongst other matters yet to be determined is the age of Adi Shankara himself'. There can, therefore, be no reliance on this work for evidence to prove that Shankaracharya had any inclination towards the Tantric practices prevalent in Kashmir or elsewhere and to support or propagate the Tantric creed in any of his genuine works. As regards 'his establishing Shri-chakra in some of his Mathas', it is possible that perhaps some name-sake of the great Shankaracharya, the Vedanta Philosopher, following the Tantric creed, may have established Shri-chakra in certain Mathas, as we hear of numerous Shankaracharyas following diverse philosophic and religious creeds who are known to have occupied the sacred 'pithas' (seats of learning) in several Mathas in southern India associated with the name of the great Shankaracharya. Moreover, Dr. Pandey gives no evidence to prove that Adi-Shankaracharya established Shri-chakra in any Matha.

We, therefore, agree with Professor Buhler's view and conclude that the Pratyabhijna system is greatly influenced by Shankara's Vedantic doctrines and not that Shakaracharya taught any Tantric philosophy which influenced the Pratyabhijna system. For similar reasons as put forth above, we cannot also agree with Dr. Paranjoti in holding the view, in her thesis on the Shaiva Siddhanta, that "Shankara was an adherent of the Shakta sect, and his system of Advaita, though to all appearances independent of Shakta Agamas, is yet

influenced by the Tantric theory." It is unfortunate that these Scholars do not base their conclusions on evidences from Shankara's main works on the Vedanta system which he represents in the Indian Philosophy. There is hardly any thing to show in Shankara's Brahma Sutra Bhashya and the Upanishada Bhashya that his system of Advaita is influenced by the Tantric theory.

Differences between the Pratyabhijna Darshana and the Vedanta System, according to traditon :- Through the invaluable efforts of Dr. Pandey, Bhaskari, an easy commentary on Ishvara Pratyabhijna Vimarshini of Abhinavagupta and the most important work on the Pratyabhijna Philosophy, believed to be lost, was unearthed which is now available in print. Bhaskaracharya, the author of this commentary, was perhaps the last teacher of this system who lived seven generations ahead of the present descendents of his family known as Rajanakas or Rajdans in Kashmir. Bhaskari not only furnishes a traditional interpretation of the abstruse text of Ishvara Pratyabhijna Vimarshini, but also brings out outstanding differences, according to tradition, between the Pratyabhijna Darshana and the Vedanta Philosophy, in a discussion between the adherents of the two systems given in its Introduction. In this discussion a distinct line of demarcation is drawn between the two systems which are shown differing widely from one another. The origin of the Pratybhijna system has been traced from Goddess Vak, Vagishvari (Goddess of Learning), since eternity and it is stated to be traditionally handed down from Mathika Gurus. † According to the Shaivas, it is itself the sacred authority and sanction for the followers of Mathika Gurus and needs no other authority. The Shaiva adherent says that the Vedantins have got no faith in the Mathika Gurus. They accept the Shruti, the Vedic scriptures, only as their sacred authority. The Shaivas are, therefore, prohibited to take part in discussions (Shastrartha) with the Vedantins. On this point Bhaskaracharya introduces a long discussion between a Vedantin and a Shaiva adherent [the follower of Pratyabhijna System] as follows :-

† **Mathika Gurus :-** 'Matha' means a hut in Mahabharata. In Rajatarangini, III, 460, occurs 'Pashupatanam Mathah'. In Rajatarangini VI, 87 and 308 occurs 'Vidyarthinam matha'. 'Vidya-matha' is stated to be the name of a college in Kashmir, Rajatarangini III, 476, Brahman's College in Kashmir.

[Note from O Bohtlingh und R. Roth - Dictionary]

The Vedantin opens the argument with a question to the Shaiva, how is it that a discussion on sacred matters is allowed to be held between a Shaiva and a Buddhist and not between a Shaiva and a Vedantin? The Vedantin is much superior to the Buddhist, as the latter, in his definition of the Supreme Cause, stops short at Buddhi Tattva (the principle of determined thought, Reason) which is even lower than Maya Tattva (the principle of Limitation) of Shaivas. On the other hand, the Vedantin goes higher in his definition of Brahman which is perfectly in accord with the definition of Sadashiva, the third principle of the Shaivas. In reply to this the Shaiva puts a counter-question. On what authority do the Vedantins hold Brahman equivalent to Sadashiva? According to the Vedantins, Brahman is existent (Sat), Conscious (chit) and Tranquil (Shanta) as the Shrutis declare :-

‘सच्चिदानन्द ब्रह्म’; ‘एको देवः सर्वभूतेषु गूढः सर्वव्यापी सर्वभूतान्तरात्मा !
सर्वा-(कर्मा-)ध्यक्षः सर्वभूताधिवासः साक्षीचेता केवलो निगुणश्च ॥’
“एकमेवाद्वितीयं ब्रह्म नेह नानास्ति किञ्चन”

Brahman is All-pervading, Absolute, transcending all forms (Rupa), devoid of plurality and the substratum (Adhishtan) of this world which is superimposed upon it. It is free from the diversity of three kinds, technically called Sajatiya, Vijatiya and Svagata, i.e., there is nothing like nor unlike Brahman, nor is it in itself diverse in nature. This definition is accepted by the Shaivas for their third principle, Sadashiva or Sadakhya Tattva. Shiva and Shakti, the first two Tattvas, are higher than this Tattva (Sadakhya). Below these are thirty-three Tattvas beginning from the principle of Ishvara and ending with the earth, the principle of solidity. Brahman is spoken of as Auspicious (Shiva) but lacks in Vimarsha (Power of perception related to objects). Aham-vimarsa (self-perception, viz. self-consciousness) and Prakasha (manifestation) are the distinctive characteristics of the first Tattva, viz. Shiva. Brahman is a little lower than this. It is of the nature of changeless or inactive consciousness (Shanta Chit). Vimarsha implies changing nature (Kshobhatvam) and activity (Kriya), viz. Its innate power of expansion into cosmos. This Vimarsha is lacking in Brahman as it is contrary to Its tranquil (Shanta) or inactive nature. Vimarsha of Shaivas is, according to the Vedantins, a form of Vikalpa, i.e. a superimposition.

But this view is not right (न तत् युक्तं), since by accepting Vimarsha as Vikalpa (Superimposition), an unlike characteristic (Vijatiya Dharma) attaches to Brahman; to wit, the world, according to the Vedantins, is Vikalpa, i.e., mere illusion, hence unreal, and Brahman is the only real entity. Thus it implies attributing unlike characteristics (Vijatiya Dharma) to Brahman, on which the world is superimposed, which is illogical. Hence, the Vedantins will have to accept Vimarsha as a real characteristic of Brahman which gives Him the changing nature (Kshobhatvam), and not a Vikalpa (mere illusion). Prakasha in relation to subjects implies Aham-Vimarsha (self-perception, viz. self-consciousness) which is therefore the distinctive characteristic of self (svabhava bhutah eva), whereas in relation to objects, it is of the nature of their becoming manifest (Prakasha): (प्रकाशस्य हि स्वविषयोऽहमिति विमर्शः स्वभावभूत एव; बाह्यविषयोऽहमिति विमर्शः... परमार्थतः सोऽपि शैवनये प्रकाश स्वभाव एव ।)

According to the Shaivas, Shiva is all powerful, viz. He has got in Himself the changing nature (Kshobhatvam), i.e. the potentiality of changing Himself into the form of the world just as fire is endowed with the nature of burning. It cannot be supposed that something extraneous causes in Shiva the nature of changing into the form of the world, as Vedantins do in attributing Nescience (Maya) to Brahman for causing the manifestation (superimposition) of the world in Himself. The Shaivas do not attribute any thing extraneous to cause the potency of burning in fire, but it has got by nature in itself the power of burning. The Vedantins do not accept any 'real power' belonging to Brahman.

The Shaiva puts another question to the Vedantin: Are Jivas and Brahman inseparable or separate (किं भवत-मते जीव-ब्रह्मनोरैक्यं वर्तते भिन्नत्वं वा?) If the Vedantin says that Jivas are separate from Brahman, the Shaiva remains silent, since according to his system also Jivas (Pashus) are separate from Shiva though in reality their nature is the same as that of Shiva. In case the Vedantin holds that Jiva and Brahman are identical, the Shaiva demands from him a textual authority from Sruti. The Vedantin quotes the following Srutis in support of his point of view "अयमात्मा ब्रह्मा"; "सत्यं चिदात्मा"; "तत् सत्यं चात्मा". The Shaiva says, the followers of the Pratyabhijna Darshana have also got the same goal and come to prove the same result, the identical relation of Jiva and Ishvara.

The Vedantin demands from the Shaiva a textual authority from his own scriptures in support of this tenet. The Shaiva says, the Pratyabhijna Darshana does not need any authority to stand upon. Recognition (Pratyabhijna) is in itself sufficient for the realization of this end, the unity of Jiva and Ishvara. It is a new path (Marga navo) to this realization. The Vedantin retorts, Recognition cannot be applicable to the realization of the unity of Jiva and Ishvara, as in this case there occurs no simultaneity of the present perception (Anubhava) and the past perception, i.e. the present perception is not associated with the memory of the past perception (Smarana), indispensable to the process of 'Recognition', since Atman is self-manifest in both the states, past and present (भातभासमानैकीकरणरूपा प्रत्यभिज्ञात्रन युक्ता). The shaiva says, it is true that Atman is perceived in the past (Bhato) as well as at present (Bhasamanashcha). Owing to forgetfulness (Vismrti) innate in his own nature of self-dependence (Svatantrya), Atman lacks in Lordliness (Ishvaratva) which is, however, regained by the intuitive experience 'Recognition.' In every-day life, this forgetfulness takes place even in the things which are actually before us, as in the famous example of the Vedantins - 'Where is the tenth boy?' the counter being the tenth in the group, forgets to count himself when he counted nine boys only standing in his presence. (भासमानस्याप्यात्मनो विस्मृतिर्जायतएवान्यथा दशमस्त्वमसीतिन्यायेन तत्त्वमश्रीत्युपदेशायोगात् ।)

Lordliness (Ishvaratva) is of two kinds, Para and Apra, the former is that which relates to the Transcendental Self and the latter pertains to the immanent self, i.e. the limited perceiving selves (subjects) in relation to this object-world. Para is characterised by Aham-Vimarsha or Aham-Paramarsha (i.e. manifestation of self-'I') and Apra by Idam-Vimarsha or Idam-paramarsha (i.e. perception of 'this'-object world). In practical life individual self is dependent upon Aham-vimarsha, perception of self (as denoted by Aham-'I') i.e. self-consciousness, as well as Idam-vimarsha perception of object (denoted by Idam-'this'), which is the counterpart (pratiyogi) of the former, hence it lacks lordliness. In this connection the Vedantin says, that Jiva is of the nature of Vikalpa, fiction or illusion, विकल्परूपः विषय i.e., on its Aham-paramarsha is superimposed its counterpart Idam-paramarsha. The Shaiva asks, how can Brahman be of the nature of Vikalpa, while Vedantins themselves admit Brahman assuming the form of Jivas, according to the Sruti,

‘यथा विस्फुलिगा...’ i.e. ‘Jivas evolve from Brahman as sparks from fire’ ‘अग्निकनन्यायेन’. It also explains the plurality of Jivas in conformity with the non-dualistic doctrine of Vedanta. This doctrine is also supported by another Shruti, * (The Self transforming Itself in diverse creation assumes various names and forms). From this it is clear that Jiva is of the nature of Brahman. If the Vedantin supposes that Brahman lacks the Paramarsha Shakti, viz. the Power of differentiating subjects from objects, then Jiva also lacks it. Thus its very existence as Jiva becomes null and void. But as we find that a spark has by nature the power of burning which is originally innate in fire from which the spark evolves; so does Jiva imbibe the Paramarsha Shakti from Brahman or Shiva who is endowed with It initially. The Vedantin objects to this point and says that Vimarsha comes to Jiva by adopting Upadhi (body) † (Upadhi means something that conditions limitation to holding capacity.) The Shaiva questions, can smoke be produced from water in an Upadhi (pitcher) of wood? It is, of course, right, that the Upadhi (body) renders Jiva limited in powers, but the power of perception (Vimarsha) cannot be the result of adopting an Upadhi (body). The Vedantin replies that he accepts Maya Shakti as a principle that divides Brahman into limited forms. On this point the Shaiva puts the question: Is Maya Shakti innate in Jiva or Brahman? If the Vedantin says, Maya Shakti is innate in the former, then the division into Jiva and Brahman is impossible, since Maya Shakti which causes this division is not, in that case, innate in Brahman. ‡ In case Maya Shakti is supposed to be innate in the latter (Brahman), then its purity is impaired by limitation which is inconsistent with the nature of Brahman (Shiva). § On this inconsistency the vedantin says that in essence Maya is not a real thing: ¶ What is it then, the Shaiva asks? The Vedantin answers, it is of the nature of illusion, i.e. which causes one to manifest itself in the form of many. What is the characteristic

* “अनेन जीवेनानुप्रविश्ये नामरूपे व्याकरवाणि”;

† “ननु देहाद्युपाधिना सात्र स्फुरिता”;

‡ “आश्रयत्वविषयत्वभागीनी निर्विभागचित्तिरेव केवला पूर्व सिद्धतमसो न पश्चिमा नाश्रयो भवति नापि गोचरः १”; § ‘अन्योन्यप्रतिघातनाशविधुरं विश्वं कथं भासताम् । मायामात्रमिदं ततोऽतिनिपुणं वेदान्तिनः संश्रिता । माया कस्य शिवस्य तर्हि शिवता नैवास्य”; ¶ ‘माया परमार्थतः किमपि तु न विद्यते’ (Refer Bhaskari PP.10-15)

[rupa] of this Maya? If the Vedantin says, it is of the nature of ignorance, the Shaiva asks, in that case, is it something of a positive character (bhavarupam) or of a negative character (abhava rupam) i.e. characterised by the absence of knowledge (Jnan-abhava-rupam)? The latter alternative cannot be accepted as in the absence of knowledge, there will be no manifestation of diverse objects. It must have some positive characteristic causing diversity of objects, since we learn in the vedas "Indra assumes many forms by Maya". (इन्द्रो मायाभिः पुरुरूप ईयते). Moreover, pure Brahman cannot be the cause of the impure world, which is of the nature of illusion, and not real like Brahman. Thus if Brahman, which is a real entity, is presumed to become illusive world, it will be reduced to nothingness (Abhava-rupam). In case of the former alternative, i.e. if it is admitted that Maya is ignorance of a positive characteristic (Bhava rupa), the Shaiva questions, what is the nature of this positive entity (Bhava)? The Vedantin replies, it is inexplicable (Anirvachya). The Shaiva questions again, how do you call it Maya, then? The Vedantin replies: 'Inexplicably' (अनिर्वाच्यतया इति). The Shaiva says, then Maya is the same as Brahman, since the Shruti declares: "from Whom all expressions cease" (यतोवाचोनिवर्तन्ते) The Sruti refers to Brahman. The Vedantin retorts if Maya is admitted as a positive entity (Bhava rupa) having ignorance as its characteristic (Ajna-rupa and is the same as Brahman, what is objectionable in it? (ननु स ब्रह्मैव भवतु का हानि?) In reply to this, the Shaiva says that the Vedantin has arrived at the Shaiva's own point of view, since he (the Vedantin) also admits Brahman as the substratum (Adhishthan) of the universe and also indirectly accepts Maya and Brahman as identical, having the power (Shakti) to assume the form of this world (Jagat). The Shaiva states further that, according to him, Maya is power (Shakti) of Brahman (Shiva). The Vedantin asks, what is the nature (rupa) of the Maya Shakti? The Shaiva replies, its nature is the same as that of Self or Brahman (स्व स्वरूप भूता). The Vedantin questions again, what necessitates the assumption (Kalpana) of another attribute (Shakti) in Brahman? The Shaiva replies, it is so because Maya alone is not the Shakti of Brahman. The Vimarsha, power of perception relating to objects, is also a power (Shakti) of Brahman, the sentient Being (Cit-rupa), since Vimarsha is

innate in His consciousness (chit-amsha) existing in Buddhi, the principle of reason (बुद्धयवच्छिन्ने तदंशे). But contrary to this doctrine, the Vedantin assumes that a veil (Avarnam) hides the real nature of Brahman, the Supreme Consciousness in an individual being (Jiva) (जीवाश्रयं ब्रह्मविषयं). This veil is caused by Maya (Mayakrtam), as the shruti declares: (जीवाश्रया ब्रह्मपदा ह्यविद्या तत्त्वविन्मता). From this point, The Shaiva draws a corollary, the part of Brahman which is circumscribed by Jivatva (limitation innate in Jiva) is veiled, and the part not so circumscribed is free from this veil: "तत्र च ब्रह्मणो जीवत्वानाक्रान्ते भागे नावरणमेवेति". In the Shaiva technique, the Vedantin's point means that the part of Brahman which is not veiled is characterised by Prakasha (Power of Manifestation) alone and lacks Vimarsha (Power of perception); but according to the Shaiva Prakasha without Vimarsha is like an unreal entity (प्रकाशश्च विमर्शं विना-असत्कल्प एव) and hence null and void.

From the above discussion, the Shaiva comes to the logical conclusion that 'Prakasha' or in other words Ahim-Paramarsha (Manifestation of Self) only is equivalent to Vedantin's Brahman. According to the Srutis as quoted by Vedantins, 'स ऐक्षत' (Chhandogya Up. VI, 2,3), 'तदेक्षत' and 'सर्वज्ञः' so on, **Ikshana** (seeing or thought) i.e. mere manifestation of self (स एव त्वाहं-परामर्शः) is attributed to Atman before the creation, viz. in its precosmic state, when no other entity existed. Pratyavamarsha or Vimarsha state is the changing state of Brahman, opposite to its state of rest (or tranquility) (Shantatvam) which lies in its Prakasha aspect. The Supreme Being (Shiva) Who is all powerful (Shakta) manifests Himself in the form of this universe in His changing state (Paramrshtam), as the water in its disturbed state assumes the form of waves. In this instance the insentient water is lacking Paramarsha, viz. reflection or consciousness related to itself and other than itself, which is the nature of Self only: "स्वपर विशया परामर्श रहितः". On this point the Vedantin questions, 'although the water is lacking Paramarsha (perceiving power or consciousness) i.e. the power of perceiving subjects and objects, it possesses Prakasha i.e. the power of manifesting itself and other than itself (ननु स्वपर दर्शनमपि तस्य संभवत्येव). The Shaiva disagrees

with the Vedantin on this point. He says, *Prakasha* (Manifestation) without *Vimarsha* (Perception) is of the nature of mere reflection (परामर्श रहितं दर्शनं हि प्रतिसंक्रान्तिरूपमेव) as we see in insentient objects like glass or a piece of marble. The same thought is given in *Pratyabhijna Sutra* :-

“स्वभावमवभासस्य विमर्शं विदुरन्यथा,

प्रकाशोऽर्थीपरक्तोपि स्फटिकादिजडोपमः”

Knowledge of everything in this world, according to the Shaiva, is the result of blending of unlimited (*aparimita*) *Aham-paramarsha* (manifestation or consciousness of 'Self') with the limited (*parimita*) *Idam-paramarsha* (perception of objects). The blending of these two processes is indeed indispensable for luminous knowledge. The Vedantin, on the other hand, tells to the Shaiva that according to him (Shaiva) *Svanubhava* (individual perception) is the prerequisite for the phenomena of knowledge. It is true, the Shaiva says, that not only Jiva but also Brahman (Shiva) is characterised with *Svanubhava* (individual perception) and their identity is realized by *Aparoksha Jnana* (direct perception or knowledge) as denoted by "Aham brahmasmi" (I am Brahman). On the other hand, *Paroksha Jnana* (indirect perception or knowledge) implied in "Asti Brahma" (Brahman is) also denotes the existence of Brahman. These two kinds of knowledge, *Paroksha Jnana* and *Aparoksha Jnana* (direct and indirect knowledge) and the *Vimarsha* (of Shaivas) do not depend upon another experience *Anubhava* which, according to the Vedantin, is of the nature of *Vikalpa* (Superimposition or Nescience). According to the Shaiva, everything is cognised by the powers of *Prakasha* and *Vimarsha* independent of any such experience as *Anubhava* or *Svanubhava* which is not at all required in the phenomena of knowledge. Here the Shaiva means by *Svanubhava* that experience which, according to Vedantin, is characterised by *Vikalpa* or Nescience. But *Svanubhava* in its true sense, i.e. *Vimarsha*, according to Shaiva, is rather indispensable to all kinds of knowledge. The Shaiva says that the powers of *Prakasha* and *Vimarsha* are self-illuminating and do not need illumination from any other source, viz. experience, as there is no need of showing one lamp by another. The Vedantin questions on this point, *Prakasha* alone

is self-illuminating, how is Vimarsha to be such? The Shaiva replies to this objection, Prakasha without Vimarsha is meaningless. The Vedantin objects here, how do you then say that the *Sadashiva Tattva* [principle] which is equivalent to the Vedantin's Brahman is lacking in Vimarsha. The Shaiva explains that *Sadashiva Tattva* is the line of demarcation between *Shiva Tattva* in which *Aham-paramarsha* [Self-manifestation or Self-Consciousness] is unblended with *Idam-paramarsha* (object-perception) and *Ishvara-Tattva* in which the former is blended with the latter. Here *Aham* and *Idam* denote 'I' and 'This' in the universal sense as different from the limited individual *Aham* and *Idam* which are lower than *Maya Tattva*. In other words, *Aham* and *Idam* in the universal sense, as implied in this relation, belong to the principle of *Shuddhavidya* and do not come under the limitation of *Maya*.

The Vedantin demands from the Shaiva a textual authority from the Vedic scriptures in support of the doctrines upheld by the latter, since according to the former the Vedas are sacred, being uttered by God *Brahma*. In reply the Shaiva says, we quote the authority of the Agamas in support of our doctrines, and not that of the Vedas. The Vedantin asks, in Agama Shastra who has seen *Ishvara* as Actor (*Karta*)? In reply to this the Shaiva puts a counter-question, who has seen Him so in the Vedas? The Vedantin responds, *Sanaka* and other seers have seen *Ishvara* as Actor in the Vedas. The Shaiva says the 'Mathika Gurus' and others have seen Him so in the Agamas. Why is the Vedantin not satisfied with the sacred authority of Agamas? The Vedantin says, this is not the authentic authority (*Pramanyam*) according to him. The Shaiva questions, how is then the authority of *Sanaka* and other seers accepted by them as authentic with regard to the Vedas? The Vedantin replies, because it is so accepted by eminent persons. The Shaiva also considers himself justified in saying that the authority of *Mathika Gurus* is accepted by great seers like *Durvasa* and others. Why the Vedantin is not satisfied with their authority? The Vedantin says it is accepted by a limited few only and that is not enough. The Shaiva rejoins, certainly it is so, because the sacred doctrines are not meant generally for all, but for the few only. Anything reasonable stated even by a boy is acceptable to us (the Shaivas) as authentic, nor to speak

of a highly sacred Shāstra which is a potent means of achieving the Supreme beatitude, and anything unreasonable spoken even by Brahma should not be accepted, as Vasīṣṭa says :

*“ Yukti yuktam-upādeyam vacanam bālakādapi,
Śeṣam tranamiva tyājyam - apyuktam padma-janmana.”*

Thus ends the discussion (Shāstrartha) between the Vedāntin and the Shaiva. In this discussion, Bhāṣkarācārya tries to bring into light the main points of difference between the two systems, the Pratyabhijñā and the Vedānta, and also to establish the superiority of the former over the latter. Obviously the two systems are not poles asunder. The Pratyabhijñā and the Vedānta systems can hardly be dissociated from one another. The Kashmir Shaivas do not, however, accept the authority of the Vedic scriptures, but strictly assert that the fountain-head of their doctrines is the Shaivāgamas. But it is evident that the Pratyabhijñā system is more or less affiliated to the Vedic systems. The Vira Shaiva School accepts the sacred authority of the Vedas besides the Āgamas. The above controversial discussion shows that the Pratyabhijñā is opposed to the later system of Shankara's Vedānta which differs greatly from the earlier Vedānta system taught originally in the Upaniṣads. As a matter of fact, the Pratyabhijñā philosophy is mostly in accord with the philosophy of the Upaniṣads, and the two systems differ from one another in minor points only.

The differences between Kashmir Shaivism (Pratyabhijñā system) and the Vedānta and the distinctive features of the former are well brought out in an article on the subject by Prof. B. N. Pandit published in J. & K. University Review (Vol. II, No. 1) of May, 1959. He writes: 'There is no doubt that there is sufficient accord and similarity between the principles of the Vedānta of Gaudapāda and Shankara, on the one hand, and those of the Shaivism of Kashmir, on the other. But, in spite of this accord and similarity, these two schools are as different from each other as are so many of the other schools of Indian Philosophy. For that matter, there is accord and similarity on many points between Shaivism and Buddhism or Shaivism and Sāṅkhya Philosophy. But that does not mean that Shaivism is identical with any of those schools of Philosophy.'

