Ontological & Existential Status of Man

4.1 Introduction

As we have discussed in the previous chapter, cognition, understood as āgmcit-saktī in Siddhānta tradition, has formed the basis of our enquiry into the cognitive status of self. But, from the beginning, we have been certain of the goal that this epistemological endeavour (pramāṇa) is for an ontological understanding of self (āgma lakṣaṇa) whose existence on earth is for attaining his soteriological goal of ultimate union with the Śiva Himself (pāyan). For, “Usually in Indian Philosophy epistemological questions are considered first as a validation for its metaphysics. But a little reflection will show that every epistemological assertion implicitly presupposes an ontology. This is true of Śaiva Siddhānta, which, as a philosophical system,... is a sustained and systematic reflection on the ontological principles disclosed in the Āgamic statements.”

Speaking on the purpose served by the instruments of logic (namely the pramāṇas or means of acquiring certain knowledge), Piet says that it is, “to attempt to prove that what is taught in the Vēdās and the Śaiva Āgamas is the fullest and truest interpretation of reality. This purpose is succinctly stated by Umāpati in the Śivaprakāśam. The Vēdās, the Āgamas and the other books have as their aim the explanation of Pati, Paśu and Pāsa”. Moreover, “Śivajñānamunivar’s Māpādiyyam, as a synthesis of the Sanskrit and Tamil traditions, refers to the twelve Tirumūrais and the fourteen philosophical texts as
Āgamas.\[6] So, we shall attempt to present the ontological status of man, by closely following the Tamil sources, in the light of the Māpādiyam. "In the podu adhikāram, the existence and the nature of the three ontological realities are established by reflective reasoning.\[8]" In this chapter, then, we shall dwell in general, using the reflective reasoning (āpma nādi)\[6] on the three padārthas of Siddhānta, Pati-Paśu-Pāśa.

According to the Śaiva Siddhāntin, experience dictates and logic establishes that Pati, Paśu, and Pāśa are the three all-inclusive eternal uncreated principles which make up the totality of existence. Pati is the Supreme Being. Paśu is the individual soul which is bound by Pāśa or the obstrusive principle of ignorance which hinders the soul from realizing Pati.\[1]

4.1.1 The Order of Placement of the Three Padārthas

Though, we are aware of the ultimate three-padārthas acknowledged in Siddhānta, we see them differently placed in sequence by different Siddhāntins in their works. Meykaṇḍar begins Śivajñānabodhīnī in the order of Pati, Pāśa and Paśu and ends it with that of Paśu-Pāśa and Pati. His disciple Arunāndh keeps basically to the order presented by his predecessor. Whereas, Umāpati, both in Śivaprakāśam and in Tiruvanantapuram, sticks to Pati-Paśu and Pāśa arrangement. The text JñānamŚātram presents yet another alternative in placing of these padārthas as Paśu-Pāśa and Pati. Tiruvatika Manavāsamkāntar in his work on the Uṟṟmai Viṇikkam (Explanation of Truth) keeps to the order of Pāśa-Paśu and Pati. Even the Āgamas differ among themselves according to the context in which these padārthas are handled. Each one must be having a rationale behind such arrangements. It all depends on the emphasis they want to give in understanding the intricacies of a particular padārtha or the other. Whereas we begin with the order of Paśu, Pāśa and Pati with which Meykaṇḍar has ended his text and which has been also commented by Śivajñānamuniyar in Māpādiyam in the same order. The logic is simple. Human learning is easier and faster when it follows the logic
of known to the unknown or from gross to subtle. We have already dealt with it elaborately in the second chapter under the title of tūḷāruntaitūmurai. 8 We shall see how the Śivajñānamunivara achieves his aim as we proceed with the chapter on the 'ontological and existential status of man'.

Our concentration is on Paśu (the subject of our enquiry) as presented in Mārādīyam. While dealing with Paśu in its existential state, an attempt will be made to unravel the essential nature of self as always dependent (Carinataca-vanānmātai), 9 his knowledge as ever demonstrative (Cuṭṭi-aritai) 10 and his (the self's) capacity to know both the Pati and Paśa (iruṭir aniruṭatirāndata ānma) 11. As already discussed in chapter one, Siddhānta recognizes three types of selves-Vijñanakalas, Pralayākalas and Sakalas.

4.1.2 Three Type of Selves (Sakalas-Pralayākalar-Vijñānakalar)

Siddhānta recognizes three types of selves - vijñānakalas, pralayākalas and sakalas. Only the last of the three is referred to human beings who inhabit the earth and are the subject and object of Anthropology in general and Philosophical Anthropology in particular. In Siddhānta, the sakalas are referred to human beings. The Tamil term 'uyir' used for the soul comes from the root 'uitai' which means 'raising oneself to a higher state of life'. By derivation it means 'to become a person' since the 'uyir' in human condition can be considered the highest form of existence by reference to the other beings below man/woman. Three levels of intensity of ānava (sthūlam, sūkram, ahaśūkram are respectively gross, subtle and subtler) forms the basis for the three kinds of selves recognised by Siddhānta. Sakalas, pralayākalas and vijñānakalas are three types of selves who are under the influence of all the three malas (tirimalattār tānva, karma and māya). 12 two malas (ānava, karma) and one mala (ānava) respectively. Sakalas are human beings who are under the great influence of three malas. As
the selves are three types, their states-of-being is as well categorised in three stages. (1) Tāṇṭilai (Kēvala State), (2) Kalappurilai (Sakata State) and (3) Tōyanilai (Śuddha State).

While enquiring into the sakata state (existential state) of the human beings, we are inevitably induced to explain the existence of Pāṣā (with its related philosophical categories of Māyā and Karma), its nature and consequences for human life. While enquiring into the śuddha state (essential state) of the human beings, we are called to explain the existence of Pati (with his āṅguṇās, pāṇḍakrityas and sānkalpa) against the background of kēvala and śuddha states of man as postulated and projected by Munivar in Māpādiyam.¹³

Given to our experience, we see the manifested world as both sentient (cētana-prapancam) and insentient (acētana-prapancam).¹⁴ The sentient world is categorised as Paśu. It isn’t like the all knowing being called ‘Pati’ (pēraṇivudayān, muṭṭraṇivudaiyan).¹⁵ It isn’t like the Pāṣā which is totally an insentient (jāda, arivarratu). It is a being which is capable of knowing but suffers from ignorance which is caused by ānava.

The eighth sūtra of the Śivajñānatabādham compares the self (Paśu) to a prince kidnapped in his infancy by gipsies and growing up in their ways until the king comes and rescues him, thus helping him to realise his royal identity. The point is this: the self, in the grip of ānava, goes the way of the sense, not the way of the Spirit. Hence it forges for itself an apparently endless cycle of births and deaths. It takes a long time for the self to realise that it must detach itself from ānava (false sense of ‘I’ and ‘mine’) and attach itself to the Lord. To quote Saint Tāyumanavar:

When dawns the day when I can be in non-dual union with the Pillar of Real Wisdom, in the way I have been all along in non-dual union with ānava?!⁶

So Paśu isn’t essentially an omnicient being. On the contrary, it’s knowing is conditioned and limited (ciṭṭraṇivudaiyatu). So it is capable of knowing only when it is let known (ānabakam ādāmu ākāṣanakāndam).
In view of dealing with the nature of God-world-self and the principle of causation (satkāryavāda) according to Siddhānta, we need to clarify the use of three essential terms (sat, asat and sadasat). ‘Sat’ and ‘asat’ literally mean real and unreal respectively. Everything that exists is sat and there does not exist anything other than sat. The Pati is referred to as sat and the world is referred to as asat. For, according to Siddhānta whatever exists eternally and without any change is sat. God never undergoes any change and hence he is referred to as sat. Accordingly, the world is referred to as asat because it undergoes change. In the causal state it is subtle and in the effect state it is gross. The self is sadasat, because during the state of bondage it undergoes change by assuming the changing modes of the world (cuḍāmāna); and during liberation it remains without change by assuming the immutable nature of God (cuḍāmāna). It should be noted that the characterisation of the self as sadasat is not a self-contradiction, because subjection of the self to change and changelessness is not simultaneous, but successive.

4.1.3 The Triple (Kēvala-Sakala-Śuddha) States of Self

The self goes through three states: (1) Tangilai (Kēvala State), (2) Kalappunilai (Sakala State) and (3) Tūyanilai (Śuddha State):

4.1.3.1 Tangilai (Kēvala State)

From the beginningless time, the self is with something other than the self (non-self, sentient) which is binding the self without any reason, making it lie low in deep slumber of ignorance. It would not be an exaggeration to say that the this sentient and binding force is connate with the self just like “the husk of the rice grain and verdigris of copper”. This connate reality is called the āṇava. At this state, the self is
in total identification with the non-self or something other than the self and has no manifestation at all of its essential qualities of consciousness and freedom. Kēvala is, "the state when the selves are under the influence of ānava alone, when they are bare" says Vajravelu Mudaliar.¹⁸

4.1.3.2 Kalappunilai (Sakala or the Existential State)

In order to free the self from this deep bondage (root bondage) of total ignorance and spiritual slumber, God, out of His own mercy and grace towards the self creates tanu (udai), karana (karuvi), bhuvana (ulaku) and makes it experience (nukarvu) the world (bhoga). This is a state that succeeds definitely the state of kēvala, in order the self gets purified from the mūlamala (ānava) and progress towards the state towards which it is destined to.¹⁹

4.1.3.3 Tāyanilai (Śuddha State)

Śuddha state is that which follows the kēvala state attaining the requirements like iruvinai oppu, malaparipāka and thus experiencing the descent of grace (aruḷ vízci). At this state, the self is ridden of the mūlamala and enjoying the bliss of Śiva through its total identification with the embodiment of grace.²⁰

4.2 Paśu (Sadasat)

Paśu, in Sanskrit, means that which is bound. It literally means, cows which are tied to something. In Siddhānta, cows represent to all living, conscious and embodied beings (souls, selves or uyirkal) in the world. According to the understanding of Siddhānta, these selves which are bound by Pāsa (the mūlamala, the ānava) from beginningless time (anādi). In Sanskrit, Pāsa literally means a 'thread or a rope' with which things are tied to or bound. Philosophically, Pāsa is an insentient (jada) category
(padārtha). Its essential character is to bind the selves and keeps them under the condition of ignorance. In Tamil an equivalent word "taţaţ" is used in the place of Pāśa. This word brings out the appropriate meaning and content of the special relationship that exists between Pațu and Pāśa. These bonded selves are helped by the grace of Pati (God) to undergo cycle of several births and deaths through an evolutionary and transmigratory process. And this process again will be guided by Pati according to the law of karma through which the selves purify themselves from the ānnavamata and enter a state of liberation.

