METHODOLOGY OF PODU AND CIRAPPU
Methodology of *Podu* and *Cirappu*

2.1. Introductory Remark

We have so far been dealing with the text of *Śivajñānamāpādiyam* in its historico-literary context and explaining the scope of our study. We have not, so far, mentioned anything about the nature and methodology of our search. Such a study of the methods and methodology in particular reference to the text of our choice against the background of its centuries old *Saiva Siddhānta* tradition is necessary.

2.1.1 Method and Methodology

The concept of method in research has two aspects. One is that of the content we intend to present (substance of research work) and the other is the procedure with which we set about dealing with the subject. Grasp of the content (for example, the *Pati-Paśu-Pāsa* padārthas of the *Siddhānta*) of study or research needs the grasp of the method or methods (*podu* and *cirappu* for example) involved. There is a reciprocal relationship between the two. A search into the content itself is a search into its method also. Method is a settled kind of procedure, followed usually according to a definite, established, logical or systematic plan. “Methodology,” then, “is the study of the methods that are used in a discipline in order to gain knowledge concerning the subject matter of that discipline under the particular treatment.” Hence in Philosophy,
it would mean studying the underlying principles and rules of organization of a philosophical system or inquiry procedure. Emphasising in general the purpose of a research methodology for all disciplines and in particular for philosophy, Ramachandran says that it, "is to identify the general and constant features of research method on the one hand and on the other to ascertain how the particular features of method vary according to the nature of the disciplines, fields and areas it operates." Conclusively, we could say that methodology is a science that deals with the cognitive processes (the meaning of cognition and epistemological nuances according to the school of Śaiva Siddhānta will be dealt in the following chapter under the title, "Cognitive status of Man in Śaiva Siddhānta" imposed by the problems that arise from the nature of its subject matter.

In order to have a fair grasp of Śaiva Siddhānta, it is absolutely important and necessary to understand the methods (for Śiddhānta begins with a method called podu and ends with another Cīrappu) employed by Śvajñānamunivar in expressing and interpreting the content of Śaiva Siddhānta in general and of Śvajñānamapādyam in particular. The methods employed by this author would reflect and belong to the content of the Śaiva Siddhānta system as a whole. "Every methodological reflection is abstracted from the cognitive work in which one actually engages. Methodological awareness always follows the application of a method; it never precedes it." Employing, thus, a proper methodology in one's research, yields rich dividends of right and critical understanding of a particular discipline. Understanding, after all, is the grasping of some mental content to which an expression points to. (Acts of understanding, not infallible though, are the primary cognitive processes with which human studies begin.) Different types of understanding on different levels of complexity of phenomenon are
unified in their purpose. This "unity of purpose in the acts of understanding is what gives each discipline its specific character and avoids reductionism."4

2.1.2 Inter-disciplinary Approach (Philosophy and Anthropology)

Our research is not merely "thinker and text-based"5 but has an "inter-disciplinary"6 approach towards the reality of our search, having the empirical (anthropological) and transcendental (philosophical) aspects in view. "The methods of physical science, like chemistry, such as experiment in a laboratory, cannot be adopted for a social science, like economics, which has to depend on the observation of a large number and variety of facts, or statistics. In a subject like philosophy7 where we deal with fundamental problems which occupy a very abstract level of inquiry, the method has necessarily to rely on a type of reflection which is far removed from laboratory and field work... A special feature of classical Indian philosophy... is that it relies on scriptural texts as sources of knowledge. Without going into the merits of the case, we might note that this class of philosophy calls for exegetical interpretation and cannot depend entirely on logical analysis or speculation as in the other case. The same variation in methods applies to specific topics discussed by research investigators."8

2.1.3 Methodology of Śivajñānamāpāṇi

The Māpāṇi begins with a clear statement on its goal, "This text aims at searching the content of jñānapāda, one of the four pādas of Śivāgamasya."9 Since this is its set-goal, it adopts a methodology, not arbitrarily but following its tradition, to fulfil its goal. Its methodology is studying the reality not merely 'as it appears to the mere means of knowledge (pōdu),' amidst the objective world of observation (ārāyicī) but 'as it is in its true and essential nature revealed through the grace of God (cirappu)."
Podu, then, is the general, observable, quantifiable and demonstrative knowledge (cuttānīvū) of things and cirappu (which is interchangably used as unmai) is the special, unobservable, unquantifiable and non-demonstrative knowledge of reality. Podu and cirappu are two levels of cognition of reality; the former could be said to be empirical in the modern scientific sense and the latter is understood as transcendental which goes beyond the level of mere observation and prediction of the natural sciences. But, though they are two modes of cognition, one does not negate the other or cancel the other but accepts the other as an important step in coming to the nature of reality.

In the process of knowing the cirappu, podu precedes the other always. It is not possible for the self to attain the cirappu without passing through the podu. What is understood partially in podu is understood totally or completely in cirappu. Hence, the methodology itself must not have any major flaw of missing the ultimate goal in the pursuit of explicating the proximate ways and means of achieving it. So the process is as important as its final fulfilment of it. In other words, the end towards which the text tends, is to be gradually achieved at each stage of the process of search. Hence, if the process of search for the goal itself is mistaken or misguided, we would never reach the goal at which the text of Śivajñānamāpādiyam aims. That is the reason why the great commentator Śivajñānamunivar, relying on the earlier tradition inherited through Mâyavançār, Aruñand and Umpāpi sets out explaining in the beginning of the text itself (which of course, runs throughout the text, as and when need arises, it would be pointed out in the later chapters of the thesis) under the introductory verse called Cirappupādiyam, the subtle nuances of this 'methodology of podu' (general) and cirappu (special).