There are so many points common to Kashmir Shaivism and the Vedānta. As regards the fundamental differences between these two schools, Prof. Pandit writes that the Shaivas argue as follows:- 'According to the Vedānta the universe is false; it has only a visionary existence like that of a mirage. The cause of this visionary appearance of the universe is a sort of ignorance, called *Avidya*. That *Avidya* has no beginning. It has been working through eternity but can be ended by means of true knowledge or *Vidya*. The powers of *Avidya* are to be admitted, but cannot be explained... In reality the soul was ever the Absolute Brahman itself, but on account of *Avidya* it considered itself as different from the Brahman; and now when this *Avidya* vanishes, the soul realizes its true nature as Absolute Brahman. This realization is the real liberation and this is the final goal of human life. In reality there is nothing like a soul, or the universe, or any sort of bondage or liberation. All this is false and visionary and appears to exist because of *Avidya*. This *Avidya* also is not a real thing. Only the Absolute Brahman is real. He is tranquil and calm like space. His nature is *Sat. Chit* and *Ānanda*, that is existence, consciousness and bliss.

The Shaivas raise objection to this view on the following points: 'If *Avidya* is false, it cannot be the cause of this universe which has been existing from times immemorial. How can a thing, which is false and unsubstantial, bring into existence anything full of substance? It is not clear as to whom this *Avidya* involves. It cannot involve Brahman which is ever pure, all knowledge and all bliss. Now it could involve a limited soul, but no limited soul, according to the Vedānta, does ever exist. It is only the Brahman which exists. So Vedānta leaves this problem unsolved. Again, when this *Avidya* is apparent, is well known and is conceived also, then how is it that it cannot be explained? A true philosophy should explain such an important topic. If this remains unexplained, the foundation of the whole Vedāntic theory remains unexplained. A thing which has an end must have beginning also. So this *Avidya* also must have some beginning and must have some cause. To say that it is beginningless and inexplicable is to betray one's lack of deep insight. It also amounts to self-deceit and incapability in teaching. Space-like tranquility of the Brahman may mean his emptiness and lifelessness. When the Brahman is calm and ineffectual like pure space,

then what is meant by his consciousness and bliss? Space is never blissful and is never conscious. A conscious element is always active, because consciousness itself is a subtle activity. If the Brahman is conscious, it cannot be passive like space; and if it is like that, then it cannot have consciousness as its nature. Blissfulness also presupposes some sort of stir, though not a stir in the physical sense. It may be a subtle stir of consciousness. But Vedanta does not admit any sort of stir in the space-like Brahman.'

'How can a person dispense with the universe as something visionary and absolutely false? ... In the view of the Shaivas, the universe is not absolutely false. It is true ... The universe exists. It always existed in the all-pervading form of Shiva. Shiva has pure luminosity and pure consciousness as his form. Luminosity is not the luminosity of the light waves known to physicists. It is that luminosity by which consciousness makes itself always known to itself ... In fact, such consciousness is by itself luminous in nature and that luminosity is by its nature conscious and thus these two are only two names of one and the same substance and that substance is God or *Parama Śiva*. His luminosity is called as Shakti or his energy. As has been said above, this energy of Shiva is a sort of stir in him... There is a constant succession of ideas going on in one's mind. If one is mentally supervigilant, then he can have the experience of this pure stir of consciousness in-between any two ideas of the mind. This stir is the most important nature of the absolute Shiva. It is a sort of vibration, ...† In fact, it is a sort of constant inward and outward vibration-like activity of the consciousness. It is named as *Spanda* in Shaivism. Because of this Spanda, the Absolute Shiva is always feeling his transcendental as well as his universal aspects. His transcendental aspect is felt by him through the inward stir of that Spanda and his universal aspect is felt by him through its outward stir. Which of these two aspects of the Lord can be called true and which can be called false? Both are true in reality. Therefore the Lord is not lifelessly tranquil like space... But he exists and exists as Shiva and therefore is always full of energy, which is a divine stir within his soul. That stir is always making this universe of limited subjectivity and objectivity appear in

† "Sā sphuratā mahā sattā, deshakālāviśeṣīnī,
Saiśā sārātaya proktā, hṛdayam paramaśhīnaḥ."

countless forms. Every soul is a hero in this divine drama of Shiva and has to reach the conclusion of this drama by shaking off his self-imagined ignorance and by realizing his nature as Shiva the Absolute. This is precisely the view of the Shaivaistic philosophers of Kashmir.

Gaudapāda has realized this nature of the self and there are clear hints to this effect found in his *Kārikas*. Shankara also has at places expressed this view and so has Bādarāyana. Upaniṣads also have preached this energetic nature of the Brahman. But, in spite of all this, this view-point has not been clearly discussed by any of the Vedāntists. All the major works on Vedānta have emphasised the falsehood * of the universe and the passive tranquility of the Brahman. There are two points of view expressed in the Upaniṣads regarding the nature of the Brahman. One is the positive approach according to which it has been preached that everything is Brahman, I am Brahman, thou art that, and so on. † The other approach is the negative approach, according to which it has been taught that the Brahman is not this, He is not that, ‡ He transcends all the objective elements, and so on. But it is this latter approach which has become popular with the authors of the major works on Vedānta. This one-sided view of the truth popularised by the Vedāntists has been responsible for all the criticism made on the Vedānta by other schools of Indian philosophy. Some have called the Vedāntists as hidden Buddhists. There is so much confusion in the Vedāntic exposition of the Truth...The Shaivaistic style of the exposition of the Truth is, on the other hand, free from all confusion,... It is thus clear that Kashmir Shaivism is an independent school of thought and is very distinct and different from the Vedānta or any other Vedic or non-vedic school of Indian philosophy...

* It will be noticed here that the history of the Vedānta really begins with the system of Shankarācārya, being a predominant school of thought in the Vedānta. In the course of time the doctrine of Māyā, as taught by Shankarācārya, invited criticism from the Vedāntins like Bhāskara, who is probably not removed from Shankara by more than two centuries. Rāmānujācārya joined Bhāskara in vehemently criticising

* "Sā ca māyā na vidyate. (Gaudapāda Kārikā)

† "Sarvam Khalvidam brahma,"
aham brahmāsmi tat-tvam-asi, (Upaniṣad)

‡ "Sa neti neti ātmā" (Upaniṣad)

Shankara's interpretation of the Upaniṣads and the Brahmasūtras. Rāmānuja was followed by Ācāryas (teachers) like Nimbāraka, Mādhava, Vallabha and Caitanya, and many other saints and writers who helped the cause of humanity by advocating *bhakti* in one form or the other. They were also obliged to criticise Shankarācārya. Vallabhacārya (1473 - 1531 A.D.) tells us that he was asked by the Lord Krishna to appear in the world and to offer a correct interpretation of the Upaniṣads and the Brahmasūtras, as these sacred works were misrepresented by Shankarācārya. Accordingly he taught a system of Vedānta known as the Shuddhādvaita. It clearly shows that the non-duality as taught by the Upaniṣads can be very well explained even without the help of Māyā, which appears in the system of Shankara. The writers of the works on Pratyabhijñā school also revelled in vehemently criticising Shankarācārya's theory of Māyā and other points of difference. Like the schools of Rāmānujacārya and Vallabhācārya, Pratyabhijñā system is therefore a criticism of Shankara's school of thought in the Vedānta as well as Buddhist phenomenalism which appears to be the possible basis of Shankara's idealism. (Ref. the system of Vallabhācārya by Prof. G. M. Bhatt, the Cultural Heritage of India - I - P. 797)

CHAPTER III

RELIGIOUS AND PHILOSOPHIC BACKGROUND

1. *Religious beliefs of the earliest inhabitants of Kashmir; Religious upheavels in the valley; Śaivism and Buddhism; The origin of philosophic spirit in Kashmir (under the impetus of Buddhism);*
2. *Survey of the earlier philosophical speculations and the doctrines evolved from the Vedas and the Upaniṣadas and different Brahminical schools as well as Buddhists.*

In the present chapter we shall trace the religious upheavels in the valley from the earliest times and survey the earlier philosophical speculations prevailing there before the rise of the Pratyabhijñā system.

Religious beliefs of the earliest inhabitants of Kashmir :-

The geographical position of Kashmir, situated as it is in the midst of high mountains, shows that it might have long remained secluded and so unaffected by any external influence. But, it seems that while a number of old cults and religious practices flourished in Kashmir, at times different religious and philosophical doctrines reached there from outside its boundaries. Various evidences point to the fact that the inhabitants of Kashmir professed both kinds of Aryan and aboriginal beliefs from very ancient times which prevail even at the present day. This consisted in the performance of the Vedic rites and recitations of Vedic prayers as well as the worship of the aboriginal deities Shiva, Viṣṇu and their Shaktis. According to the Nīlamata Purāṇa*, there existed in Kashmir in very ancient times a polytheistic religion, which included, among many other primitive types of worship, the worship of the aboriginal deities such as God Shiva, Geneśa or Vināyaka, various Vedic and Purāṇik gods, and even the worship of the Buddha as an

* This is the earliest extant work in Kashmir and is supposed by Dr Buhlar to be the record of the time not older than the sixth or seventh century A. D.

Autar (incarnation). The account of the creation of Kashmir by Prajapati Kashyapa from the lake Satisara (the lake of Sati-goddess Durga) according to the Nilamata Purāna, mentions that the original inhabitants of Kashmir were Piśācas who can be identified with aborigines. We are told that the men of four castes (Āryans) were introduced into Kashmir by Kaśyapa (from India). This evidently shows that when Āryans and aborigines following their particular creeds came in contact with one another, each of them gradually adopted the religion of the other.

Religious upheavels in the Valley :- Dr. Sunil Chandra Ray states in his work: "The Early History and Culture of Kashmir" (Chapter VI, PP. 140 ..), 'The earliest inhabitants of Kashmir probably cherished some aboriginal beliefs, the details of which are not traceable now. The snake-cult or Nāga worship seems to have been established in the valley from a remote period and undoubtedly had been one of the earliest religions of the land. In the third century B. C., Buddhism seems to have made some headway into Kashmir, converted a large number of people and overshadowed the Nāga cult which ultimately sunk into oblivion. Among Hindu gods, Shiva either originated or entered the valley sometime before the faith of the Sākya prince made its entrance and was later followed by Visnu, Surya and other Brahmnic gods and goddesses.' Various evidences produced by the scholar show that Buddhism was in a thriving state in Kashmir from the 3rd century B. C. upto the last days of the Hindu rule. Buddhism, however, seems to have been overshadowed by the growing Vaiśnava and Shaiva faith which became predominant in the valley in the centuries following the Karkota period (ending 855 A.D). The history of the introduction of Shaivism in Kashmir is shrouded in mystery. Archaeologists have discovered traces of Shiva worship in the proto-historic Harappa culture. It is not known, whether the Shiva of Kashmir was an immigrant from the neighbouring Indus Valley or was of local origin. The facts furnished by Kalhana in his Rajatarangini, the Chronicle of the kings of Kashmir, however, indicate, in the main, the wide prevalence of the Shaiva cult in the valley from an early period. There are innumerable references to the foundations of Shiva shrines and erection of temples in honour of Shiva.

In reference to the above-said observations of Dr. S. C. Ray,

in the first place, it may be noted that, as stated by H. H. Wilson in his *Essays on the Hindu History of Kashmir*, 'originally, no doubt, it (the religion of Kashmir) was ophite or snake worship but this is a part of the Hindu ritual and the Nagas are included in the orthodox pantheon. The adoration of the Shiva was soon engrafted upon this, even if the two rites were not originally identified'. † In the second place, it will be noticed that there are numerous references in Vedas, Brahmanas, Upaniṣads, epics and Purānas, as pointed out by the scholars like Dr. S. Radhakrishnan, C. Hayavadana Rao, R. W. Frazer and Dr. Hardayal, which show that Shiva worship was in vogue in India in the Vedic age. ‡ Some of the references clearly prove that this form of worship was gradually borrowed by Aryans from non-Aryans. In fact, Shiva worship seems to have been prevalent in India from the age of the Indus Valley Civilization, even before 3000 B. C., as the statues of Shiva have been unearthed in the excavations of Mohenjodaro and Harappa. It will be observed further that in the *Rājatarangini*, Kalhana connects the reigns of his first two rulers of Kashmir, Gonardo I and Damodara I, with the time of the Great Bhārata war. It is mentioned that the two rulers went to Mathura and took part in the war against Krishna and were assassinated. If we believe Kalhana, communication must have existed between Kashmir and the plains of India from the days of Mahābhārata. It will not therefore be hazardous to assert that Indian culture along with the various forms of religion then followed in the country, including Shiva worship, must have entered the valley by the time of the Great Bhārata War, which is generally believed to have occurred around B. C. 1000.

Shaivism and Buddhism :- As is evident from the above, there can be no doubt that Shiva as a popular deity must have been widely worshipped in the valley from remote period. As the first reference to Shiva worship in the *Rajatarangini*, Kalhana writes that there was a shrine

† Quoted in the Article: 'A Survey of the origin of the people of Kashmir by H. N. Koul Part II, in "Kashmir Today" (Sept. 1958)

‡ See Indian Philosophy by Dr S. Radhakrishnan; Shrikara Bhāṣya on Vedānta Sūtras, Vol I, Introduction, by C. Hayavadana Rao; Indian Thought Past and Present by R. W. Frazer; The Boddhisatva Doctrine by Dr. Har Dayal.

of Vijayesha even in pre-Ashokan days. Ashoka himself built two temples of Shiva Ashokeshvara and was the devotee of Bhutesha (Shiva). There are numerous references to the foundations of Shiva shrines and erection of temples in honour of Shiva. Shaiva faith became predominant in the valley in the centuries following the Karkota period. Avantivarman (855-883 A. D.) was the devotee of Shiva. Shaivism received patronage from the Utpalas, who succeeded the Karkotas. It also flourished under the second Lohara dynasty. Shiva Shrikantha was regarded in the valley as the promulgator of Shaivagama Shaivism which included within itself the Pashupata cult. Kalhana refers also to the Tantric cult which is closely connected with Shiva worship. When Buddhism entered into Kashmir some time before the reign of Ashoka (272-232 B. C.), there already existed a religion, the prominent feature of which was the worship of 'God Shiva in company of his female consort Paravati or Shakti'. In this form of worship God Shiva and his Shakti, adored as father and mother of all creation, symbolize the two generative principles of the universe, viz. male and female cosmogonic principles. Thus Shiva worship and Shakta faith are closely associated with one another.

It is commonly believed that the Buddhist period in Kashmir follows from the third century B. C. with the reign of Ashoka, but the new faith seems to have obtained a footing in the valley much earlier, since it was prevalent there in the time of the native king Suredra who ruled some time after the Buddha but before Ashoka. The Ceylonese chronicle Mahavamsa preserves an account of the introduction of Buddhism in the valley by Majjhantika (Madhyantika) who was sent to Kashmir by Ashoka to propagate the new faith. This fact is recorded also by the Tibetan writer Taranath who says that Madhyantika found twelve Viharas in existence at the time of his arrival. We learn from Kalhana that Kashmir formed a part of the empire of Ashoka, who was a follower of the Buddha. It is in the reign of king Ashoka that Buddhism spread all over India and flourished in the valley by the side of the ancient Shaiva faith. Kashmir was a great centre of Buddhism under the Kushanas. It was under the auspices of Kanishka, the Kushana ruler, that the **Great Buddhist Council** was held in Kashmir. It seems that in the beginning the religious policy of Buddhists was non-interfering and the Brahmans of Kashmir did not feel its advent seriously. The Nilamata Purana records that in Kanishka's

reign (125-160 A. D.) excesses were committed by the Buddhists under the lead of the famous Boddhisatva Nagarjuna. We further learn that Buddhists defeated the learned classes of people in Kashmir by preaching their own nihilistic doctrines. In consequence, the 'time-honoured ceremonies' followed by Kashmiris had to be suspended. The Nagas, perhaps a class of the original inhabitants of the valley, were greatly provoked and with their help one Brahmana, named Chandradeva, finally restored the traditional customs and freed the land from the plague of the Bhikshus (Nilmata Purana 424-429). Even after this incident the Buddhist cult was there in a very flourishing condition. As recorded by Kalhana, Meghavahana, Lalitaditya and many other rulers or the members of the royal families built monasteries and stupas there. This fact is in full accord with the report of the Chinese pilgrim, Ou-kong. That Buddhism was patronised equally along with other orthodox creeds by the rulers of Kashmir, is evident from the gifts and endowments made by Kashmirian rulers, especially by king Lalitaditya, and by the members of their courts. The worship of Buddha was recognised in Kashmir from ancient times, as is evident from Nilamat Purana which mentions the Buddha's birthday as a great festival (Ref. verses 809-816). The thriving State of Buddhism in Kashmir after Kushana ruler Kanishka is testified by archaeological evidence, and that, during the reign of Karkotas, i. e. during the 7th and 8th centuries A. D., is also attested by the evidence of the Chinese travellers Heun Tsang (who visited Kashmir during the years 631-633 A. D.) and Ou-Kong who came to Kashmir in 759 A. D. They spent many years in the valley in pilgrimages to holy sites and in studying Sanskrit. Both of them witnessed Buddhism flourishing in the country. All this shows that Buddhism and Brahmanic cults existed peacefully side by side in Kashmir for centuries before Kalhans's time (cf. Chronicle of kings of Kashmir, by Dr. M. A. Stein, Introduction, P. 9).

Origin of Philosophic spirit in Kashmir (under the impetus of Buddhism):- It has been said above that Buddhists existed in Kashmir for many centuries and lived peacefully along with Brahmins who were the followers of Shiva-Shakti cults from very early times. Consequently the exchange of views on religious matters between the two sects was inevitable. The influence of Buddhist thought upon the people of Kashmir was so great that during the eighth and ninth centuries of

Christain era the ancient Shaiva faith was gradually vanishing as is observed by Pt. Madhusudan Koul in his introduction to Ishvara Pratyabhijna Vimarshini (P. I). A religious upheaval, however, came in the ninth century A. D. which brought about the waning of Buddhism and revival of ancient Shaiva faith in the country. It will be observed that Buddhists initiated a critical view in matters which were so far believed only as gospel truths. The various philosophical doctrines evolved from Buddhists, such as Vijnānavāda and Kshanikvāda, were already known in Kashmir. Under the impetus of the Buddhistic thought, various schools of philosophy developed in the valley (as did in the rest of India) among the non-Buddhists, viz. Brahmanas, Vaidyakas, Shaivas and Shāktas. The people were also well versed in the doctrines of Vaiyākarnas (Grammarians), Sāṅkhyas, Naiyāyikas and the Yoga system which had come into the valley from India through ages. Consequently, in the ninth century A.D. there existed a concourse of various religious and philosophical currents converting the valley into a battle-ground at the time of the rise of the Pratyabhijna system.

As has been observed above, Shiv-Shakti cults were prevalent in every part of India long before the Vedic age. In course of time there grew a mass of literature of these cults, known as 'Agamas and Tantras', side by side with and possibly independent of the Vedic scriptures. Consequently in a place like India where different schools of thought grew gradually in the Vedic fold, there developed similar schools within the ambit of Shaiva fold. Shri S. G. Sakharpeker mentions in his address on 'Shaiva-gamas', delivered in the Seventh All-India Oriental Conference, held in 1933, that before the arrival of Shankarāchārya on the religious stage, the Agamavādins of Shaiva school were separated into different schools, viz. Mahāpāshupatas, Shaiva Siddhānta, Nipāla-Pāshupatas, Kashmir Shiavas and Vira-shaivas. These different Shaiva sects held varied philosophical theories, such as Dvaita (Dualism), Advaita (non-dualism), Vishishtadvaita (modified non dualism) and Dvaita-dvaita (dualism-cum-monism) like similar schools in the Vedic fold.

Survey of the earlier philosophical speculations and doctrines :-

As has been stated above, the rudiments of every system of philosophy in India originally existed in the Vedas, the Upanishadas and the Buddhist sources, which subsequently developed in different systems with some additions and alterations. These germinal ideas constitute the common

theme or skeleton of various systems, of course, including the Pratyabhijna system. They, however, differ from one another in propounding some new doctrines of their own and coining different nomenclature. As observed above in Chapter II (P. 54), the main ideas constituting the central theme of the Pratyabhijna Philosophy are traced by Dr. Lachmidhar in the verses Nos. 1270-1274, 1283-86 and 1294-1295 of the Nilamata Purana.* Dr. L. D. Barnett, while bringing to notice the similarity between 'modern theology of South India' and 'the ancient teachings of the north', endeavoured to indicate what, in his opinion, the links are which join the two, and ultimately both of them to the school which is represented by the Shvetashvatara Upanisad†. Some verses occurring in this Upanisad, such as VI-7, 8 & 9 and IV-10‡, indeed, give almost the same or similar ideas as are contained in the above-mentioned verses of Nilamata Purana representing the central theme of the Pratyabhijna System. As a matter of fact these are the common ideas which connect the Pratyabhijna system with the Vedanta school. Pt. Suryanarayana shastri § and some other scholars of his view think that the Svetasvatara-Upanishad and Kaivala-Upanishad have probably grown under the shadow of Agamas, as is indicated by the sectarian title given to the Ultimate Cause (Shiva), symbolised generally by the term Brahman in the Upanishads. It will be clear from the following that the above ideas not only occur in these two Upanishads but are also scattered in various other Upanishads as well as in the hymns of the Rig-veda. These ideas will, therefore, be traced out from the Vedas and the Upanishads in a systematic order as follows :-

*The main ideas contained in these verses are as follows :-
 -'Indra must 'recognise' (abhijñātaḥ) Shiva as the only Supreme deity (Maheshvarah), Cause of all causes (Kāraṇa kāraṇam), all-doer and all-knower (sarva kartā ca sarvajñashca) (1270-1271), who by his free will (iccha) creates the universe comprising animate and inanimate objects. This is the creeper of power (Shakti-latā) of the Lord (Prabho) which manifests the world from itself (Jagad bhāsayate bhavāt (1272-1273). The Lord brings into existence (Lit supports) the three worlds by his Maya (wonderous power) (Māyā-dhrata jagat-traya) (1283). Shiva has no extraneous motive for his acts of creation etc. other than His own nature (Tava kāryam na vidyate) (1285). He is the eternal witness (sākshī-vatasthitaḥ) (1286). Moha or delusion is produced by Shiva's own Shakti, namely Maya Shakti (Tavaiva mayaya mohitena) (1294) Indra has known this Supreme Lord (Shambho) only by his favour (Prassannosi dhruvam Shambho ena jñātosī vai mayā) (1294).

Foot Notes Continued on Page 85.)

Ah. 1, i

उपोद्धातः (प्रत्यभिज्ञाकारिकायां ज्ञानाधिकारे प्रथममाह्निकम्)

1 Meaning and Purpose of Pratyabhijñā :

कथंचिदासाद्य महेश्वरस्य दास्यं जनस्याप्युपकारमिच्छन् ।

समस्तसम्पत् समवाप्तिहेतुं तत्प्रत्यभिज्ञामुपपादयामि ॥१॥

योजना संक्षिप्तार्थश्च :-

कथंचित् (परमेश्वरप्रसादादेव¹ अथवा स्वात्मनः प्रसादादेव¹) महेश्वरस्य दास्यं (ईश्वरप्रत्यभिज्ञादर्शनस्य पात्रताम् अथवा स्वातन्त्र्यपात्रताम्²) आसाद्य (परिपूर्णतया सादयित्वा, अथवा स्वयंलब्ध्वा), जनस्य³ (संपत्तिरहितस्य तस्मात् पारतन्त्र्यादि-दुःखैः पीडितस्य अखिलस्य लोकस्य) उपकारम् अपि इच्छन्, समस्तसंपत्⁴ (सर्वं ऐश्वर्यं तस्य, स्वातन्त्र्यसंपत्ति-रूपा-मिद्धिः तस्याः, परमार्थलाभः⁵ तस्य) समवाप्तिहेतुः (सम्यग् 'अवाप्तिः' - विमर्शरूढिः, सैव हेतुः, ताम्) तत् (तस्य महेश्वरस्य, स्वात्मनः वा) - प्रत्यभिज्ञाम् उपपादयामि (संपादयामि) ।

Trans:· Somehow (viz by the grace⁶ of the Lord, the Self), having myself become a deserving recipient of the Lord's gift of the highest knowledge (of Self-recognition) or freedom, wishing to render service (do good) to humanity (suffering from want and dependence on others) I am setting forth the doctrine of Self-recognition (Pratyabhijñā⁸) as a means of achieving affluence and freedom (svātantrya-sampatti), viz. all that is of highest value (paramārtha-lābha).

(Note :- A human being suffers owing to dependence on others (pāratantrya) and inferiority complex. Pratyabhijñā teaches that freedom (svātantrya) is the essential nature of Self. The individual is the architect of his own fate.)

K 1—1. Pvr (Ud); 2. दीयते अस्मै स्वामिना सर्वं यथाभिलषितम् इति दासः तस्य भावः (दास्यम्) इत्यनेन परमेश्वररूपस्वातन्त्र्यपात्रता उक्ता (Pv 1,14)

3. अनवरतजननमरणपीडितस्य (Pv I,15)
(suffering from incessant births and deaths — Ag)

4. समस्ताः— पूर्णतादिरूपाः सर्वाः (Bh I,33); 5. Pvr (Ud)- १, संपत्तिः सिद्धिः (Pv 1,15) तां तां विभूतिं परविभूतिपर्यन्तां—(Pv II, 272-73).