The conception of self, as is well-known, is not restricted in Hinduism to the human level. Any thing alive is a self. In fact, as Māṇikkavācakar sings about his own experience, selves pass (and sometimes repass) through all levels, from that of the inanimate stone to that of the celestials. The question of the existence of selves is raised only at the human level. This question has given rise to various answers, ranging from outright denial of an enduring entity to the self's total identification with the Infinite.\(^2^1\) We will soon see the philosophical significance of the essential nature (cirappu) of man as spiritual (sart), conscious (cit). We have just seen briefly about man in his kēvala (beginningless), sakala (existential) and suddha (essential) states as postulated by Munivar and projected in Māpādiyam. We must always keep in mind all that Munivar speaks about the three padārthas have actually been developing gradually from the time of Śivajñānabodhānto the Māpādiyam.

4.2.1 The Essential Nature of Man

(Dependent, Demonstrative Knowledge and Capable of Knowing both Pati and Pāśa)
Our enquiry, so far, has brought to light certain implicit and explicit, essential and accidental (existential) aspects and understanding of human being in Śaiva Siddhānta. The knowledge of the selves as presented to us through the religious and philosophical texts of the Siddhānta and of Māpādiyāgare not merely an outcome of a reflective reasoning of the three metaphysical reality of Pati-Paśu-Pāśa (sat-sadasat-asat) but a result of an experience of vision (kāndal) through the grace (arūf) of God.

Pati (sat), according to Māpādiyāgis that which is permanent (nitya), all pervasive (vyāpaka) and omniscient consciousness (caitanya). And, therefore, it has no need to experience anything else. Pāśa (asat) is that which is changing. Moreover, it is insentient (jada) and deviod of consciousness. Therefore, it cannot experience. Of the three metaphysical categories of Śaiva Siddhānta, God does not depend on pāśa or for that matter even the selves. The implication is that pāśa and paśu are dependent on God for their existence. The pāsa which is characterised as asat cannot know either God or selves. God need not know either pāśa or paśu. Therefore God does not experience the pāśa and the selves. The pāsa also does not experience God or selves. Only the self has the capacity to know and experience both sat and asat. They can never come together. Umāpati is emphatic in expressing this fact (sattu asattai sārālu). It means Pati is an independent reality. Pāsa can never have any experience because it cannot know (asattu ariyātu). So, the only metaphysical possibility for these two to be known and experienced (ivai uvai) is left with the self (uyīr) because it has the capacity to know both Pati and Pāśa (sadasattam uyīr). Only the self is ontologically open to the condition of possibility of “knowing and experiencing” both Pati and Pāsa. (In other words, Paśu remains always a dependent reality.) Therefore, only the self which is neither ‘sat’ nor ‘asat’ has the condition of possibility of knowledge and experi-
ence. And its knowledge is ever demonstrative (*cutṭṭhi-arivatu*), in the sense, it will always have the subject-object relation in any of its experience (*anubhava*). Meykar in the seventh *śūtra* of Śvaśānabodhī explains on three important things about the self; its (1) existence (2) knowledge and (3) experience. The following characteristics will explain these well.

4.2.3.1 *Cāṅtataṇḍrappamāvatu*

"An essential or primary quality of the soul is to exhibit the nature of the thing with which it is associated (*Cāṅtataṇḍrappamātal*). It has a dependent nature. It depends either on God which is *sat* or things which are *asat*. When associated with *asat* it exhibits the characteristic of *asat*, and while in release (from its bondage) it reflects the character of *sat* which is Śiva. It is for these reasons the soul is often compared to a crystal which reflects the colour of its environment."

4.2.3.2 *Cutṭṭhi-arivatu*

*Cutṭṭhi-arital* in Tamil means demonstrative knowledge. That is basically a quality of *asat*. It means that *asat* is known always by being pointed out. All worldly things which are known in this manner is *asat*. Though *Paśu* cannot be categorised into this category, it shares this above mentioned aspect of *asat*. God who is sat cannot be known in this manner.

4.2.3.3 'Iruṭṭiraṇa arivulatu'

The quality of the self to know *sat* and *asat*, but being neither of these two, is the meaning of this expression. "Going by its literal meaning, *sadasat* is likely to be
interpreted to mean both sat and asat. That possibility is ruled out in the above quoted sūtra which says clearly that the ārya is neither of the two. The name sadasat is given to the soul because of its capacity to know both sat and asat. It is neither sat nor asat. Against the background of the epistemological insights enunciated and the arguments put forth in establishing the existence of selves (Paśu), let us now deal with the reality of Pāśa as commented by Śivajñānamunivar in Māṇḍūkiyam.

4.3 Pāśa (Asat): (Āṇava, Karma and Māyā)

Pāśa which includes the material world is a known fact and it is within the reach of our day-to-day experience. Pāśa literally means rope. Even as cattle are tied by ropes, souls are bound by Pāśa, which like a threefold cord, consists of three strands, viz., āṇava, karma and māyā. Pāśa is a common name for all three strands. These three are like a rope restricting the free movement of cattle. They are comparable to fetters round the hands and the feet of persons. Āṇava, as the main obstruction, is said to be pratibandha. Karma as what follows the selves in their moral and spiritual career is said to be anubandha. Māyā, as the primal stuff out of which the bodies of the souls, and the world in which they live are made and that with which they are associated, is said to be sambandha. Pāśa is also addressed as maia (impurity) as defiling the essential purity of the souls. Āṇava is mūlamala, the primal impurity. Karma and māyā enable the soul to over come in a limited way the influence of āṇava. It is usual to say that Pāśa is anādi because it is in beginningless association with the soul like the verdigris is in copper. 26 So āṇava is also called sahajemata (as co-born, so to say with souls) 27 whereas karma and māyā are called āgantuka (those which come later). 28 Though their attachment to souls is said to be without beginning, it is not endless (anātha). In this sense, these are not essential but accidental to the self.
In Siddhanta the word Pāśa is used in two ways, and that, sometimes, in a confusing manner. It is sometimes used as a synonym for ānava, in which case it stands for the source of the soul's ignorance and arrogance. Ānava is that which eternally encases the soul until it has realized Śiva. The second use of Pāśa is as a synonym for the three malas as a combination of binding principles, namely, the ānava mala, karma, and māyā. Ānava is as described above is the cause of self's bondage which leads the soul to ignorance or false knowledge. Karma is the fruit of deeds, the accumulation of the merits and demerits which are the cause of future experience-birth, joy and sorrow. Māyā is primordial matter or the seed of the phenomenal world that which forms the body of and the experience-plane for the soul and its purification.

In the immediately following section, we shall deal with pāśa which is used and understood in the first sense of ānava which stands for the source of the self's ignorance and arrogance.

4.3.1 Ānava

Commenting on the first sūtra, at the end of the third adhikaraṇa, Śivajñānamunivar introduces the reality of ānava (malattujatam)29 as a prelude to the whole subject of ānava which will be taken up in the fourth sūtra elaborately.29 Though it is ignorance (ariyāmai) which is considered to be the immediate cause of human bondage, it is anava which is the ultimate cause of even ignorance (ariyāmai ānavaṃ) itself says Uṇmai Viḻakkam31. Hence, it is ānava mala which is the basic obstacle to human cognition. In other words, we can call ānava as the primary, natural or root obstacle (impurity) (mūlamālam) to the emancipation of Paśu from its bondage and suffering. Mala is impurity or dirt. This ānava being the root of all impurities, it is in association with the soul beginninglessly (saṅjamālam, utan tōndriyatu). That means that there is no point of time to which the origination of anavu could be traced
back. It means āṇava has no beginning at all. Therefore, āṇava co-existed with the self from the beginning.\textsuperscript{12} Meykançär, explains the possibility of such a padartha with apt examples\textsuperscript{13}.

Āṇava cannot have come in between. Because, āṇava being insentient (jadu) it couldn't have created itself. Knowingly, no one would invite the trouble for oneself by being bound by an extraneous thing. God who is all good couldn't have created it. So, it needs to be acknowledged that the āṇava is uncreated, timelessly or beginninglessly present in this world.

If self is sentient, it can not be insentient at the same time. It would be self-contradictory to say the insentient and sentient are one and the same reality\textsuperscript{14}. In the same way, it is impossible to imagine a substance without its essential attributes and vice versa. Any change in the attributes alters (changes) the substance itself. Similarly, any destruction caused to the substance would definitely affect its attributes too.\textsuperscript{35}

Ultimately speaking, substance and attributes are only distinguishable aspects of a being and not an ontological entities in a being. That is why, when Siddhāntins speak of a state of liberation or mukti for the selves, they believe of a state where the selves are ridden of the influence of āṇava and are in a pure state (śuddha state) of being. Accepting such a state for the selves would reveal to us of the fact that āṇava, though, continues to remain as one of the three real padarthas and appears to be part of the selves, it has never been an essential attribute (lakṣāna) of the selves. So the bondedness of selves is an accidental state of affairs (condition) of their existence on this earth. Vedāntins call such accidental attributes as ‘Upātī’. Verdigris in the copper and the husk of the rice grain, may be connate but are not really attributes of the thing. Therefore, they’ll all be destroyed.\textsuperscript{36}
Etymologically, ānava comes from the term anu which means that substance which can be of by human mind as the least, partless and further indivisible. Hence, anu is that which makes the all pervasive knowledge (which would be distinguished later with the all pervasive knowledge of Pāti) of Pāśu into a limited and bonded condition. So, true cognition is the cause of eternal bliss or happiness. Vice versa, ignorance (whose root cause is ānava) is the cause of existential suffering of the human on this earth. It is light that could lead persons to greater happiness. But, it is darkness that leads persons to greater calamity. That is the reason, Umāṇṭi in Tiruvuṟuṟupayān questioned those who doubted the existence of darkness. If, there weren’t darkness (trūḷ inrēl), why then the suffering (tunpen?) of the selves. Umāṇṭi isn’t hard on the external darkness but that of the inner. According to him, this inner darkness (iruṟmalam) is the cause of all human bondage. The organ of sight, the eye can not be knowledge. In other words, knowledge is different from eye. Therefore, darkness though, obstructs the eye, it cannot block knowledge. So, even while the eye is unable to see in darkness, the self knows the existence of darkness. But it is not the same with ānava. It hides knowledge itself. Therefore, it is really difficult to know the existence of ānava itself. It is like a person who is mad cannot really know himself to be mad.

It is benficial to make a point of observation here, about the unique way ānava is understood in Siddhānta. For other schools of philosophy, causes of human bondage or ignorance are traced to māyā and karma themselves. It is only Siddhānta which goes to the root of the matter and points to ānava as the root cause of all suffering. Actually speaking, it is māyā through ānubhava, karana, bhuvana, bhoga and karma which help selves to know the nature of things. Karma is action. Action leads to knowledge and not vice versa. Māyā and karma are like the illuminating lamps to a pathfinder. But when Arulnandi says, what does he mean? Does he mean that it is māyā that ob-
structs (intoxicate) the self? The author's emphasis is to reveal the fact that it is not the nature (śvaraśa iksaṇa) of māya to do that but under the influence of the root cause, the ānava⁴¹; Therefore, the intoxication is not by māya but by ānava. That is why, Aruṇāndi addresses ānava directly, calling it the ruthless (paciṣṭa ānavaṁ) one.

