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CHAPTER VII

The Absolute and Its Manifestations

(i)

The Pure Order

The Ultimate Reality has been called by the names Anuttara, Śiva and Maheśvara in Pratyabhijñā and Pre-pratyabhijñā literature. It has been called Anuttara to mean the absolute unity of consciousness where there is no distinction or differentiation and the state is unspeakable or avānmanasagocara. No word can describe the state and it does not stand for any definite idea. The Parātrīṃśikā Vivaraṇa (19) describes it as "Na vidyate uttaram praśnaprativacorūpm Yatra". It is undefinable and sometimes referred to as parāsamvit. It is the absolute unity or perfect abheda which does not admit a philosophical analysis or a rational understanding. It is very much similar to the Śuddha-Brahman of Vedānta. It is beyond the reach of thought and language. There is complete abheda here. The state is known from the āgamas only.
The next state has the pure and absolute unity. It is conceived as the pre-dominant unity containing entire ideal creation but in unmanifested state. It is called Śiva. It signifies the state of bhedabheda. The state also is known from the āgamas, but is a presupposition of philosophy. When the manifestables, appear as somewhat distinct existents within the absolute consciousness but not different from it, it is called Maheśvara which is the subject-matter of the pratyabhijñā philosophy.

The three stages may be compared with or are the same as the concepts of Parā, paśyanti and madhyamāvāk. The parā is the total unity of pure consciousness. It is Pūrṇāham but not associated with body, mind etc. It is pure self-consciousness and the perfect unity. In the paśyanti stage the consciousness is the source of all powers subsequently manifested. In the Madhyamā these are distinct ideas but within the consciousness. In the parā stage there is absolute unity which is beyond the reach of limited consciousness. In the other two we find common elements of the universal consciousness as well as the limited consciousness. In other words, the parā stage can be referred to only the universal consciousness and not to the limited consciousness. The Paśyanti and Madhyamā both can be referred to both the absolute consciousness as well as the limited consciousness.
The limited consciousness here is merged in the absolute consciousness and does not take itself as distinct from the absolute consciousness. So it may be said that the three concepts of Anuttara, Śiva and Mahaśvara are comparable to the three conditions of Parā, Paśyanti and Madhyamā-Vāk. The vaikhārī is clear projection in physical forms and in space and time.

The Maheśvara is Viśvottīrṇa and Viśvamaya. In relation to the phenomenon, He has got the two statuses of transcendent and immanent existence. Maheśvara puts forth the impure creation in space and time.

The manifestations or the Tattvas have again been as above māyā and below māyā. Those above the māyā are called pure; there is no creation in time and space. The manifestations below māyā are inclusive of māyā and are called aśuddha or impure creation. We are concerned here with manifestations of Maheśvara in the pure state as we have already said. These do not follow a temporal order but are names given to the same Reality from the point of view of one or the other of the divine manifestation of Śakti viz. cit, ānandam, icchā, jñāna, Kriyā. In the predominance of cit we get Śiva-tattva, in that of ānandam we have Śakti-tattva. In the predominance of icchā or desire it is Sadāśiva-tattva and in that of jñāna or knowledge there is Īśvara-tattva. In the predominance of kriyā or will or activity we get vidyā or sadvidyā-tattva
after which the creations of māyā starts. The Māyā is nothing but the supreme sākṣi contracted to give rise to the rest of the principles of Tattvas in impure creation.

In the Sāṁkhya philosophy it is found that in every evolute of the prakṛti all the three qualities (Sattva, Rajas and Tamas) are present and that the distinction of one evolute from another depends upon the difference in the proportion of the constituent qualities of an individual evolute. Similarly, pratyabhijñā also holds that in every manifestation of the pure creation all the five powers of the Universal Self are essentially present and that the difference of one manifestation from another is due to the predominance of one of the powers in a particular manifestation.

Śiva Tattva is the first stage in the process of the Universal manifestation. It is the first flutter of becoming which is the ground and goal of all terrestrial evolution. Tattva Sandoha (I) says: "jatoyamanuttoramūrtinijecchayā nikhilamidam jagaṭ prasphutaṃ spandetu sa spandah prathamah Śivatattvamucyate". The power of being (cit) predominates in it. It is purely subjective, and has no objective or predicative reference. It is free not only from the impurities of karma or Māyā but also from that impurity which is technically called Ānavamala. The experience of this state is pure 'I' without the thought or feeling of 'I am', for 'am' or being implies a relation of identity meaning 'I am
this' i.e. this body, this mind etc. It is, therefore, the experience which acts as the principle of the pure 'I'. It is the alogical element, the 'I' which is presupposed in the synthetic unity of absolute consciousness in the language of Kant. This experience may be compared to that of Nirvikalpa Sāmkādi. But it is different from the unqualified and powerless Brahman of Śāmkara and his followers who is almost insentient. He is endowed with infinite powers and manifests the principles in Himself as the foundation that rests in Him. The universe to be created exists in Him as non-different from Him.

The second state of manifestation is Śakti Tattva. In this state the Ānanda Śakti predominates. The experience at this level assumed the form of 'I am'. The Śakti Tattva becomes manifest almost simultaneously with the Śiva Tattva. So they can never be separated. Again being inseparable they are continuous with each other and are eternally existent in the bosom of Parama Śiva as the seed of the Universe to come. As consciousness presupposes being, the Śakti Tattva is presupposed by Śiva Tattva. They are 'being' and 'becoming' aspects of the same transcendental Absolute Light of consciousness. But these two aspects imply the reconciliation of changelessness as well as change. Śiva Tattva is being consciousness (saṭ). It is Parama Śiva in all essential and in every respect with the experience of the Ideal universe
eliminated or negativated or dissolved. But by whom the act of negation becomes possible? This is done by Śakti Tattva. So it is by the action of the Śakti Tattva that the emergence of Śiva Tattva is made possible. The Śiva Tattva is the first stress of creative movement of the unmoving parama Śiva; while Śakti Tattva is the negative aspect of the same Śiva Tattva, because it negates the ideal Universe which is the experience of Parama Śiva. Thus Śiva Tattva is the first vibratory movement or stress towards a universal manifestation and Śakti Tattva is what regulates, guides and controls Śiva's onward march as the principle of negation or restraint. The Śakti Tattva may be called in modern philosophical term the 'Elan vital' or 'The Nisus' immanent teleological factor in the first stress (Spanda) of 'Being' or 'Saṭ'.

The third stage in the process of the Universal manifestation is sadasiva Tattva. In this stage Icchā or will is, predominant. The jñāna Śakti and the kriyā Śakti of the Supreme consciousness of Parama Śiva are held in suspense in this state. The experience of this stage is "I am this", where the 'This' is only a hazy experience. The predominant side here is still 'I'. The Ideal Universe is experienced as an indistinct something in the depth of consciousness. It actually constitutes the initial step of the process of Universal manifestation. In the Āgama Śāstra this stage is called unmeṣa or opening of the eyes of Parama Śiva or the
volitional stress in transempirical consciousness as con-
tested with the Niṃeṣa or closing of the eyes or retreat
of the same Supreme Light of Absolute consciousness into its
pristine glory. In the former the Universe as inherent Śakti,
power or irresistible will is perceived vaguely. This may be
compared to the Paśyanti vāk of the ancient grammarians
where the self perceives itself as 'this' in a very undefined
vague way or in other words an 'Idea'. In the Vaiṣṇava Tantra
the Sadāśiva Tattva has been called the Mahāviṣṇu and in the
Buddhistic Tantra it has been called Avalokiteśvara or one
who shines forth in his compassion.

In this universal Experience both the subject and the
object are consciousness. Consciousness in this aspect be-
comes perceptible to itself; hence a subject and an object.
The experiencer in this stage is called Mantra Mahēśvara.
The whole universe constitutes an object of their experience.
It is a transitional stage between the unaffected state of
the Śiva and the Śakti and the distinctly affected state of
the Īśvara Tattva. The affection of the Universal self at
this stage may be compared to that of the limited self of
an artist when he desires to produce a master-piece first
arises within him.

The next Tattva in which the pure light of Absolute con-
sciousness manifests itself is Īśvara Tattva. The Sadāśiva
Tattva manifests itself in Īśvara Tattva. In the Sadāśiva
Tattva the emphasis is on the 'Aham' or the 'I'; but in the
Isvara Tattva the emphasis is on the 'Idam' or 'This' aspect of Absolute experience. In this stage, the Idam or the 'This' side of experience becomes a little more defined (Sphuta). It is unmeṣa or distinct blossoming of the universe. The difference between Sadāśiva Tattva and Īśvara Tattva may be compared to those of a canvas; the former to the one in which the intended picture is faintly outlined in hardly perceptible dots; and the latter to the other in which the picture is fully drawn and the canvas is thrown so much in the background that ordinary people instead of calling it canvas call it picture. In the Īśvara Tattva jñāna or knowledge is predominant. The element of objectivity or Idanta becomes prominent in it. The experience of Sadāśiva is "I am this" but the experience of Īśvara is "This I am". In this stage the 'I-ness' or 'I' as pure being is eclipsed and identified with 'this-ness' of the Supreme Consciousness. Yet at this stage the Universe remains still as an Ideal Universe. This is the Tattva in which Parama Śiva realizes what constitutes the Lordliness and the Glory of the Divine Being.