२, परापरसिद्धिप्रदायिनी (Pv II, 275) ३, परापरसिद्धिलक्षणा जीवनमुक्तिविभूति (Pv II 272-73)

(i, Prosperity, fortune, success and happiness; ii, both the higher and lower spiritual powers, and iii, the glories of the liberated life).

6. प्रसाद, अनुग्रह, शक्तिपात, 7. परमेश्वरूपः निजात्मैव (Bh 1, 3)

8. The term "Pratyabhijñā" is used, for the first time, in philosophic sense by Buddhists. According to them the special feature of knowledge ('saññā', the Pali form of 'sajñā' meaning the 'conceptual knowledge') is the recognising (paccabhiññā), the Pali form of *pratyabhijñā* by means of a sign (*abhiññānena*, the Pali form of 'Abhiññānā'). According to another explanation, a recognition takes place by the inclusion of the totality of the aspects of a thing. (See *History of Indian Philosophy* by S. N. Dass Gupta, P. 98)

Somānanda uses the term *Pratyabhijñā*, for the first time and once only, in his *Śivadr̥ṣṭi*, in a special philosophic sense, for the realization of the identity of this world, consisting of multiple objects—sentient and insentient, with the Supreme Being (Reality), by means of the processes of perception or direct observation (*dr̥ṣṭa*) of one of His aspects, viz. His *prakāśhamanatā* (omnipresence), and remembrance (*smaraṇa*) of His other aspects, His *sarvajñatā* (omniscience) *sarvashaktimatta* (omnipotence), etc., as known from scriptures—

तस्माज्ज्ञेयं समग्रैक्यवस्तु शैवं व्यवस्थितम् ।

दृष्टस्मरणयोरैक्ये स्थिते तदुपपद्यते ।

तथा सा प्रत्यभिज्ञानात् स एवायमिति स्थितिः ॥ (Śd IV, 118-120)

In recognition the processes of perception (*dr̥ṣṭa*) and remembrance (*smaraṇa*) are associated or unified.

Utpaladeva uses the term *Pratyabhijñā* in the sense of revealing the powers of Self—powers of knowledge and action (*dr̥kkriyātmikā shakti*) :-

शक्त्याविष्करणेनेयं प्रत्यभिज्ञोपदर्श्यते । (Pk I, 3)

Abhinavagupta explains the term *Pratyabhijñā* as follows :-

अ] तस्य महेश्वरस्य 'प्रत्यभिज्ञा' प्रतीपमात्माभिमुख्येन ज्ञानं प्रकाशः प्रत्यभिज्ञा । प्रतीपम इति—स्वात्मावभासो हि न अननुभूतपूर्वो विच्छिन्नप्रकाशत्वात्

तस्य, स तु तच्छक्त्यैव (माया शक्त्या स्वातन्त्र्यरूपया) विच्छिन्न इव विकल्पित इव लक्ष्यते... ।

('Tasya' means 'of Maheśvara'; 'Prati' (*pratīpam*) means 'backward'—in the inverted order or indirectly-i. e., that which was already known before but was forgotten (due to *Moha* or *Māya-shakti*) and is now remembered; 'Abhi' (*abhimukhena*) means 'directly', that which is cognised now; 'Jñānam' means '*Prakashah*', light of consciousness, i. e. awareness.)

अथवा प्रतीपं ज्ञातस्यापि विस्मृतस्येव ह्यादितस्येव पुनः आभिमुख्येन न तु स्मर्यमाणतया अपितु स्फुटत्वेन ज्ञानं प्रत्यभिज्ञानं...

(Pv-I, 20 Fn. 44)

ब] प्रत्यभिज्ञा च - भात-भासमानरूपानुसंधानात्मिका, स एवायं चैत्र इति प्रतिसंधानेन अभिमुखीभूते वस्तुनि ज्ञानम्... ।

Recognition consists in the unification of what appeared before with what appears now, as in the judgement 'This is the same Chaitra, (known before)'.

ज] इहापि प्रसिद्धपुराण सिद्धान्तागमानुमानादिविदितपूर्ण-शक्तिस्वभावे ईश्वरे सति स्वात्मन्यभिमुखी - भूते तत्प्रतिसंधानेन ज्ञानम् उदेति, नूनं स एव ईश्वरोऽहम् — इति । (Pv-I, 20, 21)

(The Lord as possessed of supreme power is known from the Purāṇas, Siddhāntas, Āgamas as well as reasoning, inference, etc. and the Self is a fact of everybody's direct experience. Recognition (*Pratyabhijñā*) arises when the two experiences, the knowledge of the Lord as Supreme Power and the awareness of one's own Self, are unified in one's experience: 'Certainly I am that very Lord').

The experiences of direct perception (*dr̥ṣṭa*) and remembrance (*smaraṇa*) are unified in the experience of 'recognition':—

स्मरणानुभवारूढा सामानाधिकरण्याधीः ।

संस्कारैर्द्रियजन्या च प्रत्यभिज्ञा प्रकीर्तिता ।

(Pv I, 20 Fn)

Pratyabhijñā is, therefore, 'Recognition of Self as Maheshvara (the great Lord), because he possesses the powers of knowledge and action':—

कर्तरि ज्ञातरि आत्मन्यादिसिद्धे महेश्वरे ।

अजडात्मा निषेधं वा सिद्धिं वा विदधीत कः ॥२॥

योजना :- कर्तरि ज्ञातरि आदिसिद्धे^१ (पूर्वसिद्धे) महेश्वरे (स्वा-
तन्त्र्ययुक्ते) आत्मनि सति, अजडात्मा (चेतनः, अजडात्मवादी वा, वैशेषिकादेः
सांख्यादेः बौद्धादेजडः आत्मा, तान् विहाय^२) कः निषेधं वा सिद्धिं वा
विदधीत (कर्तात्) ।

When *Ātman* (Self) is already a fact of everybody's experience, as
possessing powers of action and cognition and having freedom (*svā-
tantrya*) to use his powers, which sensible person (other than a Bauddha,
Vaiśeṣika, and Sāṅkhya, according to whom *Ātman* is not sentient)
would deny or establish the existence of such a being?

किंतु मोहवशादस्मिन्दृष्टे स्प्यनुपलक्षिते ।

शक्त्याविष्करणेनेयं प्रत्यभिज्ञोपदर्श्यते ॥३॥

योजना:- दृष्टे अपि, किंतु मोहवशाद् (माया-व्यामोहाद्) अनुपलक्षिते
(सर्वथा हृदयंगमीभावमप्राप्ते), अस्मिन् (आत्मनि) शक्ति (असाधारण-दृक्क्रिया-
त्मिकाया शक्ति) आविष्करणेन (प्रदर्शनेन)^३ इयं प्रत्यभिज्ञा उपदर्श्यते
(निरूप्यते) ।

K I ctd — तदयं प्रमाता ज्ञानक्रियाशक्तियोगाद् ईश्वरः इति—

(Pv I, 43)

Thus it is established that Maheshvara is the Self of all crea-
tures, since all their activities follow from their powers of will,
knowledge and action (which constitute their divine inheritance) :-

इच्छा-ज्ञान-क्रिया पूर्वा यस्मात्सर्वाः प्रवृत्तयः ।

सर्वेपि जन्तवस्तस्मादीश्वरा इति निर्दिष्टताः ॥ (Pv I 43Fn)

K 2-1, पूर्वसिद्धस्य (Known before) *Pvr*; अविच्छिन्नप्रकाशे (whose
light (consciousness) is uninterrupted) (Pv I, 34); 'eternal' (Pandey)

2, ज्ञानं क्रिया च स्वसंबेदनसिद्धमैश्वर्यं, (*Pvr*); तदयं प्रमाता ज्ञान-क्रिया-
शक्तियोगाद् ईश्वरः इति (Pv I, 43); स चायं स्वतन्त्रः । स्वातन्त्र्यं च
अस्य अभेदे भेदनं भेदिते च अन्तरनुसंधानेन अभेदनम् — इति ... तदेव
अस्य पारमेश्वर्यं मुख्यमानन्दमयं रूपम् — इति — (Pv I 31); (3) *Bh* I, 55

Though the powers of Self are already known, yet they are hidden from awareness due to delusion or forgetfulness (*moha*); Pratyabhijñā is, therefore, set forth to reveal those powers of Self.

Maheshvara is the Self of all sentient and insentient :-

तथाहि जडभूतानां प्रतिष्ठा जीवदाश्रया ।

ज्ञानं क्रिया च भूतानां जीवतां जीवनं मतम् ॥३॥

योजना :- तथाहि (दृश्यतां किल), जडभूतानां प्रतिष्ठा (अवस्थानम्) जीवदाश्रया ('जीवन्तं' प्रसातारमाश्रित्य भवति)¹ । ज्ञानं क्रिया च जीवतां भूतानां जीवनं मतम्² ।

Ques. This world comprises multiple objects of experience, sentient and insentient. It is only sentients who possess powers of knowledge and action; Insentients do not either possess the power of knowledge, or the power of action. How is it then possible to establish that *Maheshvara* is the Self of all?

Ans. It is an evident fact that the existence of insentients depends upon sentient beings; and (the powers of) knowledge and action are admitted to be the very life of living beings (sentients).

K 3 1, शक्त्याविष्करणेन असाधारण—प्रभावाभिज्ञापनख्यापनेन (*Pvr*)

(i. e. revealing the extra-ordinary powers or profounder faculties of Self).

कथं शक्तेः .. दृक्क्रियात्मिकाया (शक्त्या) 'आविष्करणेन'...

(bringing into awareness higher powers of comprehension (दृक्) and action (क्रिया)
(*Pv* I, 37)

मोहापसारणमात्रमेतत्

(If is the mere removal of the veil of obscuration, *moha* or *māyā*).

Note :- Pratyabhijñā, therefore, means to become aware again of the (profounder) powers of Self (*Maheṣvara*), which are not unknown before (*nānānubhūta-pūrvah*) but which are obscured by the veil of *moha* or *māyā*.

(In this view the insentients also possess the essential characteristics of *Maheshvara*.)

तत्र ज्ञानं स्वतः सिद्धं क्रिया कायाश्रितासती ।

परैरप्युपलब्धयेत तयान्यज्ञानमूहयते ॥५॥

योजना :- तत्र (तयोर्ज्ञानक्रिययोर्मध्ये) ज्ञानं स्वतः सिद्धम् । क्रिया अपि (स्वतः सिद्धा, सा) कायाश्रितासती परैरुपलब्धयेत । तथा (क्रिया)

K 4 1, तेषां 'जडभूतानां' चिन्मयत्वेऽपि, मायाख्यया ईश्वरशक्त्या जाड्यं प्रापितानां 'जीवन्तं' प्रमातारमोश्रित्य 'प्रतिष्ठा' तत्प्रमात्राभिमुख्येन अवस्थानं, ततो जडा नाम न पृथक् सन्ति ।

(Pv I, 41-42)

The commentator says that the insentient objects, though they are essentially of the nature of sentience (consciousness), yet they are reduced to the state of insentiency by the power of the Lord called *Māyā Śakti*. They, therefore, have their being only as related to and dependent upon sentient subjects. Hence insentient objects do not have independent existence

2, जीवनं च जीवनकर्तृत्वं तच्च ज्ञानक्रियात्मकं, यो हि जानाति च करोति च स जीवात—इत्युच्यते । तदयं ज्ञानक्रियाशक्तियोगाद् ईश्वरः—इति

(Pv I, 43)

The subject is characterised by life, that is the act of living which consists of knowing and doing. For, only he is said to be living who knows and acts, Therefore, the individual subject is the Lord, because he possesses the powers of knowledge and action. The Lordliness (*Māheshvarya*) is essentially the possession of these two powers in relation to all objects.

अन्यज्ञानम् ऊह्यते 'गम्यते' ।

Ques. How do you establish the existence of powers of knowledge and action in the individual subject due to which he can be said to possess lordliness (*Maheshvarya*)?

Ans. Out of these two powers, the power of knowledge is self-established; and the power of action (Which is also self-established), is perceptible to other perceivers, as it is associated with a particular body. From that (action) the presence of (the power of) knowledge in others is inferred.

K 5 1, तत्रापि प्रत्यक्षाज्ञानमात्मसंवेद्यं परत्रापि क्रिययैव प्रसिद्ध्ययति—इति सिद्ध एव (*Pvr*); 2, तत्र जानामि — इत्यन्तः संरम्भयोगोऽपि भाति ... स च संरम्भो विमर्शः क्रियाशक्तिरुच्यते तेन आन्तरीयक्रियाशक्तिः ज्ञानवदेव स्वतःसिद्धा स्वप्रकाशा, सैव तु स्वशक्त्या प्राणपुष्टकक्रमेण शरीरमपि - संचरमाणा स्पन्दनरूपा सती व्यापारव्याहारात्मिका ... सा च परशरीरादि-साहित्येन अवगता स्वं स्वभावं ज्ञानात्मकमवगमयति ।

(*Pv I*, 46-47)

In the cognitive experience such as 'I know', there is consciousness of its association with a stir (*samrambha-yoga*) also. This stir (*samrambha* or *spanda*) is called *Vimarsha*. It is the power of action. Therefore, says the commentator, internal power of action, like that of cognition, is self-established and self-shining. That very internal power of action, because of its inherent power, enters into body, through the vital air and 'the group of eight' and being of stirring nature in itself, become directly perceptible as physical action in the sphere of *Māyā*. That physical action, when seen in another person's body, logically makes us infer the presence of the power of knowledge (*jñāna*) which is its essential nature.

(Pandey - *Bh* III, 17)

'The group of eight'—comprises five *prānas*, the group of sense organs, the group of organs of action and *Buddhi* (mind).

पूर्वपक्षविवृतिः (प्रत्यभिज्ञाकारिकायां ज्ञानाधिकारे द्वितीयमाहिकम्)

The Prima Facie View—the Existence of Atman Refuted :-

The Buddhist Saugata refutes the view of Shaivātma-vādin that there exists a permanent subject (Self) :-

ननु स्वलक्षणाभासं ज्ञानमेक परं पुनः ।

साभिलापं विकल्पाख्यं बहुधानापि तद्द्वयम् ॥

नित्यस्य कस्यचिद्द्रष्टु-स्तस्यात्रानवभासतः ।

अहं - प्रतीतिरप्येषा शरीराधवसायिनी⁶ ॥

योजना :- ननु स्वलक्षण-आभासं ज्ञानम् (निर्विकल्पकम्) एकम्, पुनः परम् (अन्यत्) साभिलापं (शब्दनरूपेण सह वर्तते) विकल्पाख्यम् (सविकल्पकम्) बहुधा (स्मृतिसंशयोत्पेक्षादिबहुभेदं), तत द्वयम् अपि नित्यस्य कस्यचिद् द्रष्टुः न (भवतः), तस्य अत्र अनवभासतः, एषा अहं प्रतीतिरापि शरीरादि अवसायिनी (भवति) ।

(Saugata Purvapaksin says, it is not right to say that there exists a permanent self-luminous Self. There are only the chains of indeterminate and determinate cognitions, but there is no substratum of the cognitions, nor any permanent being as cogniser apart from the fleeting cognitions)

Trans:— (There are only two kinds of cognitions); one is (indeterminate) cognition, which manifests itself in its essential nature (*svalakṣaṇābhāsam jñānam*) characterised by the limitations of time, space and form¹ (Being self-confined it is not applicable to others²) It is one (*ekam*), i. e. has no variety³. The other (*param*) is the determinate cognition (*vikalpākhyam*), which admits of linguistic expression (*sābhilapām*)⁴. It is of many kinds (*bahudhā*) such as

- 1) स्वरूपसंकोच भागि 'लक्षण' देशकालाकार - रूपं यस्य तस्य 'आभासः' प्रकाशनम् अन्तर्मुखं यस्मिन् बहिर्मुखीन स्वरूपधारिण ज्ञाने । Pv, I, 54;
- 2) 'स्व' अन्याननुयायि । Ibid.
- 3) 'एक' - विषय भेदेऽपि एकजातीयं स्वरूपे । Ibid.
- 4) 'साभिलापं' - अभिलापेन संजल्पात्मना शब्दनरूपेण सह वर्तते । Ibid. 55

remembrance, doubt, imagination, etc.).⁵ Neither of these two (chains of cognitions) belongs to a permanent perceiver (Self), because none such is experienced. As regards the I-consciousness (*aham-pratītiḥ*) (which persists in different experiences like "I am thin" (*kr̥ṣo'ham*) "I am happy" (*sukhyaham*) and so on, it has reference only to (cognitions pertaining to) the body (or mind), etc.^{6 & 7}

अथानुभवविध्वंसे स्मृतिस्तदनुरोधिनी ।

कथं भवेन्न नित्यः स्यादात्मा यद्यनुभावकः ॥ ३ ॥

योजना :—अथ अनुभवविध्वंसे (सति) तद् (अनुभव) अनुरोधिनी¹ स्मृति कथं भवेत्,—यदि अनुभावकः आत्मा नित्यः न स्यात्² ?

The Śaiva-vādin says :— (At the time of remembrance) when the direct perception ceases to exist, how can there arise memory, which closely follows the direct perception, if the perceiving Self were not permanent ?

K 2-5 स्मृतिसंशयोत्प्रेक्षादिवहुभेदम्

Pvr

6. शरीरसन्तानो वा कुशोऽहम्...ज्ञानसन्तानो वा सुख्यहम्—इति प्रतीतिः । Ibid 57-58

7. ज्ञानमेकं स्फुटावभास-स्वलक्षणानुभवरूपं निर्विकल्पकं ते कथयन्ति ।

अपरं तु शब्दारूपरागा स्मृति-संशयोत्प्रेक्षादि-बहुभेदं विकल्पसंज्ञम् ।

उभयमप्येतन्न युज्यते बोधरूपज्ञानातिरिक्तस्यान्यस्य संबन्धितया, तस्यानुपलब्धेः, कोऽसौ स्थिर आत्मा ? सामिलापाहंप्रत्ययेनापि शरीरादिक-वेद्यवस्तुत्तीर्णो वेदयिता न कश्चिल्लोकैरवधार्यते ॥

Pvr

K 3-1. 'तदनुरोधिनी'-पूर्वानुभवावष्टम्भधर्मा (i. e. which retains the nature of the former direct perception)

Pvr

अनुरुध्वाना-अस्वप्नमनुसरन्ती, अपेक्षमाणेति यावत् (which closely follows the direct preception; which depends upon the direct preception). Bh

अनुभवप्रकाश एव स्मृतौ प्रधानम् (the light of the former preception is the chief characteristic in remembrance).

Pv I, 60

2. स्मृतिकाले पूर्वानुभवनाशात्कथं...स्मृतिर्जायेत यदि तदापि तदनुभवबोधो नावर्तत, यच्च अनेक-कालस्थायी बोधः स एव आत्मानुभविता (How can there arise memory, if the knowledge of the former direct preception would not turn up in the later experience—i. e. remembrance. The knowledge which lasts in different times—former and the later—that is the experiencing Self).

Pvr

(The Śaiva means to say that remembrance arises, because the Self (*Ātman*) persisted from the former direct perception to the later remembrance as witness (*dṛṣṭā* or *sākṣī*). The experience of remembrance, in fact, shows that the knowledge of the former direct perception is retained in the permanent perceiving Self, which is revived in the later experience of remembrance).

सत्यप्यात्मनि दृष्टनाशात्तद्द्वारा दृष्टवस्तुषु ।

स्मृतिः केनाथ यत्रैवानुभवस्तत्पदैव सा ॥ ४ ॥

योजना :— (अत्र सिद्धान्तिनं पूर्वपक्षवादी पृच्छति) आत्मनि सति अपि, दृग् (अनुभवः) नाशात् तद् (अनुभव) द्वारा दृष्टवस्तुषु केन स्मृतिः भवति ? अथ यत्रैव (विषये) अनुभवः तत्पदैव सा (स्मृतिः) ¹ ।

(The Saugata replies the Śaivātma-vādin :—) Even if there exists a permanent Self, the direct preception having ceased to exist, how can there arise memory of things, experienced through that (preception) ? (The Saugata himself gives the reason for the rise of memory :) He says, remembrance depends upon (refers to) the same thing (as its object) that was the object of the former direct perception. (For this reason, the Saugata thinks that, although the direct perception of the former time does not exist at the time of the later remembrance, it can still be the object of the remembrance (*asato-'rthānubhavasya viṣayena sā viṣaya-vatī*), as such there is no need of assuming the existence of *Ātman*).

K 4-1. बोधात्मनि सत्यप्यात्मनि अर्थाभासनाशात्...सा स्मृति निर्विषयैवेति *Pvr*
Even if there exists Self, the essential nature of which is knowledge, but the former preception together with its object is absent in *smṛti*. Hence, in the absence of the object, *smṛti* also cannot arise. The Saugata replies here, *smṛti* can have as its object that which was the object of the former direct perception, though it is not existing then; (“असतोऽर्थानुभवस्यविषयेण सा विषयवती”).

यतो हि पूर्वानुभव-संस्कारात् स्मृति-सम्भवः ।

यद्येवमन्तर्गुणा को ऽर्थः स्यात्स्थायिनात्मना ॥ ५ ॥

योजना :—यतः¹ (यस्मात्कारणात्) पूर्वानुभव-संस्कारात् स्मृति-सम्भवः (तस्मात् तद्विषय एव स्मृतेर्विषयः)²; यदि एवं, स्थायिनात्मा अन्तर्गुणा को ऽर्थः स्यात्?^{3, 4}

(Ātma-vādin questions here, “how can remembrance claim to have the same thing as its object that was the object of the former direct perception, which is not existing at the time of remembrance¹ ? The Saugata says:-) It is because the rise of memory is due to residual traces of the former direct. perception. (*pūrvānubhava samskāra*)². (The Saugata, therefore, concludes:) If it be so, what is the use of a permanent Self, which is a superfluous entity (thing)³ ?

ततो भिन्नेषु धर्मेषु तत्स्वरूपाविशेषतः ।

संस्कारात्स्मृतिसिद्धौ स्यात्स्मर्ता द्रष्टृव कल्पितः ॥ ६ ॥

योजना :—(संस्कारः गुणत्वाद् आश्रयमपेक्षते, य आश्रयः स कात्मा) (सुख-दुःख-ज्ञानसंस्कारादि) धर्मेषु ततः (आत्मनः) भिन्नेषु, तत् (आत्म)-स्वरूप-अविशेषतः संस्कारात् स्मृति सिद्धौ, स्मर्ता द्रष्टा इव कल्पितः स्यात् ।¹

(The Saivātma-vādin objects to this point: He thinks that residual trace is a quality and, therefore, needs a substratum. That substratum is the Self. The Saugata replies to this objection :)

K 5-1. कथं सा नष्टस्य अनुभवस्य विषयेण विषयवती इत्यत्र हेतुमाह ।

Pv 29 Fn

2. अनुभवात्संस्कारः संस्काराच्च स्मृतिर्जायमाना तं पूर्वानुभवमनुकुर्व-
त्यवगाहितविषयं तमनुभवम् अवभासयति ।

Pv

3. अनुपयोगिना आत्मस्थैर्येण किम् ।

Ib.

What will the permanance of Ātman do here, which is useless?

4. संस्कारस्यात्मवादे ऽप्यङ्गीकरणात्तेनैव च सिद्धेः (स्मृतेः)

K 6-1. सुखदुःख-ज्ञानादि भिन्न-धर्माश्रयत्वेनाप्यात्मनो नोपयोगो भिन्नैरसंभिन्नस्यानुप-
जातविशेषस्य स्मृतावव्यापृतेः ।

Pv

Ātman is supposed by the Ātma-vādin to be the substratum of attributes or qualities (*dharmas*) like pleasure, pain, cognition, etc., including residual traces, yet it is unaffected by them. It can be concluded from this that a permanent Self has nothing to do with remembrance which functions by residual traces only. So it is useless to suppose the existence of a permanent Self.

Qualities (*dharmas*) (like pleasure, pain, cognition as well as the residual traces) are different from (the supposed) *Ātman* (Self), because the essential nature of that (*Ātman*) is admitted by *Ātma-vādin* to remain unaffected by them (the residual traces and other qualities) (*tat-svarūpa-aviseśataḥ*). As remembrance is admitted to take place by residual traces only (without recourse to a permanent self as remember), so the rememberer is a mere fancy just like the perceiver.

ज्ञानं च चित्स्वरूपं चेत्तदनित्यं किमात्मवत् ।

अथापि जडमेतस्य कथमर्थप्रकाशता ॥ ७ ॥

योजना :—(आत्मनः शानशक्ति निराकरोति) ज्ञानं च चित्स्वरूपं चेत्, किं तद् आत्मवत् अनित्यम् ?¹ अथापि एतत् (ज्ञानं) जडम्, (ततः) एतस्य अर्थप्रकाशता कथं स्यात् ?

(After refuting the existence of a permanent Self, the Saugata now refutes its possession of powers of knowledge and action. He first enquires the power of knowledge :—)

The Saugata says, if the power of knowledge be admitted to be of the nature of sentiency (*citsvarūpa*), then is it transient like Self? But, if it is admitted to be insentient, how can it make the objects manifest?

