CHAPTER - II

Earlier Concepts of Ātman and Duhkhānta

(i)

The key note of Indian Philosophy is 'Know thyself' (ātmānam biddhi). But what is this self or ātman? In regard to this question the whole Indian sea is turbulent. Not only the Indian but the Western Ocean is also agitated in this regard. The body is just like the wave, appears and disappears, and is subject to birth and decay in the 'dark unfathomed caves of ocean'. What then exists to keep up the passage between life and death? Why a man is the same person though there is a good deal of change in his mind and body? How can I be the same I as I was in my boyhood and youth? So all the philosophers, especially the Indians, search for a self to account for a unity underlying all the changes of body and mind and try to explain the riddle. To them, body appears and disappears, continues and decays, but the self remains unchanged even in all the changes and modifications. The waves rise and fall, the bubbles too, but the sea remains quite serene in its own depth; so also our self, undergoes no change, death or decay inspite of the change of body at every moment. The Gītā, therefore, preaches—
"na jāyate mriyate vā kadācinṇāyaṃ
bhūtvā bhavitā vā na bhuyaḥ /
ajo nityaḥ śāśvato'yaṃ purāṇo
na hanyate hanyamāne śarīre //¹

It also says,

"nainam Chindanti sastrani nainam dahati pāvakah/
na cainam kledayantyāpo na śoṣayati mārutah //²

The self cannot be slain with sword, burnt with fire, drenched in water, or dried up by air.

For the Upaniṣads the self is the only reality, the world is a show or appearance and all our indulgences in the mundane objects are in vain. So in order to be liberated we must have to get rid of the ignorance and have a good understanding of what is self and not-self. The Upaniṣad, therefore, declares:

"tameva viditvā' ti mṛtyumeti nānyaḥ panthā vidyate'yanāya'.³

So the discussion of the nature of self is quite consistent with their discussion of the theory of Reality (God) and the world of manifold appearances.

Now the question is : What is the nature of this self? Here also the Indian Philosophers cannot come to a unanimous conclusion. So while the Orthodox systems believing in the existence of self have given different opinions, the heterodox systems also without believing it have put their different opinions and thus created a whirlwind regarding this problem.
The Cārvākas and the Buddhists do not accept any self beyond this visible or changeable body. So while the Cārvākas say 'Caitanya-viśiṣṭa deha eva ātmā', the Buddhists call it 'Caitanya-pravāha' (stream of consciousness). They are not, therefore, 'dehātma-vādī' like the Cārvākas but 'nairātma-vādī' or the supporters of the non-existence of the permanent self.

The Jainas, though, of course, are atheists, yet believe in the existence of a permanent self. Self, to them, is a conscious substance. It is the possessor of infinite knowledge, infinite power and infinite bliss. It knows things, performs activities, enjoys pleasures, suffers pain and illuminates itself and other objects. It is different from the body, senses, mind etc. and its existence is directly proved by the consciousness of itself.

The theistic schools of Indian Philosophy like the Vedānta and Sāṁkhya oppose the Jaina view of qualified self (saguṇa ātmā) as they call it nirguṇa and niṣkriya. To the Jainas the self is the knower, the enjoyer and the agent, but the Sāṁkhyas admit of no agency of self, though they agree that the self is the enjoyer or the bhoktā. The Nyāya-Vaiśeṣikas also consider the self as jñātā and bhoktā. Knowledge, to them, is not an essential quality of the self. It is an adventitious quality of it and arises by the contact of the self with the manas (ātmā-manaḥ-sāmyoga). The Naiyāyikas, of course,
agree with many others in regard to the plurality of the self. The Advaita Vedāntins do not agree on this point. They accept only one self which is identical with Brahman. The Viśiṣṭādvaitins admit the identity of self with Brahman as well as the difference of it. Self, to them, is anu but God is vibhu. Jñātṛtvā, kāṭṛtvā and bhokṛtvā etc. are the qualities of the self. So it is sāguna and saviṣeṣa.

Regarding the view of self the Pāśupata Śaivas are pluralists. They consider bound souls as effects which they technically call 'pasūs'. The word 'paśu' is connected with the word 'pāśa', which means 'cause and effect', and is technically called kalā. All animals are thus bound by cause and effect, the sense images and their objects become attached to them. The word 'paśu' is also derived from paśyati. Though the animals are all-pervasive and are of the nature of pure consciousness, they can only perceive their bodies; they do not understand the nature of cause and effect and they cannot go beyond them.⁴

Paśus are of three types — gods, men and animals. As gods are not equal to Lord Śiva so the Pāśupatas consider them paśus. Paśus are also of two kinds — pure (niraññjana) and impure (sāññjana). The souls related to bodies and sense-organs are impure. But the souls devoid of them are pure. But all of them are effects. The Lord is the only cause. He binds and liberates them all. Thus the category of pradhāna,
which is considered as cause in Sāmkhya philosophy, is regarded as effect in Pāśupata Śaivism. The Sāmkhya puruṣa is treated here as an effect, a paśu of the nirañjana (pure) type.