Roughly, these two correspond to the parajñāna and aparajñāna of the advaitins but without compromising on the basic perspective on reality. It has been a search for the last six hundred years, approximately, to
realize the essence of reality as transcendental through the empirical experience of the world of objective manifestations of things, persons and events.

2.2. Methodology of Podu and Cirappu in Siddhānta Tradition

2.2.1 Śivajñānabodhham & Śivajñāna Siddhīyār (Implicit)

We cannot explicitly find the terms ‘podu’ and ‘cirappu’ used anywhere in the text of Śivajñānabodhham which has the unique status of being the first systematic philosophical text of Śaiva Siddhānta tradition. But does that really mean that the text has no methodology in it? On the contrary, it is because there is an implicit methodology interwoven within the texture of this text and in the arrangement of sūtras in the ascending order, that the later authors who inherited the Siddhānta tradition are able to authoritatively explicate them in their writings. But one thing is sure, that the terms ‘podu’ and ‘cirappu’ which represent the methods employed in the text were needed to be mentioned explicitly, for the following reasons which are more probable than certain: (1) Though the text remained the same for years to come, the socio-historical context in which the text was inherited and interpreted by later generations was constantly changing and thus warranted an explication of the implicit. (2) It may be possible that many weren’t grasping the inner meaning of this implicit-textual dynamism of podu and cirappu that were gradually unfolding itself in the progression of the text. (3) Or else, it could possibly be true that the text was already in a vulnerable situation of being misinterpreted by a few against the traditional norms of understanding the text. We would realise the fact that it is no guess but real when we read the commentary of Vadivelu Chettiyar on Śivajñānabodhham.16

Śivajñāna Siddhīyār, an immediate commentary to Śivajñānabodhham has no explicit mention of these methods. But this text, which is more elaborate than the former, has
more to say about the ‘general’ and the ‘special’ without using the terms explicitly.\textsuperscript{11} But from the fact that the author’s immediate disciple Umāpati has explicitly mentioned the method of \textit{podu} and \textit{cirappu} for the first time in his commentary (SVP.11) that followed Siddhiyar, we infer that Arulnandi had instructed his disciple during the course of latter’s initiation (\textit{dik\sha}) into the Siddhānta tradition.

2.2.2 \textit{Śivaprakāśam} (Explicit)

Explication of the methodology of \textit{podu} and \textit{cirappu} might have been one of the main reasons for Umāpati to write a commentary ‘\textit{Śivaprakāśam}’, which is, third important text of the fourteen Meykaṇḍa Śāstras of the Siddhānta tradition. Umāpati did not write \textit{Śivaprakāśam} just for the sake of giving a simplified version of Siddhānta doctrine nor did he just restate the earlier works (of Śivajñānabodham and Śivajñāna Siddhiyar). He had an intuition of his own which blossomed forth from his deep knowledge of Siddhānta tradition and contributed in a unique way for the growth and understanding of Siddhānta doctrines for his and the later generations.\textsuperscript{12} In verse 12, Umāpati says that men pledged to seek good in everything will not mind the dust that covers a beautiful gem but only appreciate its true worth. The gem of his contribution and the newness of his finding consist in announcing explicitly in his \textit{tācirappu-pāyiram Śivaprakāśam} the methods of ‘\textit{podu}’ and ‘\textit{Ummai}’(an equivalent word in Tamil for \textit{Cirappu}) which he (and his ancestors) followed. It was customary, in the old Tamil literature, to add a prologue and an epilogue for any significant literary work. This was known as ‘\textit{pāyiram}'. Pāyiram is of two kinds: (1) \textit{Pāyiram} or \textit{Tācirappu-Pāyiram} is that which the author himself writes. While writing this usually the author doesn’t mention his name or his credentials to write such a work. (2) \textit{Cirappu-Pāyiram} is that which is written by another, either someone worthier than the author or any one of his
contemporaries who is well acquainted with the author. It could as well be written by anyone of his direct disciples. According to Śivajñānamunivar it has the purpose of clarifying the doubts of any reader who wants to read in detail the text and to enthuse him in his endeavour in grappling with the text.

Meykandar, the first of gurus composed the great Śivajñānabōdhnam; his disciple Aruṇandi Śivan expanded its truth in his work Śivajñāna Siddhiyār. I have lovingly studied these two works and done obeisance to their holy feet. Combining the teachings of God’s work (traivan-nūl) and that of what is revealed by divine grace ingrained in me, I publish Śivapratāśām, a work of 100 verses of virutta metre, according to the methods of podu and Unmai, (SVP.11)\(^\text{13}\)

However, Arulsamy has tried his best, in a somewhat artificial way, to create and substantiate a ‘third’ method of ‘Thiruvaru’\(^\text{14}\) without realizing the basic fact, that ‘aru!’ is an important and essential ingredient of the method of realizing ‘Unmai’ itself. “According to Śivajñānamunivar, the above content that is described by the method of “special” is to be understood only by the grace of God. That, for the participatory experience of the self in reality, the initiative must come from the Lord, is suggested by the idea of grace (aru!).”\(^\text{15}\) Unāpati has obviously emphasised the significance of Unmai in Unmaineṭiṭilakkam (cf., Verses 4 & 5) another important work among his ‘Siddhānta Aṣṭakam’.

2.2.3 Significance of Tradition in Śivajñāna Māpādīyum

Tradition is what is handed down and inherited by generations from the bygone society. We can’t find a society which is worth the name of a cultured society without giving due importance to this vital fact. While reflecting on the genesis of text, tradition and their mode of being, D’Sa rejects the view “that exegesis is what exegetes should be busy with and that they should leave all interpretative adventures to others,” and he formulates his position in four sūtras:
“a) Every step in understanding is an interpretation... b) Every interpretation is part of a tradition... c) Every tradition is a potential text... d) A Text is potentially the source of many traditions...”