K 7-1. तेन यथा आत्मा किमनित्यः, तथा ज्ञानमपि किमनित्यम्, उभयोरपि अनित्यताधर्मी
ऽनुपपद्यमानत्वेन पर्यनुयोगमात्रम् इति ।

Pv I 69 Fn

तदपि कस्मात् न नित्यम् ? न च द्वयोनित्ययो कश्चित् संबन्धः, कार्यकारणभावो हि
असौ, नान्यः, तत आत्मनो ज्ञानं शक्तिर्-इति अवसन्नम् अदः ।

Pv I, 69

चित्स्वाभाव्ये ज्ञानस्य...आत्मन इव नित्यतादिप्रसङ्गः ।

Pvs

This line also implies that both *Ātman* and knowledge (*Jñānam*) (both of them being *citsvarūpa*) will be admitted as two separate permanent entities, in that case, it is not possible to assign one (*Jñāna-śakti*) as a quality to the other (*Ātman*).

अथार्थस्य यथारूपं धत्ते बुद्धिस्तथात्मनः ।

चैतन्यमजडा सैवं जाड्ये नार्थप्रकाशता ॥ ८ ॥

योजना :— जडोऽपि एतत् (ज्ञानम्) इत्थं (सांख्यमत-अनुसारेण) अर्थस्य प्रकाशो भविष्यति—इति ।

अथ बुद्धिः यथा अर्थस्य रूपं (प्रतिबिम्बत्वेन) धत्ते, तथा आत्मनः चैतन्यम् (अपि धत्ते) (तस्मात् बुद्धिरेव स्वच्छत्वात्प्रकाशप्रतिबिम्बमपि परिगृह्णाति), एवं सा अजडा¹ सा (बुद्धिः) (अर्थचित्प्रतिबिम्बद्वयग्रहणेऽपि) जडैव, (बुद्धिः) जाड्ये न अर्थ-प्रकाशता (भवितुम् अर्हति)² ।

‘अथ’ प्रश्ने, बुद्धिर्यथा बहिरर्थस्य रूपं धत्ते—प्रतिबिम्बत्वेन गृह्णाति, तथा अन्तः आत्मनः—भोक्तुः, चैतन्यम्—स्वरूपभूतां चेतनताम्, धत्ते, तथा च जडत्वेऽपि तस्या अर्थप्रकाशनं युक्तमेवेति भावः ।

Bh I, 109

(In the first case, the view point of the Bauddha is established: viz. that both Ātman and the power of knowledge are transient; the second case can be considered according to the view of the Sāṅkhya theory, that is to say that knowledge, though insentient in itself, yet illumines the external objects as follows:—)

If it be said that *Buddhi* assumes the sentiency of the Self exactly as it does the form of external object (as a reflection). (Because of its crystalline purity, it can receive the reflection of the self-luminous Self also.)

K 8-1. ज्ञानं बुद्धिः सा जडापि यथा विषयरूपच्छायां धत्ते तथात्मनोऽपि चैतन्य-च्छायामतोऽसावर्थप्रकाशः, तथा च तस्या चित्स्वरूपता स्यात् ।

Pvr

2. Another idea which seems to be in the mind of the teacher, is that insentient *Buddhi* can have no capacity to manifest objects, even if it receives the reflection of *Caitanya* from *Ātman*, just as a mirror receiving reflection of the flames of a burning fire, cannot have the capacity to burn. So in that case also we shall have to admit that *Buddhi* is itself sentient by nature, not that it is so because of the reflection of *Caitanya* of *Ātman*. *Buddhi* is to be admitted as sentient; otherwise how can it manifest objects?

अथ तत्प्रतिबिम्बेऽपि न तद्रूपापत्तिः, अग्निप्रतिबिम्बेऽपि दर्पणस्य दाहकत्वाद्दृष्टेः । तर्हि सा बुद्धिः अर्थचित्प्रतिबिम्बद्वयग्रहणे ऽपि जडैव । तत् स एव दोषो विषयव्यवस्था ततः कथम् इति सूत्रार्थः ।

Pvi I, 78 Fn

(But even the theory of reflection does not alter the Saugata's view against the permanence of Self. He thinks that it is not possible for *Buddhi* to receive reflection of sentiency from a source (Self) whose existence is not proved. With this idea in his mind he says :—)

Thus, the *Buddhi* shall have to be admitted itself as sentient, for in an insentient thing there cannot be the capacity of making the objects manifest (*Jādye nārtha-prakāśatā*).

क्रियाप्यर्थस्य कायादेस्तत्तद्देशादिजातता ।

नान्या ऽदृष्टेर्न साप्येका क्रमिकैकस्थोवो चोचिता ॥ ६ ॥

योजनाः— क्रिया अपि कायादेर् अर्थस्य, तत् तद्देशादि—जातता, न अन्या, अदृष्टेः (प्रत्यक्षानुमानाभ्यामनुपलब्धेः¹) । सा एका क्रमिका अपि च न एकस्य उचिता² ।

क्रियापि कर्त्री कायादेरर्थस्य, आदिशब्देन परिणामादि क्रियाविषयस्य, दुग्धा देर्ग्रहणम्, तेन कायदुग्धादेः पदार्थस्य ते ते च ते देशादयः तेषु जातता—तद्वैशिष्ट्यकृतोऽन्यः प्रादुर्भावो भवति, नवीनो न भवति । कुतः ? अदृष्टेः प्रत्यक्षानुमानाभ्यामनुपलब्धेरिति ।

Bha I, 114

(Having examined the power of knowledge (*jñāna*), the Saugata now examines the power of action :)

Action also belongs to objects like body, etc., as it appears to be produced, as it were, from them (objects) in their association with different places, times and forms. For, nothing else is perceived.

The view that it (action) is one and successive and belongs to one (agent) is not also sound.

K 9-1. केवलं गमनपरिणामादिरूपा सा क्रिया, कायादीनां तु तत्तद्भिन्नदेशकालगता—पूर्वसत्तामात्रमेतदतिरिक्तस्यान्यस्यानुपलम्भात् ।

Pv

एवं तद्देशतया तत्कालतया तदाकारतया च भाव एव भाति ।

Pv I, 81

2. नापि कालक्रमव्यापी चैकस्वभावश्च तस्या आश्रयो युक्तः ।

Pv

अनेककाल—स्पृक्त्वं हि क्रमिकता, एकश्च तत्कालो ऽतत्कालश्च—इति कथं स्याद् इति ।

Pv I, 83 Fn

तत्र तत्र स्थिते तत्तद्भवतीत्येव दृश्यते ।

नान्यन्नान्योऽस्ति संबन्धः कार्यकारणभावतः ॥ १० ॥

योजनाः— तत्र तत्र स्थिते तत् तद् भवति इति एव दृश्यते न अन्यत् (क्रिया) । कार्यकारणभावतः अन्यः संबन्धः नास्ति ¹ ।

तत्र तत्र—तस्मिन् तस्मिन् मृत्पिंडादिरूपे भावक्षणे सति, तत्तत्—स्तूपकादिरूपः स स भावक्षणेऽस्ति, इत्येव—एतावन्मात्रमेव दृश्यते, अन्यत्—अतो व्यतिरिक्तं कार्यकारणरूपं किञ्चिन्न दृश्यते । ननु कार्यकारणभावव्यतिरिक्तो ऽन्यः कोऽपि संबन्धो भवतुव, इत्यत आह “नान्योऽस्ति” इति, कार्यकारण भावतो ऽन्यः संबन्धो नास्ति तस्यायुक्तत्वादिति भावः) *Bh. I, 117*

(Having thus examined both, the power of knowledge and power of action, the Saugata now refutes the relation that may be supposed to exist between them and the Self (*Ātman*), so that by attributing these two powers to him, he may be said to be omniscient (*sarvajña*) and omnipotent (*sarva-kartā*).

Only this much is perceived that certain things exist before and the other things come into being later. (According to the Saugata's view) there is no relation other than that of cause and effect. (The Saugata means to say that even this relation cannot exist between Knowledge or Action and the Self for the apparent reasons).²

K 10-1, पूर्वस्मिन् सति परस्य सत्तेत्येतावन्मात्रं ऽनुभवः, क्रियावच्च न क्रियाकारकादिसंबन्धः कश्चिद्भिन्नस्यास्यानुपलम्भात् कार्यकारणभावाहते नान्यद्वस्तुनां ज्ञातेयम् । *Pvr*

न च ज्ञानक्रियाभ्यां सह आत्मनः कार्यकारणभावः आत्मनस्तत्कार्यत्वाभावात् ज्ञानस्य च स्वसामग्रीकार्यत्वात्, क्रियायाश्च अभावात्,—इति न ज्ञानक्रियासंबन्धो यतो ज्ञातृत्व-कर्तृत्वे स्याताम् । *Pv I, 86*

The commentator gives the following reasons regarding the absence of any relation between knowledge or action and the Self:—

1. Because, the Self (*Ātman*) cannot be spoken of as the effect of knowledge or action;
2. Because, the knowledge is the effect of things necessary for its rise; and—
3. Because, there is no separate thing called action. *Bh III, 30.*

द्विष्टस्यानेकरूपत्वात्सिद्धस्यान्यानपेक्षणात् ।

पारतन्त्र्याद्ययोराच्च तेन कर्तापि कल्पितः ॥ ११ ॥

योजना :— (संबन्धः) द्विष्टः (द्वि-स्थः), (स) अनेकरूपत्वात् (न चैकेनात्मना उभयत्र स्थितिर्युक्ता); सिद्धस्य अन्य अनपेक्षणात् (न च द्वयोः सिद्धयोरन्योऽन्यापेक्षा). पारतन्त्र्यादि-योअगाच्च (नापि स्वात्ममात्रनिष्ठयोः पारतन्त्र्यसंबन्धः), तेन कर्तापि कल्पितः (ततो यथा ज्ञातृत्वं कल्पितं तथा कर्तृत्वम्-अपि इति, कथम् आत्मा सर्वेश्वर इति¹

Having thus refuted the arguments in support of the relation that may be supposed to exist between the powers of knowledge and action and the Self, the Saugata now argues against it in general as well as in special terms.

As a rule, relationship refers to two things (*dve-sthah*). And that which exists in two must have multiplicity of forms (*anekarūpaḥ*). (It is not right to think that one *Ātman* is connected with both in relation). An established thing (*i.e.* a thing having independent existence-*siddha*) does not need another (*anyonyāpekṣā*). Nor is it related to another by relation of dependence (*pāraṇtrya*). Therefore, just as knower is a mere supposition and not real, so is actor also.



K 11-1. Explained according to *Pv*

See, Kaw, R. K., *The Doctrine of Recognition*, pp 107ff 115ff
(for Ah, I, i) and pp 123ff (for Ah, I, ii)

Ah I, iii

परदर्शनानुपपत्तिः (प्रत्यभिज्ञाकारिकायां ज्ञानाधिकारे तृतीयमाह्निकम्)

The refutation of the *prima facie* view —Permanance of Self (Ātman) established :-

The Śaivātma-vādin refutes the Saugata's reasoning against the doctrine that there exists a permanent subject (Self) :-

सत्यं किन्तु स्मृतिर्ज्ञानं पूर्वानुभवसंस्कृतेः ।

जातमप्यात्मनिष्ठं तन्नाद्यानुभववेदकम् ॥१॥

योजना :— सत्यम्¹, किन्तु स्मृतिर्ज्ञानं पूर्वानुभवसंस्कृतेः जातम् अपि, आत्म-निष्ठम्, आदि अनुभव-वेदकं तत् न (भवति)² ॥

The Śaivātma-vādin says,—True (satyam) (I quite agree with certain points stated in the *prima facie*). Although, it may be admitted, that remembrance arises out of the residual trace of the former perception (*pūrvānubhava-saṃskṛteḥ jātam-api*), yet, being self-confined (*ātma-niṣṭham*—i.e., resting in itself) as every cognitive experience is, it cannot make the former perception known (*ādī-anubhava-vedakam tat na bhavati*), (that is to say, remembrance has no scope to cognise directly the former perception).

The Saugata questions with regard to this point. He says, because remembrance originates from residual trace, it will have to be admitted that remembrance has the former perception also as its object, viz., it has direct cognition of the former experience. To this point the Śaivātma-vādin says :-

दृक्स्वाभासैव नान्येन वेद्या रूपदृशेव दृक् ।

रसे संस्कारजत्वं तु तत्तुल्यत्वं न तद्गतिः ॥२॥

K 1—1. पूर्वपक्षमध्यात् मया तावत् बहु अङ्गीकर्तव्यम् । P_v

2. पूर्वानुभवसंस्कारप्रबोधजापि स्मृतिरात्ममात्रनिष्ठत्वात्स्वरूपसंवेदिकेन न तु पूर्वानुभवावेशाभावात्पूर्वानुभूतार्थव्यवस्थापिका घटते । P_{vr}

योजना :— ¹ दृक् (ज्ञानम्) स्व-आभासा एव² (स्वप्रकाशा एव भवति); अन्येन वेद्याः न (भवति)³, (का इव?) रूप-दृशा रसे दृक् इव⁴ (यथा रसे दृक् रूपदृशा वेद्या न भवति तथा); (स्मृतेः पूर्वानुभव) संस्कारजत्वं तु तत्तुल्यत्वं⁵ (पूर्वानुभव तुल्यत्वम् भवति); न तु तद्गतिः⁶ (पूर्वानुभव अवगतिः न भवति) ॥

Perception is self-luminous (*dyk-svābhāsaiva*), it cannot be the object of any other experience, say remembrance, (*nānyena-vedyā*) just as the perception of colour cannot be the object of the perception of taste (*rūpa-dṛśeva dyk rase*). The fact that remembrance arises from residual trace only makes it similar to the former perception (i.e., direct experience) in respect of having the same object (*tat tulyatvam*), but the former perception does not come within the range of remembrance (*na tad-gatiḥ*). In remembrance there is no direct cognition of the former perception (*na tad-avagatiḥ*). In fact, the former perception does not shine in remembrance, i.e., the experience of former perception does not recur in the later remembrance, but the latter has only the similarity or likeness of the former (*tat-sādrśya-mātram*).

N. B.—*Bhāskari* text reads 'संस्कारजत्वे' in place of 'संस्कारजत्वं' as in *KSTS* and *Pvr*. In this commentary, the *Kārikā* reads ".....संस्कारजत्वे तु तत्तुल्यत्वं न तद्गतिः" and it is explained as follows :-

संस्कारजत्वे तु तत्तुल्यत्वं भवति, तद्गतिः—पूर्वानुभवावगमस्तु न भवति, अथ च तद्गतिः—तत्तुल्यत्वावगमोपि न भवति इति ॥ *Bhv I*, 130

K2— 1. ननु मा भूत् परविषयस्य स्वीकारो, यस्तु संस्कार-महिमोपनतो-ऽध्यात्ममिदृश्व मम अनुभवोऽभवत्—इति स्मृतावनुभवस्य अवभासः स किं नाङ्गीक्रियते—इत्याशङ्क्य तन्निराकरणहेतुतया दृगिति सूत्रम्.....
(*Pv I*, 93 Fn)

2. सर्वा हि जप्तिः स्वसंवेदनैकरूपा, *Pvr*, स्वप्रकाशत्वं ज्ञानस्य भण्यते, *Pv I*, 95

3. नान्यसंवित्संवेद्या *Pvr*

4. रूपरसज्ञानयोरन्योन्यसंवेदने-अन्योन्यविषयवेदनमपि स्यात्तत्तत्वेन्द्रिय-नियमाभावः । *Pvr*

5. पूर्वानुभवसंस्कारजत्वेन तत्सादृश्यमात्रं । *Pvr*

6. न तु पूर्वानुभवावगतिः तदभावात् तत्सादृश्यमपि नावसेयम् । *Pvr*

The Saugata now urges the following view against the objection of the Śaivātma-vādin :-

अथातद्विषयत्वेऽपि स्मृतेस्तदवसायतः ।

दृष्टालम्बनता भ्रान्त्या तदेतदसमञ्जसम् ॥३॥

योजना :— अथ स्मृतेः अतद्-विषयत्वे (पूर्वानुभव तद्विषय असत्त्वे, अथवा, पूर्वानुभव तद्विषयानवगमत्वे, अथवा, न तावनुभवतद्विषयो विषयो यस्याः स्मृतेः) अपि, तद् (पूर्वानुभव तद्विषयस्य च) अवसायतः (अध्यवसायतः, अर्थात्, निश्चयात्) स्मृतेः दृष्टालम्बनता (अनुभवाश्रयत्वम्, अर्थात्, दृष्टविषयो) भ्रान्त्या¹, तत् एतद् असमञ्जसम् (युक्तियुक्तं न भवति) ।

The Saugata says :- Although remembrance does not have the former perception or its object as its object, (*a-tat-viśayatve api*), yet, since *smṛti* (remembrance) has the knowledge of both, the perception and its object, (*tad-avasāyataḥ*), it must, therefore, be admitted to be resting upon them illuively (*dṛṣṭālambanatā bhrāntya*). (Saugata thinks, it is because that remembrance, being a form (process) of determinate knowledge (*vikalpa-rūpā*), cognises the invisible past perception and its object, and, therefore, it must be of illusive nature. Since there is neither the former perception nor its object as the object of remembrance, yet, there being the consciousness of both, this must be due to *smṛti* being illusive in nature)

The Śaivātma-vādin refutes the Saugata's view : (He says,) This view is quite incongruous (*tad-etad-asmanjasam*).

The Śaivātma-vādin contradicts the Saugata view :-

स्मृतितैव कथं तावद्भ्रान्तेश्चार्थस्थितिः कथम् ।

पूर्वानुभवसंस्कारापेक्षा च किमितीष्यते ॥४॥

K 3— 1. न चापि भ्रान्त्या पूर्वानुभवं तद्विषयं शुक्ती रजतमिवासंवेद्यमानमध्यवस्यतीति स्मृतिस्तद्विषया । *Pv*

यावता स्मृतिविकल्परूपत्वात् केवलमप्रकाशमानमेव अनुभवं तद्विषयं च अध्यवस्यति, तत् इयं भ्रान्ति-स्वभावा,.....*Pv I* 97-98

न तद्दर्शनं नापि तद्विषयः स्मृतेर्विषयः, तथापि तु उभयम् अध्यवसीयते, भ्रमरूपतया स्मृतेः । *Pv I*, 98

योजना :— (स्मृतिः) भ्रान्तेः तावत्, स्मृतितैव कथम् ? अर्थस्थितिः च कथम्¹ ? पूर्वानुभवसंस्कारापेक्षा च किम् इति इष्यते ?

If it is thought to be an illusion (*bhrānte*), how can it have the essential nature of remembrance (*smṛtitaiva katham*) ? How can the order of real objects be established on the basis of illusion (*arthasthitiḥ katham*) ? Moreover, why should it be supposed to depend upon residual trace, left by the former perception (*pūrvānubhava-saṁskārāpekṣa ca kim tiṣyate*) ?

As to the point said by the Saugata that there is similarity between remembrance and the former perception, since both, the former perception and its object, are determinately cognised by remembrance, and this similarity is due to residual trace, the *śaivātma-vādin* states that the use of the word 'similarity' in this connection has no significance. He, therefore, argues :-

भ्रान्तित्वे चावसायस्य न जडाद्विषयस्थितिः ।

ततोऽजाड्ये निजोल्लेख-निष्ठान्नार्थस्थितिस्ततः ॥५॥

योजना :— (स्मृतिः) अवसायस्य भ्रान्तित्वे¹ च (अत एव जडस्वभावत्वे), जडाद्विषयस्थितिः न² (भवति), ततः (तद्) अजाड्ये, निज-उल्लेखनिष्ठात् (निजं स्वसंवेदनम् 'उल्लेखश्च' स्वाकारः इति-ईयति एषा परिनिष्ठता-नियता-अवसानं गता स्मृतिः), ततः (स्मृत्यध्यवसायात्) अर्थस्थितिः न³ (विषयस्य व्यवस्थापनं न भवति) ।

If the knowlence of remembrance be supposed to be illusive in its nature and, therefore, lacking sentiency or self-luminosity (*avasāyasya bhrāntitve ca*), it cannot manifest (establish) the real objects (*jaḍad viśayasthitiḥ na*).

K 4— 1. पूर्वानुभवाप्रकाशात्तद्विषयसंप्रमोषेऽध्यवसायमात्रात्स्मृतित्वं न युक्तम् ।

Pv

अनुभूतस्य विषयस्य असंप्रमोषः कंचित् कालं मध्ये मुषितस्येव न पूर्णः प्रमोषो-
ऽपहारः पुनः प्रकाशनेन लाभादिति स्मृतेः सुख्यं रूप, येन ज्ञानान्तरेभ्योऽस्या
विशेषः, तदेव पूर्वसूत्रार्थेन उन्मूल्यते अनुभवो न प्रकाशते तद्विषयोऽपि नैव
प्रकाशते अपितु सम्यक् प्रकर्षेण मुषित इवासौ जातः इति । Pv I, 100 Fn

न च अनुभवेन विषयप्रकाशनात्मना स्मृत्यभिधानाया भ्रान्तेः किंचिदपि सादृश्यम
अस्ति । Pv I, 100

Even though it be accepted to be self-luminous, sentient, (*ajadā*), yet its self-luminosity being confined to illuminating (making manifest) itself (*nijollekha-niṣṭhāt*), it cannot establish the order of external objects (*tataḥ arthasthitiḥ na*).

The Saugata might think, that part of remembrance which refers to the indeterminate cognition (consciousness) of itself is not illusive in nature, on the other hand, that part of it which refers to the determinate cognition of object in contradistinction to indeterminate cognition of itself, involves illusiveness. Hence, remembrance is an error and, so, non-luminous (*jadā*) in relation to its object. On this point the *śaivātma-vādin* thinks that whether we take into consideration that aspect of remembrance which refers to the determinate cognition of the objects (being *jadā*) or the other aspect of remembrance which pertains to the indeterminate cognition of itself (which is confined to illuminating itself), it cannot, in any case, manifest (or establish) the order of real external objects.

The *śaivātma-vādin* arrives now at his own point of view. From the above discussion, it is evident that even though we may agree with the Saugata that there remains the residual trace (*samskāra*) of the former perception, yet remembrance cannot originate from it, for, then all kinds of cognitions (*jñānāni*) will be dissociated from one another. The established order of the world depends upon the unification of cognitions of all kinds, which figure in remembrance in association with one another. So remembrance is indispensable to practical life. Even the direct perception of Self 'I' is impossible without remembrance of one's conventional self which depends upon the unification of the conscious-

K 5— 1. इह स्मृतेः.....स्वसंवेदानांशे (इदमिति निर्विकल्पांशे—*Fn*) प्रकाशमाने न भ्रान्तिता, तत्र विपरीत्याभावात्, यस्तु तत्र अध्यवसीयते स्वाकारः स विपरीततया अस्वाकारत्वेन अर्थतया,—इति तत्र अंशे भ्रान्तिता *Pv I, 102*

2. अध्यवसाय एव भ्रान्त्या विषयव्यवस्थापको न तु संवित्, स च जडः कथमर्थव्यवस्थाया हेतुः । *Pvr*

3. अथ तु तम् अवसायरूपं स्वसंवेदानांशं स्वाकारं वा अवलम्ब्य अजडत्वम् अस्याः, एवमपि.....कथं विषयस्य व्यवस्थापनं व्यवहार्यत्वसंपादन-सामर्थ्यम् ? *Pv I, 102*

ness of the former and the later states of consciousness. If we are to believe as the Saugata states that all cognitions are self-luminous but they mutually differ and do not know one another, then they will be like dumb and deaf and hence insentient in relation to one another. So the teacher states his point of view in the following two concluding verses of this *Ahnika* :-

एवमन्योन्यभिन्नानामपरस्परवेदिनाम् ।
ज्ञानानामनुसंधान-जन्मा नश्येज्जनस्थितिः ॥६॥

न चेदन्तः कृतानन्त विश्वरूपो महेश्वरः ।
स्यादेकश्चिद्वपुर्ज्ञान-स्मृत्यपोहन-शक्तिमान् ॥७॥

योजना :— एवम् अन्योन्यभिन्नानाम् अपरस्परवेदिनाम् ज्ञानानाम् अनुसंधान-जन्मा¹ जनस्थितिः नश्येत्², अन्तःकृत-अनन्तविश्वरूपः चिद्वपुः ज्ञान-स्मृति-अपोहन-शक्ति-मान् एकः महेश्वरः न चेत् स्यात्³॥

The teacher says :- All human transactions originate from the unification of various kinds of cognitions (like, perception, remembrance, etc.) (*jñānānām-anusandhāna-janmā*), although they mutually differ (*anyonya-bhinānām*) and cannot know one another (*aparaspara-vedinām*);

if we deny the existence of One great Lord, a permanent subject, the Self of all, (*ekaḥ maheśvaraḥ na cet syāt*), who is essentially of sentient nature (*cid-vapuḥ*), who holds within Himself the whole form (manifestation) of this infinite universe (viz, the innumerable objects of the world) (*antaḥ kṛta-ananta viśvarūpaḥ*), and who possesses the powers of cognition, remembrance and differentiation (*jñāna-smṛti-apohana-śakti-mān*), all this human transaction will come to an end (*janasthitiḥ naśyet*).