An individual self is called by the Pāśupatas 'Kṣetrajña' since it pervades the unconscious effects like prakṛti, physical things and sense-organs and is a knower of them. It is conscious, atomic and immortal. It is the knower of object, experiencer of pleasure and pain, and a witness. It is unborn and not generated by physical elements and their qualities like sound, touch etc. It is eternal. Consciousness is its essential nature and not its acquired quality as the Nyāya-Vaiśeṣikas hold.

Individual selves are bound by God. He veils their knowledge, and again manifests it to them. Thus they can be bound and liberated. They are subject to the influence of time and are modifiable and hence they are effects. The bondage of individual souls consists in their lack of supernatural divine powers, or in the concealment of God's causal powers, or in dependence. The divine powers of Lordship are inherent in every individual soul. But they are suppressed in bondage and liberated in release. All this is done by the grace of the Lord.
The individual souls are the experiencers of the fruits of their actions. God causes their enjoyments, sufferings and associates them with different objects, bodies and sense-organs, with virtue and vice, knowledge and nescience, attachment and detachment, sovereignty and non-sovereignty. God is absolutely sovereign and hence expresses His playful nature without taking the help of the merits and demerits produced out of the karmas of the individual souls.

Every individual soul is of the nature of the Lord. They possess the consciousness of the Lord in the form of unrestricted vision and power of action. But it is not clear whether they possess the absolute power or the sovereignty of the Lord. It may presume that since they are not the cause but only effects, so they cannot possess the absolute sovereignty which makes the Lord the Supreme Cause. Liberated souls are ajaratah, amaratva, abhItah etc. all of which are the Godly qualities. So the Pāśupatas here differ from the Advaitīns who hold that in liberation the self becomes nirguṇa Bhahman. But for the Pāśupatas, they then possess the several auspicious or magnificent qualities, such as, manojavitva (swiftness of thought), kāmarūpitva (the power of assuming any form at his will), vikaraṇatva (supremacy over all organs), sarvajñatva (omniscience) etc.

It may be noted that such characters as ajaratva (Non-decayingness), amaratva (immortality), vikaraṇadharmitva etc.
which have been described as characters of liberated persons or siddhas refer not to the pure disembodied souls but to the embodied selves. The disembodied soul being dissociated from the pāsas or all that is material is obviously immortal, as it is in itself possessor of unrestricted vision and knowledge. The completely liberated souls are attached to Śiva but they retain their identity. Hence, they attain 'Rudra-sāyujya' and thus the theory is a pluralistic one.

Bound souls are covered by the malas that veil the real nature of the soul. The malas are of five kinds—mithyā-jñāna, adharma, saktihetu, cyuti and paśutvamūla ("mithyājñānamdharmasca saktihetucyuti-stathā/paśutvamūlam pañcaite tantre heyā viviktataḥ").

These five malas are said to be removed in liberation by discriminative knowledge. But this mere removal of five malas is not called duḥkhānta, according to the Pāṣupata Philosophy. The attainment of the Lordship is the highest end of life. Thus duḥkhānta is of two kinds—anātmaka and sātmaka. The first kind of duḥkhānta is nothing but the complete cessation of all sufferings. But the second is the obtaining of the power of vision and action which the Pāṣupatas call Pāramaiśvarya. Drksakti or the power of vision, though one and the same, is of five kinds according to its subjects, such as, dūradarsana, śravaṇa, manana, vijñāna and
sarvajñatva (''dūra-śravaṇa-manana-vijnānāni cāsyā pravartante'', ''Sarvajñatva''). Dūradarsāna, śravaṇa and manana are the miraculous powers of seeing, hearing and thinking respectively from a distance. The knowledge of the written thoughts in all scriptures of the world and their significance is called vijnāna or viveka. It helps the liberated souls to obtain a perfect knowledge of his own scriptures. Sarvajñatva is the ever awakening knowledge and siddhi which is uncovered or undestroyed about all told and untold matters (''uktānuktā-śeṣārtheṣu samāsvistaravibhāgaviśeṣataśca tattvavyāptasadodita-siddhijñānam sarvajñatvam'').

Kriyā-śakti is also of three kinds, though one and undifferentiated, such as, manojavitva, kāmarūpītva and vikaraṇa-dharmītva. The first is the swiftness of thought. It is a power to go and work as swiftly as mind. Kāmarūpītva is the power of assuming any form at his will. But here the Kriyā-śakti is not limited although it is unable to work without karaṇa i.e. body, sense-organ etc. The Pāśupatas however admit a third form which means the supremacy over all organs. The liberated souls must obtain the power of doing things without organs of action (vikaraṇadharmītva).

But now the question is : How can these powers or aśvaryas be attained by an individual soul? In Indian Philosophy three ways are suggested in this respect. They are called yogas, such as, Jñāna-yoga, Bhakti-yoga and Karma-yoga. The ultimate
aim of Jñāna-yoga is to attain liberation by knowledge (Jñāna- mukti). This knowledge is the knowledge of self or self-realization. To attain it one is to go through the course of śravaṇa, manana and nididhyāsana. Śaṅkara is one of the supporters of this view. Bhakti-yoga admits of liberation by bhakti or self-surrender to God (bhaktimukti). The Vaiṣṇava philosophers look into the path and devote themselves completely to the Lord to obtain His grace. The Karma-Yoga preaches the ideal of liberation by niṣkāma-karma or work done without any desire of fruit. All works should be done with an impulse of duty without cherishing any desire of fruit or result which will be given only by the Lord.

