The problem of Reality or Absolute is one of the most crucial ontological problem that disturbs the mind of both the East and the West. The philosophers of the East had laid much stress on the problem. There it has been discussed from two different aspects, one is philosophical and the other is religious. The Śaiva approach develops mostly as a demand of religious consciousness, while the Vedantic approach is largely governed by philosophical awareness. The Absolute or Reality is regarded by the Śaivas not only as being conscious but also as the being which is at the same time self-conscious. Thus the possession of both being and consciousness constitute the essential nature of the Śaiva Absolute or Reality.

Of all the Śaiva sects Mahāpāśupata or the Nakulīśa Pāśupata is most probably the earliest. The Pāśupatas discussed with the five categories viz. Kāraṇa, Kārya, Yoga, Vidhi and Duṣṭkhānta. Of these, the first two, the
Kāraṇa and the Kārya are the two categories of Reality. The Kāraṇa is the Lord Śiva and the Kārya is constituted by pāsus which means the finite individuals. Śiva is one who is the creator, the helper and the destroyer of the Universe. Thus the entire universe created by the Lord is called Kārya.

The Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika theory of the relation between cause and effect centres round the idea of production. The effect is considered to be a product and the products or the objects produced in our-day-to-day experience require two factors viz. the instrumental or efficient cause or the nimitta-kāraṇa and the material cause or the upādāna-kāraṇa. The potter and his activities fall within the category of instrumental cause and the earth constitutes the material cause of the pot. The world which is a product also in the same manner requires the co-operation of the two kinds of cause viz. nimitta-kāraṇa or God and upādāna-kāraṇa or the atoms. But the Nyāya-Vaiśeṣikas hold that God is not the creator of the atoms, which are external to Him. But He creates the world out of the atoms according to the Law of Karma and adopts it to the merits and demerits of the individual souls. Thus they admit that the atoms of earth, water, fire and air are the material cause of the world, merits and demerits of the individual souls are its auxiliary cause and God is its efficient cause.

The Naiyāyikas and the Vaiśeṣikas were Śaivas and Pāśupatas. Hence in all probability, the Pāśupatas accepted
the Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika point of view. It is for this reason (probably) that Śāmkara in his commentary on Brahma-sūtra mentioned the Pāṣupatas as 'Īśvara-Kāraṇin' or those who consider God as the instrumental cause of the world. As for the material cause nothing is discussed in the Pāṣupata-sūtras. But it may be presumed from the developments and tendencies of the later Śaivas that the pluralistic or dualistic Śaiva cults implicitly lent their support to the Śāmkhya view of Prakṛti as the material cause without properly digesting or assimilating the doctrine to their own position.

The Śāmkhyas believe in the doctrine of Saṭkārya-Vāda, i.e. the view that the effect pre-exists in its material cause. They do not believe in God as the efficient cause of the world or the atoms as the material cause of the world. God in their view is said to be the eternal and immutable self. What is unchanging cannot be the active cause of anything. So the ultimate cause of the world is the eternal but ever-changing (pariṇāmā) prakṛti or matter. Prakṛti creates the world unconsciously for the good of the individual selves (puruṣas) in the same way in which the milk of the cow flows unconsciously through her udder for the nourishment of the calf. Thus Prakṛti is both the efficient and the material cause of the world. It requires saṁyoga or contact with the puruṣa to be moved to act. It is the first cause of all things and, therefore, has itself no cause. Prakṛti is a very subtle, mysterious and tremendous power which evolves and dissolves the world in cyclic order.
But the Pāśupatas differ somewhat from the atheistic Sāmkhyas. For Sāmkhya, prakṛti is the cause of the world, while the Pāśupatas regard Śiva as the cause of the world. Kaundinya says in his bhāṣya, 'anyeṣāṃ Pradhānādīni, asmākāṃ tadvyatirikto Bhagavān Īśvarah'. Thus the principles called pradhāna (or prakṛti) and puruṣas of the Sāmkhya are here in the Pāśupata system nothing but effects (paśus). Śiva, to them, is the ruler of all kinds of vidyā and the like, which are the means of virtue, wealth, happiness and is in absolute isolation from prakṛti and its effects. He is rather the ruler of them, the ruler of all conscious entities and unconscious elements. As God possesses the supreme lordship intrinsic to His nature, so He is called 'Īśvara'. He is the Lord of Brahma and other rulers and hence He is called the 'Supreme Lord'. He is the cause of the entire existence (sarvakāraṇakāraṇah). So it is said:

"Karmādinarapekṣastu sveccācārī yatohyayam/
Tataḥ Kāraṇataḥ Śāstre Sarvvakāraṇa Kāraṇaḥ/".

God is independent of all karmas and He acts according to His own sweet will; so He is called by the writer 'Sarva-Kāraṇa-Kāraṇa'. Thus the cause (God) in Pāśupata and the Śaiva is that which is independent (Svatantra) and the effect is that which is dependent. The Vidyā, Kalā and bound individual souls are effects. They are produced, maintained and dissolved in Him as the stars appear and disappear in the sky.
They abide in Him, and He is their abode, seat or substratum. The effects are the modifications of His powers and He exists in them by His volition and power as inexhaustible and immortal.

About the intermediate cause like potter in case of pot the Pāśupatas say that they are dependent causes. They depend on the Supreme Cause, God. They are inseparable from Him. Thus taking both these factors in view certain characteristics described in chapter II in Pāśupata-sūtra apply to Śiva. Of them, one is 'Kalitāsanaṁ'. This applies to both the Supreme Cause and the intermediate causes. Here the term 'āsana' means that which is the lordship of the Lord, His power, His excellence, His qualified existence and the equality of His essence with all the entities. But it is not of the nature of sitting postures like padmāsana etc. It is said so because it exists in this; or by this He exists in Kārya.

The nature of Supreme Cause has been described in the sūtra No.44 Ch.I as 'Bhavodbhava' (the source of creation). Here 'Bhava' means the created world – Vidyā, Kalā and Paśu. God (Supreme Cause) is the source of that 'bhava' and hence He is called 'Bhavodbhava'. According to Kaṇḍinya, the cause is that which produces, preserves and dissolves and the effect is that which is produced, preserved and dissolved. A number of characters have been ascribed to the Supreme Lord Śiva which are mostly theological in character with very little philosophical implication. For example, He has been described as Vāma (the best), Deva (the player), Jyeṣṭha (the Highest
Being), Rudra (the cause of fear) and Sarvakāmika (one with absolute will). Lord Śiva is called 'vāma' because He is endowed with the most excellent qualities and virtues and also because He is the supreme cause among the subordinate causes and because He is the cause of the virtues that generate liberation (Kārye sa eva Kāraṇāṁ paraṁ). Vāma is used in nine senses viz. a man, a flag, a horn, an arrow, an oblation, an ornament, a mark, the best and the simple-minded. He is called 'Deva' as He is endowed with the power of producing all effects by His mere volition and since He veils the knowledge of individual souls and binds them to embodied life, produces vidyā, Kalā and paśu and removes their nescience playfully. He is called 'Jyeṣṭha' because He is superior to the released and the aspirant souls, whose nature is controlled by Him, and whose desires for happiness, renunciation of desires and abiding in Him are controlled by Him, and also because His power of knowledge, power of action, power of lordship are eternal and greater than those of individual souls. He is the Highest Being and Higher than anybody else. He is called 'Rudra' because He unites the created beings with various types of actions and fear. Again God is also called 'Sarvakāmika'. The word 'Sarva' means all Kāryas beginning with vidyā. By the term 'Kāmika' we think of the triad - desirer, desire and the desired. God is the desirer. Desire is His will. The desired is the effect beginning with vidyā. God produces the (desired) effect with or without gradation at His sweet will.
Now the question may arise regarding the material cause of the world. God, we see in the Pāśupata school and the other Śaiva systems, is described as the efficient cause; then what is the material cause of the creation. Nothing is said clearly about it either in the first or in the second chapter of the 'Pāśupata-sūtraṁ'. The interpretation may be done indifferently either in the monistic line or in the pluralistic line. The Nyāya and the Vaiśeṣika lent their support to the Pāśupata and the Śaiva ways. But, to them, the atom performs the duty of material cause by which God can create the mundane objects. But in the Śaiva systems of the Pāśupata and the Siddhāntīns there is no reference of material cause. The Sāmkhya influence is also present in the systems. Hence the monistic interpretation would be far from probable. Śaṁkara's description of the Pāśupatas as 'Īśvara-Kāraṇin' and his criticism of the system also implies that the Pāśupatas and the Śaivas had a dualistic or pluralistic point of view. Śaṁkara's commentary on Brahma-sūtra (sūtra - 2/2/37) practically identifies the Pāśupata view with the Vaiśeṣika view. He further says, "Kecit tāvat Sāmkhya-yogavyapāśrayāḥ Kalpayanti-pradhānapuruṣayoradhiṣṭhātā Kevalam nimitta-Kāraṇam Īśvaraḥ". This also implies that the Pāśupatas were known to Śaṁkara as supporting either the Sāmkhya view of Prakṛti as the material cause or the Vaiśeṣika view of atomism. The Śaivas again accept the plurality of the individual souls. This also indicates that the Pāśupatas had a pluralistic or dualistic tendency regarding the material of cause.
But in this context a few remarks will not be out of place. The ancient Śaivism was more practical than theoretical laying emphasis on cāvyā or conduct and vidhi or regulations which would lead to the attainment of liberation or siddhi as the case may be. Hence a critical metaphysics or a deep analysis or dialectical arguments regarding the nature of Reality was not present there. Theology and ritualism played the most prominent part in the Śaiva ideas. But if we read between the lines of the Paśupata-Sūtra and other texts we find there a tendency which did not develop at that time. This tendency anticipates the monistic development that we find in the latest Śaiva and Śākta Schools.

The Paśupata-sūtra describes the Lord as the Supreme Cause and also as 'Bhavodbhava' i.e. the source of the world. The word 'cause' has been taken as absolutely independent. But it has been applied both to the supreme cause as well as to the relative and subordinate causes. In both cases the cause has been characterised as 'Kalitāsanam' or that which is immanent in the effects. The earth from which a pot is made is immanent in the pot. If this interpretation is applied to the Supreme Cause then we may reasonably say that the Paśupatas also had the idea of the Lord as immanent in the material cause, whether the material cause is different from the Lord, co-eternal with Him or is actually His body or the power. The concept of 'power' or 'Śakti' as the
material cause of the world has been developed in the later forms of Saiva and Sākta views. The future developments of the Saiva views are, therefore, anticipated in the earlier forms. Religion or ritualism remains incomplete without a suitable metaphysical basis. The ancient ācāryas were sādhakas formulating mainly, the ritualistic codes, they were not philosophers in the technical sense of the term. Glimpses of metaphysical ideas are, therefore, to be weeded out of their teachings.

The Pāṇḍūpata indicates the purpose of creation by the sūtra 'devasya'. Here the word 'deva' according to Kauṇḍinya, has been derived from the root 'divu' in the sense of playing. Play actually means unmotivated action and is the same as the concept of 'līlā'. Kauṇḍinya interprets the Lord as producing, changing and dissolving the effects which are vidyā, kalā and paśu playfully. The Lord is the Highest Being or Jyeṣṭha. He is also all-powerful and of unlimited will ('Sārvakāmika Ityācakṣate')⁷. He has been called 'Rudra'. He is said so because He unites the created world with fear. But Kauṇḍinya also says that 'Ruta' is synonymous with 'abhilāpa'. The word 'abhilāpa' has been used in subsequent Indian philosophy in different senses. It means either resolution or naming. The Bk-Sāhhitā indicates the word 'Rava' or 'Savda' which originates from the root 'ru' as synonymous with the manifestation of the universe.
Notice the word 'roravītī' in the second line of the above śloka. The root 'ru' means making sound. The other portion of the word 'rudra' which means 'dravaṇam' indicates dissolution. So the word 'rudra' may be interpreted as that which manifests as well as dissolves. The psychological element of fear is thus combined with the concept of manifestation in the word 'rudra'. The multiplicity is a matter of naming according to upaṇiṣad. The Vaiyākaraṇikas consider the eternal sound or 'sphota' or logos as identical with the Supreme Reality. As Bhartṛhari says:

''anādinidhanaṁ Brahma Śavdatattvaṁ tadaksaram''.