K6, 7— 1. 'जनस्य' लोकस्य या काचन 'स्थितिः' व्यवहारः सा सर्वज्ञानानां यत् 'अनुसंधानं'—एक-विषय-भावोपपन्नस्मृतिताप्राप्तिरूपं, तत्र आयत्ता । तथा हि-स्मरणनिबन्धनः सर्वोव्यवहारः । *Pv I, 103, 104*

2. ज्ञानानि स्वात्ममात्र-परिनिष्ठितानि स्वसंविद्रूपतया नापरसंवेद्यानि तेषामन्योन्यविषयसंघटनामयः ...लोकव्यवहारः कथम् । *Pvr, 6*

3. चित्तत्वमेव विश्वरूपमतोऽतिरिक्तस्यानुपपत्तेः । अशेषपदार्थज्ञानानाम-न्योन्यानुसंधानमस्यैव ज्ञानादिकाः शक्तयः । *Pvr. 7*

It is an established fact that there exists one eternal Supreme Lord (*Maheśvara*), the Self (*samvid*) that is the basis of unification of all kinds of cognitions, and that includes the whole objective world within itself, the world comprising sentient and insentient beings. It is, therefore, implied that this *samvid* is not only the Supreme Consciousness but is also the Ultimate Substance, *Prima Materia* of all things:

अतोऽर्थप्रकाशरूपां संविदम् इच्छता बलादेव अर्थोऽपि तद्रूपान्तर्गत एव अङ्गीकर्तव्यः ।
Pv I, 107.

Abhinavagupta explicitly refutes the doctrine of Vijñāna-vādins and some Vedāntins that the Supreme Being is of the nature of consciousness (*cit*, *vijñāna*) only. The Pratyabhijñā holds that this One great Lord (*Maheśvara*), who is essentially of sentient nature (*cid-vapuḥ*), *samvid*, contains within Himself the endless objective world (*antaḥ-kṛtānanta-viśva-rūpaḥ*). Being of such nature He is the Universal Substratum, the source of all the material objects. The objects are, as it were, heaped in it (*vedya-rāsīḥ tena krodikṛtaḥ*), or are merged in it :

अत एक एव असौ,—इति एकत्वात् सर्वो वेद्यराशिः तेल कोडीकृतः,—इत्येतदपि अनि-
छता अङ्गीकार्यम् । *Ibid*.

He, in whom indwell all the objects, as identical with it, isolates some objects and makes them manifest, emerged, as it were, from the ocean of light (*prakāśa*), by the sovereignty of His will. This is called His power of Knowledge (*Jñāna-śakti*):

अतः स्वरूपान्तर्बुद्धितम् अर्थराशिम् अपरमपि भिन्नाकारम् आत्मनि परिगृह्य, कंचि-
देव अर्थ-स्वरूपात् उन्मग्नम् आभासयति.....सैषा ज्ञान-शक्तिः । Pv I, 107, 108.

When the consciousness pertaining to some particular object has once been manifested in the form of its perception and, on some later occasion, it is revived in the form of the idea recalled, His another power comes into play which is called the power of Remembrance (*Smarana-śakti*):

तेन क्वचित् आभासे गृहीतपूर्वे यत् संवेदनं बहिर्मुखम् अभूत्, तस्य यत् अन्तर्मुखं
चित्स्वरूपत्वं तत् कालान्तरेऽपि अवस्थासु स्वात्मगतं तद्विषयविशेषे बहिर्मुखत्वं परा-
मृशति, इति एषा स्मृति-शक्तिः । Pv I, 109.

In this process nothing new is manifested, but the things, ever existing in the ocean of consciousness, emerge from it :

नवं न किञ्चित् आभासितं स्मृतं वा स्यात् । *Ibid.*

उन्मगनाभाससंभिन्नं च चित्स्वरूपं बहिर्मुखत्वात् तच्छायानुरागात् नवं नवं ज्ञान-
मुक्तम् । Pv I, 108, 109.

That power, which isolates the manifestation of some particular object from the Supreme Consciousness, in which all the objects are devoid of any distinction that is caused by their association with time, place and form, and makes it distinct from the rest in the form of determinate cognition (*vikalpa-rūpa vijñāna*) owing to an impression of some past experience (*vāsanā mātra*) roused by varying nature of His will (*vicitrecchā-prabodhitā*), is called His power of Differentiation (*Apohana-śakti*):

एष एव परितश्छेदनात् परिच्छद उच्यते, तदवभासनसामर्थ्यम् अपोहनशक्तिः ।

Pv I, 110

देशकालविशेषावच्छेदशून्यत्वेन विचित्रेच्छाप्रबोधितावभास-भेदवासनामात्रोपपादित-
विकल्प-रूपविज्ञाना अपोहन-शक्तिः । *Ibid.*, 71 Fn

All the worldly transactions are performed by this triad of powers.
अनेन शक्तित्रयेण विश्वे व्यवहाराः । *Ibid.*

It is that Self, who directly perceives (*janati*), remembers (*smṛti*) and determinately cognises (*vikalpayati*) through the various limited subjects.

स एव हि तेन तेन वपुषा जानाति, स्मरति विकल्पयति च । Pv I, 111.

And innumerable and varied are the ways in which the powers of Knowledge, Remembrance and Differentiation function.

एतासां च ज्ञानादिशक्तीनाम् असंख्यप्रकारो वैचित्र्यविकल्पः । *Ibid.*

This function of His powers, in variety of ways, is called His *Svātantrya* (self-dependent power) (*tat samarthyam svatantryam*).*

*See, Kaw, R. K., *The Doctrine of Recognition*, pp 131ff.

Ah. I, iv

स्मृतिशक्तिनिरूपणम् (प्रत्यभिज्ञाकारिकायां ज्ञानाधिकारे चतुर्थमाह्निकम्)

Power of Remembrance :-

It has been proved, in Ah. I, iii, that the Self (*Ātman*) is a permanent being, who is endowed with the powers of Remembrance, Knowledge and Differentiation. In the actual order of conscious activity, the power of knowledge (*Jñāna-śakti*) precedes the power of Remembrance (*Smarana-śakti*), and the power of Differentiation (*Apojana-śakti*) is antecedent to the both and is their very essence. Remembrance is already introduced as an evidence in support of the existence of the Self as a permanent being, against the contrary view held by the Buddhist Saugata. In this *Ahnika*, the power of Remembrance (*smṛti-śakti*) is first dealt with in a greater detail. Remembrance brings the various cognitions in association with one another and is the cause of all determinate knowledge. The Self (*Ātman*) is the substratum of remembrance (*smṛti*) and hence the rememberer (*smarta*). In the former experience (the direct perception), he receives its residual trace (*samskāra*) which subsequently causes the phenomenon of remembrance. *Smarta*, the remembering Self, is not the fleeting experience or the phenomenon of remembrance itself, but it is a permanent being behind the experience, who possesses the power of remembrance. Even without experiencing the phenomenon of remembrance, that being exists. He is not only *Smarta* but has also so many other powers and lasts as a permanent being even in the absence of their functions. He is the common substratum or nucleus (*keṇdra*) of all these powers,

In the first *Kārikā*, it is explained how the Self functions in the experience of *smṛti* :-

स हि पूर्वानुभूतार्थोपलब्धा परतोऽपि सन् ।

विमृशन्स इति स्वैरी स्मृतीत्यपदिश्यते ॥१॥

योजना :— हि (यस्मात्), स्वैरी (स्वतन्त्रः) स परतः (स्मृतिकाले) अपि सन्, पूर्वानुभूतार्थ-उपलब्धा' (अनुभवितृताया) 'स' इति विमृशन् स्मरति^२ इति अपदिश्यते (कथ्यते) ।

हि यस्मात्, स पूर्वानुभूतार्थोपलब्धा परतोऽपि सन् अत एव 'स' इति विमृशन्
'स्मरति' इति....., कुतः? स्वैरी-स्वतन्त्रः, न हि स्वतन्त्रस्य किमपि दुष्करम् ।
Bha I, 155.

The Self is free to recall (*svairī sa vimarśan*) in the state of remembrance (*smṛti-kāle*), the knowledge of the object perceived previously. Having perceived the object in the former experience (*pūrvanubhūtartha-upalabdha*), he recalls the same to memory at a later time (*parataḥ*) and determinately knows: 'it is that same object' (*sa iti vimarśan smarati*). (It is because the Self exists in all the states, i.e., in past, present and future experiences as *samvid* (consciousness) that is not limited by time—*kāla-vichheda-sūnyah*)

Now the question arises that *smṛti*, being *vikalpa* (determinate knowledge), cannot make the object manifest in its real nature. The direct experience which cognises the object in the past perception, becomes a matter of past time at the later time of remembrance. The subsequent remembrance cannot, therefore, make the former perception manifest, because one cognitive experience cannot be known by another (*jñānasya jñānantarena asamvedyatvat*), and because the former cognitive experience (direct perception) ceases to exist at the time of the later remembrance (*asattvacca*). Thus the knowledge, 'I remember this', is mere illusion, since the object is not manifest in remembrance. The teacher answers this objection as follows :-

भासयेच्च स्वकाले ऽर्थात्पूर्वाभासितमामृशन् ।

स्वलक्षणं घटाभासमात्रेणाखिलात्मना ॥२॥

योजना : (स्वैरी स) अर्थात् (सामर्थ्यात्-स्मृत्यशक्त्या) पूर्वाभासितम् स्व-
लक्षणम्' (स्वाऽन्याऽननुयायि स्वरूपसंकोचभागि-लक्षणम्) आमृशन् स्वकाले
(स्मरणकाले) घटाभासमात्रेण अथ अखिलात्मना (सर्वाभासमिश्रेण वपुषा) भास-
येत् च^२ ।

K 1—1. 'पूर्वानुभूतस्य अर्थस्य' य 'उपलब्धा' अन्तर्मुखो बोधः.....'परतः'
स्मृतिकालेऽपि अस्त्येव.....'स्वैरी' स्वतन्त्रः स्मरति P_v I, 118

2. पश्चादपि पूर्वानुभूतार्थानुभवितृत्वा पूर्वानुभूतार्थप्रकाशासंप्रमोषणं तस्यै-
कस्य विभोः कर्तुः स इत्यत्र पूर्वानुभूतत्वेन प्रत्यवमर्शः स्मृतिर्नाम व्यापारः

P_v

The subject (*Ātman*) knows determinately (*amṛśan*), by the power of remembrance (*arthāt—smṛtya-śaktya*), that the object that was made manifest to him before, i.e., in the former experience (*pūrvabhāsitam*), becomes manifest again (*bhāsayet-ca*), at the subsequent time of remembrance (*sva-kāle—smaraṇa-kāle*), either as mere manifestation of itself (*svalakṣaṇam*), say as jar (*ghaṭa bhāsa-matreṇa*), or as comprising the entire group of attributes (*akṣhīlāt manā*).

The Self recollects, at the later time, the former manifestation (*ābhāsa*) of the object previously perceived, either in its indistinct form, or in the distinct form as unification of the manifestations of the object associated with time, place, etc., viz., the object becomes manifest along with all attributes of time, place and so on.

By the expression '*svalakṣaṇam*', the teacher means that the manifestation of the object perceived in the past experience reappears, in the later remembrance, as a new manifestation, giving up its indeterminate universal character identical with the Supreme Consciousness and thus becoming limited (*samkucitah*) in that state.

The expression '*akṣhīlātmanā*' implies that the knowledge of the former perception and that of the later remembrance are unified in the later state.

The question arises, the expression '*svalakṣaṇam*' denotes that, in remembrance, the picture of the object comes by itself without recourse to the perception. Hence it may be observed that there is a clear difference in the formation of the two experiences, perception and remembrance, as in the former the object is present and in the latter the picture of the object occurs itself without recourse to the perception. The teacher replies this objection in the following *Kārikā* :-

K 2—1. वेद्यांशस्पर्शी भूतकालो घटाभासस्य केवलस्य स्वालक्षण्यापत्तिहेतु दर्शितः ।
इयदेव स्मृतेः अव्यभिचारि वपुः, अर्थितातिशयात् तु स्फुटत्वम् *Pv* I, 126

2. स्मृत्यशक्त्या स इति पूर्वानुभूतं स्वलक्षणं परामृशन्नाभासयत्येवान्यथा प्रकाशितस्य परामर्शो न कृतः स्यात् स्वसत्ताकाल एव च तेन स्मरणकाले नष्टस्याप्याभासो न दुष्यति । कदाचित्त्वर्थावशाद्घटकाञ्चनद्रव्यसत्ताद्यन्यतमैकाभासरूपेणैवास्याः स्फुटावभासोऽन्यदा तु (अखिलात्मना) सर्वात्मनार्थित्वेन तथैवातिशय-निरन्तरावहितचेतसस्तु दृष्टार्थप्रत्यक्षीकार एव । *Pv*?

न च युक्तं स्मृतेर्भेदे स्मर्यमाणस्य भासनम् ।

तेनैक्यं भिन्नकालानां संविदां वेदितेष सः ॥३॥

योजना—स्मृतेर्भेदे (स्मृतिविषयस्य अर्थस्य स्मृतेः सकाशात् भेदे) स्मर्यमाणस्य (अर्थस्य) भासनं च न युक्तम्,¹ तेन भिन्नकालानां संविदाम् ऐक्यम्; एष सः (संविदाम् एकत्वलक्षणः प्रमाता) वेदिना (इति उक्तम्)² ।

एवमत्र संक्षेपः ।

स्मृतेः भेदे, अर्थात् स्मृतिविषयस्य अर्थस्य स्मृतेः सकाशाद् भेदे, इदन्ताग्रहणेन भेदे सति, स्मर्यमाणस्य भासनं न च युक्तं स्यात्, सोऽर्थः प्रकाशमान एव स्यान्न स्मर्यमाणः इति भावः, तेन-ततः, भिन्नकालानां संविदाम्—अनुभवस्मृत्यादि ज्ञानानाम्, ऐक्यं भवति, एककालत्वात् भिन्नकालस्याकिञ्चित्करत्वात् । तथा च प्रकाशमानत्वेऽपि स्मर्यमाणत्वमर्थस्य सिद्ध्यति इति भावः । ननु तथापि ग्रहीतुरभावात् कथं सिद्ध्यति इति अत आह 'वेदिता' इति । एष सः—उक्तम् ऐक्यमेव लक्षणया क्रियातद्वतोरैक्यात् योजकः ऐक्यग्रहीतैव वेदिता ग्रहीता भवति ।.....

Bhā I, 166.

If we say that the object of remembrance, i.e., the past perception, is different from the knowledge of remembrance, then it is not proper for the former to shine (or recur) in *smṛti* (*smṛti-viśayasya arthasya smṛteḥ bhede, smaryamānasya bhāsanam na ca yuktam*). We must, therefore, admit that there is unification of cognitions, associated with different times, i.e., the time of the former perception and that of the later remembrance (*tena bhinna-kalanām samyidam aikyam*). And, that subject is the knower of these cognitions (*vedita eṣa saḥ*).

K 3—1. स्मरणज्ञानात् भिन्नत्वेन बहीरूपतया यदि सोऽर्थो भासेत 'स्मर्यमाणस्य' च यत् 'भासनं' तदेव न स्यात् स्मर्यमाणमेव तत् न स्यात् ।

Pv I, 128

2. पूर्वानुभूतश्चार्थोऽनुभवेन सह तात्कालिकस्मृतिप्रकाशे ऽवभासमानः स्मृत्यभिन्न एव प्रकाशाद्भिन्नस्य प्रकाशमानतानुपपत्तेः । एवंचानुभव-स्मृत्यादिसंविदामैक्यं स एवात्मा वेदकः, तथाहि । *Pvr*

On this point, another objection is raised :- If the light of the object externally manifested by the later remembrance is not other than the former perception itself, why should we not simply say that the former experience is the object of remembrance? What is the use of this odd and uncommon expression 'unification of cognitions' (*aikyena tu alaukika ko-arthaḥ*)? To this objection, the teacher explains as follows :-

नैव ह्यनुभवो भाति स्मृतौ पूर्वं स्थितपृथक् ।
प्रागन्वभूवमहमित्यात्मारोहण-भासनात् ॥४॥

योजना— स्मृतौ पूर्वं अनुभवो अर्थवत् (अनुभूत अर्थवत्) पृथक् (-भूतो) नैव भाति हि, कस्मात् कारणात्? 'प्राग् अन्वभूवम् अहम्' इति (प्रत्ययस्य) आत्मारोहण (आत्मनि विश्रमणा, तेन हेतुना) भासनात् ॥

एवं दृष्टान्तद्वय योजना । हि—यस्मात्, स्मृतौ पूर्वं अनुभवः पृथक् नैव भाति, कथम्? अर्थवत्—यथा प्राग् अर्थः पृथग् भाति स्म नैवमनुभवः इति । अत्रानुभवगतस्य भानाभानरूपस्य विरुद्धधर्मद्वयस्य साधनात् वैधर्म्यदृष्टान्तत्वम् इति एका योजना । अथ द्वितीया । स्मृतौ पूर्वोऽनुभवो न पृथग्भाति । कथम्? अर्थवत्—यथा प्राग् अर्थः स्मृतौ न पृथग् भाति तथा अनुभवोऽपि न भाति इति । अत्र च साधर्म्यं दृष्टान्तत्वम्, न भानरूपस्य समानधर्मस्योभयत्र साधनात् ।

Bh I, 167.

It is not that the former perception shines separately in remembrance (*smṛtau purvo-anubhavo pṛthak naiva bhāti hi*), as the object (shines in perception) (*arthavat*). It shines as the knowledge (*pratyayaḥ*) expressed in words: 'I experienced it before', because it shines only as resorting to the subject, i.e., the knowledge of the past perception is carried to the later remembrance as resting in the Self (*prag-anvabhūvam-aham iti-ātmarohanabhāsanāt*).

The self, experiencing the former perception and retaining in itself the knowledge of the same, persists in remembrance. In *smṛti* the object does not stand externally as in the perception, but the knowledge of the past perception (of the object) remains unified with the consciousness that persists from the previous experience to the later. In this manner the knowledge of various cognitions is unified in the lasting consciousness, the permanent Self.

A very important point is made here for discussion. Objection is raised to the point that the former experience (direct perception) does not shine apart from the subject in remembrance, as in perception the object shines separately. Even in perception, the object (jar) does not shine separately, exactly as perception does in remembrance. But, in reality, both of them do shine separately, according to their individual nature. In both the cases, it is a common point that, in one view, even the object does not shine separately in perception as perception does in remembrance; in another view, they (i.e., the object in perception as well as the perception in remembrance) do shine separately from the subject. This view is supported, by the opponent, with the evidence that the Yogins get insight into their own remote past and future experiences, as separate from their consciousness (*samvid*), so they do also the knowledge of others' minds. He says, as the experiences of others become the object of Yogin's knowledge, so his own remote past and future experiences may also be the object of his knowledge. The teacher explains this point as follows:-

योगिनामपि भासन्ते न दृशो दर्शनान्तरे ।

स्वसंविदेकमानास्ता भान्ति मेयपदे ऽपि वा ॥५॥

योजन— योगिनाम् अपि दर्शनान्तरं (परचितविषयो ज्ञानविशेषः) दृशः (परकीयाः दृशः) न भासन्ते, ता स्वसंविद् - एकमाना (स्वसंविद्-मात्रवेद्यस्वभावाः स्वात्मारूढा एव) भान्ति'; मेयपदे (प्रमेयकक्षायाम्) अपि वा (स्वात्मारूढा एवाभासेरन्)^२ ।

Even in the particular kind of knowledge of Yogins, the experiences of others (*darśanāntaram*) do not become manifest as such (i.e., as others' experiences) (*yoginam parakīyāḥ dṛśaḥ na bhasante*); but they

K 4—1. स्मृतौ स्मर्यमाणोऽनुभूतार्थो यथा पृथग्भूतो भाति न तथानुभवः स्वात्मन एवाहन्ताप्रत्येयस्यानुभवमयत्वेन प्रथनात्, यश्चानेककालोऽहंवेद्योऽर्थः स एवात्मा

Pv

'अहम्'—इत्येवं स्वभावो य 'आत्मा' पूर्वापरसंविदन्तर्मुखस्वभावः तत्र यत् 'आरोहणं' विश्रमः तेन हेतुना पूर्वसंविद्रूपतायाः स्वप्रकाशाया 'भासनात्'

Pv I, 132

shine as unified with their own Self (*Ātam*), consciousness (*Samvid*) (*sva-samvid-ekamāṇāḥ*). Even at the level of objects, the experiences of others are one with the self-consciousness of the Yogin (*meva pade api vā*).

A Yogin in no case, has recourse to an object for getting the knowledge of his own remote experiences, past or future, or the knowledge of others' experiences. When a Yogin calls to his mind the knowledge of others' experiences, it is nothing but the part and parcel of his own self-consciousness, although he does not acquire this knowledge as a result of his direct cognition of others' experiences. Similarly, he gets the knowledge of his own remote past or future experiences or other subtleties of his life not apart (*prthak*) from his own self-consciousness. This unification of the knowledge of others' experiences with the Yogin's self-consciousness (*samvid*), as it were his own personal knowledge, shines as *prakāśa* or *bhānam* (effulgence) of his Self (soul). In all cases, viz. in the case of ordinary men as well as Yogins, the knowledge of the former experiences (perceptions) is unified in their Self, the lasting consciousness, not that the former experiences play the role of object in remembrance and, hence, stand apart from the rememberer (the Self). As a matter of fact the Self is the knower of different cognitions or experiences and has the power of recalling the knowledge of remote experiences, past as well as future, of himself as well as others.

It may be admitted, the opponent says, that, in certain exceptional cases, like Yogins, the former experience (perception) does not shine apart from the subject in remembrance, as it is resting on his self-consciousness (*aham-bhāva*), but in the case of common people, the cogni-

K5— 1. सर्वज्ञानामपि प्रमात्रन्तरगतोपलम्भाः स्वसंविन्मात्रवेद्यस्वभावाः स्वात्मारूढा एवाभासेरन्..... P_v

‘योगिनां’ यत् एतत् ‘दर्शनान्तरं’ भावनाद्युद्भवः (भूतार्थभावनाप्रकर्षपर्यन्तजः) परचित्तविषयो ज्ञानविशेषः, तत्र ‘दृशः’ इति उपलब्धयो (परकीयाः) न भान्ति (वेद्यतया) P_v I, 135

2. प्रमेयकक्षायामपि घटादिवत्प्रातिस्विकेन बोधेनावभासेरन् यदि तथा सम्भवेत् । P_{vr}

tions are not unified in their self-consciousness; they resort to the objects perceived externally as denoted by the word "this". To this objection the teacher replies:-

स्मर्यते यद्दृगासीन्मे सैवमित्यपि भेदतः ।

तद्व्याकरणमेवास्या मया दृष्टमिति स्मृतेः ॥६॥

योजना— 'यत् दृग् मे आसीत्' इति (एतदेवमनुभवोऽसौ ममाभूदिति) सा एव दृग् (अनुभवो) एवम् भेदतः अपि स्मर्यते; 'मया दृष्टम्' इति अस्या स्मृतेः तद्व्याकरणम् (व्याख्यानम्)' एव ।

The particular experience in which one remembers, 'I had that perception before', and in which the former perception appears apart from remembrance as its object (*yad dṛg me āsīt iti sa evam bhedataḥ api smaryati*), is only an analysis of the process of remembrance: 'it was seen by me before' (*mayā dṛṣṭam iti asya smṛteḥ tad-vyākaraṇam eva*).

It is the experience of common people that a person remembers that he had the knowledge of the past perception just as (*evam*) he remembers it now (on the later occasion). This later knowledge, i.e., the knowledge of the later remembrance, is a different exposition (*vyākaraṇam*) of the past knowledge, i.e., the knowledge of the former perception, as is denoted by the words: '*mayā dṛṣṭam iti*'. This shows that the knowledge of the former perception is one with the knowledge of the later remembrance, i.e., they are unified in self-consciousness.

Another objection is raised by the opponent: he says, if one looks at things indeterminately without taking special notice of anything particular determinately, there is no remembrance of any particular thing possible, just as when one looks at trees, plants, grass and leaves on the way while going to some place. So long as there is no determinate perception of anything, i.e., so long as the indeterminate knowledge

K 6— 1. मया दृष्टमिति प्रमात्रन्तर्गतदर्शनपरामर्शात्मिकाया एव स्मृतेर्विभज्य कथनमेतदेवमनुभवोऽसौ ममाभूदिति भेदेनापि निर्देशः । *Pv*

स हि न पृथग्भूतां दृशं काञ्चित् मन्यते—'सा दृक् मे आसीत्' इत्येवम्, अपि तु यत् स्मर्यते एवं-भूतमपि यत् स्मरणं कस्यचित् विवेचकमन्यस्य, तत् स्मृतेर्व्याकरणम् *Pv I, 138-39*

of a thing does not shine as determinate : 'this' (object), there can be no remembrance of it. The opponent wants to lay stress again on the point that the former perception is separate from remembrance and, as such, it has to be accepted as the object of the latter. The teacher replies to this objection as follows :-

या च पश्याम्यहमिमं घटोऽयमिति वाऽवसा ।
मन्यते समवेतं साप्यवसातरि दर्शनम् ॥७॥

योजना— 'अहम् इमं पश्यामि', 'अयं घटः' इति वा अवसा (बोधेः, अध्य-
वसायः) या मन्यते, सापि अवसातरि (प्रमातरि) समवेतं (प्रमातृमयमेव) दर्शनम्
—निर्विकल्पकम् अनुभवनम् (प्रत्यवमृश्यते)¹ ।

Whether one takes the form of determinate knowledge (experience) to be as expressed in : 'I see this' or 'this is the jar', (*aham imam paśyāmi ghato ayam iti vā avasā manyate*), it is one with the knowing subject, the self-consciousness, (*sā api avasātari—pramātari—samavetam-darśanam*), resting in it as indeterminate knowledge (*nirvikalpakam anubhavanam*).