Among those three paths the Pāṣupatas prefer bhakti-yoga. Liberation or duḥkha, to them, cannot be attained by knowledge (jñāna), disinclination (vairāgya), virtue (dharma) and giving up of one's miraculous powers (aśvarya-tyāga) but by grace (''tasmāt prasādāḥ sa duḥkhāntah prāpyate na tu jñāna- vairāgya-dharma-āśvarya-tyāga-mātrād ityarthāḥ''//8). In order to attain liberation the ascetics must have to realize the five padārthas viz. Kārya, Kāraṇa, Yoga, bidhi and duḥkhānta. Mere knowledge cannot help to attain it. So it is said :

''jñānamātre vṛthā sāstrām sākṣad drṣṭistu durlabhā / pañcārthādanyato nāsti yathāvaḥ tattvaniścayāḥ''//9

Spiritual worship is the only means to attain liberation which can only be done through the surrendering of oneself in
one's mind to the Supreme Lord, and to continue to do it until the goal is attained. When one gives oneself up entirely to Śiva alone, he does not return from the state of liberation. This is the secret of self-surrender ("'aikāntikātyantika-rudra-samīpa-prapter ekāntenaiva anāvṛtti-phalatvād asā-dhāraṇa-phalatvac cātma-pradhānam atidānam'").

Thus liberation, according to the Pāṣupatas, means to be connected with Lord Śiva, and not to be dissociated from all things like the Yoga philosophy. (ayaṁ tu yukta eva. na mukta iti viśuddham etad darsanam draśṭavyam.) In Yoga Philosophy liberation means the dissociation of the Īṣṭu from Prakṛti. It happens by the suppression of mental modes withdrawing the mind from all objects (citta-vṛtti-nirodha). But according to the Pāṣupatas, liberation is attained by the union of a soul with God through trance or complete absorption of the mind in Him which is called yoga. When mind is withdrawn from all objects of pleasure and when it becomes pure and free from distracting emotions and passions, it can be fixed on God. The suppression of mental functions only is not yoga, but complete union of a soul with God is yoga (ātmesvara saṁyoga yogāḥ.) of course, this union or connection with Śiva is not to become one with Him. But in liberation the devotee by his mental steadiness is in perpetual contact with Śiva. This is what is called sāyujya-mukti.
It is a direct and perfect contact of a soul with God, but not the extinction of a soul in Him. A liberated soul retains its identity in the state of this complete union. But this yoga cannot be attained by mere knowledge alone. To have it one has to take to a certain course of action called 'yoga-bidhi'. 'Bidhi' means action which generates virtue or merit i.e. by it liberated souls attain Maheśvara-sāmīpya.

Now let us consider the view of the Āgamas. In the Āgamas the finite self is technically called paśu. It is also called 'anu'. The word 'anu' does not mean atomic dimension, but bound and limited in respect of knowledge and action. The word also hints at the pluralistic view of the self: This self or paśu of the Śaiva-gāmas is kṣetrajña or the knower of objects, but not a knowable object. If it were so, we had to admit of another self in the same body, which is not actually experienced. Moreover, it leads to an infinite regress. So the self is always jñāta but not jñeya. So it is said:

"Ātmā yadi bhavenmeyastasya mātā bhaveṣparah /
para-Ātmā tadāniṃ syāt sa paro yadidṛṣyate // 12"

Essentially the self is of the nature of the Śiva; but he is bound by the pāsas and is liberated by the grace of the Lord. But Śiva is anādimukta. So there is a difference between the Śiva and the jīva. Even the liberated soul does not become one with the Śiva, but attains śārūpya or sāyujya.
The self is again not of medium dimension but it is 'Vibhu' or all-pervasive as it is not limited by space and time. So it is called 'ananu-kṣetrajña'.

The Nyāya-Vaiśeṣikas hold that the self is devoid of all qualities and actions in essence. Even consciousness is absent in the self. The Sāmkhyaśas again though admit of consciousness as an essential quality of the self, yet they refuse any activity in the self. So they call the puruṣa (self) inactive. But the āgamic śaivas maintain that the self is essentially conscious and active, though the power of action belongs to a limited extent. The power of knowledge and action are actually in the self, but they are covered by the malas.

The self of the āgama-vādīns is not same as the body like the Cārvākas. So they are not the dehatma-vādī. Nor are they like the Buddhists or the Jainas; as to them, the finite soul is not momentary or non-pervasive. They do not even agree with the Vedāntīns that the self is one, since the apportionment of different fruits proves that there are many individual souls. They are, therefore, the pluralists. The self, for them, undergoes birth and death for the attainment of liberation. The states of transmigration are due to the influx of impurities in the self. It is said that when these impurities ripen by the fruition of action, God, in the form of a preceptor, gives them proper
initiation so that the impurities may be burnt out.