The next Tattva which follows is known as Sadvidyā or Śuddha vidyā Tattva. In this stage the Kriyā aspect of the Divine Śakti is predominant. This is the stage where there is movement and action while in the other stages there is motionlessness. The experience of this stage may be expressed as "I am this". Here there is an equilibrium of the
'I' and the 'this' \( (Sāmānādhikaraṇyaṁ hi sadvidyā'midam-
dhiyoh) \). There is equal emphasis on both the aspects the 'I' and 'This'. These two are recognised here with such equal clarity that while both 'I' and 'This' are identified, they can be clearly distinguished in thought. Here the experiencing subject realizes the 'This' as 'my' and 'mine', in much the same way as a man does in his daily life. While he ordinarily feels himself as one and identified with his body, thoughts and feelings, he realizes himself as the possessor of these and speaks of them as this is 'my' body, or these thoughts and feeling, are 'mine'. Thus there is an equalization of both the terms in experience which is that of the true relation of the 'Aham' or 'I' and the 'Idam' or 'This' forming a synthesis on a single basis \( (Adhikaraṇa) \) and not on two different bases. What is 'I' here is 'this', and what is 'this' is 'I'. Thus 'I' and 'this'-sides of experience are equally balanced like the two pans of an evenly held balance \( (Samādṛṣṭatutaputanyayena) \). Thus the whole Experience in this state assumes the form as: I am all-this and all-this is mine as part and parcel of myself and all this proceeds from and is created by me — I am the author of all this. This experience is compared to the experience of Īśvara of the Dvaitāvādīns who visualize the universe as distinct from Lord Himself but as forming an integral part of Himself. All this is my manifestation \( (Sarvomamāyaṁ Vibhava) \). The experience is said to be in the
nature of mantra, for here we are in the plane of pure spiritual ideation. The experience of this stage is known as parāparadaśā. It is intermediate between the para or the higher and apara or the lower.

The sad vidyā Tattva is different from the Vidyā Tattva which represents one of the limited powers of a limited self. In the former, both 'I' and 'this' refer to the same thing i.e. both have Sāmānadhi karanya; there is no consciousness of the subject as quite distinct from that of the object; but in case of the latter 'I' refers to the limited subject and 'this' to the limited object.

In the above Tattvas there is no difference between the 'I' and 'this'. There the manifestation of the Universe is a purely Ideal one. Being Ideal, it is the perfect and pure way or ord dr (Śuddhadhvā) without any blemish in it. It is a manifestation in which the Svarūpa or the real nature of the Divine is not veiled. The things are realized as they truly are and hence they are the regions of pure or true knowledge (Śuddhavidyā) and are spoken of as pure creation.

These Tattvas form the potential stages of universal manifestation which is a stage of pure homogeniety. This is as if the germinal state of universal manifestation. The subjective and objective aspects of all-comprehensive Experience remain involved in it. In the language of Spinoza, it comprises the vision of world as a unity in its pure form,
sub-specie- eternitatis. The Tattvas may be compared to Platonic 'Forms' which are universal in character since there is no experience of any thing in particular and Parama Śiva as the Form of forms.

(ii)

The Manifestation in Impure State

Māyā - The Divider

The Pratyabhijñā makes two levels - The pure and the impure, the Śuddha-adhvā and the aśuddha-adhvā. But what is the point of distinction between these two levels? The state of purity is the state of complete egoity or Pūrnāhantā. There is no Idam here as distinct from the Aham, rather the entire stage is the stage of Aham. The ideal Idam is also the Aham. The five manifestations of the Absolute from Śiva-Tattva to Vidyā-Tattva are states of Aham and not of Idam. Or here the Idam is also Aham. Upto this stage we do not find the projection of the Idam outside the Aham. But the creation means a projection, a complete externalization or the assertion of the Idam as somewhat independent of the Aham. The objectivity in the prior state was lost in subjectivity. But it must come out of that if a real creation is to take place. For this purpose an agency is required and this agency is the
Māyā or Māyā-tattva. It stands mid-way between the upper and the lower hemispheres. By the agency of Māyā the objec-
tivity or the particularisation assumes the predominance. The lower hemisphere of externalization is impure or here the absolute unity is lost sight of. As Māyā is the agent of obscuration and particularisation it stands mid-way between the higher and the lower and as it is the principle of individualization and particularization, it can not be included in the pure state of the upper hemisphere. Hence Māyā is a tattva or a principle of manifestation of appearance.

Māyā, for Advaita, is also the principle of particularization and the upādāna Karāṇa of the world. It is somewhat different from Brahman, although the Lord has been called the Māyābī. Brahman is transcendent of Māyā and Māyā has no reality in the ultimate sense. As creator of the world it is not unreal and as devoid of the transcendent reality of Brah-
man, it is also not real. Further, the Māyā of Advaita is non-conscious, the only cit being the Brahman Himself. Brah-
man is pure subjectivity without having the least stigma of objectivity. But then how can objectivity spring out of the pure subjectivity ? The cit and the acit are absolutely distinct and the one cannot be reconciled with the other except as appearance projected by a third principle of neither real nor unreal Māyā. Thus the whole problem remains a mystery with Advaita. This mystery has been resolved with
ease by the Pratyabhijñā. For it, the Māyā is the Śakti which is consciousness that constitutes the essence of the Parama-Śiva. In fact, the conscious and the consciousness are identical. The distinction between the Śiva and the Śakti or the Brahman and its essence is simply one of point of view. The consciousness cannot be unconscious. Hence Māyā is not aciṣṭ. It has been said to be ultimately the same as the Svātantrya-Śakti or the Vimarśa. As Abhinava says:

"Māyā ca nāma devasya śaktirvātirekini/
Bhedāvabhāsa Svātantryaṁ tathā hi sa tayā-kṛtah".6

Māyā is, in fact, the power of the Lord which is non-different from Him. She is the reason for the appearance of distinct as independent. She is all pervasive, partless and source of the world. She has neither beginning nor end. The consort of the Lord is imperishable. All these go to show that the Māyā is nothing else than the Śakti which is non-different from Śiva. But then what prompts this Śakti to project the world? The Vedānta of Vadarāyana answers it as līlā in the Sūtra - "lokavattu līlā kaivalyam".7 Śaṅkara gives a twist to it to mean by it a puzzle i.e., inexplicable. The Pratyabhijñā seems to be here more faithful to the intention of Vadarāyana. It is a līlā or the undetermined creative fiat of the Lord which is not necessitated by anything external to Him. The poet has the poem in his imagination which is in the first instance his ownself. It is not
anything different from his inner essence. When this is projected on the paper or the canvas it appears to be external to him. The entire outer reality is a self-projection of the Lord. In this projection the ultimate subjectivity of the Lord in all His creations is lost sight of the individual organs, his essence as the all or there is a svarūpacyuti. This is done by the agency of Māyā for the purpose of play and the real essence of the individual is totally concealed. The māyā is called rodha-śakti, the power of obscuration. It is also the start of the decent downward or the avaroha.

Under the influence of Māyā the Absolute assumes a 'sleepy' aspect and, therefore, there takes place a change in His Experience. With this change their arises a change in the five typical aspects (Nityatva, Vyāpakatva, Pūrṇatva, Sarvajñatva and Sarva-Kartṛttva) of His relation to the 'All this' and they become the relations of time, restriction, limited interest, limited consciousness and limited Authorship. Thus Māyā produces five Kañcukas - Kalā, vidyā, rāga, kāla and niyati. Parama Śiva's omnipotence, perfection, eternity, all-pervasiveness and all-doership are contracted and become the five Kañcukas, though they are limited in their real nature. The Lord Himself assumes limits and contracts His powers. This contraction is not done by any external entity but is due to His volition.
The first product of Māyā is Kalā or Kalātattva. It is the cause of an individual soul’s limited agency. It partly restores to the self its power of action (Paricchinna Kartṛtva) which has been obscured in the state of Māyā. So Kalā gives rise to finite doership and limits the omnipotence of the self. It is admitted to be an independent tattva as it functions independently to bring limited power of action to a subject. The knowledge of Kalā tattva brings about the freedom of the individual soul from the bondage of Karma and places the individual in the state of vijñānakāla where he is able to transcend this tattva.