The later Śaivas identified 'parāvāk' or 'parānāda' with the Supreme Lord or Parama-Śiva. So the interpretation of the word 'rudra' is not to be taken only in the psychological sense of generating fear. Such psychological attitude of the ancient man has also been mentioned in the Vedic text. For example, we may mention the following statement:

''bhayādasyāgniṣṭapati bhayāttaṁpaṁsūryaḥ / bhayādindrasca vāyuṣca mṛtyurdhāvatipaṇcamaṁ''.

This indicates the subordination of the entire existence to the Lord and has also a metaphysical implication. The word 'abhilāpa' which Kauṇḍinya mentions as meaning of the root
'ru' in the word 'rudra' may, therefore, be interpreted as manifestation or naming or self-expression, self-positing or self-expansion of the Supreme Lord without any purpose, simply as a matter of play. The Lord is absolutely free from pain and is endowed with eternal bliss. So His creation is His unmotived action without accomplishing any purpose.

The next ontological concept of the Pāśupatas is paśu or the bound soul. This paśu is an effect. All effects are relative, non-eternal and subject to dissolution. But the soul cannot be said to be non-eternal or subject to dissolution. The Pāśupatas describe the characters of the liberated soul as sarvajña, akṣaya, ajaṅga and amara in the sutras I/22, 34, 35, 36. The word 'paśu', therefore, means not the transcendent soul but the bound soul i.e. the soul bound by the pāśas. The pāśas constitute the physical and Psychical associates of the finite soul. The Pāśas being dissolved the liberation has its beginning; but it has no end. The souls are, therefore, either associated with the Lord or are co-eternal with Him. Thus the Sāmkhya influence is found here. The Sāmkhya also advocates the multiplicity of the puruṣas or the souls. The puruṣa is associated with the body and the mind which are the products of prakṛti. The pāśas include not only the psycho-physical organs but also the Karmas and their effects. The pāśas being dissolved the soul acquires the powers of the Lord i.e. the independence of vision and action. As the Śaivas advocate the need for initiation or
dikṣā, for them the liberation is attained by the grace of Lord. The fruits of Karmas are not automatically attained as a necessary link between the cause and the effect. In case the Karmas automatically produce the fruits then according to the Pāṇḍūraṇas, the Lord cannot be said to be supremely independent. But He is the possessor of Supreme independence of will and action in respect of His creatures. The Karmas are done by the creatures. The fruits are bestowed by the Lord. Hence there is no necessary connection between the two. The pūrvapakṣins could say that in case there is no necessary link between the Karmas and their fruits then certain Karmas are to be held as fruitless, and certain fruits are to be presumed as without cause. This leads to the fallacy of ‘akṛtabhyāga’ and Kṛtapraṇāśa. But the Pāṇḍūraṇas argued that this objection is baseless. The substratum of Karma and adṛṣṭa i.e. dharma and adharma, is the finite soul. But the substratum of the power of creation and causation is the Supreme Lord. Thus the Pāṇḍūraṇas meet this argument by showing that Karma and creation or dispensation are the characteristics of two different sources. The locus of one is Jīva and of the other is Iśvara (Śiva). Hence there is no contradiction or inconsistency between the Karma of the Jīva and dispensation of the Lord. There would have been a necessary link between the action and the result, had the substrata of both these functions been one and identical. But this is not the case. The Karmas by themselves are non-conscious
and have no power to produce the result. The bestower of the fruits is Lord Himself who is absolutely independent in His will and action. Hence unless the Karmas are appreciated, approved and graced by the Lord, they would not lead to any result.

Again, there may be an objection. If the Karmas are not productive of fruits by themselves, why should a person take to such action. Knowing that all my efforts may be fruitless why should I have the desire or initiative or pravṛtti at all to perform duties. The Pāśupatas point out that such an argument is not also valid. The farmer knows that all his efforts may be frustrated by drought or flood or by the niggardly provisions of a step-motherly nature, yet he tills the land in the hope of getting a good harvest. The point is that man is to do his duties but he is also to wait for the grace of God for getting the result. If the Lord is pleased then he will get the result, otherwise not. Thus the ideas of grace is combined with the supreme sovereignty of the Lord. This is, however, a deviation from the traditional view of the necessary link between the cause and the effect. It is to be remembered that in the Vedic conception causation covers both moral and physical spheres or it may be said that the physical principle of causation is extended to the moral sphere or the physical causation has been subordinated to the moral causation. The Pāśupata view may be considered as plausible if the distinction between the moral
and the physical is considered as absolute. The law of causation has one meaning in the physical context but it may have a different import in moral context. The view is, therefore, not to be dismissed as meaningless; but is highly interesting from the theological point of view.

The effect character of the finite soul is based mainly on the dependence of the finite self on the Lord. The multiplicity or plurality of the finite selves obviously has a likeness with the Sāmkhya and Nyāya views. The traditional atheistic Sāmkhya has no scope to consider the relation of the finite with God. Every puruṣa is independent and transcendentally free. The bondage is due to its association with the Prakṛti. The Pāśupatas accepting the plurality, however, consider the finite souls as essentially dependent on the Lord. Hence the Pāśupata view need not be interpreted as absolutely pluralistic in the manner of Sāmkhya or NyāyaVaiśeṣika. Rather Rudra-Sāyujya or remaining associated or somehow connected with the Lord is the character of the liberated soul. In this sense it is a kind of qualified monism. The later developments of the Śaiva ontology point out that in the early period Śaivism could not show any settled view but was in a see-saw condition between monism and pluralism. The absolute independence of the souls would rob the Lord of His absolute sovereignty and would make Him conditioned. Hence the finite souls in liberation although
attain characters similar to those of the Lord yet are not in possession of the absolute powers of the Lord. The implications of this ontological position of the relation between God and the finite souls were fully worked out and steadily developed into a monistic position of the Pratyabhijñana school or the Vedāntic Śaivism.

The quality of the soul has been called knowledge or vidyā (paśugunaḥvidyā). Knowledge, for the Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika, is not an essential quality but is an accidental quality generated by the association of the soul with the manas and the senses. But in Pāṇḍūrata this knowledge is essential to the self. This vidyā or knowledge or the knowing power again is of two kinds, viz. of conscious nature (vodha-svabhāva) and of unconscious nature (avodha-svabhāva). Vidyā in its conscious nature is also described as citta or buddhi. The word 'Citta' is taken in Pāṇḍūrata in a different sense than in other systems of Indian philosophy viz. Sāṁkhya and Vedānta. In these systems citta is a function of the antaḥkaraṇa or the inner organ. Empirical knowledge, according to Sāṁkhya, is the modalization of prakṛti when it is illuminated by the light of consciousness. Hence it is not essentially a character of the transcendent soul. For Vedānta also citta is empirical and not knowledge as the essence of the soul. The citta is a function of the antaḥkaraṇa which causes remembrance or smaraṇa. It is a modalization of ajñāna reflecting the light of consciousness. But Pāṇḍūrata derived
the word 'Citta' from the word 'cit' which means knowledge or consciousness. The citta may, therefore, be called the essential quality or a function of the soul. It is also the way through which the finites relate themselves with the Lord. Just as the sun by its light reveals the objects, so also the citta reveals the objects to the finite soul (cetayati iti cittaṁ). This is the character of the vidyā in its conscious nature. Both discrimination (Viveka pravṛtti) and non-discrimination (aviveka pravṛtti) are the two-fold ways in which vidyā functions in its conscious character.

In its discriminative capacity or vidya in its conscious form manifests as means of valid knowledge or pramāṇa-jñāna. In its non-discriminative form it manifests as knowledge in the common-sense form which is not the pramāṇa-jñāna. Vidyā in its unconscious form is of the nature of dharma and adharma or merits and demerits which reside in the soul and are ultimately responsible for the bondage of the soul with the fetters reducing the finite to the status of paśu.\(^{11}\)

This vidyā is again an effect of which the Lord is the cause. Since vidyā reveals the nature of the real objects as pramāṇa here again we find the reflection of the Nyāya system which supports the pāśupata philosophy. For Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika also the objects are there independently of our knowledge, as padārthas or ontological entities. But they become object or viṣaya when revealed by knowledge or pramāṇa-jñāna. The difference here lies in the fact that
vidyā or knowledge of the Nyāya is an accidental quality but for Pāśupata is an inherent quality of the soul and also the fact that citta for the Nyāya is not equivalent to knowledge but is a function or form of the manas or the inner organ. As it is said:

''pramitiḥ saṃvit saṃcintanam saṃvodho vidyābhivyaktih./
pramātā puruṣah./
prameyāḥ kāryakāraṇādayāḥ pañca padārthāḥ./
pramāpayitā bhagavān.''

Valid knowledge is consciousness or thinking which is a manifestation of vidyā. The pramātā or the knower is the soul. Causes and effects are the prameyā or the objects of knowledge. It is also said:

''puruṣaścetano bhokta kṣetrajñāḥ pudgalojanaḥ /
anurvedo'sṛta sākṣi jīvātmā paribhuh paraḥ''

One peculiarity of the Pāśupata system is that the Kārya has been described here as eternal on the ground of the eternality of the Kāraṇa. The Kāraṇa is characterised by creation, grace and dissolution. The Kārya is created, graced and dissolved. Obviously the effect here is not to be taken in the ordinary sense of a fresh creation whenever it is manifested.

The dissolution also is not to be taken as absolute disappearance. If creation or utpāda made a new appearance
or is a fresh creation of that which was non-existent prior to its appearance such an effect could never be characterised as eternal or nitya. Similarly, if dissolution were also interpreted as absolute disappearance then also the effect could not be described as eternal on the ground of the eternity of the cause. As for Nyāya, Kārya is preceded by prior negation or is 'prāgbhāva pratiyogī'; similarly, dhvamsābhāva is also absolute disappearance. But it appears that Pāśupatas in this respect deviate clearly from the point of view of Nyāya and move towards the Sāmkhya and Vedānta view of Saṭ-Kārya-Vāda. It may be concluded that origination or creation for the Pāśupatas means manifestation or projection of that which was unmanifested, and dissolution or tirobhāva is concealment of that which was manifested in the body of the Lord.

Southern Śaivism goes deeper in regard to the problem of Reality. They accept three ontological categories—Pati, paśu and pāśa. The Ultimate Reality or Pati is Parama-Śiva who is immutable and eternal, and caitanya or śakti is inherent in Him. He is transcendent as well as immanent and absolutely pure. Consciousness or Citi-Śakti is of the nature of vision and activity (dṛk-kriyā-rūpaṃ). Vision includes knowledge, desire and effort. The distinction between pramātā and prameya is present in the stages of unevolved and evolved conditions of the Lord. In the transcendent stage
the Lord is both pramātā and prameya. The projection of the prameya and the distinction between the subject and the object is drawn consciously in the later evolved stages. All this is anticipated as the germs of the later Pratyabhijñā philosophy.

Consciousness for Vedānta is the essential character of Reality, and Brahman and consciousness are identical. Śaivism maintaining that consciousness is the essential quality of the Lord still retains a distinction between the possessor and the possessed i.e., Śiva and Śakti. There is thus abheda or identity as well as difference. The creation is a play of the Lord and is not unreal. Consciousness is not actionless but it is essentially active.