The souls, according to the āgamas, are three-fold, viz. Vijnānakalāḥ, Pralayākalāḥ and Sakalaḥ. The first are tainted with mala, the second with mala and karma, and the third with mala, karma and māyā. The Vijnānakalas are those who have severed all connections with organs (kalās) as a result of the wearing out of the impressions of deeds done by means of knowledge, meditation, asceticism or by the enjoyment or suffering of fruit (bhoga). The Pralayākalas are those whose organs (kalās etc.) are destroyed by the mundane destructions (pralaya) but are associated with the mala and karma. Karmas are present to those souls in the seed-form. They are, therefore, like the Puruṣa of the Sāmkhya philosophy. The third or the last kind of souls are nothing but the general bound souls. They are associated with three fetters - mala, māyā and karma. They are, therefore, called Sa-kala.

The Vijnānakalas again are sub-divided into two—Samēpta-kaluṣa and asamēpta-kaluṣa. The former kinds are those whose mala has become ripened, and as a result the concealing power of rodhaśakti has been destroyed. They are elevated to the status of Vidyeśvaras by God. The Vidyeśvaras are eight in number. Such as, Ananta, Sūkṣma, Śivottama (the best Śiva), Eka-netra (the one-eyed), Eka-Rudra (the one Rudra), Trimūrttika (one with three forms) Śrikaṇṭha and Śikhandīn (anantaścaiva, Sūkṣmaśca tathaiva
Ca Śivottamaḥ / ekanetrasta-thaiva-karudraścāpi trimurtttikah//
Śrīkanṭhaśca Śikhaṇḍīca prōkta vidyeśvarā ime). The
Vijñānākalas of asamāpta-kaluṣa are seven crores in number.
God appoints them to the office of Mantras and Mantresvaras
("mantra-mśca Karota-parāmste coktāḥ Kotayāḥ sabta'").

The Pralayākalaḥ souls are of two types – pakva-pāśa-
dvaya or other than that i.e., those in whom the two remain-
ing fetters are matured and those in whom they are not. The
first obtain liberation, but not the last. They by the power
of karma, are endowed with the puryaṅtaka body and pass through
various births. The puryaṅtaka body composed of eight elements
or 30 tattvas which we have already mentioned in the previous
chapter. Some having the puryaṅtaka, being virtuous are raised
to the position of Lords of the world by Mahēśvara

(Kāmścidanugṛhyavitarati bhuvanapatitvam maheśvarasteśām).

Lastly, the souls of Sakala type are also of two kinds—
pakva-kaluṣa i.e. whose taint is matured and apakva-kaluṣa
i.e. whose taint has not yet been matured. The first is
raised to the status of Mantresvara of 118 mantras (Śatamaṅ-
tādaśā teṣāṁ kurute svayameva mantreśān). These are, eight
maṇḍalīs, eight Krodha etc. tattva, Viṁśa, Śrīkanṭha and
hundred Rudras (tatrāṣṭau maṇḍalīnāḥ krodhādyāḥ taṭ samāśca
viṁśaḥ / Śrīkaṇṭhaḥ Śatarūdrāḥ śatamītyaṣṭadaśābhyadhikam//).

The Supreme Lord, having assumed the form of a teacher, stops
the continued accession of maturity and contracts His manifested power and ultimately grants them liberation by the process of initiation (dīkṣā). So Śrimaṭ Mrgendra declares: "Purvaṁvyatyāsitasyañoh pāśajālaṁ apohati". But those anuṣ or atomic souls whose taint is not ripened (apakva-kaluṣa) are made to enjoy or suffer according to their karma. So it is said:

"Vaddhān śeṣānaparāṁ viniyuṅkte bhogabhuktaye puṁsaḥ / taṭkarmaṇāmanugamāt ityevāṁ kīrttitāḥ pāśavaḥ". 

The Pasus, according to the Śaiva āgamas, are asvatantra or paratantra as they depend on the grace of Lord for liberation. They are bound by the unconscious pāśas. God is only svatantra or sovereign (independent), as He is anādimukta. He knows everything (sarvajña) and does all the works. He determines the destiny of the individual souls according to their karmas. The Jīvas or the individual souls are ignorant and they cannot be the maker of their own fortune. The Jīvas are naturally inclined to happiness, so if they are the architect of their own fate they would build themselves in such a way so that no suffering could touch them. They, therefore, cannot be the maker of their own fortune, nor even their body. God does so by depending on their karmas. He is, therefore, karma-sāpekṣa. For this God does not lose His sovereignty. Karmas are paratantra. He Himself only is svatantra, since He does not depend on anybody for the determination of
the fortune of the jīvas. God again is the agent of all objects, so He is well-versed in their constituents and is called sarvajña.

The bound souls are, in their essence, of the nature of Śiva. They possess the powers of vision and action which are of the nature of Śakti-Caitanya. By attaining it, the jīvas obtain lordship (Śivatva). It is called parā-mukti.