Vidyā is the limited power of knowledge which gives rise to the finite knower-ship in place of omniscience. It is different from Buddhi-tattva which is insentient, as it is simply the product of the guṇa. It cannot know either itself or that which is reflected on it.

Rāga is the cause of its love for particular objects. It reduces the all-satisfaction (Pūrṇatva) of the Universal consciousness and brings about desire for particular things. It is not a mere avairāgya which is conceived to be a quality of the Buddhī by The Sāṃkhya. It is rather that power which is responsible for the indifference (vairāgya) itself.

Kāla constitute the limitation of the self in respect of time. Because of it, the eternal appears as temporal.
So consciousness becomes manifest within time. Kāla is the cause of temporal order—the past, the present and the future. It reduces the eternity of the Absolute and brings about limitation in respect of time. In the level of Śuddha-vidyā the self realizes itself as being present as an indwelling, informing and all-pervading principle in 'All-this', it is co-eval with it or nityatva. But under the influence of Māyā the nityatva or eternity appears as temporal or having limited duration. This is technically called Kāla. In this way, the rodha-śakti of Māyā acts as a veil upon the eternity of the all-comprehensive Experience which shines forth in the temporal.

Niyati is the power which limits the freedom of the subject as regards its causal efficiency. It is because of this that fire only burns and the sprout comes out of the seed. It controls the activities of the finite agent. This reduces the freedom and pervasiveness (Svātantratva and vyāpakatva) of Universal consciousness and brings about limitation in respect of cause, space and form. It connects specific causes to specific effects. It may be mentioned here that the last four, - vidyā, rāga, Kāla and niyati are the effects of Kalatattva ('vidyā ragostha niyatih Kāla-scaitaccatusthayam/Kalākāryam...')

Of course, the five kañcukas are not to be confused with what the Saṁkhya and the Vedāntins called the liṅga-
śarīra or the Sūkṣma-Śarīra. The sūkṣma-śarīra is the product of Prakṛti or the guṇas in both Sāmkhya and Vedānta. But the Kañcukas are the limitations exerted by the Lord Himself through the power of Māyā for the purpose of descent. The ascent and the descent are the sports of the Lord Himself and hence there is no limitation imposed by any external agency like the prakṛti of the Sāmkhya or the ajñāna of the Vedānta. There is nothing external to the Lord, as all externality is a makeshift for the sake of sports.

After the appearance of the Suddha-Vidyā, Māyā, the obscuring Force, comes into being and play with her five forms of Limitation. With these forms or Kañcukas she covers the Experiencer, and the Experiencer forgets His true Divine Nature and glory. He then falls in sleep in which He has but a vague notion of experiencing an equally vague, indistinct and undefined 'something' into which the glorious 'All this' of the previous state has now been reduced. Thus Śiva becomes an individual bound soul; being limited in His powers. When His powers are expanded fully, it becomes the Absolute. He is then omnipotent, omniscient, universal consciousness unlimited by time, space and condition. Although He is absolutely free, He assumes the nature of an atomic (aṇu) individual soul through His power of Māyā. His power of knowledge and power of action are contracted, and thus an individual
soul acquires Vidyā and Kalā. It is deprived of its omni-
science, omnipotence etc. by its ānavamala which veils them
up.

Thus, here we may observe that Pratyabhijṇā philosophy
had anticipated the German philosopher Kant a thousand years
before, in the analysis of experience. According to Kant,
we get the data of experience by the senses but understand-
ing provides some laws from within on the data of experience
to transform them into synthetic, harmonious whole of know-
ledge. Kant calls them categories. These are inherent in the
very constitution of mind. Hence there are two sources of
knowledge — matter and form. Matter is provided by Nature
and form by mind. Thus there is a dualism in Kant's philosophy.
But Pratyabhijṇā believes in non-dualism. To them both matter
and form are provided by Māyā together with her kaṇcukas,
vidyā, kalā rāga etc. Form is provided by vidyā, Kalā and
niyati and matter is provided by kāla. Māyā gives rise to
prakṛti by her power of kāla. This prakṛti or pradhāna
derives buddhi, ahaṁkāra and manas. From ahaṁkāra arise
five jñānendriyas or sensory system and five Karmendriyas
or motor system and five tanmātras. Again from the five
tanmātras arise five gross elements. Thus both matter and
form come from Māyā, and Māyā arises from Śiva-Sakti. So
there is a complete non-dualism in Pratyabhijṇā Philosophy.
Again, Kant takes time and space to be form of intuition. All our experiences are within the framework of space and time. Pratyabhijñā philosophy also teaches that all our experiences are delimited by kāla and niyati. The empirical individual (man) who is called māyā-pramātā or citta-pramātā is so constituted by Māyā that his experiences are bound to be circumscribed by Kāla and niyati. Niyati has three functions—limitation in space, causality and the measure of a form of things. The first two covers Kant's idea of space and the category of causality. But there is nothing in Kant's philosophy similar to the third function of niyati. The category of relation is also includes in niyati. The categories of quality, and modality come under vidyā, the another Kañcuka of Māyā. There are two other kañcukas like kalā and rāga which have no parallel in Kant's system. Both of these are connected with activity. Kant's theory is confined to epistemology. He has formulated his theory only with reference to knowledge. But Pratyabhijñā has formulated its theory both with reference to knowledge and activity. In Pratyabhijñā man is treated as not only a bundle of ideas but an active being also. Kalā denotes limitation in respect of action. Rāga denotes his valuation, his craving for various things. Just as kalā expresses loss of full sovereignty in the case of empirical individual, even so rāga expresses loss of perfection.9
Purusa Tattva - When the Supreme Lord assumes the states of a limited knower owing to His power of Māyā which conceals His nature, He is called an individual soul or Puruṣa. It is deluded by Māyā, bound by merits and demerits, and becomes subject to transmigration. But though Puruṣa is subject to Māyā, it is the self-same supreme self who without undergoing any real change or transformation in Himself remaining as He is in Himself. The Lord limited by His power of Māyā and with all His powers of lordship contracted assumes the state of an individual soul, even as the red sun with its rays withdrawn into itself is unable to manifest itself. Thus Māyā-Śakti with all her delimiting powers brings into existence the individual self (Puruṣa).

Now by the operation of Māyā-Śakti, the Absolute blossoms forth into an infinite number of puruṣas or individual selves. Just as the infinite number of sparks of fire are in essence same as fire and at the same time its innumerable differentiations, Similarly, the infinite number of puruṣas are essentially the Supreme Self though apparently differentiated into a plurality of selves. Puruṣa, in Śaiva philosophy, is not merely confined to man, but also applicable to every individual or particular thing. Puruṣa constitutes the entire universe of psychical, biological and physical objects. All matters, life and mind are but in essence the same Absolute light of consciousness obscured and multiplied in different
degrees. They therefore, differ not in kind but in degree. Thus every particle of matter be it 'Atom', 'Electron', or 'Ion' is a puruṣa identifying itself with the solid, crust of matter which is the 'Pṛthivī Tattva' and which is the gross manifestation of subtler products which emanate out of the world-ground which is consciousness ('citiḥ Svatatrā - viśva siddhi hetuḥ').

Puruṣas are many. They are like points in a straight line forming a continuum. They resemble mathematical points having position without any magnitude or dimension, though they are real and not conceptual. They are like the 'Monads' of Leibnitz in certain respects. The Monads are real and neither conceptual nor mathematical points. The Puruṣas are also real and neither conceptual nor mathematical. Leibnitz's monads are windowless and self-complete entities; but the Puruṣas of Pratyabhijñā are, in fact, the Monad of Monads itself and hence there is no question of hierarchy. In fact, every Monad is itself the Supreme Monad imposing limitations on itself by the power of Māyā, which conception is absent in Leibnitz.