The existence of the Lord has been proved in the Nyāya manner. The entire universe is sāvayava or made of parts. A person cannot make a thing out of some materials without knowing every detail in respect of the materials (compare Mṛgendrāgama). The Lord knows the characters of the materials, the purpose of the finite selves, their enjoyment, the means of enjoyment as well as the ways for the fulfilment of these purposes. Hence without positing an omniscient Lord the creation or appearance of the World cannot be explained. This is practically the theistic proof adduced by Nyāya and accepted by Śaivism.
The materials are the whole energy of the Lord and the need of materials for evolution of the world does not mean the dependence of the Lord on the materials for the materials are in fact His body. So the conditions of dharma and adharma of the Jīvas do not impose any restriction on the Lord. He is absolutely sovereign. The Pāṇḍupatas maintain that the indifference of the Lord to the merits and demerits of the Jīvas constitutes the real meaning of His sovereignty. But for the Śaivas it is not so. The sovereignty of the Lord is not in any way affected by virtue of His dependence on the merits and demerits of the individuals. In common with the Vedānta, Śaivism argues that the indifference of the Lord to the merits and demerits of the finite soul would make Lord liable to the charges of cruelty and partiality.

**Different conceptions of the Lord or the Tattvas:**

The Śaivas have formulated various conceptions of Reality which are called the 'Tattvas'. These conceptions may be conceived as the different stages in the evolution of the Reality. But, in fact, these are not to be considered as the different stages in a cosmological or a temporal order. We may consider the same Reality from different points of view and these points of view may be innumerable. The tattvas may be said to be logico-metaphysical in character. In the Vedānta the same Reality has been considered as nirguṇa and saṃguṇa. The Advaitins consider the nirguṇa as a higher
stage and the sagunā as the lower stage. Others consider the sagunā character as ultimate, because there is logical inconsistency in characterising the same Reality as both nirguṇa and sagunā in the same breath. But the Śāivas do not find any difficulty in describing the different tattvas as all these tattvas are descriptions of the same Real from different angles of vision. The Vedāntins find a contradiction between the nirguṇa and sagunā. Hence for them one of these is to be accepted as ultimately real and the other is to be relegated to a lower point of view or is to be dismissed as a fiction. In the order of Śiva-tattvas there is no such contradiction. The difficulty lies in a confusion between the logical and the temporal orders. In fact every Tattva is equally real, for the rest are involved in it. We may emphasize this aspect or that aspect. This does not mean an exclusion of the one from the other. The non-temporal and purely logico-metaphysical concepts of Reality are to be found in the five pure concepts of Śuddha-adhvā or the Śuddha-Tattvas viz. Śiva-tattva, Śakti-tattva, Sadāśiva-tattva, Īśvara-tattva and Vidyā-tattva. Temporality comes in the asuddha-adhvā or the impure tattvas in the region of māyā and her creation. The pure tattvas, therefore, are to be considered not in the ordinary way of our viewing at things. We may rather say that the pure tattvas are different ways of looking at the Reality subspecieaeternitatis and the impure tattvas are conceptions subspecietemporis. We may consider these pure tattvas with a note on the Śaiva concept of consciousness or caitanya.
Consciousness, according to the Śaivas, is not actionless. If all activities actual or potential are excluded from the nature of Reality then practically the very nature of consciousness is negated and it is reduced to the level of dead materiality. The Naiyāyikas consider caitanya as an adventitious quality of the self either in infinite or finite. Consciousness for them arises where there is a contact of the self with mind, of the mind with the senses. Consciousness being thus negated as the essential nature of the self we find no distinction between the so-called unconscious pure substance and a piece of dead matter. Hence consciousness at least potentially must be admitted to be the essential character of the Ultimate Reality.

The Upanised says,

''na hi vijñāturvijñāteḥviparilopovidyate ....'\textsuperscript{14}

i.e., the knower is never deprived of knowing. The Advaita considers knowing to be an empirical process involving relation and therefore sullied by relativity. The Advaitins, therefore, consider the Ultimate Reality as devoid of the distinction between the knower and the known which is ultimately the essential element in knowledge. But here knowledge is considered from the empirical point of view. Transcendent knowledge in the finite self is obscured or veiled by the impurities of elements and hence is not self-manifested. The manifestation of knowledge depends on the mediation of buddhi or intellect.
and the manas. But the Ultimate Reality or Lord requires no such medium for the manifestation of His essence which is consciousness or knowledge. Compare in this connection the Jaina view of 'moti' which includes both perception and inference and is different from the Kevalajñāna. Kevalajñāna is self-manifested. The Śaivas consider consciousness as self-manifested and as transcendent knowledge. A distinction between the knower and the known in the empirical level involves relation and is vitiated by relativity. But at the transcendent stage the knower and the known may be identical. The Supreme Lord may be considered as Aham or Purnāhantā or the Supreme 'I' who is both the division of knower and the known. It is a non-relational level and hence there is no contradiction in considering the consciousness as being of the nature of vision and action. For the Lord, the vision itself is action, for the action is not physical. It is mere contemplation or ideal action which is saṃkalpa or Īkṣaṇa of the Sāmkhya view. So the Śaivas use the dictum 'Caitanyam dṛk-kriyā-rūpamjñāna-kriyā svabhāvam tattejaḥ Sāmbhavam jāyati'.

Now, consciousness thus considered as potentially is the source and the root cause of knowledge, desire, volition and action. In fact, these four words describe the same fact in the context of Ultimate Reality. The psychological distinctions, are, in fact, abstractions manipulated from our practical point of view.
In the Suddha-adhva the Supreme Reality or Lord Śiva or the Pati as is technically called has been conceived either as the logical ground of all these functions of consciousness or has been identical with the one or the other of these functions or as having the predominance of the function over other in the pure transcendent stage. The pure Tattvas considered in this way are not out and out theological but are logico-metaphysical in character. Theology has been woven out in the context of different metaphysical concepts. Therefore, the metaphysical value of Southern Śaivism should not be underestimated. As these have been worked out by those who had practical realization of the truth, these have assumed a theological character in the eye of the ordinary man. But the task of philosophy is to find out the real philosophical value of these conceptions which have been mixed up with ritualism.

The Ultimate Reality is Śiva or Pati who is absolutely independent, the cause as well as the ground of all existence. Southern Śaivism does not contribute to pure monism. Hence the finite souls are neither the manifestation nor identical with the Pati. They are, however, dependent on the Lord and are plural in number. As Bhoja-rāja says in his Tattva-Prakāśa 'tatra patiḥ Śiva uktaḥ paśavo hyaṇavōrthapāṇcakam pāśaḥ'.

The finites are dependent on the Lord for the attainment of their liberation. But the Lord is eternally free or anādimukta
capable of discharging five-fold functions viz. sr̥sti, sthiti, saṁhāra, tirobhāva and anugraha. He is cit-ghana or of the nature of pure consciousness, one, all-pervasive and the Lord of all existence. The Śaivas infer the existence of the creator from the nature of the created. The argument practically is the same as that of the Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika. The description of the Lord and His relation to the created is sometimes such as to imply a mere theological view of a theistic God. But the Āgamas describe the Lord in various ways from various points of view. The descriptions vary in implications from the ordinary concept of creator up to a concept similar to that of nirguṇa Brahman of the Vedānta. A question may be raised as to how the Lord who does not possess a body can be called a creator after the analogy of the potter making the pot. In reply it may be said that the contention is false because there is agency in the self's action on the body through a desire or a volition without having any body at all. When a soul impels its body to act, the impelled body cannot be an organ of the soul. Again another body cannot be the organ of a soul's action on its body, because it will lead to infinite regress. Similarly, God acts upon the material causes of earth and the like without a body, and produces them by His volition. Of course, it is said that He has a body made of the five kinds of mantras viz. aghora, sadyojāta, Īśāna, Vāmadeva and Taṭpuruṣa (tadvapuḥ pañcabhirmantraiḥ pañcaκṛtyopayogibhiḥ / Īśatātpuruṣāghoravāmādyairmastaκādimaditi)17.
Iśāna is His head, Taṭpuruṣa is His mouth, Aghora is His heart (hrdaya), Vāmadeva is His anus (guhya) and Sadyojāta is His leg. Such a description has a theological import but the āgamas deal with much deeper philosophical conceptions. For example, Vātula-tantra describes the three moments as niṣkala, niṣkala-sakala and sakala. Niṣkala is the transcendent stage in which all His Kalās or parts or organs or functions are concentrated within Him. Analysing from the side of experience it has been said that when all the elements, pure and impure, are merged in Him and remain there as the seed of all powers we have the niṣkala stage. In the niṣkala-sakala stage the merits and demerits of the Jīvas are in a dormant state without, however, causing any transformation in the being of the Lord. In this stage the concept of 'Bindu' or the concentrated energy and the virtual ground of māyā is brought in. When the Lord is a creator He is called 'Sakala'. "Mahesāḥ sakalaḥ bindu-māyopādāna-janita-tanu-karāṇādibhirātmānam yadā śuddhā-śuddha-bhogam prayacchati tada śiva-saṅgakah sa eva bhagavān sakala ityucyate",18. The consciousness or the caitanya is also Śakti or power of the Lord. This energy or power remains in the Lord in a state of indistinguishable unity. Consciousness or caitanya thus is not pure inaction as the Advaita Vedānta holds. But it is also Śakti. The word 'Cit-Śakti' is used to explain caitanya as Śakti or power. The Pauṣkaraṇgama considers Caitanya as of the essence of
vision and action (dṛk-kriyā-rūpaṃ). Kriyā implies a Kartā or agent. But the Kriyā is virtually grounded in knowledge as desire or icchā. When we do something we feel and know ourselves as the agent. Here knowledge, will and action are virtually one in three and three in one and cannot be distinguished from one another. In a psychological analysis we distinguish the three aspects. Caitanya or consciousness as power has all the three elements in an indistinguishable unity. Hence the Vātulatantra describes the power or Śakti as icchā or desire. "Śaktiriccheti vijñeyā .... yā parameśvarasya icchā sā śaktiritijñeyā, śaktestu jāyate śabdaḥ. Yat parameśvarasya jñānam tadeva śabdaḥ. śabdat jāyate vāgbhavaḥ. yā parameśvarasya kriyā sa tu vāgbhavaḥ." (Vātulatantra) 19.

We find here the will as the essence of consciousness, from will which may be called citi-śakti manifests knowledge and this knowledge involves the distinction between the knower and the known. Hence knowledge has been called Śavda or nāda. This knowledge is analogous to empirical knowledge or is meta-empirical knowledge involving distinction and is logically speaking a subordinate moment in the cit-śakti. The cit-śakti is concentrated in Bindu. According to Mātanga-Parameśvara-Tantra, the energy of Śiva is concentrated in Bindu. Bindu moves by the saṁkalpa of Śiva and from it māyā evolves. From māyā evolves the world.
A question may arise here that the Bindu being the cause of māyā is subject to transformation. If Bindu is the cause of the world-process how can the Lord be said to be the cause. In reply to this two points are to be noted. Firstly, Bindu or energy concentrated is indistinguishable from the Lord in essence and in the transcendent state. Hence to say that the world evolves from the Bindu is the same as to say the world evolves from Śiva. But if so, is not the Lord subject to transformation and in that case how can we explain the niṣkala or the transcendent nature of the Lord? Hence the next point in reply is that a part of Bindu is Śaśantatīta or unchangeable and a part of it is responsible for the evolution of māyā and the world. So the Lord is simultaneously transcendent as well as involved in creation. The transformation of Bindu as māyā and the world is a moment quite consistent with His nature as transcendent or beyond transformation. The waves are on the surface but the inexhaustible energy is in depth undisturbed. Thus the niṣkala and sakala stages are reconciled. This is an indication as to how the Śaivas reconcile the nirguṇa with the saguṇa aspect of Reality.

We may now discuss some aspects of the concept of Reality as expounded by Bhoja. Mādhavacārya in his 'Sarva-darśana-Saṃgraha' mentions the name of Bhoja who wrote a book named 'Tattva-prakāśikā' or Tattvapraकाशा among others. The name of Aghoraśivacārya, a commentator of Tattva-Prakāśikā, is
also mentioned. Aghorásivacārya quoting Mrgendra in his commentary on Tattva-prakāśa says, 'Caitanyam dīk-Kriyā-rūpaṃ iti cid evaḥ am deha-svarūpaṃ yasya sa ciddhānāḥ'.