The teacher means to say, whether the knowledge be determinate or indeterminate, it is ultimately indeterminate being unified in the knower. The determinate knowledge of the former perception, as a matter of fact, rests on the knowing subject in the form of indeterminate knowledge, and, in the later state (remembrance), it is revived again as determinate knowledge. All cognitions are, therefore, inseparable from the Self and are invariably dependent upon it.

K 7— 1. पुरःस्थितार्थविकल्पनेऽपि घटमिमं पश्यामि घटोऽयमिति वा प्रमातृ-
मयमेव दर्शनं प्रत्यवमृश्यते । *Pv*

अवसायः अवसा, समवेतम् इति अपृथग्भावमाह । अवसातरि इति स्वतन्त्रेऽन्त-
मुखे बोधात्मनि अहन्तास्पदे इत्यर्थः । 'दर्शनं' इति निर्विकल्पमनुभवनम् ।
विकल्पयाम्यहम् स्मराम्यहम्, विकल्पितं मया, स्मृतं मया इति अहन्तारूढयैव वि-
कल्पादेः अवभासात् । अत एव आत्मनोऽस्मी विकल्पाद्याः शक्तिविशेषाः तद्विश्रान्त-
शरीरत्वात् इति दर्जितम्,..... *Pv I, 144-45*

The teacher sums up the topic in the last Kārikā, as follows :-

तन्मया दृश्यते दृष्टोऽयं स इत्यामृश्यपि ।
ग्राह्यग्राहकताभिन्नावयौ भातः प्रमातरि ॥८॥

योजना—‘मया दृश्यते’, ‘मया दृष्टः’, ‘अयं’, ‘स’ इति तत्-ग्राह्य-ग्राहकता-भिन्नौ अयौ (एक) प्रमातरि भातः (एक प्रमातृलीनौ एव अनुभाव्य-अनुभावकौ-मायाकृतविच्छन्नी-अवभासौ अपि प्रकाशेते) ।¹

The perceiver (subject) experiences various cognitions in the orders denoted by the expressions : ‘is seen by me’ (or ‘I see’), ‘was seen by me’ (or ‘I saw’), ‘this’ and ‘that’. (*tan mayā dṛśyate, mayā dṛṣṭaḥ, ayam, sa*). They fall into two categories, as knowers (*grāhaka*) and the known (*grāhya*). Both of them shine in the subject, in their essential nature (*tat-grāhya-grāhakatā-bhinnau arthau eka pramātari bhātāḥ*)

All objects are manifested by the Supreme Self in two main divisions, the limited perceivers (*grāhaka*) and the objects perceived (*grāhya*), which are ultimately identical (*abhinnu*) with Him.

Abhinavagupta divides all cognitions into twenty-two categories (*dvā-vimśatiḥ-samvedana-bhedāḥ*), according to the differences in the various experiences of the perceiver (*Pramātā*). A perception (*anubhava*) is of two forms : (1) sometimes it is preceded by self-consciousness, which remains predominant in it. In this case the stress is on the subject as denoted by ‘*mayā-dṛśyate*’, it is still at the level of indeterminate knowledge ; (2) sometimes the subject perceives the object primarily ; in this case stress is laid on the object as denoted by ‘*ayam iti*’. It assumes the form of determinate knowledge of the object. In this case also there is the light of self-consciousness. Remembrance consists of two experiences, the past perception (*purvānubhavaḥ*) as denoted by ‘*dṛṣṭa iti*’ and the later experience as denoted by ‘*sa iti*’. As every perception is of two forms, so remembrance consisting of two experiences (*anubhavas*) falls into four categories, (*iti catvāraḥ smaraṇa-bhedāḥ*). Recognition is the unification of the two experiences : remembrance (*smaraṇa*) and perception (*anubhava*). Recognition, therefore, falls into eight categories, since the four categories of remembrance will multiply into eight because of the two different forms of perception. These eight categories are further multiplied by two, since each of them has two forms according as the

former or the later experience predominates (*pūrvāpara-vīśrāntikṛtāt pratyekam dvidhā-bhedacca ṣoḍaśadha*). Thus recognition has sixteen forms. Adding up the two forms of perception, the four forms of remembrance and the sixteen forms of recognition, there are twenty-two forms of cognition (*tad ete dvā-viṁśatiḥ samvedana-bhedāḥ*). See (Pv I, 147-48.)

K 8— 1. तस्माद् दृक्परामर्शपुरःसरायां स्मृतौ विकल्पमात्रे वा दृक्शब्दानुवेषं विनापि स इत्ययमिति वार्थमात्रनिर्देशेन सर्वत्रैकप्रमातृलीनावेव.....प्रकाशेते । *Pvr*

इह स्मृतिः अनुभवं क्रोडीकरोति (स्वान्तः करोति) इत्युक्तम् । अनुभवश्च द्विधा, —परामर्शभेदात् कदाचित् (द्रष्टृभागबहुमाने) स्वात्मपरामर्शपूर्वकम् आमृशति यत्र अस्य अभिसंधिप्रधानता 'मया दृश्यते' इति, कदाचित्.....अर्थक्रियां प्रति आग्रहविशेषो वा 'अयम्' इति,.....एवमुभयथानुभवे प्रत्येकं स्मृतिरपि द्वयपरामर्शमयी (द्रष्ट इति स इति च उभयपरामर्शमयी) उद्बेति, इति चत्वारः स्मरणभेदाः, द्वौ अनुभवभेदौ अनुसंधानरूपं प्रत्यभिज्ञानमपि एतदुभयमेलनात्मकम् (स्मरणानुभवयोर्मेलनात्मकम्) अत्रैवान्तर्भूतम् । तच्च (स्मृतानुभूतमेलनात्मकेन प्रत्यभिज्ञानेन) एतद्भेदात् अष्टधा, पूर्वापरविश्रान्तिकृतात् प्रत्येकं द्विधाभेदाच्च षोडशधा । तदेते द्वाविंशतिः संवेदनभेदाः । तेषु च ग्राह्यं.....अर्थराशिः....मायाप्रमाता.....स च ग्राहकः इति उच्यते ।.....ग्राह्यरूपेण ग्राहकरूपेण योजितौ घटादिदेहादिस्वभावौ अथौ वेद्यौ प्रमातरि विशुद्धप्रकाशरूपे भातः प्रकाशेते । *Pv I, 147-49.*

Ah. I, v

ज्ञानशक्ति-निरूपणम् (प्रत्यभिज्ञाकारिकायां ज्ञानाधिकारे पञ्चममाह्निकम्)

Power of knowledge :-

In Pratyabhijñā, *Jñāna-śakti* (the power of knowledge) means the faculty of cognition, comprehension, conscious activity and the light of the Self (*Prakāśa*). The power of perception (*anubhava*) is a form of power of knowledge (*jñāna-śakti rūpāḥ*), on which depends the power of Remembrance (*Smaraṇa-śakti*)

In this Ahnika, the teacher lays down the doctrine that all the objects directly perceptible to the perceiving subjects (*Pramātā*) exist in their real nature within the Self (*Ātman*) and are projected outward as manifestations (*ābhāsaḥ*). *Jñāna-Śakti* functions in making objects manifest externally in the form of their perceptions, which, in reality, indwell in self-consciousness. By virtue of this power, the Self takes out for separate manifestation only certain things from the unlimited mass which lies merged in it (*svarūpād-unmagnam-abhasayati*), that is to say, it isolates some objects and manifests them externally, emerged, as it were, from the ocean of light (*prakāśa*) of consciousness.

In kārikā 1, the teacher explains the nature of perception (*anubhava*), which is the very 'life' of remembrance, determinate knowledge, etc. (*smaraṇa-vikalpadīnam anubhava eva jīvitam*) :-

वर्तमानावभासानां भावानामवभासनम् ।

अन्तःस्थितवतामेव घटते बहिरात्मना ॥१॥

योजना संक्षेपार्थश्च :- वर्तमानावभासानां भावानाम् (अवभासनम्) अन्तःस्थितवताम् बहिरात्मना अवभासनम् एव घटते ।¹

अत्र चायमभिप्रायः । परमार्थतः स्वरूपतया स्थितेषु स्वावयवभूतेषु भावेष्वहमिति ग्रहणयोग्येषु मायावशेन स्वतः भेदेन यदिदम् इति भासनं तत्तत्रैवावयवतया स्थितानामेव सतां भवति, न ततः च्युतानाम्, यथा मृन्मयस्य घटस्य मृन्मयत्वेन स्थितस्यैव घटतया ग्रहणम्, नहि मृदो निर्गतो घटः किमपि भवति, मृत्सत्तयैव सतायुक्तत्वात्, इति तदन्तःस्थित्वं तदभिन्नतामात्रमेव न तु तदन्तराधेयत्वेनावस्थानं

मृदभावेन हि स्थितो घटः मृदन्तस्थ उच्यते, न तु तदाधारत्वेन स्थितः, तद्-
बहिःस्थितत्वं तु ततो भिन्नत्वमेव, मृदो भिन्नो जलतरङ्गो मृदो बाह्य इत्युच्यते ।
अतश्च चिदन्तःस्थितस्य भावराशेः चिन्मयत्वमेव तदन्तःस्थितत्वम् न तु स्व-
प्रधानतया तत्तावस्थानम्, ततो बहिःस्थितत्वं च मायावशेनेदन्तया ततो भेदेन
भासनम्, न तु ततो निर्गत्य कुत्रापि देशेऽवस्थानम् इति तद्वहिरवस्थानं माया-
कार्यमेव.....Bh I, 197

The external manifestation of the objects, which are directly percep-
tible (as separate from the perceiver) (*vantamāna-avabhasanam bhavanam-
avabhasanam*), can only be possible on the ground that they exist within
the Self (*antah-sthitavatam eva*)

In support of the same thought, the teacher says :—

प्राग्विद्यार्थोऽप्रकाशः स्यात्प्रकाशात्मतया विना ।
न च प्रकाशो भिन्नः स्यादात्मार्थस्य प्रकाशता ॥२॥

योजना :— प्रकाशात्मतया विना (प्रमातृसंज्ञा-प्रकाशस्वरूपतां विना) अर्थः प्राग्
इव (अग्रहणकाले इव) अप्रकाशः स्यात् (ग्रहणकालेऽपि । (स्वात्म-) प्रकाशः (अर्थ-
स्वरूपाद्) भिन्नः न च स्यात्; (अतः) (आत्म-) प्रकाशता अर्थस्य आत्मा
(भवति) ।¹

अयमत्र संक्षिप्तार्थः—प्रकाशात्मतया विना-प्रकाशमानतारूपशुद्धप्रकाशाख्यनिजस्व-
रूपासादनद्वारागतशुद्धप्रकाशरूपतां विना, अर्थः प्राग्वि—अग्रहणकाले इव ग्रहण-
कालेऽपि अप्रकाशः स्यात्, प्रकाशते च अतो ज्ञायते प्रकाशान्तःस्थितस्यैव
भावस्य बहिर-इदन्तया भासनमस्तीति भावः ननु प्रकाशविषयतयैव अस्य भानं
भवतु किं तद्रूपता-कल्पनायासेन इत्यत आह 'न च' इति । प्रकाशः भिन्नः न
च स्यात्, तथा च अस्य घटसंबन्धित्वमेवायुक्तं भिन्नयोः सम्बन्धायोगादिति
भावः । अतः प्रकाशोऽर्थस्यात्मा—अलौकिकं स्वरूपं भवति । Bh I, 203

K 1—1. प्रत्यक्षेऽपि यावदर्थानां भेदेनावभासः प्रमातृन्तर्लीनानामेव सतां युक्तः ।

Pvr

ततो माया प्रमातुःविच्छिन्नानाम् 'अवभासनम्' (अवच्छिन्नतया) तत् परमार्थ-
प्रमातरि शुद्धचिन्मये 'अन्तःस्थितवतां' तेन सह एकात्म्यम् अनुज्झितवतामेव
'घटते' प्रमाणन उपपद्यते ; Pv I, 153-4, see also Fn. 11

If the object were lacking the light of the subject, it would remain unmanifest (*arthah prakāśatmataya vinnā-aprakāśah syāt*), even as it was before (*prag-iva*). The light of the subject cannot be different from that of the object (*na ca prakāśo bhinnah syāt*). The light of the subject is, therefore, the very essence of a thing (*prakāśata arthasya ātma*).

It is not possible to say that knowledge pertaining to an object is separate from the light of the subject (self-consciousness). If we think that the knowledge of an object is apart from that object, say a jar or cloth, then it will not be possible to cognise it. Unless the knowledge of each one of the different objects rests on the subject (*svātman*), practical life would become impossible. The teacher, therefore, holds the view that knowledge is one, not diverse, and it is not apart from the object. To prove this, the teacher says :-

भिन्ने प्रकाशे चाभिन्ने संकरो विषयस्य तत् ।

प्रकाशात्मा प्रकाशयोऽर्थो नाप्रकाशश्च सिद्ध्यति ॥३॥

योजना :— (आत्म-) प्रकाशे (स्वविषयाद्) भिन्ने अभिन्ने च, तत् विषयस्य (विषयाणाम्) सङ्करः (सङ्कीर्णता स्यात्) ; प्रकाशो अर्थो प्रकाशात्मा ; अप्रकाशश्च (प्रकाशरहितो विषयः) न सिद्ध्यति । तस्मादर्थसिद्धिः प्रकाशात्मतायता भवति ।'

एवमत्रसंक्षेपः—प्रकाशे-ज्ञाने, भिन्ने—स्वविषयाद् भिन्ने सति, तथा अभिन्ने अर्थे एव प्रकाशः, अभिन्ने च सति, विषयस्य, जातावेकवचनम्, तेन विषयाणामित्यर्थः । सङ्करः—सङ्कीर्णता, एकज्ञानेन सर्वविषयग्रहणात्, अप्रकाशः—प्रकाशरहितो विषयः न सिद्ध्यति, यतः प्रकाशात्मा अर्थः प्रकाशो भवति इति । *Bh I, 208-9*

K 2—1. प्रमातृसंज्ञाप्रकाशस्वरूपतां विना यथादौ घटोऽस्य नावभातस्तथा ज्ञान-कालेऽपि स्यात्, प्रकाशमानता चार्थस्य प्रकाशः स्वरूपभूतो न तु भिन्नः । *Pvr*

'प्राग्' इति ज्ञानानुदये,..... अतश्च इदम् उपपत्त्या आयातम्—अर्थस्य स्वरूपं प्रकाशमानत्वं प्रकाशाभिन्नत्वम् । प्रकाशश्च यदि घटेऽन्यः पटेऽन्यः तदा अनुसंधानस्य अयोगः, द्वयोः प्रकाशयोः स्वात्ममात्रपर्यवसानात् इति वितत्य उपपादितं 'नश्येत् जनस्थितिः' इत्यत्र । तस्माद् एक एव प्रकाशः । *Pv I, 158, Fn 12*

If the light of the subject be different from the object (*bhinne prakāśe*) and remains as one in itself (*abhinne ca*), i.e., if it remains without variety or distinction in respect of different objects, it would result, then, in the confusion of one object with another (*saṅkaro viśayasya tat*). Therefore, the object, that is made manifest, has the light of the subject as its essential nature (*prakāśyo 'rtho prakāśātma*). For, what is not light, i.e., what is not known by a perceiver, cannot be said to exist (*aprakāśaś ca na siddhyate*).

An objection is raised against the above-said view by the Bāhyārthanumeya-vādin (Pūrvapakṣin), a school of Buddhists, who believe in the existence of inferable external objects. According to them, all the worldly transactions, connected with *Pramāṇa* (perception), are dependent upon determinate cognition and that is possible only because there is the direct perception of an external object which has the nature of mere reflection of *Pravṛtti-vijñāna* (consciousness) that is changing and momentary, but the *Vijñāna* (bodha) remains really as one. So the Purpakṣin says :-

तत्तदाकस्मिकाभासो बाह्यं चेदनुमापयेत् ।

न ह्यभिन्नस्य बोधस्य विचित्राभासहेतुता ॥४॥

योजना :— अभिन्नस्य (अविचित्रस्य) बोधस्य विचित्राभास हेतुता नहि (संभवति, or युक्तः), (अतः) तत् तद् आकस्मिकाभासः (अज्ञातहेतूद्भवाभासः) बाह्यम् अनुमापयेत् चेत्? (चेदिति निपातो—यदि बाह्यार्थवादिना उच्यते—अथवा—बाह्यार्थवादिना संभाव्यमानतामाह)'

Prima facie view :- If the light of consciousness (*bodha*) be assumed to be without diversity in itself, it cannot be the cause of variety in manifestation (in determinate cognition) (*abhinnasya bodhasya vicitrabhasa*

K 3—1. प्रकाशमात्र चार्थाद्भिन्नं सर्वार्थसाधारणं तस्य घटस्य प्रकाशोऽयमयं पटस्यैवेति विषयनियमो निर्निबन्धनः । तस्मादर्थसिद्धिः प्रकाशात्मतायत्ता । *Pv*

भिन्ने प्रकाशे इति, भिन्ने स्वात्म-मात्रपर्यवसाने, 'अभिन्ने' नीलाद्याकार-शून्ये *Pv I, Fn 36, P 159*.

'न च प्रकाशः प्रकाशाद्भिन्नः न च प्रकाशोऽर्थतः'; यदि प्रकाशतैव घटस्य वपुः सव पटस्य इत्यादि विश्ववपुः प्रकाशः सिद्धः, तस्मात् प्रकाशरूपाद्-बोधादभिन्न एवार्थ इति राद्धान्तः । *Pv I, 163. Fn. 56, 58*

hetutā na hi). Therefore, this variety in manifestations, being without any perceptible cause (i.e., mere accidental affections), leads to the inference of external objects (*tat tad-ākasmikabhāso bāhyam anumāpayet*).

The Pūrvapakṣin further says :-

न वासनाप्रबोधोऽत्र विचित्रो हेतुतामियात् ।
तस्यापि तत्प्रबोधस्य वैचित्र्ये किं निबन्धनम् ॥५॥

योजना :— विचित्रः वासनाप्रबोधः अत्र (अर्थाभासवैचित्र्ये) तस्य (वैचित्र्यस्य) हेतुतां न इयाद् अपि ; तत्—प्रबोधस्य वैचित्र्ये निबन्धनं किम् ?¹

Prima facie continues :-

The rise of *Vāsanā* (*vāsanā-prabodhaḥ*), being of diverse nature (*vieltrah*), cannot be (assumed to be) its cause (*na hetutām-iyat*) (i.e., *Vāsanā*, according to the view of the *Vijñāna-vādin*, is nothing else but the residual trace of impressions—*samskāra*, so it cannot be taken to be the cause of variety in manifestations.) For, then the question will arise, 'What is the cause of variety in the rise of *vāsanā* (*tat-prabodhasya vaicitre kim nibandhanam*) ?

K 4—1. जडानामाभासमानतैव सत्तासिद्धिः सा चाभासमानतैव । ततश्च बोधमात्रमेवात्र तत्त्वं, तस्याविशेषेऽपि क्रमेण विशिष्यमाणोऽर्थावभासस्ततोऽन्यमप्रकाशमानं हेतुतया बाह्यमर्थमूहयेदिन्द्रियवत् । *Pv*

'आकस्मिकाभासो'—अज्ञातहेतूद्भवाभासः *Pv I, 164, Fn. 65*

चेदिति निपातो बाह्यार्थवादिना संभाव्यमानतामाह,.....न ह्यविचित्राद्बोधात्-क्रमिक आभासभेदो युक्तस्तत एकान्तेन बाह्य एव हेतुतयानुमीयते इति ।

Pv I, 164 Fn 66

'तत्तदाकस्मिकाभासो'— can better be translated as "those accidental affections", i.e., variety in manifestation of objects.

K 5—1. विचित्रवासनाप्रबोधो न बोधाद्भिन्नः, तस्यापि वैचित्र्ये को हेतुस्ततो बाह्य एवार्थो भिन्नाभासहेतुः । *Pv*

एवं वासनानां तदुद्बोधहेतूनां च विचित्राणाम् अनुपपत्तिरेव । ततश्च स्थितमेतत्, अभिन्नो बोधः (चिन्मात्रम्—*Fn*) तस्य आकस्मिकाभास-(ज्ञानम्—*Fn*)भेदहेतुत्वानुपपत्तेः बाह्योऽर्थोऽनुमेयः संभाव्यते—इति यदि बाह्यार्थवादिना उच्यते,.....

Pv I, 175-6

The teacher denounces the point of view of the Pūrvapakṣin who upholds the separate and independent existence of external objects. He first weakens the supposition of the Pūrvapakṣin in the following Kārikā :—

स्यादेतद्वभासेषु तेष्वेवावसिते सति ।
व्यवहारे किमन्येन बाह्येनानुपपत्तिना ॥६॥

योजना :— स्याद् एतत्, व्यवहारे तेषु एव अवभासेषु अवसिते (समाप्ते) सति, अन्येन अनुपपत्तिना बाह्येन किम्^१ ?

Refutation of the Prima Facie :—

(The teacher says :—) It may be so (There may be the possibility of admitting the existence of objects) (*syad-etad*), (but there is another possibility also, that is,) since all transactions are performed by means of the various manifestations (*vyavahare teṣu eva avabhāseṣu avasite sati*), what is then the use of admitting the external objects (*anvena bāhyena kim*), whose existence cannot be established by any reason (*anupapattina*) ?

In the Vimarśini, various reasons are given to establish the existence of external objects, according to Bāhyārtha-vādin. The teacher is not inclined to accept the Bāhyārtha-vādin's view, since, according to Pratyabhijñā, it is the nature of the light of consciousness (*Prakāśa*) to manifest various objects, as different from one another. The following Kārikā gives the explanation about the existence of external objects :—

चिदात्मैव हि देवोऽन्तः स्थितमिच्छावशाद्बहिः ।
योगीव निरुपदानमर्थजातं प्रकाशयेत् ॥७॥

योजना :— चिदात्मा देव एव हि योगी इव अन्तः स्थितम् अर्थजातम् निरुपादानम् इच्छावशाद् बहिः प्रकाशयेत्^१ ।

K 6—1 आभासमानैरेवार्थैर्व्यवहारस्ते चाभासात्मकाः सन्तु का क्षतिः । तत्किं बाह्येन कार्यं तावता लोक-यात्रा-समाप्तेः । बाह्यश्चार्थः प्रमाणबाधितः सावयवो विरुद्धधर्माध्यासादेः, निरवयवश्च दिक्-षट्क-योगादेर्बहुशः । Pvr

K 7—1 चित्तत्त्वमेवेश्वरत्वात्स्वात्म-रूपतयोपपन्नाभास-रूपमनन्त-शक्तित्वादिच्छादि-वशात्-मृदादिकारणं विनैव बाह्यत्वेन घट-पटादिकमर्थराशिं प्रकाशयेत् । Pvr

(contd, on P. 42)

(The teacher states his doctrine as follows:—) The Self (*Ātman*) who is the Lord (*deva*), the Supreme Being, whose essential nature is sentience (*cidatmā*), manifests externally all the objects (*artha-jātam bahiḥ prakāśayet*), which are within him (*antaḥ sthitam*), by the sovereignty of His will (*iccā-vaśāt*), without requiring any material cause (*nirupadānam*), like a Yogin (*yogī iva*) (who brings into existence innumerable objects he desires to create, by the mere power of his will, without recourse to any extraneous substance).

Since the teacher admits that the power of freedom of *Samvid* is the only cause of manifestations of objects, he refutes the possibility of inference regarding the existence of external objects, against the Bauddha opponent's point of view, in the following *Kārikā* 8:—

(There are two ways in which the external phenomenon can be explained by inference: (i) Should we follow the analogy of jar, etc., reflected in a mirror, in the case of appearance of variety of reflection in the light of consciousness (*jñāna*) and suppose some external objects as the cause of variety, different from the mirror of *vijñāna*, (ii) or follow the illustration of Yogin and represent the power of freedom of *samvid* to be the only cause? This is doubtful. Therefore, the teacher refutes the possibility of inference with regard to external objects in *Kārikās* 8, 9 and 10.)