Śivajñānamunivar considers the Śivajñānabodham, the text he seeks to interpret as a revealed scripture handed down by the tradition through a succession of preceptors from Nandi to Meykandar. He also claims that, “his interpretation of the Śivajñānabodham as ‘general’ and ‘special’ is based on the model provided by Arulnandi Sivan and Umāpati. According to Śivajñānamunivar, what has been accepted by the tradition is unconditionally true. The validity of the tradition is that it has been accepted and shaped by great people in the past.”

Emphasising further the significance of tradition in Māpādyam, Krishnan acknowledges the fact that,

“Śivajñānamunivar recognises the absolute indispensability of the presupposition for a correct understanding of the scripture. General understanding which culminates in the special should... start from the pre-supposition of the āgamic tradition. Spiritual experience should culminate in the truth of what has been transmitted by the tradition represented in the scripture. It is in this context that his concept of initiation (dīkṣa) becomes very important. He says that one who is initiated into the Siddhānta tradition alone is eligible to interpret and understand the scripture. This means that one who is initiated should situate oneself within the tradition or, as Gadamer would put it, should have a “horizon” as a pre-requisite for a correct understanding of the scripture, which represents the tradition.”

2.2.3.1. The Rationale behind two Cīṟappu-pāyiram

It is interesting to note, in the text of Śivajñānamāpādyam, two verses under the
category of ‘Cirappu-Pāyiram’, one at the end (endai sanatkumaran) and another at the beginning (malartalai ulakin). Naturally, we tend to question the rationale behind two Cirappu-Pāyiram!

Attempting to answer this question in two ways Śivajñānamunivar quotes first the tradition:

This stanza need not be taken to be redundant simply because the stanza occurring at the end of the work expresses similar meaning. The intention of the introductory stanza is to give at the commencement of the work the same thing that is given at the end. It is with the same intention that Sri Narāyanā Kantha has given the tradition of the origin of the Āgamas at the beginning of his commentary of the Mṛgēndra even though the information is supplied by the work itself at the end.⁹

But more than that he relies more on an alternative and more significant reason for composing this stanza. It is, “that the work has divided the subject into general and special.”¹⁰ Śivajñānamunivar is of the opinion that it is not merely the fact of leaving out this in the other cirappu-pāyiram, but we can not just lose sight of the basic methodological base upon which the whole text has been composed. Thus, the methods, either the general or special, are not indifferent nets in which the reality is caught but they constitute and form an element of the reality itself. In this sense, the methods of podu and cirappu and the Śaiva Siadhānta system as whole determine each other.²¹

2.2.3.2. Ārāyici (Enquiry) and Anūbhuti (Realization)

These two methods are further explained elaborately by focusing on the verbal intransitive nouns, Ārāyici and Anūbhuti. Ārāyici comes from the verb ‘arital’ which means ‘to enquire’ or ‘to search’. Ārāyici, then, is the knowledge that we obtain through enquiry, Knowledge that happens through direct perception (pratyakṣa, kātci) and logical enquiry (anumāna, karutal/kapṭutal). Ārāyici (which is podu) has the two stages of
understanding of reality through i) kēttal (listening) and ii) cintītal (contemplation). This is the first level of knowing reality. Knowledge by enquiry results through the practice of other three pādas of cāryā, kriyā and yōga. According to Siddhānta, it is enquiry (Ārāyici) that leads to realization (Anūbhuti).

Likewise, Anūputi also derives from the Tamil verb ‘anūpāvītāl’ which (comes from the Sanskrit root and) means ‘to experience’ or ‘to realize’. Anūbhuti is the knowledge that we gain by experiencing or realizing. Knowledge that happens through direct participation with the reality. “Śivajänānamunivar distinguishes four phases in the understanding of Siddhānta and hence in the spiritual life of the self: They are, i) listening (kēttal), ii) contemplation (cintītal), iii) comprehension (tejītal) and iv) realization (niṭṭaikūdutal).” Though, terminologically they may sound parallel to the śravaṇa, manana, nididhyāsana and darśana of the advaitins, teleologically they differ, in the sense, their objective is not the realization of the only reality but of the triple padārthas of Patī-Pāṣu-Pāśā. This method of realisation seems to be common to all the Vedantic tradition with minor differences, there is a descisive difference between Siddhānta and Vēdanta schools. For example, the realisation of the ultimate is a gradual process whereas for the a Vēdantin, it is a sudden enlightenment and its content is unrelated to earlier process he undergoes.

While comparing the basic text Śivajänabōdham to the Sun, Śivajänānamunivar says, "even as the sun is responsible for the removal of the earthly darkness and for the two kinds of perception, indeterminate and determinate, so also this work removes the internal darkness of the individual self and enables it to have the two kinds of wisdom which arise respectively from inquiry (Ārāyici) and direct experience (Anūbhuti). This also implies that as the sun dispels the external darkness and reveals the worldly things of twelve kinds with respect to its constituent units, the sūtras or aphorisms."
2.2.3.3. *Podu-nāl* & *Cirappu-nāl*