Bhoja mentions cit as the essence of Śiva. Cit or consciousness is of the nature of absolute vision and action. Tattva-prakāśa further mentions the nature of Śiva as follows: 'citghana ekovyāpi nityaḥ satatoditaḥ; prabhuḥ śāntaḥ / ... jñāna-kriyā svabhāvam tattejaḥ sāmbhavam jayati / .... so'nādimukta eko viññeya pañcamantra-tanuḥ / pañcavidham tat-krtyam sṛṣṭiḥ sthiti-sāmhrīti tirobhāvah / tadvat anugraha Karaṇam proktam satatoditasya / ... śuddhāni pañcatattvānyā-dyanteṣu smaranti śivatattvam / śakti sadāśivatattve Isvāravidyākhyatattve ca ... / vyāpaka mekaṃ nityaṃ karaṇam akhilasya tattva-jātasya / jñāna-kriyā svabhāvam śivatattvam jagadāhurācāryaḥ '/'.

Pati or the Lord is absolutely sovereign in His function as cit. The five-fold functions are creation, maintenance, dissolution, concealment and grace. These five functions are done by the Lord with His energy or Śakti. It is the power of the Lord that manifests the entire world and all its functions. The Śakti or energy of the Lord is one and is indistinguishable from Him. It has diverse powers and functions. The Lord does not require any other instrument than His energy or Śakti. In that sense the Lord is the instrumental cause of the world. The energy produces māyā which is not the original form of energy. Taking māyā as the material

cause of the universe as well as an expression or product of the energy the whole energy has been described as Bindu-māyā or eternal energy whereas māyā alone is non-eternal.

"Kārya-bhede'pi māyādivan nāsyāḥ pariṇāma iti darśayati tasya jaḍa-dharmatvāt. adyām pradhānabhūtām samavetāṁ anena parigraha-śaktisvarūpam bindu-māyātamakaṁ apyasya bāhya-śakti- dvayam asti /", 22.

The substance of all this appears to be as follows:

The Lord and His energy are indistinguishable. The distinction is made in the context of manifestation. Inspite of the manifestation of the world the Lord remains above transformation and His energy is indissolubly dormant in Him. The energy being disturbed (kṣobha), concentrates into Bindu and from Bindu emerges māyā which is the material cause of the world. If this means any action on the part of the Lord it is an ideal action like the Īkṣaṇa of the Sāṁkhya puruṣa and not physical action. The Lord, therefore, in His ultimate nature does not come within the bounds of time, space and causation. Time itself being evolved from māyā, the Lord in His essential nature is above time and māyā. He is, therefore, beyond all determination.

Of the five functions of the Lord one is called ādāna or anugraha or grace. In various writings of the different texts it appears that the word 'anugraha' has been used in two senses. In the first instance it means conferment
of liberation. Again, the word 'anugraha' or grace has been used in a wider sense covering the entire field of the natural order of the universe. So 'grace' is here a general term. A distinction is made between the pure order and the impure order. The pure order is above māyā, but within the fold of Bindu; and all the categories in the pure order are of the nature of pure consciousness. These categories are Śiva, Śakti, Sadāśiva, Īśvara and Vidyā. The Lord is endowed with the power of knowledge and action. He is one, without a second, unrivalled, unexcelled, and the essence of all elements. He is all-pervasive, eternal and imperishable. He is the cause of all principles and is, therefore, different from individual soul and māyā. Hence Śiva-tattva is one, eternal and all-pervasive and is the cause of all principles and endowed with the power of knowledge and the power of action

\[(vyāpakamekaṁ nityam kāranam-akhilasya tattva-jātasya / jñāna-kriyā-svabhāvaṁ śiva-tattvam jagadāhurācāryāḥ //)\textsuperscript{23}.

The first awaking of God in order to create the world to bestow His grace on the conscious souls and the unconscious entities is called Śakti-tattva. It is not different or distinct from Śiva-tattva. God and His power are not different. It is by His power that He performs the five-fold functions mentioned above. This power is imagined or inferred from His action. When God's power of knowledge and power of action are in a state of equilibrium, they neither increase
nor decrease, Śiva-tattva becomes Sadāśiva-tattva (jñānakriyākhyāsaktayorutkarṣanikarṣayorabhāvena yah prasarastam prāhuḥ sadāśivākhyaṁ vudhāstatvaṁ //</sup>)<sup>24</sup>. In this state the power of volition (icchā-śakti) of the Lord predominates over His power of knowledge and action. He becomes absolutely pure and transparent. The Lord when with His power of action predominating over the power of knowledge, is the Īśvara-tattva. It is the creator of all principles (sarvārtha kartṛ sadā). But when, however, the power of knowledge predominates over the power of volition and action, it is called vidyā-tattva. It is pure knowledge and above all temporal order. It manifests all, being of the nature of knowledge (nyagbhavati kartṛ ṣaktirjñānākhyodrekamasnute yatra/tat tattvaṁ vidyākhyāṁ prakāśakaṁ jñānarūpatvāt //</sup>)<sup>25</sup>.

Actually all these tattvas are essentially identical with the Lord and are different names for the different aspects of the Lord. In reality the category of Śiva is identical all through. The different moments are only imaginary. There is only the category of Śiva, bristling with diverse powers, from which diverse distinctions can be made for intellectual appraisal.

It may be said that the world is of the nature of God. Śiva is the substratum cause; Śakti is modified into the world; Sadāśiva is the controller; Īśvara is the creator; and Śuddhavidyā is the manifestor. Śiva bestows His grace.
on all through these imagined different principles. The principal cause, i.e. if we apply the word cause which is responsible for the manifestation of both pure and impure orders of existence, is Bindu which is the unchangeable part of the Lord. In this concept we find the link between the eternal unchangeable status of the Lord and the temporal order of the manifestation. It is not in time, but is the seed of time; not in the world, but is the seed of the world, neither niṣkala nor sakala, but is niṣkala-sakala, or it might be said, it is a state of pure contemplation identical with the Lord, but not put into practice leading to multiplicity, the parāpara of the Triṣirobhairava.

From Bindu comes the māyā which is the source of the pure-impure and the impure categories. Māyā is one, eternal, pervasive, beginningless, endless and pure. It is one since there is no evidence for its manifoldness. It is eternal because it is not an effect, being without a material cause. It is rather the root cause or material of the world. It is pervasive since it permeates all its effects. It has no origin nor end and hence it is beginningless and endless. It is pure since it is devoid of sattva, rajas and tamas. It is subtle for it is imperceptible (Śaktaya iha-asya karaṇam māyopādānāmiṣyate suṣmā / ekā nityā vyāpīnayanādī-nidhanā śivā soktā //)²⁶.
The pure-impure categories sourced by māyā are kāla niyati, kalā, vidyā and rāga. Kāla is the principle of time which is a product. It is produced by God. The upper order is, therefore, above time. Thus time, in this conception, is both ideal and real. But it is neither ideal as the idealistic systems suppose nor eternally real principle as we find in the Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika schools. Niyati is generally translated as destiny. It is the principle of ordering the universe. We might say it is the seed of the physical and the moral order and is analogous to the Vedic conception to 'Ṛta'. Destiny determines causal relation. It makes specific causes produce specific effects. It also makes specific merits and demerits produce specific pleasures and pains, (niyamayati yena nikhilāṃ teṇeyāṃ niyatiruddhiṣṭa)²⁷.

Kalā is the principle of limited agency (paricchinnā kartṛṭva). The limited agency or freedom of the individual souls is due to this principle of Kalā. It attaches ānava mala to the bound souls, and manifests their limited agency. A bound soul pierced by Kalā-tattva can experience pleasures and pains, which is not possible without it. The principle of vidyā or knowledge is that by which the finite soul knows, understands and feels. Vidyā is of the nature of manifestation and can produce the apprehension of objects. It manifests buddhi. According to Sāmkhya, buddhi is the principle of knowledge of the puruṣa or the individual soul. But here,
in this theory, buddhi is a different principle. It comes to another series of the products of māyā. Buddhi is not self-illuminating, but Vidyā is self-illuminating which has been described as the Karaṇa of the finite soul. It may be said that vidyā is the link between puruṣa and the non-conscious (acit-rūpa) product of māyā. Vidyā is a power of the Lord and not the light of consciousness reflected on buddhi which is material. Buddhi belongs to the guṇa-tattva; but vidyā is a form of the energy of the Lord enact with Bindu-māyā. Rāga, in the general sense, is attachment but it is not a quality of buddhi. It, however, does not depend on the object to which the puruṣa is attached. It is the dormant force that is attached to puruṣa, and is the cause of puruṣa-pravṛtti. This pravṛtti belongs both to the soul that desires liberation as well as the souls that desire enjoyment. For Sāmkhya rāga is attachment to objects that are presented by the senses for the enjoyment of the same. The person desiring liberation must be free from rāga and dveṣa. But for Śāivāgama rāga is not that. It is the innate desire, unrelated to objects, in the individual soul. It remains as a mala in those enlightened souls who have not yet attained perfect Śivahood i.e., the Vidyeśvaras and Manteśvaras.

Bhoja proposes to put systematically the views of the āgamas. The two commentators viz. Śrikumāra and Aghoraśivacārya,
however, maintain somewhat different attitudes in their interpretations. Srikumāra with vedāntic bias has a tilt towards monism. But this tendency is negated by Aghorasivacārya.

As for the impure order or the products constituting the world, the āgamas mostly side with the Sāmkhyas with minor differences. The impure order is responsible for the bondage of the individual souls or the aṇus. The word 'aṇu' however, is not used in the āgama in the sense of atomic dimension as we find in Rāmānuja's view. But it simply indicates the finite and limited character of the souls. The limitation is not spatial but relates to power, function and agency. Māyā which is that portion of Lord's power or the changeable power of Bindu produces the non-conscious or the jaṭa elements and for that reason māyā has sometimes been called jaṭa. It is a pāśa or a fetter that binds the soul and distorts its vision. Māyā produces avyakta. From avyakta comes guṇatattvas. From guṇatattvas come buddhi and from that comes ahaṃkāra. From ahaṃkāra manas and the five organs of knowledge, the five organs of action and the five tanmātras emerge. From the tanmātras come the five gross matters. So the thirty-six principles are as follows:

Śiva-tattva, Sakti-tattva, Sadāśivatattva, Īśvara-tattva, Vidyā-tattva, kāla, niyati, vidyā, kalā, rāga, māyā, avyakta, guṇatattva, buddhi, ahaṃkāra, manas, pañca-jñānendriya, pañca-karmendriya, pañca-tanmātra, pañca-mahābhuta.
Of these the first five belong to the pure order, next five to pure-impure order and the remaining twenty-six belong to impure order. Avyakta is not exactly the same as Śāṃkhyā prakṛti, for it is produced and is not the underived source of the material world. Rather māyā may be said to be analogous to prakṛti as the source. But again like prakṛti avyakta has been said to be the container of the guṇas viz. Sattva, Rajas and Tamas. According to one interpretation, māyā and puruṣa have been included in the line of pure-impure categories. Māyā has also been said to be a pāśa. The five principles of kalā, rāga etc. are also said to be the products of māyā. The word 'māyā' has been used in the Śaivāgamas in a very wide sense. It is a manifestation of the power of the Lord which is practically the root cause of the world. While discussing the nature of pāśa it has been said that the power of the Lord or Śakti is responsible for the maintenance of the order of the universe (dharmānuvartana). It acts on the one hand as the material cause and on the other as a fetter or pāśa which is responsible for the bondage of the puruṣa (pāśaiti upacaryate). So māyā has the double functions. As the material cause of the impure world it may be called the tattva along with kalā, vidyā, rāga etc.