अनुमानमनाभातपूर्वं नैवेष्टमिन्द्रियम् ।

आभातमेव बीजादेराभासादुवस्तुनः ॥८॥

योजना :— अनाभातपूर्वं (वस्त्वनि) अनुमानं नैव इष्टम्, इन्द्रियम् आभातमेव (किंचिदुपलब्धेः कारणम्—अर्थात्—अनुमीयते किञ्चिन्मात्रं निमित्तं), (कुतः) बीजादेः हेतुवस्तुनः आभासात् ।

‘एव’-कारेण इदमाह—सर्वेन तावत् वादिना विषय-व्यवस्थापनं संविद्रूपम् अवपह्नवनीयम् आदि-सिद्धं हि तत् इति उक्तम् । तस्य च स्वातन्त्र्यमेव ‘देव’-शब्दनिर्दिष्टं चिद्रूपत्वम् । *Pv*, i, 185

K 8—1 पूर्वावभासान्तःस्थित एवार्थो नान्तरीयकार्य-दर्शन-वशात्तत्तद्देशकालादि-योजनया विमर्शनमनुमानम् । इन्द्रियमप्यनुमीयते किञ्चिन्मात्रं निमित्तं, तच्च बीजा-आभासाद्-आभासितमेव । *Pv*

(contd. on P. 43)

(The teacher says :) Inference is not possible with respect to things which have not been previously perceived (*anābhata-pūrve*). As for the senses, they have, of course, been cognised (as cause of external objects) to some extent (*ābhātam eva kimcin-mātram*), because of the cognitions of manifestations (i. e. perceptions) of things like seed, etc., which are (recognised to be) of the nature of cause (*bījādeḥ hetu-vastunaḥ ābhāsat*).

आभासः पुनराभासाद्वाह्यस्यासीत्कथंचन ।

अर्थस्य नैव तेनास्य सिद्धिर्नाप्यनुमानतः । ११॥

योजनाः— पुनः, आभासाद् (चिदात्मप्रकाशाद्) बाह्यस्य अर्थस्य आभासः (बाह्यस्य अनाभासस्य आभासनम्) कथंचन नैव आसीत्, तेन अस्य (अर्थस्य) सिद्धिः अनुमानतः अपि न (आसीत्)¹ ।

एवमत्र श्लोकद्वये (8 & 9) योजना । पण्डितैः अनुमानम् अनाभासपूर्वे नैवेष्टम् । इन्द्रियम् आभासमेव भवति, सामान्येनेति शेषः । कुतः ? बीजादेः हेतुवस्तुनः आभासात् । पुनः—पक्षान्तरे, आभासाद् बाह्यस्य आभासः कथंचन न आसीत्, तेनास्यार्थस्य बाह्यार्थस्य अनुमानतोऽपि सिद्धिर्नास्ति इति । *Bh, i, 235*

(The teacher further says :) There has never been, in any way, the manifestation of the object that is outside the light of consciousness (*ābhāsād bahyasya arthasya ābhāsaḥ katham ca naiva āsīt*), i. e., the object that is outside the light of consciousness never becomes manifest (externally) in any way. Therefore, its existence cannot be proved even by inference (*tena asya arthasya siddhiḥ anumānataḥ api na*).

यत्किंचिदनुमानं तत्समग्रं विकल्परूपं, विकल्पश्च-अननुभूते नोदेति (*Pv, i, 186 Fn*), इन्द्रियमपि पूर्वानुभूतमेव, न हि तत्प्रातिस्विकेन आकारेणानुमीयते अपि तु सामान्येन । *Pv, i, 188 Fn*

K 9—1 घटाद्याभासाद्-बाह्यस्य-अनुपपत्तेर्-नासीद्-आभासस्तत्र नानुमानाद् अपि सिद्धिः । *Pvr*

तेन बाह्ये साध्ये यत् किंचित् प्रमाणम् आनीयते, तदबाह्यतामेव प्रत्युत प्रसाधयति इति विरुद्धमेव, अत एव आह 'कथंचन' इति, केनापि प्रकारेण प्रत्यक्षात्मना अनुमेयात्मना वा आभासनम् आभासो बाह्यस्य अनाभासस्य न कदाचित् अभूत् इति, तस्मात् सिद्धं 'चिदात्मैव हि देव' इति । *Pv i, 191*

The teacher, therefore, lays stress on the principle that every thing external indwells in the Self:-

स्वामिनश्चात्म-संस्थस्य भावजातस्य भासनम् ।
अस्त्येव न विना तस्मादिच्छामर्शः प्रवर्तते ॥१०॥

योजना :— स्वामिनः आत्मसंस्थस्य एव (आत्मनीवाभेदेन वर्तमानस्य) भावजात-
स्य भासनम् अस्ति, तस्माद् विना इच्छामर्शः (इच्छारूपो निर्मातृतामयो वि-
मर्शः) न स्यात् ।

अयमत्र संक्षेपः । स्वामिनः—विमर्शाख्यैश्वर्ययुक्तात् प्रभवापादनरूपाच्चित्तत्वात्,
आत्मसंस्थस्य-तादात्म्येन स्वान्तर्गतस्यैव सतः, भावजातस्य-भावराशेः, भासनमस्ति,
तस्माद्विना—तस्यात्मनि समवस्थानं विना, इच्छामर्शः—“करवाणि” इति इच्छा-
रूपो विमर्शो न प्रवर्तते निर्विषयत्वात् Bh. I 241

(The teacher says :-) The mass of the so-called objects is manifested only as resting within the Lord (Self) (*Svaminah ātma-samsthasya eva bhāva jātasya bhāsanam asti*). Without that there cannot be the rise of will, which is a kind of the determinate consciousness (*āmarśah*), i.e., the first conscious activity in the process of making externally manifest the objects from within (*tasmād vinā icchamarśah na syāt*).

The teacher believes that the process of creation or emanation from the Lord follows the illustration of potter who proceeds producing externally pots, etc., from his reflective desire (*icchāmarśah*) And the act of creation cannot be possible without this reflective desire on the part of the Lord. The opponent questions here: How can the reflective desire (*paramarśa*) being a *viklāpa* (a determinative process) be attributed to the Lord, who is of the nature of pure consciousness? The teacher says on the point:

K 10—1 चिदात्मनश्चेश्वरस्य-आत्मनीवाभेदेन-अर्थेष्वपि प्रकाशोऽस्त्यन्यथा प्रति-
भासमानार्थैकविषयो निर्मातृतामयो विमर्श इच्छारूपो न स्यात् । Pv?

तस्मात् स्थितम् अन्तःस्थितं भाव-जातं—तेन विना तद्विषयस्य परामर्शस्य
अयोगात् इति । Pv, i, 196

स्वभावमवभासस्य विमर्शं विदुरन्यथा ।

प्रकाशोऽर्थोपरक्तोऽपि स्फटिकादिजडोपमः ॥११॥

योजनाः— अवभासस्य (आत्मप्रकाशस्य) स्वभावम् (मुख्यं रूपम्) विमर्शं विदुः, अन्यथा अर्थ-उपरक्तोऽपि प्रकाशः स्फटिकादि जडोपमः (स्यात्)¹

It is known (*viduh*) that sentiency or autonomy of consciousness (*vimarśa* or *āmarśa*) is the very nature of the light of the subject (*avabhāsasya svabhāva* n), for, otherwise, though there be the reflection of external objects in it (*anyathā artha-uparaktopi prakāśaḥ*), yet this light would be merely like insentient crystal and the like (*sphatikādi-jadōpamaḥ*).

The teacher, now, lays stress on sentiency of the Self or freedom of consciousness, as follows :-

आत्मात एव चैतन्यं चित्क्रिया चितिकर्तृता ।

तात्पर्येणोदितस्तेन जडात्स हि विलक्षणः ॥१२॥

योजना :— अत एव आत्मा चैतन्यं, (चैतन्यं) चित्क्रिया (चेतन-क्रिया), चित्कर्तृता (स्वातन्त्र्यं.....चित्तावेव), (तत्) तात्पर्येण उदितः (उक्तः), तेन (चैतन्येन) स जडाद् विलक्षणः हि¹ ।

अत्रायं संक्षेपः—अत एव-अवभासस्य विमर्शस्वभावत्वादेव, चित्क्रिया-चित्कर्तृता-तात्पर्येण हेतुना आत्मा चैतन्यमुदितः—“चैतन्यमात्मा” इति सूत्रे शिवेन

K 11—1 प्रकाशस्य मुख्य आत्मा प्रत्यवमर्शस्तं विना-अर्थ-भेदिताकारस्य अस्य स्वच्छतामात्रं न तु-अजाड्यं चमत्कृतेरभावात् । *Pvr*

‘अहमेवं प्रकाशात्मा प्रकाशे’ इति हि विमर्शोदये स्वसंविदेव प्रमातृ-प्रमेय-प्रमाणादि चरितार्थम् अभिमन्यते न तु अतिरिक्तं काङ्क्षति, स्फटिकादि हि गृहीत-प्रतिबिम्बमपि तथाभावेन सिद्धौ प्रमात्रन्तरम् अपेक्षते, इति निविमर्शत्वात् जडम् । सर्वं तु वस्तुतो विमर्शात्मक-प्रमातृस्वभाव-तादात्म्य-अहंपरामर्शविश्रान्तेः अजडमेव.... । *Pv* 198-99

K 12—1 आत्मद्रव्यस्य भावात्मकमप्येतज्जडाद्भेदकतया विमर्शाख्यं मुख्यं रूप-मुक्तं चैतन्यं चितिशक्तिर्दृशिरिति सा चेतनक्रिया चितिकर्तृता । *Pvr* (see P. 46)

कथितः । हि—यस्मात्कारणात्, सः-आत्मा, तेन-चैतन्येन, जडाद्विलक्षणो भवति, भवति च बाहुल्येन प्रधानस्य धर्मस्य स्वरूपतया निर्देशः मनोधर्मस्य संकल्पस्येव मनस्तया इत्यलम् ॥ Bh I, 249-50

Therefore (*ata eva*), i.e., *vimarśa* being the very nature of the light of the subject, the Self is sentiency (*caitanyam*), the implied sense of which is said to be the sentient activity (*cit-kriyā tatparyeṇa-uditāḥ*), the liberty or sovereignty in respect of conscious activity (*citt-kartṛtā*). It is, therefore, said, in Agamas, that the Self (*Ātman*) is distinct from the insentient (*jadāt sa hi vilakṣaṇaḥ*).

It is now arrived at that the essential characteristics of the Self (*Ātman*) are light or luminosity (*Prakāśa*) and thought (*Vimarśa*) and, as such, it is distinct from the insentient. The question arises here, how is the existence of insentients to be explained, if non-luminosity (*a prakāśa*) and lack of thought (*a-vimarśa*) be attributed to them, which distinguish them from the sentient. With this question in mind the teacher says:-

चित्तिः प्रत्यवमर्शात्मा परा-वाक्स्वरसोदिता ।

स्वातन्त्र्यमेतत्मुख्यं तदैश्वर्यं परमात्मनः ॥१३॥

योजनाः— चित्तिः प्रत्यवमर्शात्मा (प्रत्यवमर्शः-स्वात्मचमत्कारलक्षण आत्मा-स्व-भावः, विमर्शो हि सर्वं सहः परमपि आत्मी करोति, आत्मानं च परीकरोति.....) परा (पूर्णत्वात् परा) वाक् (वक्ति विश्वम् अलपति प्रत्यवमर्शेन इति च वाक्) स्वरसोदिता (स्वरसेन चिद्रूपतया अनस्तमिता-सदोदिता), एतत् स्वातन्त्र्यम्, तत् परमात्मनः मुख्यम् ऐश्वर्यम्^१ ।

चित्तिक्रिया च चित्ती कर्तृता, स्वातन्त्र्यं संयोजनवियोजनानुसंधानादिरूपम् आत्म-मात्रतायामेव (चितावेव) जडवत् अविश्रान्तत्वम् अपरिच्छिन्न-प्रकाश-सारत्वम् अनन्य-मुख-प्रेक्षित्वम् इति । Pv, 1, 202

यथा जडः स्वात्ममात्रनिष्ठः संयोजन-वियोजनादि-स्वातन्त्र्यरहितः नैवमात्मा इत्यर्थः । Ibid. Fn

K 13—1 अभिन्नवाच्याद्या वागमेया नित्यचित्स्वरूपत्वेन-अनाद्यन्ता प तन्त्र-भा-वान्तयापेक्षं शुद्धमेतत्स्वातन्त्र्यमैश्वर्यसंज्ञम् । Pv (see P. 47)

The creative thought is the very life (nature) of sentiency (*citiḥ pratyavamarṣātmi*). It is the Transcendental Word (*parā-vāk*), which ever shines with its self-dependent sentient nature (*svarasodita*). It is the freedom of consciousness (*svātantryam etat*). It is the chief power of the Supreme Self (*mukhyam tad-aīśvaryam paramātmanah*).

The teacher further states the characteristics of the *citiḥ*, as follows:-

सा स्फुरत्ता महासत्ता देशकालाविशेषिणी ।
सैषा सारतया प्रोक्ता हृदयं परमेष्ठिनः ॥१४॥

योजना:—सा स्फुरत्ता (स्फुरणकर्तृता....भवनकर्तृता-विश्वविस्तारः चितिक्रिया-शक्तिः), महा-सत्ता (विश्वजीवनम्), देशकाल-प्रविशेषिणी (अस्पर्शणी), सा एषा सारतया परमेष्ठिनः (परमे पदे तिष्ठतः ब्रह्मन्ः) हृदयं (प्रतिष्ठास्थानं विमर्शरूपम्) प्रोक्ता (आगमेषु अभिधीयते) ॥ स्फुरणं=स्पन्दनम्, 'सारम्'=इति यत् अनुच्छं, हृदयं च नाम प्रतिष्ठास्थानम् उच्यते,
“महा सत्ता महादेवी विश्वजीवनमुच्यते.....।”

‘चितिः’ चितिक्रिया तस्याः प्रत्यवमर्शः (स्मर्त्तात्मा *Fn*) स्वात्म-चमत्कारलक्षण आत्मा स्वभावः (*Pv, i, 204*)..... विमर्शो हि सर्वसहः परमपि आत्मीकरोति, आत्मानं च परीकरोति उभयम् एकीकरोति,... .. प्रत्यवमर्शश्च अन्तरभिलापात्मक-शब्दन-स्वभावः । *Ibid. 205*

पूर्णत्वात् ‘परा’, वक्ति विश्वम् अपलपति प्रत्यवमर्शेन इति च ‘वाक्’, अत एव सा स्वरसेन चिद्रूपतया स्वात्मविश्रान्तिवपुषा उदिता सततम् अनस्तमिता (सदोदिता *Fn*) नित्या अहमित्येव, (पृ-पालनपूरणयो) । *Ibid. 205-6*

K 14—1 स्फुरत्ता स्फुरण-कर्तृता अभावाप्रतियोगिनी अभाव-व्यापिनी सत्ता भवत्ता भवनकर्तृता नित्या देश-कालास्पर्शात् सैव प्रत्यवमर्शात्मा चितिक्रिया-शक्तिः । सा विश्वात्मनः परमेश्वरस्य स्वात्मप्रतिष्ठारूपा हृदयम् इति तत्र तत्रागमे निगद्यते ।

Pvr

‘स्फुरणं’—स्पन्दनम्...स्पन्दनं च किञ्चित् चलनम्, एषेव च किञ्चिद्रूपता—यत् अचलमपि चलमाभासते इति । किञ्चिच्चलनं च यदि स्वरूपाद्वस्त्वन्तराक्रमणं तच्च चलनमेव न किञ्चित्त्वं... ..। *Pv, i, 208, Fn 347*

‘सत्ता’ च भवनकर्तृता सर्वक्रियासु स्वातन्त्र्यम् । ‘सारम्’ इति यत् अनुच्छं रूपं तत् इयमेव विमर्श-शक्तिः, ग्राह्य-ग्राहकानां यत् प्रकाशात्मकं रूपं। ‘हृदयं’ च

It is the eternal stir (*sa sphurattā*), the Supreme Reality (*mahā-sattā*). It is beyond the limitations of time and space (*deśa-kala-aviśeṣiṇi*). This (*citiḥ*), being the essence of all (*sāra*), is spoken of as the heart (i. e., the resting place) of the highest Lord (Self) (*proktā hṛdayam parama-ṭhinaḥ*).

Citi being of such nature, in reality, no distinction can be made between the sentient and the insentient. With this idea in mind, the teacher says :-

आत्मानमत एवायं ज्ञेयी-कुर्यात्पृथक्स्थिति ।
ज्ञेयं न तु तदौन्मुख्यात् खण्ड्येतास्य स्वतन्त्रता ॥१५॥

योजना:—अत एव अयम् (विमर्शरूपः प्रकाशात्मा परमेश्वरः) आत्मानम् (स्वा-
त्मानम्) ज्ञेयी कुर्यात् (अज्ञेयमपि ज्ञेयी करोति), ज्ञेयं तु न पृथक्-स्थिति, तद्
औन्मुख्यात् अस्य स्वतन्त्रता (स्वातन्त्र्यम्-आत्मनः स्वरूपम्) खण्ड्येत (अन्याधीनत्वं
नाम पारतन्त्र्यम् अस्य आनीयते)¹ ।

Because of this stir (*spanda*) or the power of creative thought (*vimarśa-śakti*), therefore (*ata eva*), He (the Self) makes himself as the object of knowledge (*ayam jñeyī kuryāt*). The objects have no separate existence (*jñeyam tu na pṛthak-sthiti*). If it be contrary to that (*tad-
auamukhyāt*), his freedom would be lost (shattered), (*asya svatantratā
khandeta*).

नाम प्रतिष्ठास्थानमुच्यते,.....तस्यापि विमर्शशक्तिः इति विश्वस्य परमे पदे-
तिष्ठतो विश्रान्तस्य इदमेव हृदयं विमर्शरूपं परमन्वात्मकम्.....। *Pv, i, 209-12*

K 15—1 एतादृग-शुद्ध-स्वातन्त्र्यवशात् नैष तदा पृथगेव लब्धप्रतिष्ठं-वस्तु-अवेति
अपि तु अज्ञेयमात्मानमनियन्त्रित-प्रभावतया ज्ञेयी-करोति, भिन्न-ज्ञेयसापेक्षत्वे ज्ञान-
कर्तृता म्लायेत् । *Pv*

प्रकाशात्मा परमेश्वरः स्वात्मानं ज्ञात्रेकरूपत्वात् अज्ञेयमपि ज्ञेयीकरोति इति.....
ननु एषैव कुतः संभावना आत्मानं ज्ञेयी करोति ? इति आह पृथक् प्रकाशात् बहि-
र्भूता स्थितिः यस्य तादृक् ज्ञेयं नैव भवति ।.....यदि व्यतिरिक्तं ज्ञेयं स्यात्...
तेन व्यतिरिक्त-विषयीन्मुख्येन अन्याधीनत्वं नाम पारतन्त्र्यम् अस्य आनीयते । पार-
तन्त्र्यं च स्वातन्त्र्यस्य-विरुद्धम् । *Pv, i, 214-15*

The teacher said above that *Citi* (sentieney) is eternal and shines independently (*svarasodita—svarasena cidrūpatayā anastamita—sadodita*). It is *parā-vāk*. *Parā* means infinite or all pervading (*pūrnatvat parā*) and *vāk* implies that this world existed first in the Transcendental Word which is identical with thought (*vakti viśvam alapati pratyavamarśena iti vāk*). All the limited perceivers included in the category of objects (*bhava-rāśau*) also derive their limited powers from the *Citi*. This *Citi* is absolute existence (*mahā-sattā*), unaffected by the limitations of time and space. The world is the expansion of the *mahā-sattā*, hence it is also called *sphurattā*. It is the *sāra* (essence) of all that exists. It is also said to be *hṛdayam* (heart) of the Transcendental Self. *Hṛdaya* implies, in the Āgamas, the supreme power of *Vimarśa* (*idam eva hṛdayam vimarśa-rūpam*). This power of thought or reflective activity (*Vimarśa-śakti*), called also '*parā-vāk-śakti-mayam*', is ultimately the origin of all. Although the Supreme Self possesses innumerable powers, yet it is His power of *Vimarśa* that mainly brings forth objects from Himself, which are not apart from Him (*avyatirikta*). The Lord (Self) manifests Himself in two ways, one in the form of sentient objects which are full of power of freedom (*svātantrya-yuktatābhāsanena*) and the other in the form of insentient objects lacking power of freedom (*svātantrya-sūnyatābhāsanena*). Both the kinds of objects, being identical with the Self, are manifested by Him by virtue of His power of *Vimarśa*, which is His chief power (*vimarśa-śakti-balāt...saiva pradhānam*).

On the point of creation of the sentient and the insentient, the teacher further says :-

स्वातन्त्र्यामुक्तमात्मानं स्वातन्त्र्यादद्वयात्मनः ।
प्रभुरीशादिसंकल्पैर्निर्माय व्यवहारयेत् ॥१६॥

योजना :—अद्वयात्मनः (महेश्वरस्य) स्वातन्त्र्यात् स्वातन्त्र्य—अमुक्तम् (युक्तम्) आत्मानम् (ईशादिरूपैः) निर्माय, प्रभुर्-ईशादि-संकल्पैः व्यवहारयेत् (व्यवहारेण योजयति भावनादि व्यवहारार्थं—अथवा—जगत्-व्यवहारार्थं)

K 16—1 अत एव वेद्यैकीभावलक्षण-पूर्णतामयात् स्वातन्त्र्यात्-तदानीन्तनमेव वेदकमात्मानमीश्वरः शिवो वेदिता इत्येवमादि-विकल्पैराभासयति भावनादि-व्यवहारार्थम् इति । *Pvr*

(contd. on P. 50)

From the freedom of His own (i.e. of Himself), who is one without a second (*advaiyatmanah svatantryāt*), creating Himself (in the form of various subjects and objects, as separate from Himself), thus not losing His freedom (*svātantrya-amuktam ātmānam nirmāya*), the Lord (Supreme Perceiver) carries on the transactions of the world by the desires of the created beings like Iśa and others (*īśādi-saṁkalpai vyavahārayet*).

The 2nd line of this Kārikā implies that besides the ordinary objects (*nīla, pīta*, etc.) the Lord creates from Himself *īśa, śiva* and other gods as objects of worship and meditation, etc., who are also possessed of freedom (*svātantrya-yuktam*), in other words, who are not devoid of freedom (*svātantrya-amuktam*).

Here the opponent raises the question : It is said that Iśa and other gods, who are the created beings, and, as such, as good as insentient objects like stones, etc., are of the order of "this", viz. being reduced to the level of objects. They should, therefore, be lacking freedom. The Pūrvapakṣin asks, how do you account for the freedom of these gods and other created beings? The teacher explains, in the following Kārikā, how the created beings like Iśa and other gods are not devoid of freedom (*svātantrya-amuktam*) :—

नाहन्तादिपरामर्श-भेदादस्यान्यतात्मनः ।

अहमृश्यतयैवास्य सृष्टेस्तिष्ठवाच्यकर्मवत् ॥१७॥

योजना :— (ईशादि) अहतादिपरामर्शभेदाद् अस्य आत्मनः अन्यता (भेदः, अन्यान्यरूपता) न (युक्ता), अस्य (आत्मनः) सृष्टेः (सृजमानस्य) अहमृश्यतयैव (अहं-विमर्शनीयत्वमेव), (तद्भेदः) तिष्ठवाच्यकर्मवत् (भवति)^१ ।

न च केवलं नीलादिरूपमेव ज्ञेयं, यावत् अत्यक्त-कर्तृ स्वभाव स्वातन्त्र्येण, अपरित्यक्तमेव सन्तम् आत्मानं निर्माय व्यवहारेण ध्यानोपासनार्चनोपदेशादिना योजयति इति यत् संभाव्यते तदपि अत एव इति संबन्धः । *Pv, i, 215-16*
स्वातन्त्र्यामुक्तम्-स्वातन्त्र्ययुक्तम् ।

K 17—1 वर्तमान-प्रमातृभावेन-आहित-प्रत्यवमृश्यस्य प्रमेयत्वेन-इदन्ताविमर्शभेदे च आभासभेदे च प्रमातृव ईश्वर-शब्देन सृष्टोऽहंपरामर्शो व्यवधानेन केवलं, यथा क्रियादिशब्देन क्रियादय उच्यन्ते पचत्यादिवत् पचत्यादिमुखेन इत्यभिधानात्, ईश्वर-शब्दादात्मशब्दात् चाहमिति परामृशन्-नात्मानम् अवैति न साक्षात् प्रतीतिस्तु अस्त्येव स्मृत्येव अनुभवमुखेन-अनुभूतस्य इति । *Pvr* (contd. on P. 51)

(The teacher says): The Lord, the Supreme Self, does not become different in the form of (different) gods like Īśa and other created beings (*na asya anyatātmanah*) because of the difference in their mental attitudes, *saṅkalpas* or *vimarśa*, (*ahamtādi-paramarśa bheda*) Their freedom is intact, because the mental attitudes of these created beings, gods and others, are one with 'I-Consciousness' of the Supreme Self, i. e. with the Universal Consciousness (*asya sṛṣṭeḥ aham-mṛśyatayaiva*), just as the consciousness of the meaning of a noun, derived from a root, rests on the consciousness of the action, represented by personal termination (*tinvācya-karma vat*).