While first mentioning explicitly the terms ‘*podu iyalpu*’ and ‘*cirappu iyalpu*’\(^\text{25}\) Śivajñānamunivar means that this text intends to delve deep into the triple-reality of ‘*Pati-Paśu-Pāśa*’ at two levels. One is of ‘knowing their general characteristics’ and the other ‘realizing their special characteristics’. Second time, elaborating on the same theme, he uses the verbal nouns ‘*Ārāyici Anūbhuti*’\(^\text{26}\) respectively to explicate the meaning and content of *podu* and *cirappu* and affirms the fact that this is the special and ultimate goal of this text itself.\(^\text{27}\) To understand and distinguish these concepts properly we must keep in mind the difference we brought out in the introductory chapter between the general (*podu*) and special (*cirappu*) on the one hand and *vyavakārika* (apparent) and *paramārtika* (real) of the *advaitic* school on the other. Consecutively, he develops the theme of inquiry (*Ārāyici = iyalpu turītal*\(^\text{28}\)) that is done basing primarily on the *āgama-pramāṇa* and secondarily on perception and inference (*vaļiyajavai-karutai oļjavai-anumāna-parokṣa*). In the same manner, he explains the theme of realization (*Anūbhuti=cirappilakkāṇam unartai*\(^\text{29}\)) that takes place only with the singular grace (*tiruvaru kāṛnāka*) of God.\(^\text{30}\) Though it is a matter of grace, man has to prepare himself seriously for the onset of divine grace. However, they are not opposed to each other since God is related with the soul in an advaitic relation. Therefore, man's effort towards realisation itself is God's gracious act. A third time, he clearly says that this is an epistemological pursuit exercised during the stage of bondage (*pettai*) and *cirappu* is an ontological realization enjoyed during the stage of liberation (*muktiyal*). It does not mean that the *cirappu* is only for the liberated ones muktas but on the other way, *cirappu* is meant for those who wish and make effort for attaining liberation. The content of *cirappu* can be known as it is by the *muktās* (by the liberated ones) only. For,
bondage is not (natural) essential to being but ‘that which came in between’ (āgantukam), whereas mukti is co-natural to the being (sahajam). "It should be noted that what is called the general nature is that which is attributed to the three entities from the standpoint of bondage. This is adventitious. That which is known to be the characteristic of these entities from the standpoint of the state of release is known as the special or true nature which is inherent." Thirdly, Śivajñānamunivar questioning the Āgamas, the rationale behind these two categories of division, sympathetically answers in the words of Aruṇandī in Siddhiyār that these two types of knowing are needed for souls to grow steadily, stage by stage, according to each one’s maturity (sāpāna = an evolution in life. It is further defined in 2.5 of this chapter) It is imperative that everyone who intends seriously to clarify one’s doubt and to deepen one’s conviction on the nature of reality as podu and cirappu, undergoes instruction under a ‘guru’. Otherwise one’s effort will end up with confusion and frustration. And it is for this purpose the primary scriptures (Āgamas) and even the later works (whether the commentaries that followed or the other translated texts) are also divided on the basis of podu and cirappu.

2.2.3.3.1 Āgamas

Accordingly, the following Āgamas—Pavutkaram, Mrgāndram, and Matangam—are categorised as podu. The rest of the Āgamas including Śivajñānottaram are considered Cirappu. Some texts are categorised as podu not because they speak of souls in bondage but also because they were written by authors of inferior status (according to their level of maturity). Hence, Śivajñānamunivar cautions us by stating a traditionally accepted norm of interpretation that these ‘general texts be interpreted in the light of the special texts and not vice-versa’. According to Śivajñānamunivar.
since Agōra Śivācāriyar hasn’t followed this norm, his commentary Siddhāntārtha Samuccaya is to be considered defective to that extent.  

2.2.3.3.2. Upanisads

The same principle of the general texts being interpreted in the light of the special is applied to Upanisads too. Upanisads like Subala and the rest belong to podu. Cāndōgya is considered to be both podu and cīrappu. Since the Upanisads like Atarvasikal, Atarvasira, Śvetāsvatara, Kaivalya etc., speak of the liberated state accordingly, Śivajñānamunivar is hard on Rāmānuja and other who don’t follow the principle of general texts being interpreted and understood in the light of the special texts. However among the Upanisads some are sāmānya and others are viśāṣa. But in the light of the Śiva Āgamas, Upanisads are podu (sāmānya) and the former are cīrappu (viśāṣa).

3.3.3. Vēdās & Āgamas

Being consistent with this principle, Munivar categorises the Vēdās under podu and Āgamas as special. In order to be convinced on this, he quotes from Poriyapurāṇam, "Just as Śaiva Siddhānta which is the fruit of Vēdās (Vēdāp payanām Śaivam mōḻ)."

2.2.3.3.4. Translated Texts

Jñānāṃṭaram which is a translated text (according to Śivajñānamunivar from Sanskrit) belongs to podu. Whereas two earlier texts out of fourteen Siddhānta Śāstras, Tirumuniyar Tirukalirrupadīyar (apparently, according to Śivajñānamunivar, these works as well seemed to have been translated texts) are considered to be cīrappu. For Jñānāṃṭaram deals only with logic and epistemology, the latter two deal with the mystical experience (state of grace).
2.2.3.3.5. Tamil Texts: Tirukural and Tirumurai.

The Tamil works like Tirukural and Tirumurai are also categorised according to this podu and Unmai. Tirukural speaks of aram (dharma), porul (artha) and inbam (kama). Though Tirukural speaks of vidupeti (moksha), it does not have a separate adhikaram on it. Hence, it is categorised under podu. Whereas, the Tirumurai which is the outpouring of the jivanmuktas is considered to be the special according to the Saiva Siddhanta tradition.