Puruṣa assumes different names in different states of existence. When it identifies itself with the body etc. it is called Deha-pramātā. When it is free from any association with the object of the world as in pralaya and deep sleep, it is called pralayākāla. Such type of Puruṣa is almost
like insentient, because it is free from the sense of both Ahantā and Idantā. It is almost a state of blankness. Again when puruṣa is free from Karma, it is called Vijnānakala. Vijnānakala puruṣa is like the liberated soul of the Sāmkhya, but it is still individualized. It is free from agency and hence is of the nature of pure knowledge. It is, in fact, above Māyā and near to Suddha-vidyā. It is highest state of the individualized consciousness. It is affected only by the ānavamala, hence the individualization. According to 'Pratyabhijñāhṛdayam', it is apūrṇajñāna, incomplete knowledge i.e. all-pervasive knowledge contracted, and hence is the cause of the saṃsāra. The power of volition of the Lord is unimpeded svātantrya. That being contracted the incompleteness or apūrṇamanyatā arises. This is ānavamala. The vijnānakala puruṣa possesses all knowledge of the temporal order, but still it is tainted with the individualization although free from Kārmamala and māyīyamala. The Kārmamala refers to the limited power of action and māyīyamala refers to the limitation of knowledge. The Tantrāloka IX says - 'Śarīra-bhuvanākāro māyīyath parikīrtītath'. The Vijnānakala or the liberated puruṣa of Sāmkhya is free from the sense of embodiedness and worldliness and hence is free from māyīyamala. Lastly, when Puruṣa is associated with all Kalās, it is called sakala. Sakala Puruṣa is the finite individual. Thus all the above categories fall under the concept of puruṣa, the differences being their association
with or freedom from the kalās. They are all the different states of Śiva below the level of universality and hence are contracted states of the Śiva.

There is a point of similarity between the Śaiva and Sāmkhya, concepts of puruṣa. Like the Sāmkhya the Śaivas believe in the plurality of the puruṣa (though, of course, in the region of Māyā) and think that the creation of the Prakṛti is for supplying the necessary stimuli for the varying experiences which these puruṣas must enjoy or suffer according to their individual Karma. But they differ from the Sāmkhyas when they say that the innumerable puruṣas are independent entities. To the Śaivas, the Puruṣas are the manifestations of the same ultimate Reality, but not the independent entities. According to the Sāmkhya, Puruṣas always remain unaffected, it is a pure sentient entity (puruṣastu puṣkara patasavat nirlepaḥ kintu cetanaḥ). But, for the Śaivas, Puruṣas though equally sentient, they do not remain entirely unaffected under all circumstances. Puruṣas are not regarded here as ultimate Reality beyond which there is nothing as is in the Sāmkhya philosophy, but are the grosser aspects of the more subtle aspects of the Parama Śiva, the ultimate Reality. Puruṣas are the Śiva obscured and multiplied by Māyā and delimited by her Kañcukas, such as, Vidyā, Kalā, Rāga etc. As individualized units or centres of force they pervade the entire universe and constitutes the 25th category.
Prakṛti tattva - In the order of manifestation the Prakṛti is the first purely objective manifestation. While Puruṣa is the subjective manifestation the Prakṛti is the objective manifestation. It is the matrix of all objectivity. The word 'Pra' means before or the indefinite background which is prior to all well-defined clear-cut experience, and the 'Kṛti' which means expression connotes what we mean by Prakṛti. Thus Prakṛti is the vague indefinite objective basis of all future experience of the Puruṣa. In the Sadvidyā Tattva 'Aham' and 'Idam' together form the all-comprehensive unitary Experience. But when Māyā Śakti intervenes, it bifurcates the homogeneity of this 'Aham' and 'Idam' and instead of the all-pervading homogeneous whole we have the experience of a heterogeneous universe of objects. It is an effect of kalā-śakti of Māyā. This kalā-śakti delimits the unlimited jñāna-śakti, icchā-śakti and kriyā-śakti of the supreme self and transforms Him into the Puruṣa-tattva. This puruṣa is only the contracted form of the 'All-Experience' and as such it cannot exist without any relation. Now the relations always presuppose the distinct existence of the term to be related. Hence for the existence of the Puruṣa as a being with relations, it is necessary that there must be a second term to which the Puruṣa is related. And this second term in this state must be, Indefinite Something which is called Prakṛti. Prakṛti is thus a most important factor — as important as the Puruṣa himself. And it comes into manifestation simultaneously with
the Puruṣa and affects him (Puruṣa). Thus the Puruṣa and
the Prakṛti are nothing but the limited representations of
the two factors in the two-fold experience of the Suddha-
vidyā state and hence inseparable. Evidently all manifesta-
tions are characterised by a dual aspect. There is the posi-
tive and the negative electricity, or the potential and the
Kinetic energy, though they coimplicate each other. Modern
science says that the dual role of the electron as a unit
of matter and a unit of electricity simply describes differ-
ent manifestations of the same reality. If matter sheds its
mass and travels with the speed of light, it is called radia-
tion or energy, and when the energy congeals and becomes
apparently inert, it is called matter, Similar is the case
of Puruṣa and Prakṛti. They are the simultaneous manifesta-
tions of the universal 'I' or 'All-this' that constitutes
the all-comprehensive unitary Experience. (Puruṣa is the
contracted form of the 'All-Experiencer' obscured by His own
Māyā-Śakti and Prakṛti is the same universal 'All-this' in
the form of 'something' indefinite and vague). Again, as the
Puruṣas are many because of the self-multiplying power of
Māyā-Śakti, similarly, Prakṛtis are also infinite in number,
one for each Puruṣa, the one universal 'All-this' being per-
ceived dimly by the different Puruṣas as so many different
'this-es' as different persons may perceive the same sun in
so many different reflections in different portions of the
sea.""evam kīnicīt Kārttṛtvam yaṭ māyākārye, tatra kīnicītvāviśiṣṭaṁ yaṭ kārtṛtvāṁ viśeṣyaṁ, tatra vyāpriyamāṇā kāla
vidyādiprasavahoturiti nirupitam idānāṁ viśeṣaṇa - bhāgo
yah Kiṃcidityukto jñeyah Kāryaśca, tām yāva t sā kalā
Svātmanah prthak kurute tāvadeva eva sukha-duḥkha-mohaḥ-
makabhogyaviśeṣānusyutasya sāmānyamātrasya tadgūpadāmyāparanā-
mnaḥ prakṛtītattvasya sargah — iti bhoktṝbhogyayugalasya
samameva kalātattvāyatvāsṛṣṭiḥ'.

'Again Tantrālokaḥ(Ahn. 9) says:

'Samameva hi bhogyam ca bhoktṝram ca prasuyate/
kāḷa bhedābhisaṃdhānādaviyuktam parasparam//
evaṃ sāmvedyamātram yat sukha-duḥkhavimohataḥ/
bhotsyate yattataḥ proktam tatsāmyātmakamāditah//'.

Now there are the differences between the Śāmkhya concep-
tion of Prakṛti and that of Pratyabhijñā. Śāmkhya philosophy
says Prakṛti is one and universal for all the Puruṣas, while
Pratyabhijñā believes in that each Puruṣa is associated with
a different Prakṛti. Prakṛti is independent in its action,
according to the Śāmkhya, but to Pratyabhijñā Prakṛti works
only when it is stirred to activity by Ananta. Again, Śāmkhya
posits a plurality of Puruṣas representing the formless con-
sciousness with one unconscious Prakṛti which is the form
and potency of all creative activity, but in the Pratyabhijñā
Prakṛti is neither an unconscious nor really independent
principle. Puruṣa and Prakṛti are but the offspring of the
common finitising principle called Māyā. Thus the duality
of Puruṣa and Prakṛti is explained as being the emanations
of one and the same ultimate Reality. Prakṛti is the same citi-śakti of Parama Śiva obscuring and multiplying itself with its own power of Māyā-Śakti. Prakṛti in reality is māyā-śakti itself in action.

Prakṛti has three guṇas viz. Sattva, Rajas and Tamas. They are the three threads of a chord or constitutive elements of Prakṛti-tattva. In her manifested state, Prakṛti holds these guṇas in perfect equipoise. They produce the feeling of pleasure, pain and delusion. In the order of being, Sattva is characterised by brightness, in the psychological order it is characterised by transparency, joy and peace, in the ethical order it is the principle of goodness. Again, in the order of being Rajas is characterised by activity, in the psychological order it is characterised by craving and passion, in the ethical order it is the principle of ambition and avarice. Lastly, in the order of being tamas is the principle of darkness, inertness; in the psychological order it is characterised by dullness, delusion and dejection and in the ethical order it is the principle of degradation, debasement and in action. According to Pratyabhijñā, Sattva, Rajas and Tamas are only the polarisation of Śiva's Jñāna, Icchā and Kriyā Śakti. The guṇas, therefore, do not mean attributes or qualities as understood in Western parlance. It represents a gross form of the universal powers (jñāna, icchā and Kriyā) without any reference to emotional feeling or will.
Thus in the Pratyabhijña philosophy the Puruṣa is called the experient or bhokta and the Prakṛti is the experienced or bhogya. The Puruṣas are just like Leibnitzian 'Monads' each perceiving the universe in its own way. But the Prakṛtis are the basis of all sentiency ('tadeva [Prakṛtitaṭṭvam] tu bhogyasāmānyam').

From Prakṛti the process of limited manifestation differentiates into the grosser tattvas of Buddhi, Ahamkāra and Manas. These three tattvas are technically called 'Antaḥkaraṇa'. Antaḥkaraṇa means the inner instrument, the psychic apparatus of the individual. It is the unity of Manas, Buddhi and Ahamkāra.