Another fact to know whether ānava is one or many. Siddhānta holds the view that souls or selves are many (innumerable, countless). Naturally, when we witness to the countless souls-in-bondage, we are induced to question whether the ānava has a great over the souls is one or many as the selves on this earth. Dr.Arunaivadivel Mudaliyar explains it thus:

Ānava as a substance, it is one. If what is insentient were to be many substances, they would be considered to be effects which have an origin, existence and destruction. Such effects would call for a cause. Substances which are insentient and many will naturally have a first cause. Hence, if you call ānava, not one but many, it would be concluded that ānava too, has a first cause. But we know that ānava has no first cause. It has been beginningless present with the souls. Therefore, ānava itself is one and not many.⁴²

The qualities of ānava as mentioned in Mapadiya are also explained by the Siddhāntins both in Siddhiyār⁴³ and in Śivaprabhāṣam.⁴⁴ Aruṇāndi says that ānava is one (onre) but has many forms of energy or has much energy (anēka saktiyutaiyatā). If ānava is one, how does it manage to influence the many selves? The answer is that ānava makes its presence felt through its manyfold forms of energy. These forms of energy are varied and limited by time. Thus forms of energy disappear and stop influencing the souls according to their time limit and as well, according to the gradual maturity (sōpāna) attained by the selves. Each soul experiences liberation according to its attainment of maturity. This is called pakkuvam⁴⁵ or paripākam in Siddhānta. Thus ānava could be briefly defined as follows:

“Ānava is an ontological substance, different from, and cause of false knowledge. It is in beginningless association with the self like verdigris is in copper; hence it
is known as sahajamala. It is one and has infinite powers that could be overcome at different times. It is responsible for the three states of the self-kevala, sakala and suddha. It is asat, because it undergoes change.”

4.3.1.1 The Status of ānava at the Šuddha (or Mukti) State

We know that the self attains mukti by ridding itself of ānava. But that does not mean ānava ceases to exist at the state of liberation of the self. How can these two, the existence of ānava and the liberated state of the self be reconciled? If ānava continues to exist, how can the self enjoy the liberated state? What appeared more powerful in the beginning and hid the selves from right cognition of self as self and the objects as objects, loses its hold over the selves steadily as the selves progress gradually in their spiritual maturity.

Though ānava never ceases to exist ontologically, its power to bind the selves is weakened steadily. That is because ānava is, after all, insentient (asat). The insentient one goes through change and continues to shrink, whereas the sentient is not so. This never undergoes change. Thus the selves reach a stage of spiritual progress where ānava does not merely lose its influence over the selves, it loses also its power to obscure selves from true cognition. Thus the selves experience their state of liberation by shedding away the influence of ānava over them. At this stage, though ānava exists, it exists as though it exists not. It is like a snake which is allowed to move around after its (venomous and) poisonous teeth have been taken away.

Thus the self which is now freed from the power of ānava which obscured itself from the self and obscured as well the self from enjoying the “Śivānanda” or “Śivadarśana”, enjoys its soteriological bliss (vidu pēru or siva pēru).
It is true that *karma* and *māyā* are separate categories. However, Śivajñānamunivar considers *māyā* as a locus of *karma*. Since *karma* can not have either God or Self as its locus.
4.3.2 Karma

Whatever things exist in time and space on this universe can be called existents. The movement of these existents is called karma (karmam or vinai, toäl ceyal, étisar. Gñāvyai, Gñemô). Hence action by all means can not exist by itself. It always exists in an existent, a thing or a being. Our analysis will reveal the fact that karma exists in māyā. Karma is, after all, māyā’s action. For, māyā, according to Siddhānta is the material cause of any existent. Āṇava obscures totally, where karma and māyā manifest the intelligence of the self to certain extend as a lantern is used until the sun dawns.

4.3.2.1 Two States of Kārama:(Kūraṇa Karma & Kārya Karma)

Even when an action hasn’t taken place, the possibility or the potentiality of action is in the thing. Though at this stage, we can not predict what sort of action would that be. Such a state is called the causal state of karma. For example, the capacity or potentiality of child to walk without really walking can be considered fitting to explain this state. One significant person who holds this opinion is Tolkāppiar (The first Tamil Grammariian comparable to Pānini in Sanskrit). State of effect (kārya nīlai) is that when such a potential state of action really takes place. That is, when the child really walks. At the causal state there is no distinction between good and bad or right and wrong action. This distinction is drawn only at the state of effect. Therefore, what is told as ‘iruvinai or pāpa punya’ in Māpādiyam and other Tamil texts mean this kārya karma only (actions performed at the causal state).

If we take the ‘iruvinai’ mentioned here as the actions of good or bad performed at the state of effect, the term ‘mummatakkat’ would refer to the causal state only.
THREE MALAS
(and their Divisions)

1. Ānava
2. Karma
   - Sañcita
   - Prārabdha
   - Āgamyā
     - Kārmyā
     - Pāpa
     - Puṇya
3. Māyā

Śuddha Tattvas
(Śiva Tattvas)
(5)

Śudhāśuddha Tattvas
(Vidya Tattvas)
(7)

Aśudha Tattvas
(Āgma Tattvas)
(24)

Māyāyas (60)

Bhūtakāryas
(25)

Vāyus
(10)

Nādikās
(10)

Vāsanās
(5)

Vākkūkas
(4)

Gupās
(3)

Ahamkarās
(3)
4.3.2.2 Three Malas are Anādi (Beginningless)

It calls for a deep awareness within oneself to analyse the intricacies or nuances of our action. Why does one act at all? Either to obtain the good which he desires for or to avoid the evil which he dislikes within. Therefore, a feeling of like or dislike seems to form the basis of one’s action. Ultimately this like or dislike springs from the āgya-cit-sakti which is already obscured by ānava. We have already been instructed well about the fact of ānava being identified beginninglessly with the soul. Therefore, it is needless to say then, karma is identified with the āgya beginninglessly. 49 On the outset, we’ve already noticed that no action is possible without an existent. Therefore, āgya which acts (according to its likes or dislikes), needs an instrument for acting. And that instrument of action is māya. Therefore, māya too must necessarily be identified with karma beginninglessly. Hence, the good or bad acts performed at the state of effect, māya, the instrument of action may appear to have a beginning (ādi) and an end (antam) and may be limited by time and space, the karma and māyā at the causal state, are as well beginninglessly present with the soul (āgya) like that of ānava (cf., App.I.2.2.12). 50

Nellirku umiyum nikazh campinilkajimpum
Collil putitanru tonmaiye-valli
Malakanamam anṣu ulavām vallalal ponval
Altarcokam cey kamalattu ām. 51

It is translated as follows: If the husk of the rice grain and the verdigris of copper are considered, they are not new, but are connate. In the same manner māyā, mala and karma are beginningless. But their functions of becoming patent and potent are to be done by the bountiful one even as the opening and the closing of lotus flower are caused by the sun’s light.
We can notice the same in Śivajñāna Siddhi as well. ‘Valli’ mentioned above, means ‘māyā’ ‘malam’ means the mūlamalam that is ānava. ‘ānru’ (= anrē) would mean beginninglessly. Though ānava, māyā and karma are beginninglessly associated with the self, they all have a beginning and an end at the state of effect. It is like how a flower blossoms forth and dries up by the same sun rays, so also māyā and karma are associated and disassociated with the soul by the grace of God.

4.3.2.3 Clarifications about Māyā and Karma

This clarification is due to the misunderstanding prevalent among other schools of thought towards Śaiva Siddhānta. It is accepted among the Siddhāntins that karma is the cause of birth. Birth (begins with the conception and) is the moment of being delivered out of mother’s womb with a body. In Siddhānta, body is considered māyā. Without body, souls can not act at all. Karma and māyā are like the seed and the tree. One becomes the cause for another vice versa. Thus the continuity is explained. Now the question is how can karma be identified with the soul without a cause? The dispute whether karma or māyā is first based on a pre-supposition that the soul before the identification with karma and māyā had been pure and without blemish. Moreover, Siddhāntins when they mean karma and māyā they only mean the karma and māyā at the state of effect. That is why, they are of the opinion that how can there be an effect without a cause. Here is where the Siddhānta differs from other schools:

Śiddhānta believes basically that the souls are impure because they are beginninglessly associated with ānava. Therefore, the cause of their impurity is ānava itself. This is the cause as well of action (both good and bad) performed by souls. Therefore, mūta karma (action at the causal state) and karma māyā without one being the cause of another one’s origin, are beginninglessly present. So, there is no interval left for the souls to identify itself with māyā
through the likes and dislikes expressed through *karma*. Therefore, it is certain that along with *ānava*, the other two *malas* (*karma* and *māyā*) are also beginninglessly present with the selves.\(^{33}\)

### 4.3.2.4 Embodying the Souls

Through the likes and dislikes caused by *ānava*, selves are induced to action (*karma*). God who knows this inducement of the souls combines the *mūla karma* with that of the *kāraṇa māyā*, embodies the souls from *māya* first with *kāraṇa sārīra*, secondly with *kaṇjuka sārīra*, thirdly with *guṇa sārīra*, lastly with *sūkuma sārīra*. Thus when the souls which are embodied thus with *kāraṇa, kaṇjuka, guṇa* and *sūkuma sārīras* begin to act according to their likes and dislikes, the Lord bestows on them further seven types of *tūla sārīras* (subtle bodies): They are: Devar, people, animals, birds, reptiles and plants. The selves which are bestowed with these *tūla sārīras* begin to do what they thought of doing and felt like enjoying (in their previous birth). Thus the cycle of birth leading to action and action leading to (death and another) birth sets in the life of selves. This is how *Siddhānta* clarifies the doubt raised on the phenomenon of how selves begin their very first action or take to their very first body on this earth. Though all the three *malas* are *aṇādi*, we know for certain by now that the *ānava māla* is beginninglessly associated with the selves. It wasn’t created or caused by God at all at any point of time. And since it exists beginninglessly without any causal reason, *ānava* is called *sahaja māla* in *Siddhānta*. Whereas the other two *malas*, namely *karma* and *māyā*, though exist beginninglessly, they have been caused by God to counter the influence of *ānava* over the selves and rid them from ignorance which leads them to innumerable miseries of the world. Hence though ontologically all the three *malas* exist beginninglessly, ontically *karma* and *māyā* come as after-effect of this *ānava māla*. 
4.3.2.5 Dual states of Kārya-Karma: (Tōlam and sūkram)

Even while performing the action at the state of kārya-karma after the transition from the mōla-karma, it has two states within it. One is tōlam and another is sūkram. Say, someone who has thought of a good in his mind, expressed it in words and exercised it through his body. This is the first tōla state. According to Siddhānta, whatever is, is forever and cannot be destroyed. So, tōla karma as expressed above might have taken place and may appear to have gone into oblivion, in reality it is not. It is present for ever at the sūkma state. This is the sūkma karma. This is the sūkma karma which basically denied by the atheistic schools of thought. As well, this is the same sūkma karma which is accepted and affirmed resolutely by the theistic schools. “Arampava eppum arunkayiṣṭināī katti”.⁴ Așam and pavam mean the kāryakarma only. This is again confirmed by Tiruvaiyur va is his Tirukkura! (irulser iruvinal...).⁵⁵

4.3.2.5.1 Agāmiya karma

When someone does an action anew (just now) is called agāmiya karma. This agāmiya karma, when done, enters the next phase of saṃcita karma (action done and so to say, stored up for the time being).