2.2.4 Sivajñanamapadiyam and its Composition:

It is nothing strange that Sivajñanamunivar applied the same logic in composing his commentary to Sivajñanabodham. The whole commentary has been divided into two major sections of ‘Podu Adhikaram’ and ‘Unmai(cirappu) Adhikaram’. In turn, each of them is further divided into two sub-sections. Podu adhikaram consists of i) Pramana lyal and ii) Ilakka laiyal and the Unmai adhikaram consists of iii) Sadhana lyal and iv) Payaniyal. Each sub-division consists of three sutras. The first two sub-divisions are meant for empirical enquiry which in course of its evolutionary dynamism and with the grace of Lord Siva will lead souls (Pasu) through the Sadhana (spiritual means of mukti pañcaksaaras; It is further explained in 5.6 of the thesis) to the ultimate payan (gain) of participating and realizing the darshan (vision) of Sivan. The later two divisions are meant for that.

2.3. Differentiating Podu & Cirappu (Unmai)

Saiva Siddhanta, inspite of being part of the Indian Philosophical tradition has its own unique understanding of reality and tries to articulate it in accordance with its peculiar conceptual schema. As we have already mentioned, each concept, in a way, is
a key to open the conceptual whole of a system. It is important then we differentiate
and distinguish the concepts of podu and cirappu in comparison with the other schools
of thought existing and interacting in a specific cultural context like India. Śvājñānamunivar
clearly accepts that, "the import of these terms," namely podu and cirappu, "general
and special nature used in doctrinal literature and in logical works should be distinguished
and understood."\(^{42}\)

2.3.1 With Sāmānya and Viśeṣa of Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika

In order to differentiate podu and cirappu with that of Sāmānya and Viśeṣa of
Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika, we need to know the conceptual meaning given to such terms in those
schools of thought. As to what Sāmānya could mean, Hiriyanna has the following things
to say:

There are, in the first place, the diverse eternal substances which form
the basis of the universe, viz. the four elements, selves and manas. To these
we have to add the myriad finite objects derived from the former four.
These fundamental and derived objects, though quite distinct from one
another ontologically, are not without common features. It is by virtue of
these common features that we divide them into groups as earth-atoms,
water-atoms, selves, chairs, tables, etc. The common features, by virtue of
which they are so grouped, are called universals. They are revealed only
through the corresponding particulars, and are never found by themselves.
Yet they are regarded, like the particulars which they characterize, as real
in themselves."\(^{43}\)

Speaking on Viśeṣa of Vaiśeṣika's, Puligandla says that, "it is particularity that
distinguishes a given atom from all the other atoms. It should be emphasized that
according to the Vaiśeṣika particularity belongs only to indivisible and eternal entities
and not to composite ones like table and chairs. In other words, Viśeṣa is the particularity
that can only be predicated of ultimate entities and not of any other entities. Thus we
Sāmāṇya in Nyāya is a class concept. Whereas the Viśeṣa is a concept referring to particular. But Śivajñānamunivar uses the Sāmāṇya (podu) term in the sense of understanding the whole of reality in a mediate way and Viśeṣa (Chāppu) in the sense of knowing the reality in an immediate way (intuition).
may correctly regard Viṣeṣa as the particularity by virtue of which something is an ultimate entity. Further, according to Vaiśeṣika, since there are innumerable particulars (individuals), there must necessarily be innumerable Viṣeṣas (particulars). Viṣeṣa, then, is particularity which subsists in individuals." 44 Śivājñānamunivar puts his understanding of sāmānyā and Viṣeṣa in a nutshell saying, "In logical works the qualities that are common to a number of things are called general, whereas those that are attributed to particular ones are called special or particular one." 45 Śivājñānamunivar does not use this in this sense.

2.3.2 With Nirvikalpa and Savikalpa pratyakṣa

What is Nirvikalpa pratyakṣa? It is, "Perception," according to Puligandla, involving no conceptual activity, such as naming and relating. In other words, indeterminate perception consists of pure, uncategorised, sensations. For example, when one is looking at an apple, one's indeterminate perception of the apple consists in one's merely being aware of certain visual sensations. Such sensations are the raw material of knowledge." 46

According to Nyāya school Savikalpa pratyakṣa means the following:

Determinate perception, unlike indeterminate perception, arises when one brings the raw sensations under various concepts. That is, while sensations are the material of knowledge, conceptions the imposition of form on the sensations. In the above example, knowledge of the apple consists not only in having certain sensations but in categorizing them under such concepts as "color," "shape," "taste," "size." It is by rendering the indeterminate sensations determinate with the aid of concepts that one comes to say that the thing one is sensing is red, round, tart etc., and that it is an apple and not an orange. For Nyāya, just as for Kant, knowledge is thus constituted of sensation and conception. Sensation without conception is blind, and conception without sensation is empty. This is the same as saying that knowledge has both content and form, the former deriving from sensation and the latter from conception. 47
Determinate perception, though, may resemble the cirappu of Siddhānta, it lacks the dimension of grace in it. Nirvikalpaka cannot be compared to the general knowing of Siddhānta.

2.3.3 With Tatāsthā-lakṣaṇa (Accidental) and Svarūpa-lakṣaṇa (Essential)

Except for the fact that these terms are couched in Sanskrit, they bear more resemblance than difference between podu and cirappu. Munivar, explicitly states the fact that, "in doctrinal literature, the term general (podu in Tamil) is a technical one used in the sense of Tatāsthā-lakṣaṇa and the term special (cirappu in Tamil) is equivalent to the technical term Svarūpa-lakṣaṇa." There may be differences in acknowledging which one is tatāsthā-lakṣaṇa and svarūpa-lakṣaṇa. For example pancakritya, according to Siddhānta is svarūpa-lakṣaṇa for God but for the Vedāntins it is an accidental quality.