Buddhi is the ascertaining intelligence (niścayākārinī Buddhi). It is a product of the guṇas. It is capable of receiving reflection of the light of the self from within as well as of the objects from without. The objects which cast their reflections on Buddhi are of two kinds: (1) the external i.e., a gross object like jar that is perceived through the eye and (ii) the internal, such as, the images built out of the saṃskāras (the impressions left behind on the mind).

Prakṛti is the equipoise of the three guṇes—Sattva, Rajas and Tamas. But due to the predominance of Sattva guṇa when the equipoise of Prakṛti tattva is disturbed, Buddhi
emerges. It is the prakāśa aspect of Prakṛti. It is a state of pure intelligence. In this state there is only the bare awareness of object. This is nirvikalpa-jñāna. In such a stage of pure intelligence, the feeling is one of bliss without any tinge of moving passion or interest. Buddhi is spoken of as the memory of Śuddha-vidyā experience in a limited form. Thus it is the subliminal self which is later on transformed into a dim indefinite impersonal sub-conscious self. As such it is the unruffled consciousness without the manifestation of any moving passion or interest or inert passivity. The Trika philosophy agrees with Sāṃkhya that Buddhi is a common meeting place of both the light of the self and the reflection of the external object. But they differ on the nature of the source of internal light. Sāṃkhya says it is the pure self (Śuddha Puruṣa) that casts its light on Buddhi, but the Trika philosophy holds it is one that is affected by two impurities, Ānavamala and Kāraṇamala. Again, according to Sāṃkhya, it is not objective (asaṃvedya), but according to Trika, being an instrument of knowledge, it is knowable, like any other instrument, such as, the mind.15

From Buddhi emerges the ahaṁkāra. It is the ego-making principle and the power of self-appropriation (ahaṁkṛtiḥ ahaṁpratitikari). It is that in which there is the realization of the experiencer as a particular person. It is the
self-same sub-conscious impersonal self in which there is the experience of 'I am so and so'. It represents the stage of particularised personality as distinct from the universal personality or the transcendental 'I'. It is responsible for the identification of the limited self with the Buddhi and consequent attribution of the latter's activity to the former. Here the Rajas guṇa of Prakṛti tattva is the dominating factor in which the two other guṇas are held in a more or less subdued form.

Ahaṁkāra is the agency through which experiences are stored up in the form of memory in the abysmal depth of the particularised self and assimilates the present experiences with the past with a sense of personal identity. In so far as this 'I' is the particularised personal 'I', it is nothing but the sum total of experiences past and present. Hence ahaṁkāra-tattva superimposes the particularised personality upon the Universal Parama Śiva. So the Tantrasāraḥ says, "'ahaṁkāro yena buddhipratibimbite vedyasamparke Kaluse puṁprakāśe anātmanī ātmābhimānāḥ śuktau rajatābhimānavat\/ ata eba 'kāra' ityanena kṛtakatvam asya uktat/Sāṁkhyasya tu tanna Yujuvate, sa hi na ātmanaḥ ahaṁvimarśamayatāmicchat\; vayaṁ tu kartṛtvamapi tasya icchāmah / tacca śuddham vimarśa eva Svātmacamaṭkārarūpoḥhamiti'\16

The distinctive function of ahaṁkāra is to control the five vital airs within the system and so the life itself.
Ahamkāra is different from self-consciousness (ahaṁbhāva) as the latter is purely subjective, without any objective reference, while the former is due to superimposition of the self on the Buddhi.

Lastly, manas is the product of ahamkāra (egoity). It is the gross manifestation of the particularised self as embodied ("tasyā Kriyā tamomaya mūrttih manas ucyate Vikalpakari"). At this stage Tamas guṇa is the dominant and determining factor and the Sattva and Rajas guṇas lie in a more or less dormant stage. Manas co-operates with the senses in building up perceptions, and by itself it builds images and concepts. In our perception our senses come in contact with an external stimulus awakening sensation called 'Alocana'. But what is presented by senses is a mere manifold. The function of manas is to select a certain group to the exclusion of others and to construct of images out of the chaotic flux of the manifold sense-impressions. This function of manas is called 'vyavaccheda'.

This may be compared to Kant's 'Synthetic apperception'. Kant also says senses only provide the data of experience, but understanding imposes its own laws on the data of experience to transform them into synthetic, harmonious whole of knowledge. Kant calls these laws categories. These are inherent in the very constitution of mind. Similarly, Pratyabhijñā philosophy also says manas is what constructs particular images out of the manifold of sensations supplied by
the senses and assimilates, co-ordinates and synthesises the chaotic discrete flux of sensations into mental images.

Again, the Ahaṃkāra does not produce only the manas but also two other groups of tattvas generally called indriyas. In the Pratyabhijñā Philosophy the word 'Indriyas' does not mean sense-organs like cakṣu, karṇa, nāsikā, jihvā and tvak, or organs of action like vāk, hasta, pāda, pāyu and upastha, but also those powers of Puruṣa tattva as endowed with and manifesting these faculties which exhibit themselves as operating through these physical organs. The Indriyas are divided into two heads—Jñānendriyas (the powers of more perception or the senses) and the karmendriyas (the powers of action). The jñānendriyas are of five kinds as mentioned above and are responsible for seeing, hearing, smelling, tasting and touching and as such are mere manifestations of the vidyā, the limited power of knowledge. The Karmendriyas are also of five kinds as mentioned above and are responsible for the five kinds of the physical activities of voicing, handling, locomoting, rejecting and resting respectively and as such are simply different forms of kalā, the limited power of action.

Like the Indriyas, five tanmātras or primary (subtle) elements of perception are also the products of Ahaṃkāra. Literally 'tanmātra' means 'that only'. These are the general
elements of the particulars of sense perception. They are: Sound (Śabda tanmātra), touch (Sparśa tanmātra), colour (Rūpa tanmātra), taste (Rasa tanmātra) and odour (gandha tanmātra).

Finally, from the five tanmātras there arise the five gross elements or pañca-mahābhuta. They are the effects of the tanmātras. These mahābhutas are—ether, air, fire, water and earth. Ether or ākāśa is produced from Śabda tanmātra. Air or Vāyu is produced from Śabda and Sparśa tanmātra. Fire or Teja or Agni is produced from śabda, sparśa and rūpa tanmātra. Water or apa is produced from śabda, sparśa, rūpa and rasa tanmātra. Earth or prthivī is produced from gandha tanmātra in combination with above four.

Among these 36 principles, the first five Tattvas (1-5) are in the pure order (Suddha-adhvā), from six to eleven (6-11) tattvas belong to the pure-impure order (Śuddhāśuddha-adhvā) and the remaining from twelve to thirty-six (12-36) tattvas are in the domain of impure order (asuddha-adhvā).
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CHAPTER-VIII

The Absolute and the World - Ābhāsavāda

(i)

The word 'Ābhāsa' means the manifestation or the shining forth of the Ultimate Reality into the infinite forms of the universe. It is nothing but the ideation of the Universal Consciousness appearing as external to the empirical subject. It is the manifestation or appearance in a limited way, (ā = iṣat saṃkocena, bhāsāḥ = bhāsanam or prakāśanā). Hence all that appears in any form whether as an object or subject, knowledge or means of knowledge, all that exists in any way is only an ābhāsa, a manifestation of the Universal Consciousness. The ābhāsas are the external projection of the ideation of the Divine. Sṛṣṭi, therefore, means manifesting outside what is contained within. The Divine does not require any external material for this creation (sṛṣṭi). This is done only by His mere power of Will. It is, therefore, said:

Cidātma'iva hi devo'ntaḥsthitamicchāvāśādvahih/
Yogīva nirupādānam arthajātam prakāśayet//1

1. Vedic sentence for the spiritual context.
The Divine Being whose essence is cit makes the collection of objects that are internally contained appear outside by His will without any external material even as yogi makes his ideas appear outside by his mere will. It is the Universal Consciousness itself that appears in the form of subjects and objects. All ābhāsas are like the waves in the sea of the Universal Consciousness. Just as there is neither loss nor gain to the sea with the rise and disappearance of the waves, even so there is neither loss nor gain to the Universal Consciousness because of the appearance and disappearance of the ābhāsas. Ābhāsas appear and disappear, but the underlying Consciousness is unchanging.