4.3.2.5.2 Saṃcita karma

When tōla karma expressed first as agāmiya and loses its tōla state, enters the second phase and remains permanently at sūkma state, it is called saṃcita (well be-gotten or obtained).

4.3.2.5.3 Prārabdha Karma

An agāmiya karma becomes saṃchita and expresses itself as prārabda karma. According to Siddhānta, it is believed that the souls take to births in order to enjoy and
experience the effect of the (deposited) actions which have been stored up in the sañcitā karma and which have reached their maturity and are ripe enough to reap their fruit in one’s life time. This is the prārabḍha karma. It is called ‘Ūzh (இஞ்சு)’ in Tamil. It doesn’t mean that the fruit of the actions would be sequential. It all depends on the intensity of the actions. It will be in twists and turns or unsequential in its expression.

“Totangataivin ataiyate tōnrumma”\textsuperscript{36} It is a strong belief and conviction among the theistic religions of India that it is because of this law of karma (கார்ம) that people go through the joys and sorrows in life. Tirumuṭais speak of sañcitam as ‘toivinai (தொவினை)’ and akāmiyam as ‘mālvinai (மால்வை)’. What is said as ‘pazha vina’ in other books means the same ‘toivinai’ which is sañcitam. Prārabḍham invariably means the same in all books as ‘Ūzhvinai (இஞ்சுவை)’. Having understood the meaning of these different types of karmas, we can call them in the following way: (i) Sañcitam could be kidaivinai (கிடவினை), (ii) Prārabḍha as nukarvinai (நுகர்வை) and (iii) akāmiyam as varuvinai (வருவை). Thus the actions done by human beings (the selves) can be categorised into three types.

4.3.2.5.4 Pravāha Nittam

The action done in one’s previous birth and its fruits, according to its maturity and intensity, is lived out in the present birth. If that be so, what is the need for another birth again? The answer according to Siddhānta is that not all actions reach their maturity and intensity in one birth. So only some actions are lived in the present life and not all. We need to wait for some more births for other actions and the fruit of such actions to be matured and to be lived out. Moreover, it is not possible to experience prāratta without effort. So such efforts in turn, enter into akāmiyam, sañcitam and prāratta again. Thus, when we try to live out the fruit of one action that in turn lead us
to several other new actions. Accordingly, it will be clear to notice that though each action when began and done has a beginning and an end, ‘karma’ in general doesn’t seem to have a beginning and end. To that extent, karma too remains an eternal substance (कर्मसिद्धिः). Since it resembles the continuity experienced in a running stream, it is called the pravāha nītām (प्रवाहनित्तम). It is otherwise called ‘nasogpatti (नसोगपति)’, i.e., that which is produced anew while something else is destroyed.” It is as well compared to the seed that becomes food for the one who produced it and at the same time, it becomes the seed for the next harvest too. So also is karma. If such an unbreakable continuity exitsts between karma and its phala, how can we ever imagine the liberation of the selves from karma maṇḍa?

It is true that no soul on earth lives out all the karma phala even if it were to take several births. Logically, karma becomes inevitable because of āṇava. Therefore, once āṇava reaches its paripāka, souls will automatically lose their attachment to (interest in) karma. This state of the soul, in Siddhānta, is called ‘iruvinai oppu’ which will be dealt in the next chapter. When the soul loses its attachment to karma, Pati appears in the form of a Guru and drives away the ajñāna (false knowledge) caused by āṇava and fills the self out of his grace, with meññāna (true knowledge). At this state, the sancitam will be totally destroyed by his grace because of which akāmiyam would not arise. Since the self has lost its attachment to karma, prārabdha would not affect the self but may appear at the level of the body and be destroyed for ever. This is how the karma and its phala over the souls get destroyed.

4.3.2.6 Further Categorization of Karma

Even though karma means action, it is not done by/through body alone, it could be exercised even through thought that emanates from one’s mind and the words that are
uttered through mouth. So action could be categorised into three other types. They are
i) ymānatam (action done through mind), ii) vācikam (action performed through utterance)
and iii) kāyikam (action exercised through one's body).

Actions which are performed knowingly are called as 'putti pūvam' and actions
which are done unknowingly are called 'aputti pūvam'. Buddhistic schools don't accept
such unknowingly done actions. They deny such actions because of their lack
knowledge of the svarūpalakṣaṇa of things. Puranas bear many instances of selves
suffering from karma done unknowingly. There is a way out for actions performed
without one's knowledge (वृद्धिः खात्री विकृतिः कालिनिन्द्रां). Actions done knowingly
have no such way out. That is all the difference.

4.3.2.7 God's Role in Karma

As we have seen, karma is insentient (jada). Therefore, there is no chance for
crmana to know the actor who performed the action and has no capacity even to follow
such selves by itself. So, it is only the all-knowing Pati who can direct karma to reach
the souls proper to its action. It is done by God, in order that the selves experience the
fruit of their actions, so that the ānava māla becomes ripe enough to be destroyed
(तथापि ज्ञात ज्ञातानां वस्तुधारा ज्ञातानां संतुष्टिमिति). That is
the reason God directs and unites the karma with the selves concerned. The unorthodox
schools like Buddhism, Jainism and the orthodox school like Mīmāṃsā don't agree
with this sort of understanding about the role of God. They belief that karma by itself
does everything and it does n't really need an extraneous factor for it. Because of such
understanding of God's role in karma according to Siddhānta, the logic is extended to
the enjoyment of the fruit of it own karma.
We must be aware of the fact that there is no guarantee that when someone does something good, the fruit of such good action automatically cancels off the effect of a bad action. According to Siddhānta, everyone has to go through the consequences for every action of oneself without any difference of whether the action is good or bad. So, even if one does something with the intention of counteracting another good or bad act and its consequence, his intention could be met with to a certain extent by God alone but not fully. So, karma continues have its hold over the selves.

4.3.2.8 Rationale behind the law of karma

Law of karma is n’t a negative outlook as many would perceive in this modern and scientific world. Belief in the fruit of one’s karma is n’t fatalistic as well. But, rather it is a logical and experiential fact of life. It is here we understand the inbuilt autonomy of the human soul within the theo-cosmic whole to which (and within which) it belongs to. Law of karma according to Siddhānta explains convincingly the logic of human experience with in the frame work of freedom and responsibility of the self.18

4.3.3 Maya: The First Cause

Having discussed the nature of karma, let us now try to understand māyā. The Universe is an effect. It is like what the mud to the pot. So also is māyā to the world. It is the material cause out of which the world is caused. Thus māyā is the first cause of the world. It is our common observance that whatever is an effect has its origin (evolutuion) and end (involution) in its cause. So also is the world has its beginning and end in māyā from or out of which it is created.

4.3.3.1 Three Types of Maya and 36 Tattvas

The ultimate stuff of the material universe is prakṛti for the Sāṅkhya and paramāṇu for the Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika. The Siddhānta argues that if the ultimate means what is unitary
and indivisible, neither prakṛti nor paramāṇu can be ultimate. For, prakṛti according to the Sāṅkhya has sattva, rajas and tamas as its constituents. Paramāṇu, insofar as it is linked with another āṇu to join compounds, must have parts for the link-up. What has parts cannot be ultimate. The Siddhāntin says that the ultimate stuff is māyā, spoken of in the Vādās and the Āgamas. The Siddhāntin holds māyā to be real in contrast to the Advaitin who says that it is indeterminable (anitvacaniya) as real or unreal of both or neither. The Siddhāntin speaks of sūddha māya, aśuddha māya and sūddhāśuddha (prakṛti) māyā. Besides recognising the twentyfour tattvas of prakṛti māyā as in the Sāṅkhya, the Siddhāntin recognises five tattvas (called Śivatattvas) of sūddha māya and seven of aśuddha māyā (called vidyā tattvas). Śivatattvas are directly actuated by the Lord. The vidyā tattvas and the twentyfour of prakṛti-māyā called ātmatatattvas are actuated by deities under the authority of the Lord. The five Śivatattvas are called prārakakanda (the direct part); the seven vidyā tattvas are called bhojyārtikanda (the part that brings about enjoyment); and the ātmatatattvas are called bhogyakanda (the part consisting of objects of enjoyment). Appropriate to the status of the Lord and the deities acting under His authority the material acted upon is subtle, gross and very gross. Sūddha-, aśuddha- and prakṛti-māyā are compared to silk, cotton and jute. Sūddha māyā has no taint of mala and hence is fit to by actuated directly by the Lord. The Siddhāntin works give justification for recognising twelve categories more than the twenty four given by the Sāṅkhya. As the evolutes of māyā help souls plunged in total darkness by āpava, to have at least partial illumintions of their faculties, they are compared to a lamp that sheds a little light in darkness. The state of release is like sunrise overcoming darkness and illuminating everything. If through the experience made possible by association with the evolutes of māyā, souls work out their karma in the right spirit, there comes about maturation of āpava mala. This is the stage when the soul
is fit for removal of mala by the grace of God. Even as a cataract of the eye can be removed only when it is ripe, ārava can be removed only when it is mature.

4.3.3.1.1 Three Types of Selves and Three Bhuvanās

While we mentioned about ārava earlier, we took note of the three types of selves according to the number of malas the each one has. Since the world is created for the sake of the selves, it is natural that three types of worlds (bhuvanās) are created to suit their requirements. They are, i) suddha, ii) asuddha and iii) misram (suddhāsuddha). Since there are three types of created worlds (effects, bhuvanās), their causes too would be three in number. They are i) suddha māyā, ii) asuddha māyā and iii) suddhāsuddha (prakṛti) māyā. In that suddha māyā and asuddha māyā are causes which don’t have their origin in the other. Whereas the suddhāsuddha (prakṛti) māyā is created out of asuddha māyā. Therefore, strictly speaking, there are only two māyas which are worth calling māyas with their own merit as i) suddha māyā and ii) asuddha māyā.