2.4 Textual Interpretation of Podu and Cirappu

Podu and Cirappu are further interpreted with the two textual expressions taken from the Cirappupāyiram, the one that of "aruntuyar kurumpayin āgma nādi" which leads us to further understanding of podu (General) and the other, "perumpayar kadavul'in kāṅgal" which enhances our grasp of the Cirappu (Special).

Śivajñānamunivar has the purpose of establishing the supremacy of the Siddhānta doctrines and the texts. And he effectively achieves this goal through the method of podu and cirappu together with the principle of sōpāna.

2.4.1. Aruntuyarkurumpayin āgma nādi (Existence of self and body which is subject to great suffering is established through reasoning): Podu - General

Having known from traditional and reliable sources, the methodology of podu and cirappu in Śaiva Siddhānta, we are ready to see how Śivajñānamunivar arrives at a
series of conclusions from the phrase, “arutuyarkurumpayin āgma nāḍi,” taken from the Čirappu-pāyram to Śivajñānaśīloham. According to Śivajñānamunivar, the word “āgma” is common for both self and God. “Therefore, knowing the general nature of both God and self can be called “general”. “Reasoning” here means, according to him, mediate knowledge of reality and this is suggested by the word, “nāḍi” (inquiring, reasoning or inferring) From the phrase, “aruntuyark-kurampai.” Munivar arrives at different conclusions by means of reflective reasoning. This phrase literally means body... the purpose of general understanding is to arrive at an intellectual conviction about the three realities as envisaged in the scriptures. This understanding is mediate (vaijñāvai) in which there is no direct apprehension of the object of understanding.” Knowing through reasoning and inquiry is like knowing about the properties of sugar through a scientific test. But knowing the taste and its properties of sugar personally by tasting is not the same as above. Nāḍi is mere knowing about the reality. Realisation takes place only when one knows the reality and directly and immediately. That is the meaning of kāṇḍal.

2.4.2. Perumpeyar Kadavul’in kāṇḍal (Realisation of the Supreme God): Čirappu - Special

According to Śivajñānamunivar, there is an understanding where the self (subject) participates in the object of understanding. This understanding by participation is called “ālunti arital”. “Ālunti aritale anubavital.” (Experience is always understanding by participation) says Śivajñānamunivar. After the removal of ēṇavamale (pāsapparru arutal) through the participatory experience, the self experiences the realities (which were known earlier ‘indirectly and mediate’ through reason) and knows them ‘directly and immediately’ (sāksātkāra) now. That this immediate apprehension of the
reality is a vision (darśan). It is suggested by the term "kāṇḍal". Therefore the phrase, “perumpeyark kadavujin kāṇḍal,” (perumpeyark kadavul—literally means the God whose name is great but it represents the manāvākyas of Vedas and Āgamas) mean that the self has the (direct and immediate) vision (daršan) of God. Actually speaking, “The self is unique in the sense that it alone can have such an understanding by participation, since God is omniscient, there is no need for him to understand by participation. The other reality, Pāsa, being insentient, can not have any understanding by participation”.54 Interpreting this phrase, Krishnan draws the following conclusions.

1. From the point of view of the omniscient Lord, the self is parviscendent.
2. The self cannot know unless made to know by the object (vyājyaka) in which the self participates.
3. The self is bound by impurities in various degrees.
4. There is plurality of selves.
5. The self attains perfection progressively through different stages.
6. The omniscient Lord without participatory experience not only can know, but also makes the self know.
7. It is the Lord who comes as a guru and informs the self about the favourable and the unfavourable for the spiritual progress of the self.
8. To know the above, austerity (tavam) is essential.
9. It is grace (Śivañāna) which removes the defilements of the self and unites it with the friendly or the favourable.
10. The removal of pāsa is an absolute precondition for the onset of divine knowledge.
11. Pāsa will be removed by the proper recitation of the mukti-paṅcāksara.
12. Just as the crystal which assumes the colour and radiance of the ruby by just being beside it, so the self without getting dissoved in the being of God, will assume the eight-fold qualities of the Lord by its union with him.
13. Śiva is the only reality worth knowing. If one is steadfast in his love towards the Lord, he will attain the unsurpassable bliss of Śiva.
14. The self is always a dependent reality.55
These are truly the content of the ‘special’ which the Siddhāntins seek. As it has been already mentioned, it is not mere effort of the self but much more it is by ‘the grace of God’ that the self experiences this. “That, for the participatory experience of the self in the reality, the initiative must come from the Lord, is suggested by the idea of grace (arul). The important point to be noted is that in both “general” and “special” understanding it is the same three-fold reality - Pati-Paśu-Pāśa- which is being understood in increasing degree and intensity. The reality which is mediately comprehended in “general” is immediately apprehended in the “special”. This is the same meaning for the Tamil word ‘Umaiy’. Umaiy is the reality which is oppositeless and pure. By no means, ‘existence’ and ‘non-existence’ can be applied to this.” In the original stanza, the word ‘nadi’ (inquiring) implies by inference, and the word ‘kāṇgu’ (having realized) implies by direct experience."

In this sense, all the ‘enquiry’ (ārācyi) has to be done in accordance with śabda-pramāṇa (Āgama-pramāṇa) and gradually should lead to that realization:

Śvaṭānāmounivar is of the view that man’s spiritual progress starts from reasoning, which culminates in the realization of reality. But the type of reasoning called “general” is neither deductive nor inductive. It should be considered as a reasoning or reflection which holds fast to the reality disclosed in the scripture. Similarly, the ‘special’ is also a description of what is disclosed in the text. This means that the philosophy of Siddhānta is an explication of the contents of the scriptures.