A distinction is made here in the āgamas between parā-mukti and aparā-mukti. The former is higher than the latter, as when it is attained the souls become of the nature of Śiva or they attain Śiva-sārūpya. Aparā-mukti keeps the souls under the realm of māyā. According to the Śaivāgamas, the Vidyesvaras who are the highest in the class of the souls, have not attained parā-mukti and are not free from the mala, but they are appointed by the Lord for discharging mythical functions of Him. So here is the difference between the view of Pāśupata and the Śaivāgama. According to the Pāśupatas, the delivered souls get release from ignorance, weakness and sorrow and attain infinite knowledge and miraculous powers of action and are raised to the state of Mahāgaṇapatī by the grace of Śiva; whereas, according to the āgama school, the delivered souls become Śiva; that means, they attain perfect resemblance with Śiva, of course, without the power of creation.

Vīra Śaivism is a form of Śivādvaita Vāda but it oscillates between pure Advaitism and Viśiṣṭādvaita Vāda. Being
based on an interpretation of Vedānta it casts aside all dualism or pluralism. It accepts release by knowledge of 'tattvamasi' and tries to reconcile the same with the cult of bhakti which cannot but retain a distinction between the self and the Lord.

The Sthala divides into liṅga and aṅga i.e. God and self. Final liberation comes from the union of the liṅga and the aṅga (liṅgāṅga saṁyoga). But the exact form of the union is not very clear and appears to be inaccessible to intellect. The distinction is asserted due to the limiting condition or upādhi. The analogy of 'mahākāśa' and 'ghatākāśa' is accepted and this inevitably leads to a view of ultimate identity between the Lord and the self. But at the same time a difference between the Lord and the self, the upāsya and the upāsaka is sought to be retained. Although it is asserted that none which is aśīva i.e., other than the nature of Śiva, can be either the worshipped or the worshipper.

"'nāśivasya śiva-pāstir ghaṭate janmakotibhiḥ/ śivasyai'va śivopāstir iti nānāśrutisṛṭiḥ'//20

This implies Śiva Himself is the worshipped as well as the worshipper, yet the highest form of liberation is described as sāyujya which is not absolute identity. The soul is also described to be a part of the Lord. If both the Lord and the self are essentially the self-same thing and is of the nature
of pure existence, consciousness and bliss, it is not intel­
lectually ascertainable as to how the absolute identity can
be avoided. The relation between the part and the whole i.e.
avayava and avayavī is understandable in the context of
material objects, but not in the context of consciousness
and yet the Śivādvaita is inclined to introduce the cult of
bhakti. The Advaita Vaiśñavism unhesitatingly retains the
the
distinction between the worshipped and/worshipper and hence
accepts a clear form of duality. But Advaita Śaivism lays
greater stress on the element of identity. This is a position
not accessible to intellect. The Śaivi-bhakti or the parābhakti
is said to be above mokṣa which is called by Māyideva 'Śāmbhabī
bhakti' and something different from the general concept of
bhakti. As Anubhava-sūtra says:

''Jñānād eva hi mokṣāḥ syān mokṣād upari Śāmbhavī/
bhaktiḥ paratarā bhāti svaṭantrā bhaktiḥīlayā''\(^{21}\)

The view seems to be akin to that of the Gauḍīya Vaiśñava's
concept of the fifth puruṣārtha which is asserted to be above
mokṣa.

Hence it may be concluded that a mysterious difference
is sought to be retained between the self and the Lord after
final liberation. This is not sāyujya as ordinarily under­
stood, but is like the case of sāmarasya on which the monis­
tic Śaivas in general laid emphasis. The sāmarasya in other
forms of Śivādvaita or Śāktādvaita is maintained in the
context of Śiva and Śakti — a homogeneity and yet a distinct concept. The Vīra Śaivas retain the same view in the context of the relation between the Lord and the self. The view no doubt is supra-logical or alogical.

Now, a few more discussion on the Śaiva concept of duḥkhānta is needed to clear out the meaning of the same. So the next section of this chapter is devoted to this purpose.

(ii)

The cessation of suffering or duḥkhānta has been accepted by almost all the other systems of Indian Philosophy. Duḥkhānta or liberation is considered there as the matter of illumination or enlightenment or the attainment of a perfect vision. The liberated soul is in a state of pure knowledge and perfect equanimity and peace. It has nothing to do as there is no desire or imperfection. But the Śaiva concept of duḥkhānta is however somewhat different as it supplies a wider connotation to the concept of liberation. Pure consciousness, according to the other Indian systems, is pure knowledge and illumination and nothing else. But, to the Śaivas, consciousness has two fold functions. It is both the power of vision as well as the power of action (dṛk-śakti and kriyā-śakti). Both these powers being limited by māyā, mala and karma lead
to bondage or suffering, and liberation is nothing but the getting rid of them. So it is said in Mokṣa-Kārika:

'*Malādipāśavicchitṛ Sarvajñāṇakriyodbhavaḥ Mokṣaḥ*'

The three basic elements of Reality, according to the Śaivas, are described as Pati, paśu and pāśa. The pāśas are the fetters that bind the finite soul (Paśu). The Lord Pati is unfettered by the pāśas. The finite soul free from pāśas becomes of the nature of the Lord Śiva. The Lord is the possessor of infinite power of vision and infinite power of action. He is the instrumental agent of all the activities of production, maintenance, destruction, veiling up of the truth and liberation.