So long as the self is in bondage it has to inhabit any of the three universes (bhuvanās), which are products of asuddha, suddhāsuddha and suddha māyas respectively. Since the self has the quality of assuming the mode of that which it knows (cāntatavyamāvatu), its object of knowledge will be characterised by the qualities of these universes. When the self occupies the universe constituted by asuddha māyā, its object of knowledge will be essentially characterised by the three guṇās of rajas, tamas and sattva. Though, the universe constituted by suddhāsuddha māyā, is beyond the three guṇās, it is still mixed with mala (ārava) and karma. Hence, the self’s object of knowledge will be characterised by forms which are the effect of mala and karma. The universe constituted by suddha māyā is beyond the three guṇās, mala and karma. But, as we know, Siddhāntin is a realist and advocates satkāryavāda. He does not
deny the presence of *karma* in *suddha māyā*, for if there were no *karma* in *suddha māyā*, it could not be manifested in the universes constituted by *suddhāsuddha māya* and *aśuddha māyā*. Therefore, when he says that there is no *karma* in the universes constituted by *suddha māyā*, it must be understood that there is no *aśuddha karma*, which is responsible for pain. Therefore, the self, so long as it occupies the universes constituted by *suddha māyā*, will experience only pleasure. But, even this pleasure is not everlasting, because *suddha māyā* is an effect and it will suffer the final act of dissolution.

4.3.3.2 The (Dual) Inner and Outer Worlds of *Siddhānta*

According to *Siddhānta*, two types of worlds emerge from *māyā*, the first cause. One is the world of Language (*sollulakam*) and the other one is the world of (material) beings (*porululakam*). The world of language is addressed as ‘śabdaprāpañcam’ (the world of sounds) or ‘vākku’ (term or word).

4.3.3.2.1 The World of Language (*Sollulakam*)

*Sollulakam* or *vākku* can be further divided into four kinds or stages. Language has definitely different stages in its production of sounds, words and meaningful sentences. Broadly speaking, they are of two kinds. One is the ‘inner (world of) language’ and the other is the ‘outer (world of) language’. When someone intends to utter a word or a sentence, he creates a linguistic code and gives an utterable form to it within one’s inner-self and finally expresses it. The inner (world of) language consists of different processes before uttering a word outside. The outer (world of) language is obviously all that is expressed, spoken, or uttered outside. (Sanskrit agamas are the first source. In Tamil Arulnandi uses these Sanskrit vocabulary. Śivajñānamunivar uses them elaborately in his *Māpadiyam*.)
4.3.3.2.1.1 Sūkkuma Vākku

The first stage of production of language is highly subtle and technical. It is at this causal state language is formed first. Therefore, at this stage language is known as sūkkuma vākku or nādam. It is even called as parai in Tamil. This stage is beyond the sensory perception.

4.3.3.2.1.2 Paicanti Vākku

When Vākku goes through the change from the subtle to the gross, it is still hazy and not yet formed state. This stage is paicanti which means that which is known to the sensory perception but indeterminately.

4.3.3.2.1.3 Mattimai Vākku

At this stage, the language has taken a full shape but not yet been spoken or heard. It lies hidden below the larynx of the speaker. This third stage is known as the mattimai or the middle stage.

4.3.3.2.1.4 Vaikari Vākku

Vaikari is nothing but mattimai vākku finally uttered and heard outside. Vaikari literally means divided or differentiated (sāraguguragnu). At this level, the word goes through a crucial stage. The intended word is articulated basically by a complex process of utterance. The sound produced, passing through the larynx and hovering over the tongue, hits at the teeth and palate and are uttered in audible and meaning words and sentences. These are the four kinds of vākku accepted by Siddhānta.

4.3.3.2.2 The World of Beings (Porulukam)

Things which have their origin in māya but always known and demonstrated by the above mentioned linguistic forms are categorised as Porulukam (world of be-
ings). This is known as the *arthaprapancam* in Sanskrit. It is created out of all the three *mâyās* mentioned earlier. They will be in the forms of *tanu* (body), *karaṇa* (mind and other inner organs), *bhuvana* (the place of living, the world) and *bhōga* (the things of experienced). The bodies of *Viśānankalar, prajāyākalar, and sakalār* have their origin respectively from *śuddha mâyā, aśuddha mâyā*, and *prakṛti mâyā*.

### 4.3.3.3 Tattvas

Before even the *tanu, karaṇa* etc., are created out of *mâyās*, they are formed into minute evolutes which are called *tattvas* in *Siddhānta*. *Śiva, Śakti, satakkiyam, isuram, suddhāvittai* are the five *tattvas* which evolve from the *śuddha mâyā*. Since *Śiva* himself effects *śuddha mâyā*, these evolutes are called *Śiva tattvas*. Since it is pure (*śuddha*), it is also known as *śuddha tattvas*. These five evolutes send the rest of the *tattvas* to the *prajāyākalar* and *sakalār* without they themselves forming part of their *tanu, karaṇa* etc... *Kālam, kalai, vittai, niyati, arakam, purudan*, and *mâyā* are the seven *tattvas* which evolve out of *aśuddha mâyā*. Since these *tattvas* are effected and regulated with the grace of *Śiva*, they are known as *vidyā tattvas*. It is because of these seven *tattvas*, selves, ridding themselves of the (insentient) influence over them by *ācava*, through cognition (*jñāna*), affection (*ichhā*) and connation (*kriyā*, volition) experience and enjoy *karma* in their life. Since it gives such experiences to the selves, it is called *

### 4.3.3.3.1 Origin of Prakṛti

*Prakṛti* appears out of *kalai*, one of the seven *tattvas* mentioned earlier. This is the *mūla prakṛti*. Since this forms the first cause for the rest of the *tattvas* to follow, it is also called the *prakṛti mâyā*. Except *Siddhānta*, all the rest of the orthodox schools stop with this *prakṛti*. They consider only those evolutes which appear from this (*prakṛti*)
36 MĀYA TATTVAS

(36 Evolutes of Māya)
According to Siddhānta

Śuddha Tattvas-5
(Pure Evolutes)
(Śiva tattvas)
1. Nāda
2. Vindu
3. Sadākkiya
4. Mahēsura
5. Śuddha Vittai

Śuddhasuddha Tattvas - 7
(Pure and Impure Evolutes)
(Vidya Tathvas)
1. Māyai
2. Kāla
3. Kāla
4. Nyadhi
5. Rāga
6. Vitta
7. Puruṣa

Aśuddha Tattvas - 24
(Impure Evolutes)
(Prakṛti or anma tattvas)
1. Citā
2. Ashamkāra
3. Buddhī
4. Manas
5. Tanmātras - 5
6. Jñānendriyas - 5
7. Karmendriyas - 5
8. Mahābhūtas - 5

Tanmātras - 5
(Subtle Elements)
1. Sound (Śabda)
2. Touch (Sparśa)
3. Form (Rūpa)
4. Flavour (Rasa)
5. Odoar (Gandha)

Jñānendriyas - 5
(Cognition)
1. Ear (Śrota)
2. Body (Tavak)
3. Eye (Cākuṣ)
4. Tongue (Rasanc)
5. Nose (Ghraña)

Karmendriyas - 5
(Action)
1. Hands (Pani)
2. Legs (Pada)
3. Mouth (Vāk)
4. Procreative Organ (Upasta)
5. Excretive Organ (Vayu)

Mahābhūtas - 5
(Gross Elements)
1. Ether (Ākāśa)
2. Air (Vāyu)
3. Fire (Tējas)
4. Water (Āpas)
5. Earth (Prīti)
as tattvas. The essential character of this mūla prakṛti is guṇa. This guṇa is understood in terms of sattva, rajas and tamas. So all that evolves from this mūla prakṛti will bear this three guṇas in themselves.

4.3.3.3.1.1 Twenty four tattvas evolve from this prakṛti

They are as follows:

Four antakaraṇas (mind, buddhi, chittam, ahamkāram),
Five jñānendriyās (body, mouth, eyes, nose and ear),
Five karmendriyās (vakku, padam, pani, payu and upattam),
Five tanmātras (sattam, parisam, rupam, rasam and gantam) and
Five bhūtas (pritivi, appu, īyu, vāyu, akāya).

The things that appear from prakṛti māyā are known as ājña tattvas because it is the great Śrikanda Rudra who came after Ananta Dēvar who is the cause of all these. With these only, the selves undergo the three guṇa rūpa in the form of happiness, suffering and mayakkam. Therefore, they are also known as bōgya kāndam. The other schools stop with these ājña tattvas. Viḍyā tattva and Śiva tattvas are known by Śivāgamas only. That is why, only the śaivism has these two tattvas. Therefore, according to Siddhānta, there will be thirty six tattvas in total (5+7+24=36). Śāstrās explain these tattvas elaborately.

4.3.3.3.2 The Five Kośas

In order to differentiate the adhikāra bhūda and the sōpāna, Śivajnanamunivar quotes the following details from the Sūktasamhitā. Out of the thirty six, the śiva tattvas (5) don't become the body for people like us. Out of the rest bhūtas, jñānendriyās and karmendriyās together make fifteen tattvas, are called the sthūla śarīra or annamaya kośa. Tanmātras and antankaranās (without the citta) are categorised as sūkṣma śarīra or prāṇamaya kośa. Prakṛti or citta is guṇa śarīra or manomaya kośa. (It is prakṛti which
stands as citta). Vidyā tattvas without māyā are kaṇcuka sārīra or viññānamaya kōśa. Māyā is kāraṇa sārīra of ānandamaya kōśa. Thus bodies are of five kinds. Guṇā, kaṇjuka and kāraṇa sārīras are named together as para sārīra. Thus the sārīras mentioned before also broadly divided into three types: sthūla sārīra, sūkṣma sārīra and para sārīra. Param means uti sūkṣma (subtler). Souls which have the three guṇās of the prakṛti and are influenced by them repeatedly are sakala. Those who haven’t such three guṇās are akalar. (Kalai is one of the seven tattvas of aśuddha māyā. So sakulas are selves which have the kalai tattva and akalars are selves which haven’t got kalai in them.)

4.4 Pati (Sat)

4.4.1 Existence of God is Established

The first sutra (under the pramāṇa iyal of the podu adikāram) of Śivayānaboddham itself, is aimed at proving the existence of God by the use of the means of knowledge, especially pratyakṣa (perception) and anumāṇa (inference). From what is perceived on the day-to-day experience, the unperceived reality of the Supreme Being (Pati) is inferred.

Sutra 1

On the Existence of God

The world, (which consists of three classes of beings, designated by) he, she, it and which is subject to three operations (viz. creation, sustenance and dissolution), will be dissolved in the same way in which it is created and sustained and will be re-created (re-appeared) from mala. The Agent of dissolution (antam) is the Primal Source (śadr) (i.e., The Universe comes out of the Lord of dissolution). So declare the wise (that such a God (Pati) exists (or remains the unchangeable efficient cause of the world).)