The process of reasoning to realization, mediate to immediate, general to special and proximate to ultimate could be explained by an evolutionary (ascending order of) methodology of logic called, “tulāruntah nyāyam” (Learning from gross to subtle). It is a logic that proceeds from gross and gradually leads to the subtle (sthula to sūkṣma). In the modern sense, it is also known as the logic of the identification of the unknown through the known. The meaning of this tulāruntah nyāya is similar to other Indian traditions.
2.5 Sōpāṇa-An Evolutionary Principle

Another methodological principle that plays a crucial role in the presentation as well as the understanding of the Siddhānta is the principle of sōpāṇa (an evolutionary principle). Even the methods of podu and cārappu presuppose this sōpāṇa. Even in and through this principle, God's grace is operative because the whole human race is a gradual unfoldment of divine grace. For, even the podu gradually evolves and culminates in cārappu. The spiritual progress of the individuals, the classification of classical texts (one's own and others) and other religious traditions are understood according to this principle by the Siddhāntins. It is important to note that based mainly on this principle, every religious text and tradition is given a particular place in the evolution of religious thought in which Śaiva Siddhānta is considered to be the conclusion of all conclusions. (For the advaitins what is true for them is the only truth and other's views are not true. But for the Siddhāntins inspite of their cent percent belief in what they consider true, they accept others views as partially true). Therefore, throughout our thesis the content of Siddhānta will be explained in terms of this all important methodological principle. We will deal with more of sopana in chapter 5 of the thesis.

2.6 Tulāruntati Nyāya: (Gross to Subtle)

Śivajñānamunivar raising the question, "why should scriptural literature deal with the two kinds of characteristics, general and special? Is it not enough if the special characteristic alone is given?" answers it in the words of Arulnandi.

The path of realization of an individual lies through the various external and internal religions, by observing the rules and regulations prescribed, by performing penances, by learning the various departments of knowledge, the Vedās and the Purāṇas which are held in reverence, and by having a clear knowledge of the import of the concluding portions of the Vedās. For
a person who has followed all these various courses is reserved what is called the region of Ṭāgamic literature. There too the aspirant approaches the Supreme, going through external worship, then through the internal worship. If such a person lives the life of Śivaśītha, i.e., worships the divine with pure wisdom, he attains the feet of God. so a person reaches the zenith of the state of release through a flight of steps like those of a ladder; the scriptural works should clearly point out these various steps or stages.59

Hence the characteristics which are dealt with in scriptural work naturally falls into two broad divisions, the general and the special.

This manner of treatment of a subject is called the approach of tulāruntati nyāya, i.e., the treatment from the known to the unknown, from the gross to the subtle, from the external to the internal.

The method employed in pointing out the subtle star called arundati is to show a big star near arundati and then when the learner has fixed his gaze on the gross star, the real star is pointed out to him. The real object intended is not the gross one but the subtle one, which is near it.50

This kind of leading a person from the gross to the subtle is known as the approach of tulāruntati nyāya, the example in which the gross is treated at first as the subtle arundati itself. Arundati is a small star in the constellation great bear called saptarishi group, situated near one of the seven constituent stars called vaśīsta, and later on the real object is pointed out.

The following may be taken as an illustration from Jñānamṛtam,61 (a Sanskrit text translated by Vakisa Munivar into Tamil, categorised under the podu because it deals with logic and epistemology) of how the method is used:

Disciple:- Master, What is the reason for the Supreme Self being free from bondage and the individual self being chained by the spiritual darkness?

Guru:- They are so from the beginningless past. If the spiritual darkness had come to the self at an intermediate point of time, it would have required a cause
for such an occurrence. But we cannot give any reason for natural things. The supreme Being is like the clear crystal whereas the individual self is like copper, which is made impure by its verdigris.

(Here the example is given so that the disciple may understand the truth in a general manner, but the question is pursued further.)

Disciple:- Master, isn't it truer to say that copper is made impure with the verdigris in accordance with the land which produces it?

(So a better example is given by the master in order to draw the disciple closer to truth.)

Guru:- Think of some space which is filled with both light and darkness. Isn't it true that if one of them dominates, the other subsides. But still, we know for sure that darkness cannot persist in the presence of light. In the same way, even though there is inner presence of Light, the individual self is submerged in spiritual darkness. So let us hoist the flag of grace, so that such an individual self may realize and be filled with the splendour of divine grace.62

(In the former example, copper is such because it originates from the land of its birth, so it cannot be a suitable example for saying that no cause can be ascribed to the presence of the impurity. In the second case, the sky, light and darkness are independent of one another. So such a question will not arise.) Śvajñānamunivar follows this method throughout the commentary in leading the selves from general (podu) to special (cirappu).

Hence there are two levels in this:

1) Cirappu is more specific, as an example and

2) Cirappu is the special goal to which the teaching (sādhanā) leads.
What is that ultimate realization which both Meyκarıdtar and Šivajñānāmumkur drive home to us? The answer to this question is nothing but the goal of the text itself.

2.7 The Goal of the text “Uyar Šivajñānabōdham”

The name of the work itself points to the nature of the work. The term ‘Šivajñāna’ is common to both the knowledge of the wisdom portion of the Šivāgamas and the light of grace of the Lord as per Šivaprakāśam stanza 10 of the introduction. Bōdham means ‘teaching the determined conclusion’ of the exact import. So, this work determines the import of the wisdom portions of the Šivāgamas and hence this name for it. It is also clear that this can be derived from the last line of the twelfth sūtra of the Šivajñānabōdha in Sanskrit, which says ‘know from Šivajñānabōdha the determined conclusion of the contents of the wisdom portions of the Šivāgamas in this way’ (ēvam vidyat Šivajñāna bodha saivārtha niṃayam).