The other systems question the relevance of action in respect of the Lord who is āpta-Kāma. Hence these systems find difficulty in explaining the fact of creation or evolution of the world. The Śaivas solve it by attributing spontaneous action, or creative power to the Lord by including this within the very connotation of consciousness or cit-Śakti. Fire burns, for it is the very nature of fire to burn. There cannot be any question as to how or why it burns. Similarly, cit-Śakti is unlimited consciousness and it also acts. There cannot be any question as to why it acts. Consistently with this basic concept the Śaivas interpret the meaning of duḥkhānta or cessation of suffering or the state of emancipation
in a double manner. For them the freedom from suffering is of two kinds viz. anātmaka and sātmaka. The former refers to the negative aspect and the latter to the positive aspect of the state of emancipation. The negative aspect consists in freedom from all sufferings and passing into a state of eternal perfection. The positive aspect implies that the soul at this state also becomes the possessor of absolute power of the Lord. The Pāṇḍavas do not accept the former type of liberation as the supreme state of emancipation. The actual nature of duḥkhānta, to them, is to obtain the absolute power of vision and action or the attainment of Pāramaiśvarya. But so long as the paśutva (finiteness) is retained the finite soul cannot get the identical nature of the Lord.

The Śaivas differ widely in their ontological position. The Pratyabhijñā and the Vīraśaivas' theories of Reality are monistic; but the other forms of Śaivism hold a somewhat pluralistic or dualistic view. In all cases, however, the Kriyā-Śakti is included within the connotation of caitanya. The cit is also force. Liberation also has its degrees, accordingly as it is called aparāmukti or parāmukti. The possessors of aparā-mukti acquire the powers of the Lord, but they live in obedience to the Lord. The possessors of parā-mukti become exactly of the nature of the Lord possessing absolute powers of vision and action. According to the Pāṇḍavas-Śaivas, the liberated souls obtain absolute sovereignty as soon as they
obtain Lordship. But the other Śaivas do not accept it. To them the liberated souls like Vidyeśvara etc. are the possessors of aparāmukti; so though they partake of the divine nature of Śiva, yet remain in obedience to Him and act according to His will.

We may cite a few of the characters or powers of the emancipated soul from the Pāśupata-Sūtra. One of them is: "Duraśravaṇamananavijñānān ca asya pravartante". He gains the miraculous powers of seeing, hearing, thinking and knowing from a distance. He attains sarvajñatva or omniscience. He possesses manojavitvam or the swiftness of thought, kāmarūpitvam or the power of assuming any form at his will. He possesses vikaraṇatva i.e. supremacy over all the organs. It is also said 'Sarveca asya Vaśyābhavanti', all become subject to his control. 'Sarvvāṃśca aviśati', he enters into all. 'Sarveca asya bādhyābhavanti', all become liable to be killed by him. He becomes 'Abhītaḥ' or fearless, 'akṣayaḥ' or indestructible, 'ajaraḥ' or without old age, or 'amarah' or deathless.

The implication of these statements are far-reaching and entail knotty problems regarding the state of emancipation. But this points to the fact that the emancipated, according to these theories, become as powerful as the Supreme Reality even possessing the powers of creation and destruction. The Śaivas generally used two terms viz. Svātantrya or absolute
sovereignty and aisvarya or unfettered power of action which together they call Maheśvaratā. These two powers are possessed by the Lord and the emancipated alike. The Śaivas controvert the position of the Vaiṣṇavas who consider the emancipated soul as the servant of the Lord. For them any kind of servitude or dependence cannot be considered to be the highest state of the emancipated soul. To them where there is servitude there is dependence and where there is dependence there cannot be complete cessation of suffering. Hence it cannot be the highest state of liberation which is complete cessation of suffering as well as the attainment of Pāramaisvarya.

The Śaivas also differ from the Advaitīns. In the state of Mokṣa the Śaivas claim that the liberated souls obtain the absolute power of action but the Advaitīns do not accept the attainment of any power of action by the liberated souls but only the merging into the nirguṇa Brahman i.e. their inseparable existence with the Brahman:

"avibhakta eva pareṇātmanā mukto'vatiṣṭate" 24

The Śaivas, on the other hand, mostly do not believe in the merging of the liberated soul into Brahman or identity with the Śiva; but they thought it to become united i.e. eternally associated with the Śiva or they become one with the Śiva in the sense that Godly attributes are evolved in them. They remain by their mental steadiness, in perpetual contact with Śiva and never return to the cycle of the birth
and death. Hence their theory of liberation is somewhat different from that of Kevalādvaita Philosophy of Śaṅkara.

We find again in the system of Pātañjala-yoga that the yogīns attain miraculous or supernatural powers by yoga which appear to be similar to the powers described by the Śaivas. But there is a difference. According to yoga, the attainment of Supernatural powers is not the same as liberation. Yogīns, in order to attain emancipation, is to go further and become truly a Kevalīn in which state these powers become irrelevant. The Kevalīn state is a state of complete aloofness from Prakṛti and there is nothing to do. He has no function or Kriyā. Further, the supernatural powers attained by the yogīns are liable to be diminished, or lost. Hence these are no part of the connotation of liberation. The Śaivas put the matter in a different way consistently with their interpretation of the meaning of caitanya or consciousness. Citi-Śakti being identical with Lord is not only pure vision but it is also absolute action. It is absolutely free to act in any way it likes. The emancipated who becomes the Śiva (pāśabuddhaḥ jīvaḥ, pāśamuktah Śivah) attains absolute sovereignty in respect of knowledge and action permanently and eternally. Such powers of actions are not antecedent to the state of liberation at different stages on the way to the goal. But the goal being attained these appear there as a permanent feature. Hence for the Śaivas emancipation or duḥkhānta is
not a passive state but is an absolute active state or is endowed with absolute power of action.