Since there is nothing other than the Absolute which is the all-inclusive Reality complete in itself and by itself, there cannot be a coming forth of something which was previously non-existent. This shows the contradiction of the doctrine of Ārambha-vāda or the Asaṭkārya-vāda of the Nyāya-Vaiśeṣikas and the Buddhists. It is a kind of saṭ-Kārya-vāda but unlike that of the Sāṃkhya philosophy. For Sāṃkhya the source is the unconscious Prakṛti and hence the rest of its products are all unconscious. In fact, Prakṛti itself for the Trika system is a manifestation of the Ultimate Reality and is not independent or unconscious. The entire Reality beginning from the Absolute up to the infinite names and forms of particular objects is surcharged with consciousness or truly speaking
the Reality itself. We might say that the entire creation is a manifestation of the Universal Experience and is non-different from the Parama Śiva. The poet, his imagination and the poem which is the product are all but vibration of the consciousness of the poet himself. No part is extraneous to him, nothing is bereft of his self-experience. Similarly, the entire universe is a vibratory expression of the Lord Himself in the infinite names and forms.

As for Vivarta-vāda also there is nothing other than and nothing extraneous to Brahman. The names and forms for Vadarāyana are like bubbles and foams and waves on the bosom of the vast ocean. This version of Vadarāyana has been given the twist by the AdvaitIns so as to imply some complications, the conception of multiplicity. The bubbles etc. are contingent, the underlying reality of the ocean being its unchangeable substance. If our vision is confined to the temporary manifestations, the basic substance is lost sight of. Again, if the vision is concentrated to the basic substance and its eternal reality, the manifestations are contradictory in the experience of the nirvikalpa-samādhi. Hence the one and the many for the Vivarta-vādIns are contradicted. But the Vivarta vādIns conceded a borrowed reality to the manifestations. They are somehow real but not ultimately. Thus they are half real, half unreal or neither real nor unreal. The manifestations taken in themselves are also not the substance, for they do not persist. The Vivarta-vādIns consider the ultimate
substance as beyond all change and temporality and beyond space, time and causation. The manifestations being in space, time and causation are relative and hence unreal. Further, for the Vivarta-vādīns if the manifestations are held to have their source in the unchanging substance and as following from them, this will inevitably lead to a diminishing of the reality of the Absolute. Thus the manifestations remain a puzzle of which a proper conception is not possible or expressible in verbal terms. They are thus relegated to the realm of Māyā which itself is neither real nor unreal.

Is it not possible to have a conception of the manifestations as having their source in the substance and at the same time not diminishing the reality of the all-inclusive stuff? The reply of the Trika is that it is possible and the Trika solution stands on two positions. The first is that the real is not comparable to the dead inert matter in respect of its permanence and unchangibility. Consciousness and matter are absolutely diverse objects in the sense that the character of the one can neither be attributed to the other nor can be even in a nascent way the determinant of the character of the other. They are not equal realities. Hence if we are to have even an inadequate conception of the Absolute we must totally forget the limitations of the forms of thought as the categories of knowledge with regard to the ordinary object of our experience. That is, the point of view is to be shifted from the vision of object and raised to that of an absolute vision which
is completely different from the former. This point we generally forget in a philosophic understanding of the total and this leads to complexities and riddles of thought. The very concept of the Absolute as the Parama-Śiva from the Trika point of view is that of a vibrant consciousness which is absolutely unlike anything else of our ordinary experience. A vibrant consciousness need not necessarily be construed as a diminishing of the reality of the all-inclusive consciousness nor leading to the concept of its imperfection. This leads to the second presupposition of the Trika point of view of one basic standpoint of the system. The Absolute is an Absolute Experience in which there is no term which is other than or outside or in anyway lesser than the Absolute itself. The poet, the poetic imagination and his expression is one total whole in which no division can be made. The Absolute, the Absolute Experience and Its expressions constitute one totality which can not be divided into so many terms which are more or less complete or incomplete or relative or contingent from one another. The vibrant experience is one whole which is present in every point of the whole and thus every point in the whole is as complete and perfect as the whole itself. This is the significance of the Upaniṣadic sense:

"puṇṇamadāḥ puṇṇamidaṁ puṇṇaḥ puṇṇamudacyate/
puṇṇasya puṇṇamādāya puṇṇamevāvāsiṣyate//"
While considering the doctrine of Ābhāsa-vāda we should remember the basic facts and propositions that are stated above. The concept of Reality or Absolute Experience has not been properly formulated in any of our theistic or absolutistic philosophical systems although it is implied in the Upaniṣads. Only the Trika system definitely emphasizes this concept and hence it solves the problem of the relation between the Reality and its manifestations in a suitable manner. The orders of experience in the individual psyche have been put as jāgraṭ or the waking state, svāpna or the dream state and Susupti or the state of dreamless sleep. The Upaniṣad conceives a fourth state of the Turīya. The Advaitism relates them as being contradictor and contradicted and hence the problem assumes a serious proportion. Can't we conceive the relations among these four orders not as the relation of mutual contradiction or mutation but as one of immanence of the world into the other? If we could do that, that would be the point of view of the Trika, and therein would lie the basic difference between the Trika and the Advaita Vedāntins like Gauḍapāda and Śaṅkara. The dreamy state contains the waking state as saṃskāras. The susupti absorbs the entire world of jāgraṭ and svāpna into its being. Similarly, the turīya or the fourth state also contains all the other levels into its bosom failing which a waking up would have been impossible. A going out and a coming in of the four orders as beautifully expressed by the concepts of
unmeṣa and nimeṣa by the philosophers of Trika is the essential nature of the entire Absolute Experience.

The ābhāsas or the manifestations or the shining forth of the Absolute Experience are, therefore, as real as the Absolute itself. This makes the doctrine of ābhāsa a distinct philosophy which absorbs the truth of all the other systems into its body. With this basic remark and comment on the position of the ābhāsa-vāda we shall pass to the different kinds of manifestations and their explications.

(ii)

In order to understand the meaning of Ābhāsavāda it is necessary to understand the meaning of the word 'Ābhāsa'. Broadly or roughly speaking we have taken the word 'Ābhāsa' as the manifestation of the Ultimate Reality. We have also instituted some comparison of the doctrine of Ābhāsa with the Sāmkhya and the Vedānta views of the manifestations of the empirical world. But the Ābhāsavādīns go much deeper into the problem and are not satisfied with the broad divisions of the manifestations into the categories as explained by the other systems of Indian Philosophy. The doctrine of Pratyabhijña inherited not only the materials from the traditional systems of philosophy like Sāmkhya and Vedānta
and the āgamas as explained in the 'Śivadrṣṭi' of Somānanda, but the great Abhinava also assimilated the tenets of Buddhism in his system. Kāśmīr and the adjoining areas experienced a very profound development of Buddhism and hence the teachings of Buddhism could not be set aside in a philosophical understanding of the great system of pratyabhijñā. Abhinava himself maintained that if dualistic doctrine were given up by the so-called Āgamikas; if Māyā were to be taken as the power of the Brahman by the Vedāntins; and if two vijñānas, the Ālaya-vijñāna and the Pravṛtti-vijñāna, were to be admitted to be the manifestations of the Ātmeśvara or Maheśvara, the Universal consciousness, by the Buddhas, all differences between the Pratyabhijñā on the one hand and the Āgamikas, the Vedāntins and the Buddhas on the other disappear.3 "Āgameṣu dvaitavyākhyāmapāsyā, Brahma vāde avidyām māyāśakti-kṛtya vijñānadvayam ātmeśvarābhhiprāyena nirūpya siddhyatyesa janaḥ".4 It is very much interesting to note in this connection how the Buddhistic doctrine of momentariness, instead of being set aside as the heretic and unacceptable presupposition of a section of extreme thinker has been assimilated to this great system in a way that can not but strike the intellectuals as a novel and supremely valuable contribution to philosophic thought.

The Buddhists explain the entire world of experience as two series of momentary states. The two series are constituted by the citta-caittas and the bhuta-bhautikas, —
the psychical and the physical states. The Kṣanikavādīns go thus far and do not explain further as to how or wherefrom these momentary series appear. But the interesting part of the doctrine is to distinguish between the psychical and the physical series. There is a dualism inherent in this doctrine which remains a puzzle for philosophy. If these two series act and inter-act upon one another, this implies that metaphysically some sort of reconciliation is awaited by pointing some underlying Reality. But the Kṣanika-vādīns did not go further than this. The Buddhistic Idealism however was not satisfied with this limit and ultimately passed on to the doctrine of vijñaptimātratā and deduced from that the two lines of grāhya and grāhaka or the pravṛtti-vijñāpa and the Ālaya-vijñāna. Some of them termed these to be Māyā in the sense of an eternally inexplicable puzzle and hence mithyā in the Vedāntic sense. The Buddhist Idealism tried to resolve the dualism but they have to impute or attribute an unreality or phenomenal reality to the manifestations. Gouḍapāda, the great preceptor of the Māyā-Vāda, absorbed this idea of unreality or phenomenal reality and termed all manifestations including those of the waking state as well as the dream state as the effect of Māyā, the grand source of all errors. It is interesting to note that the Buddhist Idealists and the Māyā-vādīns somehow coalesced together to come to a strikingly similar position. But both these schools rejected the world of experience as unreal and false. The riddle of the philosophic problem of one and many could not
be solved by them in a better way. The original problem was to tackle the nature of the pure consciousness, as the state of Samādhi was taken by them to be the absolute ground for understanding the nature of the Supreme Reality.