4.4.1.1 Through Inferential Reasoning (From the Known to the Unknown)

The Siddhāntin takes the world as real and proceeds to give its efficient (nimittā), auxiliary (saṅkārī), material (upādāna) and final (pravājana) causes. The efficient cause
is Pāti (Śiva). The auxiliary cause is Śivaśakti. The material cause is māyā. The final cause or purpose (prayōjana) is the purification and perfection of souls which leads to the ultimate union with Pāti. In taking the world as real and as subject to the processes of creation (srṣṭi), maintenance or sustenance (sthiti), and periodic destruction or involution or dissolution (samhāra), the Siddhāntin rejects the views of (1) those who maintain that it is a void (śūnya), (2) those who maintain that the world has always been in existence—has been never unlike its present state and thus does not require to be created, and (3) that is a natural combination and natural dissolution of four elements (earth, water, fire and air), and thus needs no spiritual agent for either of these processes. Likewise, in giving māyā as the material cause, the Siddhāntin rejects the views of those who suggest (1) atoms (āṇu), (2) prakṛti, and (3) Brahman (i.e., rejects both Brahmaparīṇāma-vāda and Brahmacīvatavāda). It is through His Śakti as an auxiliary cause that Śiva engages in the activities of creation, and dissolution of the world. The dissolution is periodic to give rest to souls. These activities are līla (sport or play) for Śiva, not in the sense that it is a pastime or idle play. It has redemptive purpose. The word, līla is used to show that there is no strain involved in the process. It is, as we might say, child’s play for Him. The redemptive purpose has two features: tirōdhāna (obscuration) and anugraha (bestowal of grace). Creation, maintenance, destruction, obscuration and bestowal of grace are the five activities of the Lord (pañcakṛitya). The first three are in respect of the physical universe, (acētana prapancā), and the last two are in respect of selves (cētana prapancia).

The Meykāṇḍār in the first sutra of Sivajñanabodha says that the world is classifiable as ‘he’ (masculine), ‘she’ (feminine), and ‘it’ (neuter). It is a whole consisting of these three parts. The assembling of these parts must be due to an intelligent spirit.
Besides, it is subject to changes. In other words, it is brought into existence, maintained and withdrawn. These changes are not self-made. They are made by an intelligent spirit. It may be objected that it is not right to affirm of the entire world changes witnessed in regard to individual things. The *Siddhāntin* suggests an analogy to clarify and reinforce his point. We see an entire species of plants or insects coming into existence in a season, staying for some time and going out of existence. His contention is that change is ingrained in the world. It is usual to give the potter as an example in this context. The *Siddhāntin* anticipates the objection that God would be ignorant, like the potter who is ignorant in many respects. the *Siddhāntin* replies that the potter may be ignorant of many things but not of making a pot. Similarly, since the universe is all that is (besides God and selves), God cannot be ignorant of the universe or of the mode of its creation.

4.4.1.2 Argument on Moral Grounds

The foregoing argument is based on the existence of the physical universe. The *Siddhāntin* advances another argument on moral grounds. The Lord subjects the world to the processes of origination etc., to enable the selves to get rid of their impurity. Acting from a sense of egoism, they accumulate *karma*. They are subjected to births and deaths till they learn the lessons of morality and spirituality. *Karma*, being an inert principle, cannot apportion its fruits properly to selves. Selves, in their state of bondage, are not likely to apportion the fruits properly to themselves. Hence a moral governor (*karmadyakasa*) is required. That moral governor is Śiva. Though these are the arguments usually given in the *Siddhānta* works, for the existence of God, it is possible to build up two more arguments from the devotional works referred to earlier, as the *Pāippirū Tuṟumurai*. 
4.4.1.3 Teleological Argument

In the *Tirumandiram*, we have the nucleus for a teleological argument or argument from design. One of the verses of the *Tirumandiram* speaks of God as the Mighty One who has placed a fire in the midst of the sea to prevent its overflowing on land. Anticipating the objection that there are occasional cases of coastal erosion, of sea submerging the land, the author says suggestively that nonetheless, the Lord showers His grace day and night, ceaselessly. Here we have a stimulus at once to our faith and to our intellect. The stimulus to faith is whether it can respond to the presence of God as it ought to, by remaining unshaken despite calamities on a limited or even cosmic scale. In the devotional works we find the firm declaration of such faith in spite of calamities. The stimulus to the intellect is to stir it to see the divine plan as a whole. Thus what appear to a short range view as cases of dysteleology and seem contrary to purpose or design are really seen to be necessary, from a long-range view. ‘Out of evil cometh good’. In short, the physical world is designed to serve the purpose of spiritual advancement.

4.4.1.4 Ontological Argument

It is possible similarly to construct an ontological argument also. The ontological argument is to the effect that the idea of a perfect Being, than whom nothing higher can be conceived, carries with it existential necessity, not merely logical coherence. M.Hiriyanna and S. Radhankrishnan in their works on Indian Philosophy have drawn attention to the similarity of an argument in the *Yogadarśana* to the ontological argument we come across in European Philosophy. There is a line in the *Tevāram* verse of Saint Appar. It is in the form of a question which carries its own answer. “How can I declare that He who has entered and who abides in the ambit of my intellect is false (is
non-existent)" In other words, Appar is certain that the idea of God is not a mere
figment or fabrication of his mind. It is so central that it gives meaning to and validates
the very idea of existence. God exists. He is a necessary Being. Souls and the world
derive their existence from Him. The accounts of the lives of some of the saints given in
the Periyapurāṇam make it clear that the Saints required no arguments to support their
faith. The life of Saint Kanapiyar is remarkable in several ways, not the least being that
he felt the sivalinga to be living presence, pulsating with life. Totally illiterate in the
worldly sense, he was yet aware of that by knowing which everything else can be
known. The devotional verses of the Śaiva Saints are vibrant with a sense of the pres-
ence of God.

4.4.1.5 Pati is the Sambhara Karapan and Hence He is the Nimitta Kārana

Pati is the supreme of the three padārthas. After an initial discussion on the logic
of Siddhānta that only the sambhara karpan (the Lord of dissolution) should be the
real and the only nimitta kārana (the efficient cause) of the world, K.Sivaraman
succinctly says,

...About Śiva Himself it is said that He is pati, the Lord of the bound (paśupati)
who freely descends and assumes the states of laya, bhoga and adhikāra
and takes on the respective forms of śiva, sadāśiva and mahēśvara and per-
forms the respective functions of dissolution, governance and creation of
all the realms of existence including the realm of speech. As referred to
Śiva the Agent par excellence, differences of the functions of srṣṭi, sthīti,
and sambhara do not imply a difference in the cause of the functions: śiva,
sadāśiva and mahēśvara are functional differences belonging to the same
unity behind them, whereas, with reference to the intermediary agencies,
their differences involve differences of agents also. 74

4.4.1.6 Knowledge of the Existence of God is actually a Gift from God

Detailing elaborately on the nature of God and stressing the fact that the knowl-
dge gained (through not only perception, inference but even through the scriptures)
by the sakalas during the stage of bondage will have finiteness (i.e., conditioned or limited by the subject-object structure), basing his argument on the text, Krishnan gives opinion that only the divine grace and the intuition that takes place by divine grace are the real means of knowing God.

“The sixth sūtra of Śivajñānabodhām brings out the fact that God cannot be known by the pramāṇas of perception, inference and verbal testimony. For, if he could be known by the pramāṇas, he would become asat, like the world which is known by these pramāṇas. But, if He is unknown by whatever means, then he would become non-existent, because unknown things cannot be asserted to exist. Therefore, God cannot be known by the pramāṇas, but can be known by divine grace (pati-jñāna) or intuitive or non-demonstrative knowledge (sūtrāntarātal).”

Apart from that, Krishnan also traces out the most fundamental qualities of God in Mapadiya which form the basis of the other qualities for which God is known.

4.4.2 Enugās (Eight Qualities) of Pati

If God were to be known by pramāṇas, he will be subject to change like the selves and the world. In which case, Pati can never be the Supreme being. Hence, the knowledge of God needs to be from ours and that must reflect naturally the essential characteristics (citapiplakkanam) of Pati.

God is Śiva because he cannot be known by the pramāṇas, and he is sat because he can be known by divine grace. Therefore, God is Śivasat, which means that God is cit (consciousness) and sat (existent). According to the Siddhāntin, cit and sat are the most fundamental qualities of God, and other qualities of God are derivable from these two qualities.

He is supreme because of His ontological nature (svarūpa lakṣāna) is such that He can’t but be, any other way than the way He is. He exhibits His Being (His essential
characteristics as a Supreme Being) through His eight-fold essential qualities (ṣaṅganas.
svaśe kārṇaśe).27 These natural qualities of God are: 1) Absolute Independence (tanvayatanaṭal, sūti svaśe kārṇaśe). 2) Pure Body (tūya udambinanṭal, svarūpa
śe kārṇaśe). 3) Essentially Cit (lyākai arvinanṭal, svarūpaśe kārṇaśe). 4) Om-
niscience (Mūrtumunṭal, svarūpaśe kārṇaśe). 5) Beginninglessly Unboundedness (lyāpākave
Pāsangalininkutal, svarūpaśe kārṇaśe). 6) Infinite Grace (pēraruludaimai, svarūpa
śe kārṇaśe). 7) Omnipotent/Infinite Power (mudilāṭaludaimai, svarūpa
śe kārṇaśe). 8) Infinite Bliss (varambilinbamudaimai, svarūpaśe kārṇaśe).29 God,
is by His immutable nature (nirvikār)30 and by His being transcendent to the selves and
the world which is made of asuddha maya, He is unaffected by the three guṇas of
rajas, tamas and sativa. According to this understanding He is also known as
"nirguṇa".31

The opponent may object since God performs the fivefold function, He can not be
immutable. The Siddhāntins answers that the immutability of God is understandable only
to those who follow the Siddhāntic path and thereby have the eye of divine grace (arutkaṇ).

God remains unaffected, because He performs the actions in absolute freedom
(tanvayam).32 God transcends the universe constituted by sudhāsuddha maya, and is
unaffected by, mala and karma, so He is known as "nirmaṇa".33 He is as well tran-
scendent to the categories of cause and effect. So His Bliss is, everlasting, and hence
he is known as "nityānandan".34 God is transcendental not only to maya and its prod-
ucts, but also to the self. Thus, He is known as tatparan.35 Since God is transcendental
to both the self (Pāśu) and the world (Pāśa), he cannot be known by analogical
reasoning. Therefore, he is known as tanimutakānu (unique or supreme Lord).36

He is what He is (God’s Being) by His eight-fold qualities. He acts (God’s do-
ing) as the supreme spiritual being through His pōṇekṛtyas, the five-fold functions
(aimōlikā) according to the way He wills by his gracious saṅkalpa.
4.4.3 *Pati’s Saṅkalpa*

After stressing the necessity of the presence of a sentient being (*sat*) and its existence as a necessary being against the background of *karma* which is insentient (*asat*), in the second illustrative verse of the second *adhikarana* of the first *sūtra*, Śvajñānamunivar, entering into the logic of the opposing school of philosophy, which argue whether it is not enough of selves which are sentient for the functioning of the deeds without the presence of a Supreme Being, answers back saying, it is not enough. Because the selves are bound by the spiritual dirt which is known by the name of ānava and so they require the presence of a sentient being for their activities even as a jar of mud. In the third illustrative verse of the same *adhikarana*, an objection is raised saying that the potter is shrouded by ignorance and is not free to act and will be affected by changes. So, the Supreme Being which is established on his analogy should also possess such imperfections. The objection is overcome: There are two kinds of agents. One is he who functions with the requisite instrumentalities. Another kind is the agent who can function with *will power* (*saṅkalpa*), in the second case there is no limitation or change due to activity. God produces the world with His will power without requiring any instrumentalities. He protects and destroys the whole universe on similar lines. So He is as independent and free as a man who remembers his experiences in a dream during his wakeful state. Time is the instrumental cause for a number of changes in the universe. But it remains unaffected by the changes produced by it. The term with the mind or as the mind (*ujjatiḥ*) may be taken to give two kinds of imports. One is that it simply means *will power*. The other is as follows:

A man who masters a particular art or science, of course, undergoes certain changes and sufferings at first. But after the mastery, the meaning and the expression
that conveys the meaning come from his mind freely without affecting him in the least. So also God involves the whole universe with His will power (saṅkāipa) and the evolution of the universe takes place as freely as the delivery of a lecture on the subject mastered by a person. The intention behind the illustrative verse is that though there are two kinds of agents, yet the analogy of the potter is cited because of the common element of the agency or being the efficient cause.