The following statements from Mṛgendrāgama, a source book on the later Śaivas, support this view:

''Caitanyam dṛk-Kriyārūpaṁ tadastyātmani sarvvadā/
Sarvvataśca yato muktau śrūyate sarvvatomukhaṁ''/\(^{25}\)

Consciousness is of the nature of knowledge and action and it exists in the soul eternally, and in the state of liberation it becomes absolutely free from all obstruction.

It is also said in Tattva-prakāśa:

''muktātmāno'pi Śivāḥ Kiṁ tvete yatpräsādataḥ muktāḥ/
Sohanādimukta eko Vijñeyah pāñcamantratanuḥ''/\(^{26}\).

The emancipated souls are also of the nature of Śiva. The second line indicates a pluralistic tone. Śiva has been described as anādimukta i.e., free from all eternity. The other souls become liberated by the grace of the Lord. So long as these souls are within the region of māyā they cannot be said to be absolutely free or parā-mukta. It is the state of aparāmukti. In the state of aparā-mukti the subtle body which has been called by the Śaivas 'pūryyaśtaka' remains there. But in the state of final emancipation which is called parā-mukti the souls are beyond the region of māyā and they attain absolute sovereignty and attain what is called Māheśvarya.
In the systems of Indian Philosophy a distinction is very often drawn between the concept of Jīvan-mukti or liberation in the embodied state and Videha-mukti or liberation after the dissolution of the body.

Rāmānuja does not agree to this distinction. He considers videha-mukti to be the only form of liberation. To him this body is formed by avidyā. So if we accept Jīvan-mukti, we have to accept the nirvāṇa or mukti even if we have the avidyā. So jīvan-mukti is not acceptable. Rāmānuja holds that mere enlightenment is not emancipation proper. The embodied state is a fall from Heaven and a journey back to Heaven would necessarily mean the dropping of all that is earthly. For Rāmānuja liberation is sālokya or sāmīpya. The Vaiṣṇavas differ in giving a mythological colour to the liberated soul. Some consider that residence in Vaikuṇṭha or living in the presence of the Lord as his permanent servant is the character of the liberated soul. According to Rāmānuja, the jīva is connected with the Lord inseparably (aprthaka-siddhi) as His Prakāra or aṅga or Viśeṣa. From one point of view the finite soul is adjectival to the Lord or His Viśeṣa. From another point of view the finite self has also a substantival existence and it is of atomic dimension. It is a kind of bhedābheda.

As for many other systems like Advaita Vedānta and also according to the Gīta and presumably according to Sāmkhya-yoga, the Videha-mukti is distinguished from the state of jīvan-mukti.
The realization of the self as Brahman, according to the Advaita, may take place by Śravaṇa, manana, nididhyāsana and samādhi. Samādhi again is either savikalpa or nirvikalpa. In the savikalpa state there is waking up from the state of trance. In the nirvikalpa there is no further coming back. The body may continue as the result of the past Karmas till such time as the Karmas are completely exhausted. But there is complete enlightenment and such an enlightened person maintains his day to day existence in a different way from that of the ordinary persons. He knows that he is neither the body, nor the senses, nor the intellect. He is neither a male, nor a female but he is of the essence of saccidananda. The avidyā or ignorance is burnt and he is not subject to any affliction. He has no action, nothing to do except for the sake of setting examples to man (lokasaṁgrahārtham).

But in the state of videha-mukti he completely becomes identified with the Brahman and there is no further association with the product of prakṛti or the guṇas or avidyā. The Advaita, however, considers videha-mukti to be the higher state and calls it para-mukti or final deliverence. The state of jīvan-mukti may be considered to be a form of aparā-mukti or the pen-ultimate stage.

The Śaivas, in general, do not consider this distinction between jīvan-mukti and videha-mukti as of any importance. Hence they do not develop this point much. As for Pratyabhijñā
or the monistic form of Śaivism we reserve the point for discussion later on. We may consider for the present the view of the Pāśupatas and the Southern Śaivism who follow the Śaiva-āgamas. The distinction between the Lord or the Pati and Paśu or the Jīva lies in their freedom from the fetters or the Pāsas. The Lord is free from the Pāsas eternally. He is therefore, called 'anādimukta' or eternally free. The jīva is fettered; but by following the religious practices he becomes gradually free from the fetters. The pāsuptapas, however, make a distinction between two kinds of paśus, sānjanaḥ and nirañjanaḥ i.e. those connected with the bodies and those not connected. The emancipation means the attainment of Śivatva or the complete nature of Śiva who is the Ultimate Reality. Such an emancipated soul attains omniscience, omnipotence and the powers of the Lord. The Pāśupata-Sūtra suggests that such powers do not necessarily mean the dissolution of the body but a state of physical immortality also. Sūtras 21-38 mention these various qualities and powers attained by the emancipated soul. It appears that it is left to the sovereign will of such a being either to retain the body or to shun it. But they are emancipated. The nature of Śiva or Śivatva as a common quality is the only monistic trend. But in all other respects the Pāśupatas appear to be dualistic or pluralistic. The Pāśupata-Sūtras also imply Maheśvara-sāmipya or nearness to the Lord as the ultimate stage. The Pāśupatas were mainly Sādhakas or they emphasise
from the beginning to the end the performance of the yoga. Hence probably such problems as are involved in a pluralatistic view of the selves and a solution of such problems did not arise in their mind.