Abhinava took the common word Māyā as Māyā-śakti inherent in the Supreme consciousness. The Supreme consciousness is not a closed whole in a state of still equipoise denying any possibility of change or variation. This was shown to be the only way to retain and maintain the absoluteness of the Ultimate Reality. The Pratyabhijñā position of the Maheśvara as being of a total nature of Śiva-Śakti, or Prakāśa-Vimarsa fit upon this basic and fundamental position and thus was able to solve the philosophic riddle in a very effective manner.

The Supreme Consciousness is essentially vibrant and this vibrancy does not take away from its absoluteness. The great Buddhist scholar Nāgārjuna identified nirvāṇa with samsāra like Spinoza's Natura Naturans and Natura Naturata as being the twin aspects of the same Ultimate Reality. The dualism is very well solved in this way. Is it not possible to dissolve the problem of dualism in the line indicated by the great thinkers of the past by showing the manifestations to be as much real as the Ultimate Reality without either taking a way from the absoluteness of the basic
consciousness or without relegating the world of manifestations to a lower world of puzzle and inexplicability? In our opinion the great Abhinava could solve this riddle and it was a very grand feat. The Reality is one and omnipresent in all the manifestations. The manifestations are not independent, nor so many closed circle but are all the points or vibrations of the Supreme Being. The empirical self as well as the empirical world of the so-called inorganic objects are qualitatively the same. Every drop of water, every point of foam or every-wave is the sea or the ocean not partially present, isolated from the rest of the whole, but each is complete as the whole, rather each is the whole (Pūrṇamadāḥ pūrṇamidam).

The Reality is the Universal Consciousness. It, as we have seen has the two aspects of transcendence and immanence (viśvottirṇa & Viśvamaya). The Ultimate Reality or the Parama Śiva is not only prakāśa but is also Vimarśamaya.

The Vimarśa aspect has a reference to the aspect of immanence. The Universal Consciousness is also self-conscious and is pūrṇāhantā. There is nothing outside the Universal Consciousness. All manifestations are reflections on the background of the Universal Consciousness. The ground is Lord Himself and He evolves the manifestations from within His being. A comparison may be drawn with the mirror. The mirror contains the reflections. The reflections are not
different from the mirror. In case of the ordinary mirror the objects are outside, but the reflection is on the mirror. In fact, reflections are the same as the body of the mirror. But herein the Universal Consciousness there is nothing outside its being. The relation of causality is a pragmatic relation, the identity is the essence. A relation of causality could not be avoided by the Sāmkhya-Vedāntins and hence they were confronted with the problem of ascertaining the nature of this relation and the status of the relata. The Sāmkhya formulated the Saṭkārya-vāda according to which the effect prior to its production was existent in the cause and the production is a real transformation of the causal substance into the effect. This puts the cause in mutation or eternal transformation as we find in the case of Prakṛti. The original state of Prakṛti is a hypothetical state. Hence the absoluteness of Reality is not there. For the Advaitins, the manifestations are not due to any external reality which is avastu. The Māyā is a functional explanation and is not a real explanation, for it is itself along with its products which are of an inexplicable nature. The Advaitins, therefore, had to relegate the empirical world to the status of unreality like the rope-snake illusion. Both these views have their limitations. The Pratyabhijñā took the clue from the evidence of self-consciousness in individual being. The consciousness retains the seed of the world, either of the waking state or of the dream state as possibilities within
itself. The consciousness is capable of evolving all that is perceived or unperceived, i.e., all appearance from within itself. In the context of the Parama-śiva it is the Vimarśa-śakti of the Lord that is capable of retaining the traces as seats and arousing the traces into objectification at its will. Cit, ānanda and icchā are the fundamental characters of the consciousness which constitute the vimarśa-śakti of the Lord. This Vimarśa aspect of the cit-śakti is the cause of manifestations. The traces lie within the consciousness and the arousal of the traces are for the pleasure of the cit. The cit is free to arouse the traces or manifests all that is within her at her pleasure and at her will which is unfettered. The Vimarśa is, therefore, the Svātantrya-Śakti. Just as the reflections are non-different from the mirror so also the traces or the will are non-different from the Absolute Consciousness. Hence there is no bheda and since there is no bheda the traditional problems of causality, being a relation between two kinds of real, does not arise. As the Pratyabhijñāhṛdayam says: "Cideva bhagabatī svacchasvatan-trarūpā tattadananata-jagadātmanā sphurati, - ityetāvaṭ paramārtho'yaṁ Kāryya-Kāraṇabhāvaḥ." It is redundant and unnecessary to suppose an unreal inexplicable ajñāna as distinct from the Brahman as the cause of the world. As the same source mentions: "citiḥ - iti ekavacanām deśā-kālādyanavacchinnatāmahidadhatō samastabhedavādānāmavāstavatāṁ
vyanakti. 'Svatantra'- śovdo bhahmavadavilaksnyamācakṣāṇah
cito māhesvaryasāratām brūte'.

The second sūtra of the
same text says 'Svecchayā svabhittau viśvamunmilayati.'

A separate upādāna is not required for the manifestation
of the world. There are not two substances related as cause
and effect, but the substance is one. The Saṭkārya-vāda is
retained but its logical pitfalls are avoided. The 'abhinna
nimittopādānakāraṇatva' of the Brahma-vādins is also retained
but it is not necessary to relegate the appearances to the
inexplicability of a Māyā which is bhāvarūpa ajñāna. The
Māyā is śakti, the essence of the Lord and is not a lower
Reality. Since the Vīmāra-śakti is the absolute freedom of
the Lord to evolve the world, there is no diminution of Rea-
lity. The 'I' is the 'All': 'my ideas', 'my dispositions'
are not different from myself. Hence, it is not that, I am
real and my ideas are unreal. Thus the Pratyabhijña corrects
the errors of the Sāmkhya-Vedāntins in its doctrine of mani-
festation.

In the context of manifestation the Universal Conscious-
ness has been compared with individual consciousness. In
the dream state of the individual the objects of dream are
one with the consciousness of the dreaming self and are
aroused from within the self. In case of the Universal Cons-
ciousness also the manifested and the manifestable are all
essentially one with the Universal Consciousness. The arousal
of the ideas depend on the will of the Universal Consciousness. So it is said "Svecchayā svabhittau Viśvam unmilayati". All action involves knowledge of what is to be evolved or what can be evolved. This knowledge again involves desire to evolve; so desire, knowledge and action are the principles of the vimarṣa-śakti responsible for all possible manifestations. In the context of the Universal Consciousness three stages have been indicated in the process of manifestation of the Universal Consciousness. In the state of anuttara the māyā manifestable and the manifested are absolutely non-different from the Universal Consciousness. It is the state of pure abheda. In the śiva state there is bhedābheda or the manifestable are slightly differentiated while retaining the original identity in essence. In the Maheśvara state the manifestable are slightly differentiated while retaining the original identity in essence. In the Maheśvara state the manifestable are clearly differentiated but not separated from the Universal Consciousness. All these three stages are in pure creation or śuddha-addhva and correspond to the three states of parāvāk, paśyanti and madhyamā. Thus in the Universal Consciousness abheda, bhedābheda and bheda are held as different relative stages of the same Reality. The externalization like the vaikhārī state of speech descend to the impure creation and here the original identity or unity is lost sight of and there is a clear duality.
The manifested and the manifestable, we have seen, are in essence the being of the Lord and are not in any way different from Him. The Lord is prakāśa and hence the manifestables are also of the nature of prakāśa (prakāśātmā prakāśya artha). The Vimarṣa is the power in the prakāśa, evolves the manifestable by a selection. The Lord as prakāśa-vimarṣāmaya is the ground as well as the consequent. Hence the question of establishing a relation of causation or production is immaterial.