Though the term ‘Šivajñānam’ denotes the Āgamic scripture as a whole, it is taken to indicate here the wisdom portions thereof; for they are of prominence. The prominence of the wisdom portions will be clear from the dictum of Šivaprakāśam which says:

whatever comes under the mention of kriya (purposeful action) is instrumental to the attainment of wisdom.

The expression uyar Šivajñānabōdham (Šivajñānabōdha that excels) in the introductory (cīrappu-pāyram) stanza means Šivajñānabōdham which excels the works which make an inquiry into the contents of the three divisions caryā pada, kriyā pada and yōga pada. Hence it is clear that this work should be listened to after listening to the works dealing with the inquiry of other divisions. It implies that the aspirant should first of all get initiated, study the Šivāgamas, then should listen to the works which inquire into the contents of the other three divisions and then make a study of Šivajñānabōdham.
2.8 Justification for Comparison of methods: Empirical & Transcendental

Siddhānta doesn’t deny the empirical world of experience and observation. Rather, Siddhānta is realistic, apart from affirming the existence of pati, it firmly establishes the existence of Paśu and Pāśa as real. Where does then Siddhānta differ? It differs with the empiricists by affirming ‘transcendence’ not simply as an aspect of reality but its essence of it. Therefore, there arises the need to justify the comparison of empirical and transcendental methods.

2.8.1 Podu is empirical and rational

According to Siddhāntins, the purpose of general understanding (podu) is to arrive at an intellectual conviction about the three realities(Pati-Paśu-Pāśa) as envisaged in the scriptures by going through progressively the other three padas, namely the caryā, kriyā and yōga. This understanding is mediate (vaṣiyajavai) in which there is no apprehension of the subject of understanding. This is after all the understanding of empiricism both as a theory of knowledge and as a theory of mind. It holds that there is nothing in the intellect that there has not previously been in the senses. Out of rudimentary experiences first impressions are formed. These impressions are transformed into forms of knowledge. Empiricism maintains, thus, that everything is acquired from physical universe via the senses. Hence, senses are its only authority. Moreover, it claims that whatever is empirically verifiable is real. So far as it affirms the fact of real as empirical, it is fully equivalent to the understanding of podu. But when it denies whatever is beyond the empirical, it steps beyond its scope of knowing the reality. This is its limitation. If ‘what is sensuous is only real according to empiricism. then, it is not legitimate for empirical sciences to speak about the extra-sensory or intuitive realities which transcend the realm of senses. Empirical method is, then, an inadequate method
for verifying the transcending and transcendent realm of reality. It is because of the limitation that is inherent in the empirical methodology and scientific rationality that we can not successfully cope with many problems in our society and environment and find answers for questions which calls us beyond the seen to the unseen and from the known to the unknown.

2.8.2 *Cirappu* is Transcendental and intuitive:

By contrast, *cirappu* (special) is an understanding where there is a kind of participation of the subject in the object of understanding, in the sense; it is an immediate apprehension of the reality, which is obtained only by the grace (*aru*) of God. Though it may depend on the senses at the beginning, it transcends beyond the sensory experience to the non-sensory or intuitive realization of reality. This realization is purely a gracious act of God bestowed on the selves unconditionally; not done abruptly but gradually depending on the spiritual maturity of the selves (*sōpāna*). Yes, podu ultimately makes one ready for grace.

"Truth, according to *Siddhānta*, is two-fold: the empirical and transcendental. The empirical experience is necessary for the onset of the transcendental experience, which is liberation. Both the truths are verified immediately in one's consciousness (*svataḥ pramāṇya vāca*). The empirical truth can also be verified by sense experience. But *Siddhānta* does not accept sense experience as the sole criterion of truth. Positivism is right in what it affirms, but wrong in what it denies."

2.8.3 Inter-disciplinary Approach (Philosophical Anthropology)

As we have already mentioned that ours is not merely a text-based but an inter-disciplinary approach.
From the foregoing, we have to classify the knowledge from Anthropology as a social science (man as observed, seen and analyzed) as podu.\textsuperscript{65}

But that would only be a partial view of man. For, as the heretic (an imaginary character created by Dan Sperber in On Anthropological Knowledge) did towards the conformist anthropologist, we could even retort, saying:

Well then, the price has been paid: but where are the goods? Has anthropological field-work much improved our knowledge of human nature?\textsuperscript{66}

It would be appropriate at this juncture to listen to Sperber again as a theoretician of Anthropology of his view:

What are the common and specific attributes of humans? this question, central to anthropology, can only be answered in a speculative fashion. Human languages, cultures, and social systems are specific to the species, but they are not universally shared: they are, on the contrary, the main source of differences among humans. If humans share specific attributes beyond anatomy, these must be the mental capacities which make possible the development of a variety of languages, cultures, and social systems. But what are these capacities? This has been the central issue of Philosophical anthropology. For empiricists such as Locke, these capacities amount to an indefinite malleability and receptiveness, so that knowledge owes all its content and structure to experience and to the environment. For rationalists such as Kant, human cognitive capacities comprise innate categories and principles which structure human knowledge and limit its variability.\textsuperscript{5}

For, Siddhāntins, human nature is more than the empiricists' and rationalists view. Human nature is more trascending and can not be exhausted by any empirical or rational analysis.

It is for this reason, we don't just complement anthropology with Śava Siddhānta Philosophy but strive to be philosophical in enquiring into the Anthropology of Śava Siddhānta presented to us. It is therefore, not merely a social scientist's task but a challenging project thrown before anyone who intends to shape oneself and the world around as a socio-religious philosopher.
COGNITIVE STATUS OF MAN
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