In fact, there are various ways of describing the principles or categories adopted by the different writers or commentators. Bhoja's Tattva-prakāśa proposes to summarise the teachings of some āgamas such as Mṛgendrāgama, Pouṣkarāgama etc. Hence the
commentators take their stand variously on the different āgamas in the statements of which there is no uniformity, as the philosophy of the āgamas did not properly crystallize into a cohesive and well-knit system as we find in case of the Pratyabhijñā or the Śaiva Monism. Puruṣa practically belongs to a different class and cannot quite consistently be described as a tattva of the pure-impure or the impure order. But in one interpretation of Bhoja it has been described as a tattva of the pure-impure order probably because of its association with the impurities of the world or as a paśu. The Śāmkhya categories have been adopted in the Śaivāgamas not exactly in the way of Śāmkhya but there are also differences in the description of these tattvas in different texts. Hence the number of the tattvas need not be taken in a very rigorous manner. In fact, the Śakti although is one has its various functions. We find in Tattva-prakāśa, "Tattvāṁ vastuta ekaṁ sivasaṁjñāṁ citraśaktiśatakhacitaṁ / Śaktivyāprtibhedat tasyaite kalpitābheddāḥ//". The Śakti also is one, but it has various functions and as such it is called by various names.

There are instances in some of the Śaivāgamas (such as, Mṛgendrāgama) in which the atomic view of the Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika has also been supported. But such instances are rare. The Lord is the instrumental cause of the world in the sense that the modification of His power is only an ideal action and does not
involve a real modification of the transcendent Lord. The difficulty is apparent and obvious. It is not pure monism, nor again pure pluralism. Ideal action on the part of the transcendent Lord may be said to be deviation from the unchangeable transcendent character of the Lord. The upādana kāraṇa is not the Lord Himself, but is a form of His Śakti which although involves modification yet does not affect the transcendent or niṣkala aspect of the Lord. The position is logically inexplicable and, therefore, is combatable by Vedānta which characterised the Śaiva as Īśvara-Kāraṇīn.

The Vīra Śaivism also deals with the nature of Reality which is called by Them 'Sthala'. The word 'Sthala' used by the Vīra Śaivas has two parts viz. 'Stha' and 'la'. 'Stha' means 'sthāna' and 'la' means 'laya'. It is the ultimate ground from which everything emerges and that to which everything returns after dissolution. This is practically the same as the upaniṣadic idea of Brahman. Here the aspect of Rudra is emphasized and He is equated with Brahman. The Lord is, on the one hand, the transcendent deity and the material cause of the universe on the other. Śiva and Śakti are sāmarasa being one in two and two in one. The Lord is called Parā-Śiva and His power is Parāśakti. Thus the 'Anubhava-sūtra' says: "śaktir apratima sākṣāt śivena sahadharmini / sākṣinī satyasampūrṇā nirvikalpā maheśvarī //!".29
Thus the energy or Śakti is an eternal adjunct qualifying the Reality and inseparable from it. It is two-fold, such as, cit-Śakti and acit-Śakti, there being virtually no difference between spirit and matter. Here also the question arises, if the Supreme Lord is transcendent and unchangeable how can He be the material cause of the universe. The reply given is that the Śakti becomes partially agitated and transforms itself into the manifested universe. There are some aspects of Śakti viz. cit and ānanda which are devoid of krama or succession, but there are other aspects of Śakti viz. icchā, jñāna and kriyā which are agitated. The upaniṣad also declares:

"Parāsyā Śaktirvividhaiva Śrūyate"30

Thus the supreme power has various forms and aspects. The Ultimate Śakti is called Sāntatīta. It is unchanged but the three Śaktis of icchā, jñāna and kriyā are subject to change. It is thus with the assistance of Śakti that Śiva Himself remaining unchanged appears in different forms. Strict logic cannot explain the reconciliation of the two aspects of transcendence and immanence. Hence, all forms of Śaivism have an element of mysticism.

The Siddhānta-śikhāmani considers Brahman as the identity of 'being', 'bliss' and 'consciousness'. It is in Him that the whole world of the conscious and the unconscious remains in a potential form and it is from Him that the whole world is manifested without the operation of any other instrument.
It is by the will of the Lord and out of His own joy that the world appears. But the Lord is not directly the instrumental cause. Hence the name 'mahesvarakararin' by which Śaṅkara describes some forms of Śaivism does not apply in case of the Vīra-Śaivas. Sometimes the description is such that it shows assemblance with the Advaita. Thus the following two Kārikās of Siddhanta-Sikhamani may be noted:

\[
\text{guna-trayātmikā śaktir brahma-niṣṭha-sanātani/}
\text{tad-vaiṣamyat samutpānā tasmin vastu-trayābhidhā/31}
\text{bhoktā bhojyaṃ prerayitā vastu-trayamidam smṛtam/}
\text{akhande brahma-caitanye kalpitam guṇa-bhedataḥ/32}
\]

In the former verse it is stated that the energy in the Lord being disturbed, the division arises. The expression 'guna-traya' reminds one of the writer's lining towards the Śāmkhya. Only the prakṛti of Śāmkhya is independent and here it is 'brahma-niṣṭha'. It is again similar to Rāmānuja's view also. But Rāmānuja does not subscribe to the view of 'Śamarasya' or homogeneity. Cit and acit are, for him, 'apṛthakasiddha' but are heterogeneous although existing as the adjectives of the Lord. As for the monistic Śaiva the Lord and His power are homogeneous but coexistent in a unity. Although sometimes described one as the qualifier of the other, yet the element of identity and unity is so predominant that the adjectivity is to be taken only as a mode of expression and not as real. But in the second verse the word 'Kalpita' suggests the relative unreality of 'bhoktā-bhoṣya' etc. The 'brahma-caitanya'
is said to be 'akhaṇḍa'. Thus there is a direct inclination to the Advaita view. To state 'brahma-caitanya' as 'akhaṇḍa' clearly shows that the Ultimate Reality is totally transcendent and all differentiation is relatively real. It is, therefore, clear that Vīra-Saivism is an eclectic school which combines the views of Āgamas, Sāmkhya and Vedānta.

The name given to the Ultimate Reality by the Vīra-Saivas is 'Śtala', the meaning of which we have already discussed. It is same as the Brahman of Vedānta and is of the nature of pure existence, consciousness and bliss. The Vedāntic absolutism passed beyond theism to the concept of 'nirguṇa Brahman' — the impersonal or the non-personal Reality. The Vīra-Saivism advocates theism as combined with absolutism. Hence, for them, this Ultimate Reality is pūrṇāhantā i.e., super-personal. It is the permanent ground of all existence and is endowed with powers or 'Śakti'. The supreme power of the Lord has various aspects. In the Upaniṣad also we find the statement 'Parāsyā Śaktir vividhaiva śrūyate'. But what exactly is the relation between the substance or Śiva and the Śakti? The Lord is pure cit. Hence the power is inherent in Him. The Śaivas used the word 'sāmarasya' to indicate the relation between the substance and power. It is practically an indissoluble unity indescribable in words. The manifested world for the Śaivas is not unreal and hence it must be posited as emanating from the basic substance. But the basic substance is not less than absolute and hence cannot
be taken as subject to transformation. Logically that which is beyond transformation cannot be said to have transformed itself into the manifested world. Hence the concept of Śakti has to be brought in; but the duality is to be avoided. The theistic absolutism goes beyond logic. The concept is supra-logical. It resembles the 'acintyabhedābheda-vāda' of the Vaiśñavas. Śakti as qualifying the Supreme Reality is Its eternal adjunct. The Parā-Siva has the Parā-Śakti or is 'Cidambara'. So the Anubhava-sūtra says:

'Saktir apratimā sāksāt śīvam sahadharmī' \textsuperscript{33}

The Śakti is inseparable from Śiva. The principal forms of Śakti are cit and acit. Substantially the two names represent the two aspects of the same fundamental power. For Rāmānuja, cit and acit are the two adjectives of the Lord. By 'cit' he means, the finite self and by 'acit' he means matter or prakṛti. Thus, for him, there are three padārthas—Īśvara, cit and acit (Īśvara-citacitceti padārtha tritayaṁ). But for the Vīra-Saivas the padārtha is one i.e. Śiva. Hence the Viśiṣṭadvaita of the Vīra-Saivas is more advaitic than that of Rāmānuja. The Viśeṣa is recognised as different from the Viśeṣya or the Lord. But for the Vīra-Saivas it is not recognised as different. The acit of Rāmānuja is matter in the Lord as His body; but the acit of the Vīra-Saivas is not like that. It is a secondary aspect of the supreme power or parāśakti and as such there is no fundamental distinction
between matter and spirit. The Śivāditya considers the relation between dharma and dharmi i.e. the Lord and His power as one of tādātmaya (Tādātmayaḥ anayor-nityaḥ dharmādharmi svabhāvataḥ)\(^3\) The word 'reflection' or 'prativimva' is also used in this connection. The cit-śakti is said to be brahmādharmanurūpa and the acit-śakti is considered to be its reflection or prativimva. Both are subtle or sukṣma. The concept of 'equilibrium' is also brought in. In the Ultimate Reality the power is also described as Vimarṣa. There is an equilibrium which is ultimately undisturbed and that is the ultimate position of the Supreme Self in which the power is Svasthā. There is, therefore, a state of Reality which is beyond Kārtṛtva or agency. But the Reality is not devoid of agency as in the concept of nirguṇa Brahman. But the agency is potential. Even when there is agency manifested, as for example in creation, the stillness of the ultimate ground is not disturbed. It is thus a conception which defies logic. We find in the Śaivāgama the concept of 'Bindu' or 'Bindumāyā' of which one part is unchangeable and the other part produces the world. So also here we find the agitation or 'Śakti-Kṣobha', which is responsible for the production of the 36 principles. The Lord is not wholly involved in creation and hence cannot be said to be the instrumental cause. But a part of His śakti is instrumental to the production of the manifested world. The surface shows waves but the depth is unruffled and calm. The sattvā or existence as the eternal unchanging background the cidānanda
aspect of the Śakti are without succession but the other aspects have succession. The clue is taken from the Upaniṣadīc statement 'Parāṣṭyaśaktirvividhaiva Śrūyate' of Śvetāsvatara. The logical contradiction between staticism and dynamism is solved in an alogical or supralogical way. We cannot but consider logic as a partial point of view. The riddle of Reality cannot be solved by logic. Hence pure absolutism has always been subject to attack by theism in all ages.

There is a partial agitation of the Śakti and this leads to differentiation of the Lord into liṅga and aṅga i.e., the Lord and the self or worshipped and the worshipper. This distinction is aupādhika and not fundamental. The upādhi is again not unreal as the Advaitins maintain and yet there is a suggestion that the upādhi is not ultimately real. But this is a suggestion only, which the Śaivas will not accept, as for them the world is real. The view is a kind of Realistic Idealism although both in its pluralistic and monistic forms. Liṅga and aṅga i.e., the Śiva and the jīva are differentiated like the mahākāśa and the ghatākāśa in the manner of Advaita. But the 'ghata' here which represents upādhi is a manifestation of Śakti and not of nescience or avidyā. Śripati Paṇḍit is an interpreter of Vedānta in the Śaiva manner and so he could not avoid the word 'avidyā' that shows his Vedāntic bias or inability to get rid of the pure advaitic concept in his interpretation of Śaivism by the texts of Vedānta.
We have already seen the fundamental distinction made by the Vedāntic thinkers in their interpretation of cit or consciousness. The source of both is no doubt the Upaniṣads. But yet the philosophical ideas as woven out of the Upaniṣadic thought are somewhat different. For Vedānta consciousness is actionless or niḥkriya, but for the Śaivas action or power is the inherent character of consciousness.