(iii)

The ābhāsas, as we have seen, are all that is, all that can be, and all that will be; all that is experienced, all that is not experienced, all that is imagined. The principal ābhāsas are the jīvābhāsas or the sentient manifestations and jaḍābhāsas or the insentient manifestations. The Jīvas are the sentient manifestations and everything else is the jaḍābhāsa. In fact, there is virtually no qualitative difference between the different kinds of ābhāsas but the difference is only pragmatic. All the manifestations in concrete forms are collocations of some constituent ābhāsas. The constituent ābhāsas are more ultimate than the concrete forms. The ābhāsas are, in fact, the waves on the vast sea of the
Universal Consciousness. There is fundamentally the Consciousness. There are the different kinds of collocations of these constituent ābhāsas which make both the jīvas and the jādās. Some collocations are more active, more responsive than the others. The former are the jīvābhāsas while the latter are the jādābhāsas. The former has Nairmtlya, the capacity to receive reflection, so that when it rises facing the latter and receives the reflection of the same, the phenomenon of knowledge takes place.

The limited jīva is also an ābhāsa or collocation of a number of ābhāsas. Its self-hood is the self-hood of the Parama-Śiva or the Maheśvara Himself. The Sāmkhya considers the puruṣas as separate independent entities, self-complete and closed circles/the monads of Leibnitz. The Advaita considers the empirical selves as the Brahman-consciousness reflected on the antaḥkaraṇas which are the modes of ajñāna or Prakṛti. The finites in Sāmkhya have got complete independence and in Advaita a relative independence. But in Pratyā-bhijñā there are no reflections but the Universal Consciousness is the one self appearing in the form of ābhāsas. The finites are not the finites but are in essence the one infinite. The apparent independence and separateness is because of the tirodhāna or concealment of the Lord by His Māyā-śakti which in essence is the Vimarśa-śakti. Since all manifestations are the spontaneous sport...
of the Lord, the considerations related to the suppositions of independence, i.e., the concepts of virtue and vice, karma and karmaphala, freedom and necessity are all pragmatic and have no bearing on the Ultimate truth.

A jīva or a jīvābhāsa is nothing fixed or constant or unchanging. It is an avabhāsa or a series of ābhāsas in continuity. What is the 'I' or rather the empirical 'I'? It is continuously changing; this moment I am thinking in a way and the next moment I am thinking in a different way and with every momentary condition the so-called self of mine is in continuous change. I will, I feel, I imagine etc. are really the states of ideation, feeling, imagination etc. on the background of the Universal Consciousness and are due to different collocations in the different moments. This has an obvious similarity with the Buddhists' doctrine of momentariness of the self. Each ābhāsa remains the same; but the change is in the combinations. The Buddhists negated the Universal Consciousness which the pratyabhijñā posited. The ābhāsas are collocated differently in different moments. It may be said, therefore, that in fact, there is nothing as the finite consciousness or an independent jīva; but the only Consciousness that is infinite or the Śiva-consciousness concealing itself by Māyā-sakti in the collocations.

That which we call the finite consciousness or the jīva has two aspects, a permanent aspect and a transitory aspect.
According to Pratyabhijñā, the all-inclusive Universal Consciousness is the only self and there is nothing different from it. The permanent aspect of the self is the Maheśvara Consciousness which is one in all cases and not many or varied in the different jīvas. Everything that is deemed to be different from the Maheśvara Consciousness considered as self or the only knower, i.e., all experiences, conditions or states are ābhāsas. Thus our thoughts, affections, volitions, so-called objective experiences including even those which are termed as jaḍa are all ābhāsas or manifestations of the Universal Consciousness. Some of these manifestations are termed subjective and some are considered as objective. But this distinction between the subjective and the objective is valid only from the finite or empirical point of view. But in the ultimate analysis all these are essentially subjective in the context of the Maheśvara Consciousness. Actually there is no difference between the consciousness of this individual or that individual in the nirvikalpa state of knowledge. At this stage the consciousness is not individualized. In the subsequent moments the Maheśvara Consciousness becomes apparently individualized and combined with the other ābhāsas. All ābhāsas are, in fact, internal to the Maheśvara Consciousness and one with that. These are externalized or brought out according to His will. The Kartṛtvā-śakti as a form of the cit-śakti floats out the internal ābhāsas as external and certain combinations or collocations
of these ābhāsas constitute the jīva or finite knower and certain collocations constitute the known or the Jaḍābhāsa. This is the play of the Lord in the process of descent. The Mahēśvara Consciousness conceals its nature by the Māyā and becomes so to say the finite selves. For Advaita, the Brahman consciousness is also the same in all the finite jīvas, but it is qualified by the different antahkaraṇas which reflecting the light of the transcendent consciousness assumes the form of the jīva. The transcendent consciousness is the Supreme Truth according to Advaita and the individualized reflected consciousness appears to be different due to the difference of the antahkaraṇas. Thus, according to Advaita, the Brahman remains untouched by the manifestations which are the creations of Māyā or ajñānaparikalpita. As distinct from Advaita the transcendent consciousness itself by the play of Māyā becomes individualized or appear to be individualized in the different collocations which are its creations by the Māyā-śakti and not the product of an unspeakable ajñāna. So Mahēśvara remaining the same, the differences in the empirical selves are due to the differences in collocations of the ābhāsas. The ābhāsas as we have seen are externalization of the waves in the Mahēśvara Consciousness. The empiricals are, therefore, not false or subject to sublation in the state of liberation. The Lord Himself willingly blinds Himself by the power of Māyā and appears in the role of the empirical selves, the jīva or
the mâyândha pramâtâ. In the state of liberation the âbhâsas are not cancelled but the Mahâsvara Consciousness restores its original status as the Supreme self. The jīva is Mahâsvara not excluding the âbhâsas but including all these within His being. The idam is neither different from the aham, nor is cancelled, but it practically is reduced to aham. Such a state is called samâdhi or samâveśa or taking its position in the cit. The descent is the sport of the Lord or the Supreme Consciousness and the ascent is restoring its position as aham. The objection will be raised from the Advaita point of view that the consciousness thus subjecting itself to change is mutable. But the Pratyabhijñâ assumption is different. The consciousness for it is not a closed state of immutable stillness. The change is in the very heart of the consciousness and is its nature. The nature of a thing cannot be questioned. There is no answer to the question as to why fire burns. It is illegitimate to raise any further question in respect of the nature of a thing because that is its svarûpa or essence. Even then we can notice a difference between the empirical concept of change and the state of change experienced to the Supreme Consciousness as lîlā or sport. In respect of the empirical change it may be said that here the original state is lost and beyond recovery or redemption. Mahâsvara consciousness enjoys the sport of going out and coming in or recovery into its own transcendent state as the Supreme aham. The identity is
in respect of the Mahesvara Consciousness alone and not in respect of anything else. All sports, all creations, all varieties are due to the collocations of the ābhāsas. The states of memory, knowledge, differentiation and negation proceed from the Mahesvara Consciousness according to the collocations of the ābhāsas.

If all the manifestations are simply an externalization of the inner traces or contents of the Mahesvara Consciousness then how do we distinguish between the jīva and the jaḍa, the self and the not self or the subject and the object? This leads to the consideration of jaḍābhāsa. All the infinite manifestations are waves or the ābhāsas of the Universal Consciousness. Some are more active or responsive than the others. The more responsive or the more active ones are the subjective elements and the less active or comparatively less responsive ābhāsas are the jaḍābhāsas. A jaḍa or the so-called material object including all the kaṇcukas and the tattvas in the impure creations are also collocations of the waves or ābhāsas. The collocations are continuously changing from moment to moment and hence change is the law of things. A jar or a piece of cloth is also a collocation of momentary ābhāsas. Different people see these in different ways in different perspectives as different because the collocations are changing every moment according to the will of the Lord.
Thus exclusive separation of the subject and the object has been denied in Saiva Absolutism. To them knowledge could not be possible if the object was really different or cut off from the subject. In Vedānta philosophy, the two, the subject and the object, are quite opposite in nature like light and darkness. What constitutes empirical knowledge is the unwarranted mutuality of the two. But in Saivism, the two are regarded as identical in the integral unity of consciousness. This integral unity manifests itself as finite subject and object at the time of determinate knowledge. The determinate knowledge itself depends upon the interest, need and the analytical capacity of the knowing subject.

Yathāruci Yathārthitvāṁ yathāvyutpatti bhidyate/
ābhāsopyarthā ekasminnanusāmdhānasādhite//⁹

For example, the causal efficiency of a jewell depends upon the knowing capacity of the subject. It would be different in case of an ordinary farmer than in the case of an expert jeweller.

Thus each individual lives in a world of his own, a world consisting not of shadows and apparitions, as the Vivartavāda would have us believe, nor of the momentary creations of the beginningless vāsanā of the individual, as the subjectivism of the Vijñānavāda would represent it to be, but of Ābhāsas, the apparent objects of perception
or conception which have got a separate existence from himself. Of course, the world is not exclusively of his own, but it has much in common with similar worlds of others. These are the common elements which make possible all the worldly transactions that depend upon the co-operation of many.\footnote{10}
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