The Śaiva-āgamas of the South, however, differ from the Pāṣupata views in some important aspects regarding the matter. They make a distinction between the paramukti and the aparāmukti. The Lord to them also is anādimukta, but the emancipated are not eternally free. The Vidyeśvaras attain the qualities of Śiva except complete sovereignty upto the end of Kalpa or a cycle of creation and dissolution. They attain omniscience, they are free from the pāsas; but even that upto the end of the Kalpa, they do not attain the state of equality with the Lord. They have, therefore, been described as the highest kind of pāsas and they are employed by the Lord to discharge his functions as his deputy. So they are called the Kiṅkara of the Śiva. But the completely emancipated souls (mukta-ātmās) get the identical nature with Śiva. They become free from all fetters even in this life. They become as pure as Śiva and become the master of divine powers like omniscience, omnipotence (Sarvajñātva, Sarvakartṛtva) etc. but this they attain only by the grace of the Lord.

According to Pratyabhijñā also, one attains Jīvan-mukti by the realization of his identity with the cit-Śakti even though the body etc. remains the same. He realizes himself.
as one with the universe and is in possession of the blissful state of the cit. It is, of course, the result of Samādhi or Samāvesa as they call it. There is waking up from the samādhi; but by frequent merging into the samādhi the realization of identity with the cit-śakti becomes confirmed and this destroying all the sins brings jīvan-mukti.

"'Cidānandalābhedahādiśu cetyamāneśvāpi cidaikātmya-pratipatti dārdhyam jīvan-muktiḥ',"27.

The Vedānta recognizes the four states of waking, dreaming, the state of dreamless sleep and a fourth state which is attainable in the state of samādhi (jāgraṭ, svāpna, suṣupti, turīya). In the fourth state, which is the highest, the self realizes its identity with Brahman and ajñāna is destroyed. The body etc. remains there so long as the saṃskāras are not completely burnt or exhausted. But these are also the products of ajñāna and hence are unreal or mithyā. There is waking up from the state of trance or savikalpa-samādhi and the body continues. The realization, however, has already been attained. In the nirvikalpa state there is no waking up and there is the dissolution of the products of ajñāna. The entire world is anātmā or other than the Ātman or Brahman. It has no reality and it is no part of Reality or Brahman. The monistic Śaivas, however, differ from the Advaita point of view here. The world for them is not the product of a 'bhāvarūpa-ajñāna'. It is the Lord becoming everything by His sport of the
soverignly free will. The body is the Lord, the senses are the Lord, the citta is cit-sakti herself become contracted.

''Citireva cetanapadadavardhā cetyasaṅkocinī cittam''\textsuperscript{28}.

The bondage and liberation are both the play of the Lord. The jīvan-mukta of Advaita is as good as the puruṣa of the Sāmkhya who has attained kaivalya and dissociated himself from the ajñāna and her products i.e. the world by ātma-anātma-viveka. The monistic Śaivas have a different point of view. The liberated soul does not realize the universe as unreal but knows himself to be the universe.

''valalābhe visvamātmasāṭkaroti''\textsuperscript{29}.

It is also said:

''Sarvo mamāyāṁ vibhava ityevam pariṅanataḥ/
Visvātmano vikalpānam prasāre'pi maheṣatā//''\textsuperscript{30}.

He knows everything to be himself or his powers. He becomes visvātmā. It is expansion in contraction. The Lord Himself is Jīva deluded by His own ways. This delusion is His play. The expansion is also His play. There is a descent and there is an ascent which are simultaneous from higher point of view but follows order from lower point of view. So the world is not considered as unreal, but is not only as real as the Lord but also the Lord Himself. The monistic Śaivas recognize a state above the Vedāntic turiya state. They call it 'turiyātita'.
or 'nityodita-samādhi'. It is jāgrat-samādhi or the waking trance. The jīvan-mukta is in possession of this state. So virtually there is no qualitative distinction between the jīvan-mukta and the videha-mukta. The Ultimate Reality, according to Vedānta, is pure consciousness which is neither subject nor object, while, according to the monistic Śaivas, the Ultimate Reality is the Supreme Subject or Pūrna-ahām, the 'I'. The 'I' is above the distinction between the subject and the object and holding all objects within His being as 'I'. It is the swallowing of the object by the subject. All is 'I'. It is 'alāmgrāsakaraṇa'. This view is a kind of Absolutistic Theism.
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