Again it may be insisted that the agent who imposes the three kinds of changes should possess embodiment and so should possess a form. But it is not so, for the self that moves and controls its own body which has a form has no form for itself. So also the Supreme Being while remaining formless could act on the universe which is His form. In order to impress this idea on the disciple the author of the second work, Śivañāna Siddha has spoken about the subtlest functions of the Lord in the following words.

The individual self while acting on its physical body has its mind to display the will, cognition and desire and is able to grasp the impressions of the external world through the sense organs. In the same manner the whole universe is the embodiment of the Supreme Being. The living beings are the parts of the body where the sense organs are situated. The inner instruments for the Lord are the three-fold potency which manifest in the form of conation (kriya), cognition (jñāna) and volition (citta). The individual selves are the sense organs which are activated by the dance of five functions by inducing consciousness to the individual self which does good to them. If we admit embodiment to the Lord, then on that similarity we should admit the existence of another Lord, who has to create the embodiment of the Lord. This will lead to infinite regress.

Also since embodiment is an impediment which will prevent freedom of action of the agent, first of all we suppose that the formless God with His Consciousness—
Force (Śiva-cit-śakti) creates Nāda etc., from pure māyā. Then by His own free will He embodies Himself with nāda etc., and functions. This idea is expressed in the 53rd stanza of Jñānamṛtam.

Here is an objection raised by the opponents. If a man has seen God and His creation at a particular place first and then if he sees only His creation then it will be proper that he will infer the existence of God by the strength of the concomitance. So far as God is concerned, He was never seen as in the case of a potter. So there is no possibility of the occurrence of inferential reasoning itself.

Now we shall question the opponents. A man who has seen both the smoke and the fire in a hearth if he happens to see the smoke alone in another hearth, it is proper that he should infer the existence of fire though it is not visible. But in the case of a mountain smoke alone is seen by the person and not the fire. Do you admit that he will be able to infer the existence of fire in the mountain also by using the analogy of the hearth, even though smoke on the mountain is comparatively large. If you say that since there is difference in the volumes of smoke in the hearth and that on the mountain, there can be no inferential knowledge, then I should say that you are not a believer in the efficacy of inference. If, on the other hand, you say that there will be inferential knowledge in the case of mountain as well on the strength of the universality of interdependence of the substances smoke and fire, the same thing will equally apply to the existence of God. A man who sees the object as well as the doer at a certain place, invariably, grasps the concomitance of them. So as he sees the object alone, which is the universe it is but proper that he should infer the presence of the creator of the universe who is the agent. This argument is used in verse 50 of Jñānamṛtam also. Such arguments may be found and read with advantage in Sanskrit Śivāgamas.
All the above mentioned arguments fall under the category of podu. Therefore, the perception, inference and even sabda before the saktinipata (the descent of grace) give us only partial knowledge of God. There is a quality difference but not contrary at the level of cirappu.

4.4.4 Five-fold Functions of Pati (Panākriyas, Aintojilka)

The Prime Lord who was denoted the Lord of dissolution of the universe is in union with the selves, as the self is in the physical body; He is different from them even as the sun’s light is from the eyesight. Having this relationship with the selves, He wills them to undergo death and birth, experiencing the results of their works which fructify by the action of the consciousness-Force which is known as His authority. This authority is in implicit union with Him, samavāya, the union of substance and quality.

The expression ‘being one with and other than the selves’ is interpreted so as to yield two meanings simultaneously. In Śivajñāna Siddhi also it is said that the Lord is the same as the selves, different from them, and is together with them. In conformity with the expression used in the first aphorism that the universe comes out of the Lord of dissolution, here also death is mentioned before birth.

The term authority is related to both the works of the selves and the Lord. From the expression, ‘having the relation with selves He wills them to undergo death and birth’, we have the description of the Lord that He is the agent of the five fold functions. From the expression that the selves experience the results of their works which come to fruition being activated by His authority, we know that the Lord’s consciousness-Force is the instrumental cause of the universe and the works of the selves are also instrumental through and depending on it. From the mention of the two-fold works
(iruvinaiyin) we conceive of a substance which is the state of the works, and that substance (māyā) is obtained as the material cause. From the expression that selves undergo death and birth in accordance with their works, we obtain that at the time of reappearance the universe will have the multiplicity of the forms so as to conform to the fruition of the works of the individual selves.

It is enough for the purposes of definition that the Prime Being is the agent of any one of the five functions, creation etc. But in order to give no room for doubt to creep in, it is said that He is the agent of five fold functions.

The five fold functions are creation, maintenance, dissolution, disciplining and the act of grace (It is usual to use the term obscuration or screening instead of disciplining so as to represent the Sanskrit expression tirābhāva). Now these five fold functions should be understood to be of three kinds. They are the gross, the subtle and the subtlest.

Of these the gross are the well known ones. The origination and the dissolution are the manifestation and the disappearance of the universe. Maintenance is the abiding of the universe from the time of its manifestation till its disappearance. Disciplining is to be understood as the state of bondage, and the act of grace is the grant of the state of release.

From the state of kēvala state until malaparipaka, God continues to discipline the selves until they are matured. Upto the selves are under the state of podu only. Once they receive the descent of grace they enjoy the same act of God, not as the discipline but as joy (anugraha).

If it be so, it may be questioned how maintenance can be considered to be an act of the Prime Being, for the universe which has been created will last till it is again
destroyed; so there is no need for the effort of God in that respect. In the case of worldly kings they have to protect their kingdom from being destroyed by their enemies. But for the agent of dissolution there is no other agent of dissolution till He Himself willing to dissolve the universe.

Further even as the changeless state of a water pot depends upon the effort of a person who bears the pot, so also the sustenance of the universe after its origin till its destruction depends upon the will power of God. The effort of God is to be understood as His will that the universe should abide for such and such a duration.

God is omniscient. So He knows the painful experience of all the living beings. He is omnipotent. So He is able to grant liberation to all the living beings. His names are Śiva (the auspicious), Śankara (giver of bliss) etc. So He is full of mercy and when He sees the painful experience of any living being. He will not differentiate between the experiences but will immediately be moved to remove their pains and will relieve them all and grant them eternal bliss all at once. Such a God having such attributes should know the bondage of works which have been produced and accrued from the beginningless past and their diversified effects of pain. He also knows the various potencies of the inherent maia, which prevent the attainment of release, but still He does not remove the cause of pain and grant supreme Bliss. This is because of the following reasons:

The presence of maia which prevents the selves from enjoying the presence of God may be compared to the presence of the antiheat stone (kulikai) which prevents
the heat of fire being felt by the palm of a person till an anti-spell, (which will act against the stone), is pronounced. The pronunciation of the anti-spell is comparable to the spiritual wisdom of the individual self which enables the self to experience the blissful presence of Lord directly. Till such a spiritual wisdom comes to the individual self, the self is not able to experience the presence of the Supreme Being. The Divine will which acts according to the various potencies of the mūla mala. Karma is a tendency of the self, so karma does not condition God. He creates and reveals himself through his will. This will is called obscuration or screening. Saint Māṇikka vācakar has said in st. 20 of Tirup-percunnam that God is bondage as well as freedom (bandamāy vidum-ayinārukku). Here bondage refers to the act of obscuration of the Lord. So it will be clearly understood that obscuration is the function of the Primal Being. It may also be noted that because obscuration, is the function of God, the potencies of knowing and doing of the selves blossom and fade alternately and grow in ascending order like the stairway.

Some people will explain obscuration as obscuring the detestable nature of things which are detestable. The principles of mala, karma and māyā will hide the wisdom of the seer so that he may not see the object. There is no principle to obscure the objects other than these principles which hide the cognitive power of the seer to be established by valid means. So it is not different from the principle of bondage. Some will say to obscure the bondage is obscuration. It is none other than the function of grace. Similarly the various ways of explanations offered by other people also should be understood to be incongruous. Śīvajñāna Siddhi in st. 87 of the 2nd sutra defines the power of obscuration as the potency of the primal being which directs the three impurities so that they may function. So it will be known that our explanation alone is the intention
The threefold function of creation, sustenance and dissolution may be expanded into fivefold function of Śiva, namely, creation, sustenance, dissolution, obscuration and bestowal of grace. The twofold function is with regard to bondage and release which is already included in the fivefold function.
of the master. The nature and function of grace is more explained in the chapter that follows.

Now the five subtle functions are what happens to the selves after dissolution in the state of the loneliness (kēvala - the state when the selves are under the influence of ānava alone).

The five functions classed as the subtler are to be seen while the self has experience of the worldly objects. If it be so, in the first aphorism the author referred to three changes; in this (second) aphorism he confined himself to saying the ceaseless experience of going and coming. Even in the Agamas the three states of iaya, bhoga and adhikāra and the three-fold potency of Hārīti, Janārū and Rodhayitri alone are referred to: So how are we to obtain the five-fold functions, by the addition of obscuration and bestowal of grace. Obscuration is nothing but the direction of the fruition of the works by the will of god (saṅkalpa) and it is included in the function of sustenance. Dissolution is becoming absorbed in the Supreme with the spiritual dirt and bestowal of grace is becoming one with the primal being without return. So it is included in dissolution, with this point in view, the five-fold functions are concisely referred to by the three-fold functions. Also since the three functions of creation, sustenance and dissolution are included in obscuration, the five divine functions may be referred to as two-fold function namely the bondage and release. When these functions are expanded, all the Āgamas are consistent in speaking of the five functions.⁸⁸

All the five kinds of actions performed by God are expressions of divine grace, though grace is stated as the last and one among the five-fold action. The five-fold action can be called "providential grace", for it has the aim or telos of enabling all selves realise their essential advaitic union with the Lord. The Siddhāntin makes a two-fold classification with respect to the operation of divine grace. So long as the self remains in bondage, God’s grace operates through mala and karma and enables the
self to reap the consequences of its actions. Since God's grace operates indirectly to bring about the spiritual maturity of the self, this aspect of divine grace is known as "tīrōḍhaṇā śaktī". The first four functions of God, viz., creation, sustenance, destruction and obscurcation are brought under tīrōḍhaṇā śaktī. The fifth function, viz., bestowal of grace, is called "anugraha-śaktī," because when the powers of anava are fit enough to be overcome, God appears directly in the form of the spiritual preceptor (guru) and grants relase to the self.89

4.5 Relationship between Three Padārthas

Against the background of above mentioned findings, the relative and the absolute possibility or impossibility of the relation among the three padārthas (the relation between God and on the one hand, and self and the world on the other) and their basic ontological relationship are explained. For, it has important implications not only for the concept of man (as an organic whole of jñāna, ichhā and kriyā) but also for divine grace. Thus this discussion will set the right tone and form the basis for understanding the soteriology of Śaiva Siddhānta which succeeds this chapter.