Just as the Sthala is bifurcated into liṅga and aṅga so also His power which is pure cit is also bifurcated. The power associated with liṅga is called 'Kalā' and that associated with aṅga is called 'bhakti'. The two are however not different as Anubhava-sūtra says: 'Sakti-bhaktyor na bheda'sti.'\(^{35}\) The two are like the downward and upward tendencies of the same force which may explain descent and ascent. Kalā or Śakti or Kalā-sakti has a downward tendency towards creation and bhakti has an upward tendency towards unification.

The Śaṭṭsthalaś are generally the six states of the liṅga corresponding to which, of course, there are six states of the aṅga. But the one side is a reflection or a by-product of the other side. The liṅga is identical with Śiva or the Sthala and it is three-fold viz. bhāva-liṅga, prāṇa-liṅga and iṣṭa-liṅga. The bhāva-liṅga is pure existence and is niḥkala. It is a conception of pure being which is above the comprehension of the mind and may be realized in pure intuition. Intuition
gives a totality undisturbed by thought. The mind works by
division. Intuition gives the original unity. So the original
unity is pure existence or śaṃmātra. The bhāva-liṅga is again
two-fold viz. mahāliṅga and prasāda-liṅga. The mahāliṅga with
cit-Śakti is the immeasurable, eternal unity, self-contained
and self-reflecting and this is known as Śiva-tattva. The
prasāda-liṅga is also called Sādākhya-tattva, the same bhāvliṅga
beyond all limitation given to jñāna as the ultimate ground
containing the manifested universe as potentiality or in a
seed form which is yet unmanifested. The two viz. mahāliṅga
and prasādaliṅga are the same original immeasurable unity
conceived as pure unity one as abstract and the other as con­
crete, one as without reference to subsequent manifestation
and the other as referring to the subsequent orders but yet
the original unity given concretely. The next form of liṅga
is prāṇa-liṅga given to thought or mind. It is also called
Śūkṣma-tattva. It is the cit aspect. It is both indeterminate
and determinate. It is unitary or above division but at the
same time infinitely divided i.e. both niṣkala and sakala.
Thought works by division and at the same time has its root
above division. The cit aspect or the caitanya or pure con­
sciousness contains the capability of division but is itself
undivided. It is one homogeneous totality and is niṣkala;
but the division is its play or ideal action or the vision
of multiplicity and hence it is also sakala not in the mani­
fested form or in reality but in ideality. The third form of
linga is called Iṣṭa-linga and is the ānanda aspect of the Lord. This aspect assumes the form of Iṣṭa or the Lord as worshipped or propitiated and fulfils the desires of the finite for liberation and freedom from pain. It is the sthūla-tattva or the Lord as actualized in the lower world. Each of these lingas are again divided as two-folds in association or combined with action of the six forms of the Śakti viz. Čit-Śakti, Parā-Śakti, Ādi-Śakti, Icchā-Śakti, Jñāna-Śakti and Kriyā-Śakti.

The bhāva-linga with Čit-Śakti assumes the form of mahā-linga. This is called Śiva-tattva. It is self-contained, self-illumined, the immeasurable ultimate unity given to intuition. The bhāvalinga with parā-śakti is called prasāda-linga or the Sādākhya-tattva. It is also nirupādhika and super-sensuous. It is difficult to understand in thought the distinction between these two aspects as they are both given in intuition. The conception of one appears to be as undefinable and without reference to the seed of development. The other may be conceived as containing the seed of development, but potentially.

The two forms of prāṇa-linga are cara-linga and Śiva-linga. These are given to thought. The cara-linga is the Lord with ādi-śakti. It is realized in mental concentration or mānasadhāna. It is the pure luminous puruṣa and is also known by the name ātman. The Śiva-linga is the Lord with icchā-śakti. It is the aham with one face (ekamukha) and shines with vidyākalās.
The Iśta-liṅga which is the ānanda aspect and has reference to the gross tattva assumes two forms. The first is guru-liṅga and the second is ācāra-liṅga. The Lord with jñāna-Śakti is the teacher from whom or from whose mouth flows the tantras. The other form of Iśta-liṅga i.e. the ācāra-liṅga is the form of the Lord with Kriyā-Śakti. His action confers renunciation or nivṛtti. The ācāra-liṅga has also been conceived to be the aspect in which the Lord holds all in the mind and draws every­thing towards Him.

The six forms of the Lord or liṅga or sthala are known as the ṣaṭ-sthalas. These ṣaṭ-sthalas are reflected in the six forms on the āṅga or the finite self. The finite is a reflec­tion of the infinite being substantially of the nature of the Lord. The two, the infinite and the finite, or the Lord and the Jīva are distinguished for their upādhis like the mahākāśa and ghatākāśa of Vedānta. The distinction in Vedānta is aupādhika or due to upādhis which have their origin in the ajñāna and hence are unreal. But here the upādhis being real the distinction is not one of pure identity but is one of identity-in-difference or bhedābheda.

Śripati Paṇḍit interpretes the Vedānta-sūtras in the foot­steps of Rāmānuja in his commentary known as Śrikarabhāṣya. The Paṇḍit was well-versed in Vedic learning and tried to found the Vīra Śaivism on the firm footing of the Upaniṣads.
He tries to combine the concept of Lord as a differenceless unity with the concept of difference in the order of creation. The Lord expands His energy in the order of creation and at the same time remains unchanged basically and in essence. The Advaitins put up against the view two criticisms in the same manner in which they object to the other forms of Vedāntism. Śripati gives a queer theory viz. That the Lord remains a differenceless unity before creation but assumes difference after creation. This makes the distinction a matter of temporal order. But such a conception is mythical and not logical. It is better to hold that the Lord is simultaneously differenceless as well as with differences from the two points of view. But to hold that the Lord was sitting in unity before creation and became many after creation is somewhat imper­vious to philosophical thought.
While throwing light on the nature of Reality or if we prefer the term, the Ultimate Reality which technically means the ultimate ground or cause or reason from which the manifold appearances of the world flow, it is also the task of every philosophy to explain the word 'appearances' with reference to its relation to their ultimate ground. If Reality or Ultimate Reality is worth the name its character must be such as to explain in a suitable manner the evolution of the manifold appearances of the world, for as it has been aptly said by a philosopher viz. F.H. Bradley that Reality appears in appearances. Philosophers have their independent ways of rendering an explanation of the world-show. The process has variously been either from the above to below or from the below to the above. The former is a case of descent and the latter is an explanation by ascent. As for those systems that have no such pre-supposition as God or those that do not lay absolute emphasis on any authority the task is easier. But for those who have religious bent of mind or those systems that have absolute reverence for some authority the task becomes difficult. The Upaniṣads, e.g., accepting Brahman as the Ultimate Reality
which is given in intuition or integral experience must show how the multiplicity of the world flows from the nature of Ultimate Reality. Although we find a logical and analytical attitude in case of some upaniṣadic texts as examplified in the mutual discussion of the teacher and the pupils, yet the realization in integral experience works as the basis of such analysis and obviously the whole trend of argument moves inevitably to the fact realized in a supralogical experience. There are others who proceed from below and gradually move upwards by way of finding out the common elements and the basic categories underlying the multiplicity of experience. We find such examples in the systems of Śāmkhya and the Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika. The heterodox systems also follow the same procedure. In their discussion nothing is seriously presupposed. The Nyāya-Vaiśeṣikas connect the world with God in a causal relation. The Śāmkhya takes for granted the facts of experience and starts from a broad division of the world of experience into the conscious and the non-conscious. The idealistic systems also follow another method which is logico-metaphysical in general. Here the criterion of Reality is first determined and then this criterion is applied to the various concepts. Non-contradiction as a criterion has been taken for granted as characterising the nature of Reality. By a process of dialectical reasoning the inconsistencies in the categories which lie at the root of the objects of
the world are pointed out. It is then concluded that the world-show is an appearance and all appearances logically pre-suppose a Reality as their basis. Then by an apriori reasoning the nature of Reality is ascertained and subsequently a theory of the relation between such a Reality and the appearances is worked out. This has been the method with Spinoza and Bradley in the West and with the Advaitins in the East. Philosophers are however absolutely free in adopting any method they like. Hence sometimes a combination of these different methods is also found in the systems of a good number of philosophers.

As we have already discussed, Saivism was primarily a religion and subsequently the philosophy proper, involved in their religious attitude has been developed. In modern period it has been accustomed to despise such an attitude as being the character of mediaeval philosophy which made philosophy a hand-maid of religion. But such an attitude of the period of enlightenment right from the ideas of Francis Bacon and Rene Descartes has not found much favour with the Indian philosophers. This is because the conception of philosophy in the East differs from that of the West. In their zeal for absolute independence of thought the Western philosophers have reduced philosophy to a mighty show of intellectual exercises paving the path for Scepticism and restlessness ignoring the deeper experiences of the human soul. The Orientalists do not consider reason or discursive thought
as the supreme ruler of human soul. Man does not live on logic alone. From the psychological point of view also logic or logical thinking is simply a partial aspect of our consciousness. Consciousness is not knowing alone; but it is willing and feeling also. The superficial field of our survey of consciousness has got an inexhaustible and vast source of its energy. The depth is much deeper than we can ordinarily imagine. The psychology of the unconscious developed by Adler, Jung and others have laid the foundation on a point of view much more profound than that of the superficial point of view of the logical thinkers. Ideas are not the supreme guide and prerogative to human life. There is an inscrutability, unpredictability and freedom in the element of will. William James and Henry Bargson have aptly directed our attention to this fact. The Orientalists further consider philosophy not to be a mere show of intellectual exercises but as a sure way for the realization of the basic worth or values of human existence. The supreme end of life is not to fight and argue but to set at rest the various forces that tear the mind into pieces and lead human existence to the abyss of continuous conflict and restlessness. Life is deeper, richer and much more profound than what it appears to be. It is profound and immeasurable. Philosophy is a vision and not a culture alone. If philosophy is not a vision of the truth, if it fails to put us in tune with Reality, if it cannot put the fighting forces of human nature at rest then it does not serve any
useful purpose for man. So every philosopher in the East has considered the prayojana or the necessity of a discussion before starting the discussion. The truth of religion is not a prejudice. The earliest forms of religion viz. Animism, Totemism etc. appear primitive because they are the expression of a primitive mind. But unmistakably they point to a deep craving in the human soul to found itself on a sure basis of Reality so that all its aspiration for reaching the deepest ground of existence can be satisfied. Religion is living and is not a fruitless culture of logic. It is meditation, realization, truth-seeing, truth-hearing and truth-being. Anything less than this cannot satisfy human aspiration. If God is truth we must become truth and not simply know it from outside; it is in this end in view that the Upaniṣads declare 'Brahmaveda Brahmaiva bhavati', 'tameva viditvā atimṛtyumeti'. Therefore religion which is meditation and 'being the truth' cannot be divorced from metaphysics. We shall be careful to keep these facts in our mind while discussing the subject-matter which we propose to take up in the sequel.

Coming to the philosophy of the Pāśupatas we feel it necessary to discuss first the Pāśupata view of cause and effect which will throw much light on the actual teachings of the Pāśupata system in respect of their view of the world in relation to the Lord. The chief characteristic of the cause
or the Supreme cause, according to the Pāśupatas, is independence or complete sovereignty (Svātantrya). The Lord in so far as He is the Supreme cause is absolutely independent or sovereign whereas the effects are all dependent. Intermediate causes are also admitted. But they are not independent. In view of the relation between the Lord and the world and also the status of the world the Pāśupata Sūtras 42 and 44 of the first chapter are significant. The sūtra 44 describes the Lord as 'bhavodbhavaḥ' in which the Lord is described as the supreme source of creation. The effects are Vidyā, Kalā and Paśu. Paśu means the bound soul. Vidyā is the quality of the bound souls inseparably associated with them and the Kalā means the insentient objects like Prakṛti, atom etc. The sūtra means that the effects evolve out of the Lord or are His manifestations. This implies that the materials of the world or the effects do not exist independently of the Lord like the Pradhāna of the Sāmkhya or the atoms of the Nyāya-Vaiśeṣikas. These are in His being. The creation is a sport or play of the Lord who is absolutely free and unfettered.