On the basis of this idea, even the so-called insentient objects are also not devoid of *svātantrya*, for the existence of the object is not apart from the existence of the subject. When we say: '*nīlam idam*' (this is the blue object), we mean to say; "*aham vedmi—'nīlam idam*" (I know this is the blue object). The essential characteristic of *svātantrya* is *aham parāmarśa* (self-consciousness), devoid of which even the insentient objects do not exist. Thus, there ultimately exists no gulf between the subject and the object.

It has been established above that all thoughts of all the created beings, in reality, rest in one pure "I-Consciousness" (*aham-paramarśa*), which is the essence (*tattva*) of all cognitions. This *aham-vimarśa* has perception and remembrance as its main powers, and perception has variety of forms, such as certainty (*nirṇaya*), doubt (*saṁśaya*), etc. The teacher now explains how one and the same thought (*aham-paramarśa*) functions in variety of forms corresponding to various kinds of objects:—

अहम् इत्येवंरूपो यः परामर्शो, यश्च ईश्वरः प्रमाणा आत्मा शिव इत्यादिः अनन्त-
प्रकारः परामर्शः, तस्य यद्यपि भेदोऽन्यान्य-रूपता, तथापि तद्भेदात् हेतोः अस्य
आत्मनो निर्मातृरूपस्य अहंपरामर्शमयस्य निर्मेय-रूपस्य च ईश्वरादि-परामर्शस्पर्श-
स्य यो भेदः शङ्कितः, स न युक्तः अस्य ईश्वरस्य आत्मनः सृष्टेः सृज्यमातृस्य
अहंविमर्शनीयत्वमेव । अस्य ईश्वरस्य यतः ईश्वरादिसंकल्पेषु अपि अहं-परा-
मर्शनयोग्यस्यैव सृष्टिः । परामर्शो नाम विश्रान्तिस्थानम्, तच्च पार्यन्तिकमेव
पारमार्थिकं, तच्च अहमित्येवंरूपमेव । *Pv, i, 219-21*

मायाशक्त्या विभोः सैव भिन्नसंवेद्यगोचरा ।

कथिता ज्ञानसंकल्पाध्यवसायादिनामभिः ॥१८॥

योजना :— विभोः (परमेश्वरस्य) सा (अहंविमर्शमयी चित्तिः) माया-शक्त्या भिन्न-संवेद्यगोचरा (सती) (भेदेन आभास्यते), (सा एव चित्तिः) ज्ञानसंकल्पाध्यवसायादि अनेक-नामभिः कथिता^१ ।

(The teacher says :) The same power of *Vimarśa* or *Citi* of the Lord (Supreme Self) which is *aham-vimarśa-mayī* (characterised as self-consciousness) (*sā vibhoḥ citiḥ*), by coming within the range of various objects, which are separated from Him (the Lord) by His power of *Mayā* (*māyā śaktyā bhinna-samvedya-gocara*), is called by different names such as perception (*jñāna*), imagination or thought (*saṅkalpa*), etc., (assuming the various forms of determinate consciousness) (*jñāna-saṅkalpadhyavasāyādi aneka-nāmaabhiḥ kathita*)

The teacher further states :-

साक्षात्कारक्षणेऽप्यस्ति विमर्शः कथमन्यथा ।

धावनाद्युपपद्येत प्रतिसंधानवर्जितम् ॥१९॥

योजना :— साक्षात्कारक्षणे (निर्विकल्पविज्ञानक्षणे) अपि विमर्शः अस्ति, अन्यथा धावनादि-प्रतिसंधान-वर्जितम् (अनुसंधानेन विना) कथम् उपपद्येत^१ ?।

K 18—1 प्रकाशात्मनः परमेश्वरस्य मायाशक्त्या स्वात्मरूपं विश्वं भेदेन आभास्यते, ततः 'सैव' चित्तिः ज्ञानमध्यक्षं, तस्यैव भिन्नस्य-आभासस्य स्मृतिः संकल्पो-ऽध्यवसायो मनो-बुद्धिवृत्ति-रूपत्वेनापि चित्तिरेवेति । *Pvr*

ततो ज्ञानसंकल्पादयो भिन्नाः तस्य अप्रध्वस्त-स्व-स्वभावाभेदस्य संवित्तत्त्वस्य अनुसंधातुः शक्तय इति उक्ताः, संशयादयश्च भिन्ना नीलादि-वैचित्र्यं च इति सर्वम् अखण्डितम् (अभिन्नम्) । *Pv, i, 224*

K 19—1 साक्षात्कार-क्षण-ज्ञानेऽपि चितोऽर्थप्रत्यवमर्शोऽस्ति सूक्ष्मः, वाचन-धावनादौ शीघ्रक्रिया तत्तद्दृश्यमान-देशाद्य-उपादित्साजिहासानुसंधानेन हि भवेदिति । *Pvr*

प्रथमसमये-साक्षात्कारलक्षणे (बालः, *Pv, i, 225 Fn*), निर्विकल्प-विज्ञानक्षणे विकल्पव्यापारः । साक्षात्कार-प्रत्यक्षनिर्विकल्परूपः (*Ibid. 228, Fn*) । तस्मात् अस्ति साक्षात्कारे प्रत्यवमर्शः (*Ibid. 228*) । (contd. on P. 53)

At the time of indeterminate experiences (like the first moments of experiences of boys, etc.) also, there exists the determinate consciousness (*sākṣātkāra-kṣaṇe api vimarśaḥ asti*), otherwise (*anyatha*), how can there be the possibility of running, etc., if there were no determinate consciousness (not even in a subtle form, in such experiences)? (*dhāvanādi prati-sandhāna-varjitam katham upapadyeta*).

The Pūrvapakṣin questions here, *Vimarśa* or *Pratyavamarśa* cannot be admitted to be present in the first experiences (*sākṣāt-kāra-kṣaṇe*), as, for instance, in the case of small boys learning the meaning of such expressions as 'gām ānaya, naya, ...', but the first experiences in their case must be due to the remembrance arising from the impressions (*saṃskara*) of such experiences which they had in their previous lives (*atha bālasya prāg-janma-anubhūta-saṃketa-smṛteḥ evam*). In reply to this, the teacher says: *Vimarśa*, the determinate knowledge, is the essential nature (*svabhāva*) of *Cit* (Self-Consciousness). Even in the first experiences of boys (*prathama anubhava samaye*) or in the acts of speaking, running quickly, etc., *Vimarśa* is present. It cannot be supposed to be entirely lacking, even though it may be present in a subtle form.

The Pūrvapakṣin states, it may be possible that the subtle determinate consciousness be present in the indeterminate in certain cases, as shown above; but, in other cases, the determinate consciousness is explicitly present, because of its grossness and also being denoted by certain indicatory words which appear as separate from the subject like other external objects. The question arises, how can the indicatory words be held as one with or non-separate (*apṛthakbhūtaḥ*) from the light of the subject, i.e, indeterminate consciousness? In reply to this question, the teacher says :-

विकल्पो हि प्रत्यक्षस्य व्यापारः,.....न च व्यापारः तद्वतो भिन्नो युक्तः, तत्-
स्वरूपभूतो हि सः । भवतु वा क्षणमात्रस्वभावः साक्षात्कारः तत्रापि अस्ति विमर्शः,
अवश्यं चेत्—अन्यथा इति यदि स न स्यात्, तत् एकाभिसंधानेन जवात् गच्छन्,
त्वरितं च वर्णान् पठन्, द्रुतं च मन्त्रपुस्तकं वाचयन्, न अभिमतमेव गच्छेत्, उच्चार-
येत्, वाचयेत् वा.....। Pū, i, 228-29

घटोऽयमित्यध्यवसा नामरूपातिरेकिणी ।

परेश-शक्तिरात्मेव भासते न त्विदन्तया ॥२०॥

योजना :— ‘अयं घटः’ इति अध्यवसा (अध्यवसायः) नामरूप-अतिरेकिणी (अति-रिक्त-भूत्वा) परेश-(चित्ति-) शक्तिर् (एव), (तत्तदाकारेण) आत्मा एव (अभेदेन) भासते, न तु (कदाचित्) इदन्तया (विच्छन्नत्वेन) (भाति)^१ ।

The determinate knowledge (adhyavasāya) such as expressed by the words “this is the jar”, is the potency of the highest Lord (Self) (ayam ghataḥ iti adhyavasā pareśa śaktiḥ), which is beyond the name and form (nama-rūpa-atirekīni), and always shines as one with the Self (ātmeva-abhedena bhāsate) and never apart as object denoted by the word “this” (na tu idantayā bhāsate).

The teacher clearly says that even the determinate knowledge, expressed by the words “this is the jar” rests in the indeterminate consciousness.

Although all cognitions rest in one indeterminate consciousness or ‘I-Consciousness’ (aham-vimarśa), yet they appear, at the objective level, in diverse forms of determinate knowledge. This is what the teacher states in the concluding Kārikā :—

K 20—1 अयमिति घट इति वा-अध्यवसायो भिन्न-प्रकाशमान-नाम-रूपातिरिक्त-चित्तिशक्तिमय एव-आत्मेवाभेदेन आभासते इति । *Pvr*

...घटः इति यः स्थूलः शब्दः स प्रकाश-जीवितस्वभावो विमर्श इति । सोऽपि हि स्थूलः शब्दोऽर्थवत् पृथग्भूत एव भाति । तौ नाम-रूप-लक्षणौ शब्दार्थौ एक-रूप-तया ‘सोऽयम्’ इत्येवंरूपत्वेन परामृशन्ती अध्यवसायशक्तिः या, सा परमेश्वरशक्तिः विमर्शरूपा आत्मवत् एव अहमित्यनवच्छिन्नत्वेन भाति, न तु कदाचित् इदन्तया—विच्छन्नत्वेन भाति..... । *Pv, i, 232-33*

केवलं भिन्नसंवेद्य देशकालानुरोधतः ।

ज्ञानस्मृत्यवसायादि सक्रमं प्रतिभासते ॥२१॥

योजना :— (यद्यपि अक्रममेव संवित्त्वम्), (परं तु तत्) केवलं भिन्नसंवेद्य (विषय) देशकाल-अनुरोधतः (तौ अनुरुध्य—च्छायामात्रेण अवलम्ब्य, अर्थात्— विभिन्न-देशकालादिना) ज्ञान-स्मृत्यवसायादि (भेदेन) सक्रमं प्रतिभास्यते¹ ।

Though Citi (Consciousness) is one and devoid of diversity (akramā), yet, owing only to the affection by temporal and special limitations of the variety of objects (*bhinna samvedhya deśa-kālanurodhataḥ kevalam*), it assumes diverse forms (becomes *sakramā*) as perception (*jñāna*), remembrance (*smṛti*), determinate knowledge (*avasāya*), etc (*jñāna-smṛtya-avasāyādi sakramam pratibhāsate*).

K 21—1 चित्तत्वस्य मायाक्त्या भिन्नं घटादि संवेद्यं तत्तद्देशकालभिन्नं प्रकाश्यते, यस्याभेदेन-अवष्टम्भाद्विभिन्नदेश-कालादिना ज्ञानस्मृत्यादि अवभासते इति । *Pv*

अक्रममेव संवित्त्वम्, किन्तु स्वशक्तिवशात् भिन्नत्वेन भासितानि यानि वेद्यानि तेषां मूर्तिभेदकृतो यो दूरादूर-वैतत्यावैतत्यादिः देशः, क्रिया-भेदकृतश्च चिरशीघ्र-क्रमादिरूपः कालः, तौ अनुरुध्य—च्छायामात्रेण अवलम्ब्य, ज्ञान-स्मरणाध्यवसायानां स्वांशा इव भान्ति.....। *Pv, i, 234-5*

*See Kaw, R. K, *the Doctrine of Recognition*, pp 147 ff

अपोहनशक्ति-निरूपणम् (प्रत्यभिज्ञा-कारिकायां ज्ञानाधिकारे षष्ठमाह्निकम्)

Power of Differentiation :-

The power of Differentiation (*Apohana-śakti*) is indispensable to all determinate knowledg (*vikalpa*). Differentiation (*apohana*) is a determinative process (*vikalpa*) which implies certainty (*vinīścaya*) between two different things of contrary nature, such as between fire (*vahni*) and non-fire (*a-vahni*). In determinacy many images are constructed in the mind and one particular manifestation is differentiated from all else, which was first doubted.¹ 'The determinative process begins with the selection by the mind (*manah*) of some points out of the mass reflected on the *Buddhi*. It is like carving an image out of a big stone. It consists in a reaction of the mind on the sense data recorded (to speak figuratively) on the *Buadhi*, in making a selection of certain group of points from the whole mass, in adding to the selected something from the old store of memory and in giving it a definite shape and name'.² By virtue of *Apohana-śakti*, the perceiver is capable of determining or ascertaining the manifestation of one object as different from that of another. It upholds both the former two powers, the powers of Remembrance and Knowledge (*tad ubhaya anugrahinī apohana-śakti*). The determinative process (*vimarśa* or *vikalpa*) applies only to the worldly things, which are of the nature of diversity (*Māyā*), to whatever is related to speech. It cannot apply to the Self (*Ātman*) or the self-consciousness (*aham-pra-tpavamarśah*), the essential nature of which is light (*prakāśātma*), although it is embodied in speech (*vāg vapuḥ*), but that is the transcendental speech (*parā*), the inner speech which is one with *saṁvid* (*saṁvid-rūpāveśī*) and ever shines within (*antara avabhāsamānaḥ*); it is different from that sound which is of the nature of an object and, as such, is the object of the sense of hearing³.

1. विविधा कल्पना विविधत्वेन च शङ्कितस्य कल्पोऽन्यव्यवच्छेदनं विकल्पः
Pv, i, 240
2. Pandey, *Abhinavagupta, An Historical & Philosophical Study*, 1935, 282-83.
3. विषयरूपात् श्रोत्रग्राह्यात् शब्दादन्य एव अन्तरवभासमानः संविद्रूपावेशी शब्द-
नात्माभिलापो वागित्यनेनोक्तः । Pv, i, 239-40

The teacher, in the first Kārikā, says that the nature of determinacy cannot be attributed to self-consciousness :-

अहं प्रत्यवमर्शो यः प्रकाशात्मापि वाग्वपुः ।

नासौ विकल्पः स ह्यक्तो द्वयाक्षेपी विनिश्चयः ॥१॥

योजना :— अहं प्रत्यवमर्शः, यः प्रकाशात्मा वाग्वपु अपि, (स्वभाव-भूतः सन्) असौ विकल्पः (अपोहन-समुत्पन्नं ज्ञानं) न (भवति), स द्वयाक्षेपी (घटाघटयोर्द्वयो-ज्ञानयोर्मध्ये एकः प्रतियोगि-निषेधपूर्वो) निश्चयः उक्तोहि ' ।

The Self-consciousness (*aham-vimarśa*), whose very life or essence is light (i. e., that of consciousness) (*prakāśatmā*), even though it is embodied in the transcendental speech (*vāg-vapuḥ*), is not the determinate knowledge (*nāsaṁ vikalpah*), because determinacy is certainty (*vinīścayaḥ*) that implies two objects (different from each other, say jar and non-jar) (*dvayakṣepi*).

भिन्नयोरवभासो हि स्यादघटाघटयोर्द्वयोः ।

प्रकाशस्येव नान्यस्य भेदिनस्त्ववभासनम् ॥२॥

योजना :— (कदाचित्) भिन्नयोः घटाघटयोः द्वयोः (विषयोः) अवभासः स्याद् हि, प्रकाशस्य इव तु भेदिनः (प्रकाश-भिन्नस्य) अन्यस्य (अप्रकाशस्य) अवभासनं न' ।

It so happens that there appears manifestation of both jar and non-jar, which are essentially different from one another (*bhinnayoravabhasaḥ*) (in place of one and the same object), due to imperfect perception, and the perceiver determines or ascertains it to be the manifestation of one

K 1—1. प्रकाशस्यात्मन्यहमिति परावाग्रूपत्वात्साभिलापोऽपि स्वभावभूतः प्रत्यवमर्शो न विकल्प इत्युच्यते, स हि प्रतियोगिनिषेधपूर्वो निश्चयो न चात्र प्रतियोगि-सम्भवः ।

Pvr

यदि वाग्वपुः—कस्मान्न विकल्पः ? आह—न ह्यस्य विकल्पलक्षणमस्ति, तथाहि—विविधा कल्पना विविधत्वेन च शङ्कितस्य कल्पोऽन्यव्यवच्छेदनं विकल्पः, विविधत्वं च ब्रह्मावग्निसंभावना-समारोपनिरासे सति भवत्, द्वयं बह्वन्यवह्निरूपमाक्षिपति, तेन (हेतुना) विकल्पेऽवश्यं तच्च (द्वयरूपत्वम्) निश्चेतव्यम्—अतश्च व्यपोहितव्यं भवति ।

Pv, i, 240-41

object as different from another), but nothing else shines like the light of consciousness (subject), which is different from that (i e, which is not light) (*prakāśasya iva tu bhedinah anyasya avabhāsanam na*)

The act of determinacy cannot, therefore, apply to the Self (*Ātman*) which is of the nature of light (*prakāśa*), since nothing contrary to light (*a-prakāśa*), viz of the nature of darkness, shines. Differentiation is not possible in respect of such entities as *prakāśa* (light) and *a-prakāśa* (darkness), which are contrary in nature, since the latter does not shine. For this reason, the essential nature of the Self, which is sentient (*cit*) and luminous (*prakāśa*), is only self-consciousness (*aham-pratyavamarśaḥ*) and not determinacy (*vikalpa*)

The Pūrvapakṣin asks the teacher to elucidate the process of differentiation, since we have not even heard of the name of *a-ghaṭa*, not to speak of its rejection. How can the impression or idea (*vāsanā*) of non-jar arise on perception of jar? In reply to this question, the teacher says :-

K 2—1. प्रकाशाद्-द्वितीयस्य भिन्नस्य प्रतियोगिनोऽप्रकाशसंज्ञकस्यानवभासने प्रकाशेतरत्वं न स्यात् तस्यानवभासे व्यपोहनायोगाद्विकल्पताहानिः । *Pvr*

.....अतो घटाघटयोर्द्वयोरवभासस्य संभावनात् समारोपः सावकाशी भवति, अघटस्य सत्यारोपे निषेधलक्षणोपोहनव्यापारः—इति तदनुप्राणिता विकल्परूपता घट इत्येतस्य निश्चयस्य,न च यत्प्रकाशेन कर्तव्यं तदप्रकाशस्य कदाचित् दृष्टंअतः प्रकाशतुल्यस्यात्यस्याप्रकाशरूपस्य भेदिनस्तत्तुल्यकक्ष्यस्यापोहनात्मकभेदनव्यापारासहिष्णोरवभासनमेव नास्ति, तदभावे कस्यपोहनम् ?यस्मात् एवं, ततो द्वयाभावादपोहासंभवे विकल्परूपत्वाभावात् चिन्मात्रे परामर्शात्मनि अहमिति प्रत्यवमर्श एव, न तु विकल्पः । *Pv i, 242-43*

तदतत्प्रतिभाभाजा मात्रैवातद्व्यपोहनात् ।

तन्निश्चयनमुक्तो हि विकल्पो घट इत्ययम् ॥३॥

योजना :—‘तद्’-‘अतत्’-प्रतिभा-भाजा’ (अन्तर्लीन तद्-अतत्-अर्थाभासः यस्मिन् तेन) मात्रा (प्रमात्रा) एव ‘अतद्’ वि-अपोहनात् (वि-अपोहनेन) ‘तत्’ निश्चयनम् ‘अयं घटः’ इति विकल्पः हि—उक्तः ²

The subject, who experiences both the manifestations of ‘this’ and ‘not-this’ (with respect to one and the same object) (*tad-atat-pratibhābhāja mātṛā*), feels the certainty of this (*tan-niścayanam*) by rejecting ‘not-this’ (*atad-vyapohanāt*), and that is spoken of as *Vikalpa* (the determinate cognition as is denoted by the expression ‘this is jar’ (*ayam ghataḥ iti*).

When the determinate knowledge of *ghaṭa* arises, i.e. when an object, say ‘jar’, is perceived with certainty, it serves some practical purpose (*vyavahāra*). The term “*a-ghaṭa*” denotes various and numerous cognitions of different objects, which are rejected in the act of differentiation to get the determinate knowledge (*vikalpa*) of a particular object “*ghaṭa*”. On the other hand, in the state of indeterminacy (*avikalpa-dāśāyam*), the object “*ghaṭa*”, in its nature of *Cit* (consciousness), remains as one with the Universal Consciousness, and, as such, it serves no practical purpose of the world.

The Pūrvaapakṣin questions here, why cannot the process of determinacy or differentiation apply to self-consciousness (*aḥam-vimarśa*), as, in this, the consciousness of the objects other than the Self (*an-aḥam-vimarśa*) gets negated? The teacher replies :-

K 3—1. तत्-प्रतिभां घटाभासं अतत्-प्रतिभां च अघटाभासं प्रमाता भजते सेवते (इति तेन) ।

Pv, i, 244

2. प्रमातुरेव स्वतन्त्रस्यान्तर्लीनतदर्थभासस्यातद्व्यपोहनेन घट इति निश्चयो विकल्पो नाम व्यापारः । *Pv*

एवं च तत्-प्रतिभां घटाभासम् अतत्प्रतिभां च अघटाभासं प्रमाता भजते-सेवते तावत्,तेनाघटस्यात्मनः पटादेशचापोहनं क्रियते निषेधरूपं, तदेव व्यपोहनमाश्रित्य तस्य घटस्य निश्चयनमुच्यते ‘घट एव’ इति—एवार्थस्य संभाव्यमानापरवस्तु-निषेधरूपत्वात्,.....। *Pv, i, 244*

चित्तत्वं मायया हित्वा भिन्न एवावभाति यः ।

देहे बुद्धावथ प्राणे कल्पिते नभसीव वा ॥४॥

प्रमातृत्वेनाहमिति विमर्शोऽन्यव्यपोहनात् ।

विकल्प एव स पर-प्रतियोग्यवभासजः ॥५॥

योजना 4&5 :— चित्तत्वं (स्व) मायया हित्वा 'अहम्' इति विमर्शः यः अन्य-व्यपोहनात् (व्यपोहनेन) देहे बुद्धौ प्राणे अथवा कल्पिते नभसि इव (एव) प्रमातृत्वेन भिन्न एव अवभाति, स विकल्प एव, (यस्मात्-यतः) (स) पर-प्रतियोगि अवभासजः (भवति) (अर्थात्—यतः स प्रतियोगिनिषेधात् जायते)¹

(Trans. (4) and (5)) The Self-consciousness (*aham-iti-vimarśah*) that gives up its sentient nature by the power of obscuraton (*cit-tattvam māyaya hitva*) and shines distinctly as limited subject (*pramāṭṛtvena-avabhāti yah*) within the limitations of the body, the intellect, the vital airs or the supposed voidness (*dehe buddhāv atha prāṇe kalpīte nabhasīva va*), is determinate cognition (*vikalpa*). It is because it differentiates itself from others (*anya-vyapohanāt*). *Vikalpa* (determinacy) owes its being to the manifestation or awareness of another thing which is of opposite nature (*sa para pratiyogi-avabhasajah*).

K—4&5 (1) चित्तत्वस्यैवैश्वरस्य माया-शक्त्या भेदावभासिनि शरीरे बुद्धावन्तरे स्पर्शे तदुत्तीर्णे वाकाशे इव शून्ये एव कल्पितेऽहमिति प्रमातृ-भावेन विमर्शः तत्तदा-भासमानशरीरादिप्रतियोग्यपोहनकरणात् घटोऽयमिति वद्विकल्प एव । *Pv*

अहमित्यवमर्शोद्विधा—शुद्धो मायीयश्च, तत्र शुद्धो यः संविन्मात्रे... । अशुद्धस्तु वेद्यरूपे शरीरादौ । तत्र शुद्धेऽहं-प्रत्यवमर्शे प्रतियोगी न कश्चिदपोहितव्यः संभवति .. । अशुद्धस्तु वेद्यरूपे शरीरादौ अन्यस्माद् देहादेर्घटादेश्च व्यवच्छेदेन भवन् विकल्प एव—इति वाक्यार्थः । *Pv, i, 247-48*

... ..तथा च देहाभिमान-भूमिकायां स्थिताश्चार्वाकाः 'चैतन्यविशिष्टः कायः पुरुषः' इति कायमेव प्रधान्येनाहुः । ततोऽपि विवेकवन्तः प्राणमेवात्मानं केचन श्रुत्यन्तविदो मन्यन्ते । ततोऽपि समधिकविवेकभाजः... .. ज्ञानसुखाद्याश्रयभूतां बुद्धिमेव काणादप्रभृतय आत्मानमाहुः । अपरे तु... .. यन्न-किंचिद्रूपं सकलवेद्यराशिविनिर्मुक्तं शून्यत्वान्नभस्तुल्यं न तु महाभूताकाशस्वभावं प्रमातृत्वं शून्यब्रह्मवादिनः सांख्यप्रभृतयः आहुः... .. तथात्वाभिमानमात्र—देहादिः प्रमातेति, संकोचमात्ररूपं चित्तत्वं... .. । अमी एव भूमिकाविशेषा उत्तरोत्तरमारोहतां योगिनां तत्स्थितम—अशुद्धः 'अहम्' इत्यवमर्शो विकल्प एव ।

Pv, I, 249-54