4.5.1 Siddhānta's Theory or Relation (Guṇa-Guṇi-Sambandha)

The theory of relation between substance and attribute (guṇā-guṇi-nyāya),90 is no more than the summation (samudāya) of the qualities. This relationship is explained elaborately in the Māpādiyam under the title of the "The nature of the quality and the qualified," wherein Śivajñānamunivar calls to our attention of the fact...that the view that a whole is altogether different from its parts and the classification of action, class, difference etc., as different from a thing are not proper. It should also be appreciated that inherence (samavāya) is not different from what is called tādātmya in Śaiva Siddhānta".91 According to this understanding of relation between substance (guṇi) and attributes (guṇā), we can say that the self is nothing but the expression of its
Though Advaitins, Viṣiṣṭādvaitins and Dwaitins seem to interpret advaita (differently), Śivajñānamunivar contends that all of them ultimately interpret advaita to mean that Reality is One. Therefore, they are not different in their main contention. However, Śivajñānamunivar interprets advaita not in the numerical sense of one-ness but as a relation between two realities (Pervasive and the Pervaded) whereby Śivajñānamunivar refutes the interpretation of Advaitins, Viṣiṣṭādvaitins and Dwaitins.
triple-attributes, namely jñāna, ichhā and kriyā. In the same way, māyā is nothing but the organic expression of its triple-guṇās of satva, rajas and tamas.

4.5.1.1 The Relation between God and Self- as “Advaita” (The Essential)

According to Sivajñanamunivara, God or Śiva is in advaitic relation with the self. The relation is explained by an interpretation of the word “advaita”. The negative prefix in the word “advaita” could be understood in three different senses of (1) Non-existence (inmai), (2) Contrariety (marutalai) and (3) Inseparable togetherness (agmai). The Advaitin interprets the word “advaita” in the first sense and hence reality, according to him, is not two, that is, it is one which is nirguna (qualityless). So the advaitins are known as kēvaladvaitins. Though Ramanuja and Śivādvaitin also understand the term as non-existence of the two, and hence for them reality is onequalified. For they ascribe śakti, sankalpa to the one (Brahman), but also recognise the reality of the souls and world. So, these are known as viśiṣṭadvaitins. The dualists (Bhādadvādins) interpret “advaita” in the second sense. The opposite of the two is one; but since there is an opposite, reality is ultimately two. But if we look at them critically, we realise that all of them interpret “advaita” meaning as one, and interpret the one-as kēvala, viśiṣṭa and as having an opposite-to be in accord with their own philosophical predilections.

But, the Siddhāntin summarily dismisses the interpretations of the advaitins and bhēsadvātins, as they are contradictory to the śrutis statements. He is not averse, however, to considering the souls and world as qualities of God, but Viśiṣṭadvaitins’ interpretation that there is only one reality is not acceptable to the Siddhāntin. If reality is not one, the Vēdas could have stated explicitly that “it is one” not as “not two”. Moreover, if reality is one the Mahāvākyās would lose their significance; for they say
that “you become that,” “I become that“ and “this becomes that.” According to Siddhāntin, therefore, the subject and predicate of the above vākyas refer to two different substance; and hence “advaitic” should be understood as intended to explain the relation by means of which the one becomes the other. The emphasis is on the relation that holds between the two, and not on the identity of the two.

Before formulating his own interpretation of “advaita”, the Siddhāntin considers several possible relations between God and self as one of union (aikāya), identity-indifference (tādātmya) and conjunction (samyoga) and dismisses them as untenable and finally accepts the relation that holds between god and self as one of inseparable togetherness (ānmai).

According to the Siddhāntin, the relation that holds between God and self is one of inseparable togetherness. The twoness of the two is denied, because the self, though different form God, is similar in essence. The relation of tādātmya is of two types. The first type of relation is that which obtains between a substance and its attributes. In the second type, two distinct substances exist as if they are one. The Siddhāntin calls the first type of relation “tādātmya” and the second type of relation “advaita”. Therefore, the interpretation given by the Siddhāntin is one of ananya, according to which the two substance exist as not-two. The advaita of Siddhānta emphasises the essential similarity and not the substantial identity of the two substances-Śiva and the self.⁹²

4.5.1.2 The Relation between God and Pāśa (ānava)

Since advaitic relation holds between God, the pervader, and the self, the pervaded, the same relation of advaita should hold by implication between God on the one hand, and māyā and karma on the other, for the latter are pervaded by; the self which in turn is pervaded by God, However, according to the Siddhāntin, no relation between God and ānava, the third constituent of Pāśa, could be postulated. Because, though ānava is pervaded by God, it does not exist in the presence of God as darkness does not exist in the presence of sunlight. It may be objected that since may too is non-
According to the Siddhānta tradition the liberated state does not negate pāśa but the self remains a master of it. A Jīvanmukta, for example, can use pāśa to express his liberated state. This is consistent with the realism of the Siddhānta.
existent in the presence of God, no relation could be postulated between God and māyā. The Siddhāntin replies that when sruti says that māyā is sūnya before God, it does not mean non-existence, but only means that in the presence of God it does not manifest its energy. Again, if māyā is interpreted as non-existent, it would contradict the scriptural statement that may is the pāngraha-śakti of the unfettered one. Moreover, products of māyā like earth, water, fire, air, moon, sun and space along with the self are considered as constituting the body of God. Therefore, the Siddhāntin concludes that the advaitic relation that holds between God and self should also hold between God and māyā. However, the Siddhāntin, in spite of postulating the advaitic relation between God on the one hand, the the world of selves and things on the other, is careful to point out that the self, because it is cit, has special privileges. This means that the self as a distinct spiritual substance has freedom. The advaitic relation does not annul, but preserves and guarantees the freedom of the self. This advaitic relation between God and self is further postulated into three which will be taken up in the last chapter on the soteriology of Siddhānta.

4.5.1.3 The Relation between Self and Pāśa (Accidental)

Self, in its kēvāta state has been related to Pāśa from the beginningless state. At this state, the self wouldn’t even know that it is related. Its power of consciousness, knowledge and freedom is almost nil at this state. Through the grace of God, at the sakala state, the self is gifted with māyā and karma, which though are constituents of pāśa as such, play as instruments in the hand of God and help the self realise its existential condition through the partial manifestation of its consciousness, knowledge and freedom. At the śuddha state though the self has severed its bondage to āpavā, its ontological openness to the possibility of experiencing the pāśa remaining, in the actual sense, it identifies totally with the Pāṭh who is omniscient, omnipotent and an embodi-
ment of all freedom. This being the telos of the self, the self in the true sense has not
relation with the pāśa and is now lost in the overwhelming bliss of the Lord.

4.5.2 An Ontological Analysis on the ‘Anubhava’ of the Soul:

(Subject and Object Structure of Human Consciousness)

Pati(sat), according to Siddhānta, is that which is permanent, all pervasive con-
sciousness. And, therefore, it has no need to experience anything else. Pāśa (asat) is
that which is changing. Moreover, it is insentient (jada) and devoid of consciousness.
Therefore, it cannot experience. Of the three metaphysical categories of Śaiva Siddhānta,
these two (Pati and Pāśa) are on the opposite pole with each other and so can not
experience each other. They can never come together. Umāpathi is emphatic in ex-
pressing this fact (sattu asattai sāratu). It means Pati is an independent reality. Pāśa
can never have any experience because it cannot know (asattu anyatu). So, the only
metaphysical possibility for these two to be known and experienced (ivait uññat) is left
with the soul (uyir) because it has the capacity to know both Pati and Pāśa (sadasattām
uyir). Only the soul is ontologically open to the condition of possibility of “knowing,
experiencing and willing” both Pati and Pāśa. (In otherwords, Paśu remains always a
dependent reality.)

Both the concrete function of cit-śakti, namely the cognitive and the cona-
tive fulfil a function in the acquisition of knowledge. The conative removes
the hindrance or the veil to the object becoming known; its cognitive śakti
invests the object with a competence which is conducive to its manifesta-
tion in knowledge. Whenever one is referred to the other also is to be
understood as implicitly present. The ‘intention’ (icchā) behind knowledge
brings about the identification of the subject and the object and accomplishes
the ‘experience’ (anubhava). The intelligence becomes pure ardour. To
enjoy or experience is interchangeable with ‘to know’, the latter being only
a nomen abstractum of the former.93
Therefore, only the self which is neither ‘sat’ nor ‘asat’ has the condition of possibility of knowledge and experience. One of the essential qualities of the self as we have mentioned earlier is that the self assumes the mode of that which it knows. This quality of the self is known as “cāntatagyanamātā.”

It means the self has the quality of pariticipating in the being of that which it knows. This kind of knowing by pariticipating is known as “ajunjitațal.” Therefore, the Siddhāntin says that whatever is known is also experienced. It is only in this sense the Siddhāntin uses the word “anubhava”. The known that is experienced is other than the self which knows and experiences. This explains the Siddhāntic concept that God does not have anubhava, because God is the all-pervasive ground and hence, there is nothing outside him worth experiencing. Pāsa cannot have any anubhava, because it is non-sentient. It is the self that has the ability to experience both Śiva and the world, for it is the one relativity that has the ability to know both sat and asat. Hence in Śiva Siddhānta the self is referred to as ṣadasat.⁹⁴

And its knowledge is ever demonstrative (cuṭṭyaṇivatu), in the sense, it will always have the subject-object relation. According to Siddhānta, the self’s knowledge is made manifest by the object (vyāṇjakā), and since after the manifestation of knowledge, the self assumes the mode of that which it knows, the question arises whether the self has a knowledge of itself, apart from the knowledge it has of the object. The Siddhāntin replies that the “self as a centre of consciousness (cit) does not know itself independent of the object which it knows. The consciousness of the self is always consciousness of the object, and when it is thus conscious, it becomes conscious of itself. The object is always a correlate of consciousness. Therefore, the self knows itself, if and when it knows either sat or asat. Self’s knowledge of itself is intrinsic to the structure of the self’s knowledge of the object”.⁹⁵