Śaṅkara describes the Pāśupatas as 'Īśvara-Kāraṇins' which suggests that according to the view the Lord is only the instrumental or efficient cause whereas the material cause is different from the Lord. Śaṅkara further says that some of the Pāśupatas accepted the Sāmkhya view of Prakṛti as material cause and some also were inclined towards the atomism of the Vaiśeṣikas. But the original Pāśupata Sūtras
as explained by Kauṇḍinya does not lend much support to this view. It might be that there were different sects among the Pāṣupatas who indifferently accepted various positions without a proper cohesion of these views. We shall see in the sequel that the expression 'Īśvara-Kāraṇin' may be explained in a slightly different way accepting the original position of the Pāṣupata Sūtras. We shall try to discuss first the relation between the cause and the effect in which we shall notice certain important features.

It is usually accepted that although the Supreme cause or the Ultimate cause is taken as eternal the effects are generally taken as non-eternal. But the Pāṣupata Sūtras consider both the cause and the effect as co-eternal. The cause is all-pervasive. The Sūtra 'Kalitāsanam' (Ch.2, Sutra 5) means that the cause is immanent in the effect. The Supreme Lord who is imperishable, is present in all the effects which evolve out of and also exist in His nature or power. This implies that the effects are nothing more than the arrangements and collocations of the elements that are in the Lord. The Lord being eternal, His nature or power is also eternal. There is no effect which is outside the nature or is not in the nature or is anything except in His nature and hence the effect in this interpretation is co-eternal. The Lord is the instrumental agent in the sense that He associates, preserves and dissociates these elements in particular collocation.
In this sense only the Lord can be said to be the instrumental cause consistently with the teaching of the sutras as explained by Kaundinya. The question is raised as to how the causal nature and the effect nature can co-exist. The answer given is that just as in turmeric water turmeric and water remain indissolubly mixed up together and no distinction can be made between the two so also the causal nature and the effect nature co-exist in the manifestations. Sutra 42, Ch.I 'Bhabe Bhabe Natibhabe' explains that the Lord is the cause and in Him exists the created world. The Lord comes into being or manifests Himself in all forms of the effects. The word 'Natibhabe' means the Lord does not exceed the world. The cause and the effect are thus co-eternal and co-existent. The view, however, sounds like Pantheism. But it is also said that the manifestation of the world is left to the will of the Lord who is supremely sovereign in this respect. From the temporal point of view the production, preservation and dissolution which means nothing more than the collocation, association and disassociation of the elements that are in the Lord are subject to time. But the entire world is lying in the nature of the Lord. There is nothing new, or nothing that was non-existent comes into being. This shows the Pashupatas are Satkaryavadin like the Samkhya. The question may be raised that although the elements may be entirely present in the Lord, are not their particular collocations subject to the transformation of time.
and hence non-eternal? The Pāśupatas are indifferent to this question as for them there is no time when the Lord is free from His play. He is termed as 'Deva' which comes from the root 'Divu' which means play. Kaṇḍinya further explains that the Lord is a player and this sportiveness or playful nature is His essential quality. The cause and the effect are also said to be in the relation of Vyāpaka and Vyāpya i.e. the pervader and the pervaded. The Sāṁkhya categories are admitted but they are all dependent on the Lord. Kaṇḍinya in further explaining the Sūtra 5. of Ch. 2 also says that the production means the attainment of Vṛtti or bodily functions (Dehendriyādiprāptiruṣṭiḥ). The dissolution means the cessation of function. A question arises as to whether the production and dissolution or the different conditions of the effect elements are according to any definite rule or are dependent on factors like the merits and demerits of the individuals. For the Naiyāyikas and the Vaiśeṣikas such actions are governed by the laws of adṛśta or dharmadharmā. But the Pāśupatas refuse to accept this view and maintain that the Lord is completely free and unfettered (Svecchācārī) in this respect. It is all His play and hence is not subject to any condition whatsoever (Sarvakāmika ityacakṣate)36.

Nothing much is said about kalā or the insentient object which constitutes the pāśa. Kalā includes the effects and the sense-organs. Earth, water, light, air and ether are effects and their qualities are as follows:
Sound is the quality of ether, sound and touch of air, sound, touch and colour are of light; sound, touch, colour, and taste belong to water and in addition to these the earth possesses the odour also. The five organs of action manas, buddhi and ahamkāra are also included in Kalā. The five organs of knowledge are also included. Citta or manas is a form of the cit or consciousness. It is an effect in the sense of a modification of cit and is not an adventitious product like the citta of Sāmkhya or Vedānta.

The Kalās again are put under two heads — the causal Kalās and the effect Kalās. Here the cause is not taken as absolutely independent, but as relatively independent and sources or material. The five organs of action, manas, buddhi and ahamkāra are the causal Kalās and the earth, water etc. and their qualities are the effect Kalās. The manas or citta is a quality of the finite soul and it manifests the object to the Jīva. It is called citta, for it makes one conscious of the object. This quality of making the Jīva conscious of the object is called vidyā which may be both discriminative and non-discriminative. Discriminative Vidyā is manifested as forms of valid cognition or pramāṇa-jñāna. This is the peculiar feature of human beings. But Vidyā as non-discriminative form or we might say as instinctive consciousness is common to both man and lower animals. The merits and demerits which lie implicit in the soul are also called non-discriminative
vidyā. The function of buddhi or intellect is ascertainment or decision (niścaya) and that of ahamkāra or ego-sense. The finite souls have this quality of vidyā inseparably (Paśuṅga vidyā). The Pāśupatas are realists as they admit both the conscious and the non-conscious elements existing in their own right but evolving out of the Lord who is 'bhavodbhava'.

The Southern Saivism or the Siddhāntī Saivas admit three padārthas viz. Pati, Paśu and Paśa. Pati is the name given to the Supreme Lord, Paśu means the finite souls and paśa includes the insentient objects. The Siddhāntīns accept the Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika arguments for proving the existence of the Lord. The Mrgendrāgama says:

"Sarvajñāḥ Sarvakartṛtvāt Sādhanāṅgafalaiḥ saha / yo yajjānāti kurute sa tadeveta susthitam"/37

One who is omniscient and omnipotent knows how to do things and is capable of doing the things concerned. This world is an effect like the pots etc. Hence there is a maker of this world who has always the material and also the power to make things out of these materials.

"Vivādādhyāsitaḥ sarvam buddhimāṃkarṭṭpurvvaḥ / Kāryyaṭvād āvayoh siddham kāryakumbhādikām yathā"/38

All these arguments are identical with those of Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika. Any effect is an effect in so far as it is Sāvayava or is a combination of parts. Here arises the question whether
the world can be said to be an effect or not. The answer given in these arguments is that the very fact that a thing is a combination of parts makes it an effect. All the objects of the world and even the entire world is a combination of elements. Hence the universe is an effect and must have been the work of a cause who is in possession of clear knowledge of the materials and has complete control over these materials. The individual is not his own maker, for in that case he could have been the ruler of his fortune. Descartes in the West also argues in his Meditations (Causal Argument): Had I been my own maker I could have conferred all perfections on me.

The Siddhāntīns differ from the Pāṇḍūpataś in that they consider the Lord as dependent on merits and demerits of the individuals in respect of his conferment of body and other objects to the soul. This does not however take away from the sovereignty and independence of the Lord. The agent does the work through his organs which are his own self or body. The king does his work with the help of his treasurer which does not deprive him of his independence. Dependence means an action done on the prerogative of another person and not in following a certain body of rules framed by the agent himself. Hence in depending on merits and demerits of the individual the Lord remains absolutely sovereign and independent. The Lord is endowed with power which manifests in the form
of māyā. Here the concept of 'māyā' is brought in as that from which everything is manifested and to which everything returns after dissolution. The word 'māyā' comes from the two roots 'mā' and 'ā' + 'yā'. Mā = that to which everything goes after dissolution, 'āyāti' means that out of which everything comes or evolves. Māyā is a power of the Lord and is in the Lord. In fact it is identical with the Lord. The Saurabheya Tantra says:

"Śaktirupeṇa Kāryyāni tallānāni mahākṣare /
vikṛtau vyaktimāyāti sā kāryyena kalādinā" 39

It is that power of the Lord which draws everything to the Lord in universal dissolution and puts forth the effects in creation. Māyā as the power of the Lord not only puts forth the products but also controls, determines and regulates their nature. The bodies, senses and other materials that bind the individual souls are called pāsās. The word 'māyā' is used in the sense of the pāsā itself as well as in the sense of a form of pāsā along with other forms.

"tāsāmaham varāśaktih sarvānugrāhikā śivā /
dharmānuvarttanādeva pāśa ityupacaryyat" 40

The word 'dharmānuvartana' means controlling the merits and demerits of the individuals and conferment of results according to them. The word 'dharma' here means the general nature and character of the laws of things. So pāśa is said to be an upacāya or the secondary meaning of māyā. The pāśa
is said to be of four forms, mala which conceals, rodha-śakti or that power which determines the special nature of an object enables it to discharge a particular function and debars it from discharging other functions, Karma or the product and māyā.

''pravṛtisō valam karma māyākāryyaḥ caturvṛtīdaḥ / pāśajālam samāsena dharmānamnaiva kīrtitāh''/41

In some of the texts 'Bindu' is said to be another form of pāśā. As we have already seen the power of the Lord being disturbed contracts as Bindu, this Bindu has an unchangeable and a changeable nature. Māyā may be said to be the changeable part of Bindu which is responsible for evolving and dissolving the world and is linked between the world and the Lord.

The other pāśā is said to be mala. It is the covering aspect of the Lord. It has been described by the words 'pravṛti' and 'Īśā'. It is called 'pravṛti' because it covers or veils and it is called 'Īśā' because it has got the power to function by itself. The natural powers of the self are vision and action. These are, in fact, unlimited. But the finite self is always under limitation in respect of these powers. This limitation is imposed by the mala. The analogy, that is taken to explain the nature of mala is that of the husk that covers the white rice within or that of black spot on copper. The inside is quite all right and if free from the covering material will shine as infinite vision and power of
action. This indicates that the self is essentially of the same nature as the Lord and its limitations are due to karma or action of the individual which is another form of pāśa or fetter. Karma is the action performed by the person who desires fruits of it. It is of the nature of dharmadharma i.e. Karma which produces dharma and adharma or virtue and vice. The limited karma of the jīva is also anādi like that of mala. If karma is not anādi, its variety cannot be proved. So it is said:

''yathānādi malastasya karmālpakamanādikam / yadyanādi na samsiddham vaicitryaṁ kena hetunā''//42

The last form of the pāśa is vala or rodha-śakti. It is secondarily called pāśa because though mala is separate, yet the power in mala covers the power of vision and action according to the nature of mala.

The concept of 'māyā' here again is different from the Sāmkhya concept of 'Prakṛti'. The Sāmkhya prakṛti is independent. But the māyā is dependent. It is the power of the Lord. In Śaivism of all forms the Lord and His power are not considered as separate. They constitute one reality and the matter is one of emphasis on this side or that side. The later Śaivism, however, makes a subtle difference between the two, but considers them as homogeneous (Sāmarasa). The difference appears to be a matter of concept. The Śāktādvaita considers them
identical. The difference is one of emphasis. The Lord in action with His power has been called the Śiva-tattva.

The first product of māyā is kalā which imposes limitation on the powers of action and knowledge. The finite self which essentially is of the nature of the Lord considers itself as finite and limited and is not aware of its infinitude under the influence of kalā. The second transformation of māyā is kāla or time principle. The original vision of the Lord is an eternal here and now not divided into the past, present and future. This distinction is the essence of kāla or the time principle. Hence the Lord is above time. Time here may be interpreted as both realistically and idealistically. Realistically it is a product of māyā and idealistically it is a function of the māyā limiting the vision of the individual to a group of substance and their function at a point of time. The Nyāya concept of time is that of an independent reality and hence is different from the Śaiva concept. The next function of māyā is niyati, which imposes limitation in respect of space. It is different from different individual and is manifold. The time principle is one but the rules of time are different from every individual and it imposes the Law of karma on each finite severally. The other transformation of māyā is called vidyā which is also called by the name 'citta' which is a quality of the pasū or the finite self. The function of citta gives rise to
attachment or rāga. The next product of māyā is prakṛti and her products or the guṇas. Hence prakṛti, according to Śaivism, is not the equilibrium of the guṇas but is a distinct product of māyā which by itself gives rise to the guṇas. So these seven forms which are direct transformations of māyā are kalā, kāla, niyati, vidyā, rāga, prakṛti and the guṇas. These are the seven tattvas. The other twenty three tattvas are ahaṃkāra or the ego-sense, manas, buddhi, the five tanmātras, the five organs of knowledge, the five organs of action and the five forms of gross matter. They constitute the thirty tattvas of the Śaivas which are associated with each of the finite selves.

A distinction is drawn between the gross body and the subtle body. The subtle body which is called the puruṣaṣṭaka is constituted by the thirty tattvas, according to Aghora Śivācārya. It is to be noted here that the five gross matters are not the gross matters of the Saṃkhya nor are the tanmātras the subtle matters. The tanmātras are essences and the five gross matters are not the five-fold combinations, nor the results of five-fold combinations but independent forms evolving out of the tanmātras. If this conclusion is not accepted, we cannot explain the 30th tattvas as constituting the puruṣaṣṭakas or the subtle body which is said to be transmigrating as a result of Karma after death or the destruction of gross material body. The gross material body of flesh and blood is
not, therefore, the same as the body constituted by the five gross matters but are further transformations of these gross matters. On this point the Śaivas differ from both Śāmkhya and Vedānta. The purṇyaṣṭaka continues till the attainment of liberation in which stage only it is destroyed by the grace of the Lord.

We have already touched the orders of the Tattvas, pure and impure, briefly. We may now consider again the pure tattvas in greater details. These are called the tattvas or the principles of Reality and have been continued in the latest form of Śaivism with different interpretations. The germs of later Śaivism are all present in the Siddhāṇtas in rudimentary form. But there is a continuity of the Śaiva thoughts and these have been developed in much greater details in the later Śaivism. It is said that the Lord is the agent in the pure order and His deputy is the agent in the impure order. This interpretation is mythical and theological, but its philosophical implication has been brought out in later Śaivism with full details.

The five tattvas of the pure order are Śivatattva, Śakti-tattva, Sadāsiva-tattva, Īśvara-tattva and Vidyātattva. The supreme principle is the Śiva-tattva. The other tattvas are but the different forms of this one Supreme principle i.e., the one principle has been described by different names according to functional differences. The Śiva-tattva is transcendent
but personal. The later Śaivism indicates that the Supreme Reality is supra-personal in the sense that it is beyond the ordinary concepts of personality and impersonality or saguṇa and nirguṇa. The Siddhāntīns have not gone so far in their analysis. As such it is theistic but not strictly absolutistic. The Śiva-tattva or the Supreme Reality or the ultimate cause or ground is called anādimukta and is different from the finite souls which are once in bondage and then released. The Śiva-tattva is consciousness, unity, all-pervasiveness and eternity as Tattva-prakāśa says, 'cidghana ekovyāpi nityaḥsatatodita; prabhuḥ śāntah.'\(^{43}\) Discharging the five functions of Sṛṣṭi, Sthiti, Saṃhāra, tirodhāna and anugraha, this consciousness is not, however, the absolute actionless.

It is but the form of knowledge and action (Jñāna-kriyā svabhāva). We have seen that the Śiva-tattva is transcendent but it is not so in the absolutistic sense. In the absolutistic sense pure transcendence is beyond immanence and also remains untouched by immanence. But in the theistic sense this transcendence may be interpreted in a slightly different manner i.e., in the sense of all-pervasiveness as cause. But cause and effect are not identical and in this sense it is transcendence. So, the word 'Vyāpi' or all-pervasiveness and 'Satatodita' or omnipresence have been used indicating an interpretation of the still higher sense or transcendence which is implied. The implications have deep philosophical significance which have been worked out in later Śaivism.
Kāla or the time principle has been said to be the product but it appears that the concept of kāla has not been divorced from and transcendent in the concept of Śiva-tattva. It is not, however, easy to have a very clear idea of Lord as beyond time as the human mind is so inter-woven with the notion of time that it cannot intellectually transcend time. So far we go, the tinge of time will remain there and we shall interpret the eternity not as pure timelessness but as comprehending past, present and future. The eternal here and now does not involve division. But the pervasiveness involves the division although comprehended together. Anyway the Śiva-tattva of the Siddhāntīns is the supreme principle and is not an aspect of a still higher principle as is found in later Śaivism. So the five-fold functions are attributed to Śiva-tattva. What then is the meaning of Śakti-tattva? Is there any duality? It is very difficult to answer such question. Yet it may be said that there is no duality, as it is said, "Śaktiśivau vasvaikyaṁ maniprabhābaṁ". It is so to say non-distinct from the world. The Tattva-prakāśa says, "cidacidanugrahahetorasya sīrṣkṣo yarādyauṁmeṣaḥ". Hence the Śakti-tattva is not fundamentally different from Śiva-tattva but is identical, yet conceived differently by our intellect. Consciousness in the form of knowledge and action is a power of the Lord bereft of which Lord would not be the Lord. So we might say the Śakti is the essence of the Lord not really distinct, but considered
distinctly. It is the same Śiva-tattva considered as active as the Upaniṣad says, "parāsyā śaktirvividhaiva śrūyate svābhāvikī jñānabalakriya ca". It is 'Śvābhāvikī' as it is the essential nature of the Lord and the essence of the thing cannot be differentiated. It also contains immense potentialities as we have seen in the context of māyā that the supreme power has been called Śiva. The Supreme Reality is considered as both masculine and feminine. Considered as masculine it is Śiva or Śiva-tattva and considered as feminine it is Śakti or Śakti-tattva. The magical power or the māyā is in the Lord and it is also a way of describing the function of the Lord. It is not, therefore, a heterogeneous principle but is homogeneous with the Lord.

The third principle or tattva is Sadāśiva-tattva. It is a state of Śiva when there is no predominancy of either the power of knowledge or the power of action. It is a state of equilibrium (Śāmyabasthā). The Lord's power of volition (Icchā-śakti) only becomes dominant and it predominates over the power of knowledge and action. In this state of Sadāśiva all the powers of Lord which are the modifications of His supreme power remain folded and the creation or līlā becomes stopped. Śiva becomes Sadāśiva at the time of absolute extinction (pralaya) of the world and all the world of things and beings come to merge in Him. It happens by the will-power of the Lord which predominates at that time. This equipoise may
be compared to the activity of the spider as mentioned in the Upaniṣads. The spider creates its net by the help of the material produced out of its own body and when it wishes, it folds it up into itself. Similarly, the Lord (Śiva) also folds up all His powers and productions deliberately into Him. No duality remains there at that time. It is sāmarasya or sāmyābasthā. The state, of course, is not absolutely equal with the Sāmyābasthā of the Sāmkhya prakṛti, when the three guṇas are there in a state of equilibrium and all the modifications of Prakṛti remain stopped. According to Sāmkhya, no power prevails in prakṛti at that time as it loses the contact of puruṣa and itself is jaḍa in nature. But to the Śaivas the power of volition prevails there in the Śiva and all the other powers are in the equipoise. To them it is a state absolutely pure and transparent.

Śiva-tattva becomes Īśvara-tattva when His power of action predominates over His power of knowledge and volition, which are in a state of equilibrium. In this state the Lord is the creator of all principles. He creates everything and sustains them. But the creation always requires the material for the work. What is the material then? The answer has already been given that it is His power or Śakti that provides the material cause of creation. The Lord in the Īśvara-tattva creates the world and the finite things and beings by using His own power (Śakti). It may be objected that the Lord's power of action cannot act when His power of knowledge and
power of volition are in equipoise; because action depends upon antecedent knowledge and volition. But this contention is not correct. To answer this it may be said that the Lord's power of knowledge and power of volition manifest their objects and exist in an inactive state. The theory, of course, opposes to the theory of Advaita Vedanta. The Advaitins hold, Brahman being nirguna cannot be active, as action indicates change; but Brahman is beyond any change or transformation. It is the Saguna Brahman that creates and sustains the world. But it is true to the Vyavaharika point of view, but mithyā or ajñāna from the pāramārthika view point. But the Śaivas do not hold any such gradation of truth. To them what is real is real from every angle of vision. The creation of the Lord is also as real as the existence of the Lord Himself. Thus they advocate Saṭkhyaāti-vāda as opposed to the Anirvacanīya-khyātivāda of the Advaitins.

The Lord considered in the context of knowledge and manifestation is called vidyā-tattva. Here the power of knowledge is considered as predominant, but it is not in action. It is a simple manifestation and is the source of the manifestation of all objects. With this power the Lord knows Himself as one in all and all in one. The world of manifold objects is not differentiated.

These five principles are called pure orders while the world is in the impure order. While the impure order is the
product of māyā, the pure order is in the region of Mahāmāyā. Thus a distinction is made between the higher māyā or mahāmāyā and the lower māyā which is the source of kāla, rāga, niyati etc. Such liberated souls as Vidyeśvaras and Mantreśvaras share the vision of Śiva i.e., the vision of all one; while the lower beings or selves infested with mala, kārma, māyā, do not realise nor have the vision of this total unity. That is why the lower order which is the product of māyā is called the impure order or the aśuddha-adhvā.

We may compare in this connection the distinction between the parā-prakṛti and the aparā-prakṛti as expounded in the Gītā. The parā is the vision of unity and that by which the Lord Himself manifests as finite selves. The speciality lies in this fact that in this vision the selves are not absolutely separated in vision and action but are in the Lord, in the vision of the Lord and each is a reflection of the Lord in eternal conjunction with Him. The aparā is the source of the insentient world which is called 'pāsa' in the Śaiva terminology. As the Gītā says the five material principles and the manas, buddhi and ahamkāra are the manifestation of aparā-prakṛti. These roughly describe the pāsas that bind the pure souls and blind their visions.

One point may be touched in this connection. We have already discussed the concepts of niḥkala, sakala and niḥkala-
sakala. Kalā means a part. The Lord is said to be niṣkala when all the kalās or parts i.e., the elements of the world of manifold objects are not yet manifested; but are in Him in seed-form and in indistinguishable unity. This may be compared to the Śāmkhya conception of Prakṛti or to the Vedānta concept of māyā as jagatbīja. This is the causal form of the Lord. Prakṛti or māyā is not sentient but is insentient. The seed of the world of insentient objects is not according to Śaiva a separate principle distinct from the Lord but is ultimately the Lord Himself holding His power or prārti within Himself. The niṣkala is not the nirguṇa, as the nirguṇa of Vedānta is neither the effect nor the cause. It is the cause which has not yet burst into the effect. The 1akala is the Lord when burst into effect and the manifold have come forth. It should be remembered that the word 'Sakala' is used in the context of the Lord and not in the context of the world. The world and the Lord being related, the Śaiva view may be said to be a dvaitādvaita or bhedābheda or a kind of viśiṣṭādvaita. But it is different from the Rāmānuja form of viśiṣṭādvaita in which the selves and the world are adjuncts to the Lord and in which the selves and the world are eternally co-exist with the Lord. For the Śaivas the world and the selves are products or manifestations. The world is the product of māyā which is put forth by the Lord from within Himself. The selves are His manifestations
or are essentially of His nature inseparably associated with Him but are not His adjuncts. The niṣkala-sakala is an intermediate state connecting the causal state and the effect state. All the three conditions of niṣkala, niṣkala-sakala and the sakala may be said to be the states of one saguṇa Brahma. The Vedântic concept of nirguṇa is a different concept.
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