CHAPTER I

I. One of the functions of metaphysics is to clarify the meaning of philosophical concepts. It is this philosophical activity that has attracted the mind of the people since time immemorial. "In all the ages, philosophers have in fact been greatly concerned about words, whatever their official definition of philosophy might be. I need only mention Socrates."

In all periods from Socrates' time to our own, with the possible exception of the dark part of the Dark Age, clarification has been regarded as an essential part of the philosophers' job, though not generally as the whole of it. .... the modern clarifier is surely very foolish if he neglects what has been said on the subject by the clarifiers of the previous ages." This function of metaphysics knows no barriers of land, language and time. This is held to be one of the very important functions, because the confusion in philosophy is due to the use of the terms about which we are not clear. The confusions

---

and wrong notions crop up when such concepts are put to use. The great systems of philosophy came into existence only when such work was in great need. At present the problem for discussion is the problem of 'Satsthala' which has a number of philosophical meanings to be made clear.

II. Saivism is one of the very ancient schools of Agamic religions which have a very long and variegated history. It branched off as a type of theism into a number of subsections. The Saivagama state that Virasaivism is one of the branches of Saivism. Virasaivism is a metaphysical religion as the devotion like Upaniṣadic one is metaphysical devotion. It is not the same as the psychological devotion. God or the Absolute is not the theistic Absolute. The devotion in it is like the Upaniṣadic devotion which is beyond knowledge (jñānotterabhakti). So it is peculiarly Upaniṣadic in origin. It is this school in which we are interested.

The central concept of Virasaivism is Satsthala. Virasaivism has its own scheme of categories and has its own
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way of explaining and connecting them to one another. This is done by most schools of thought in the East and West both.

A study of the history of philosophy makes clear that there are a number of philosophical concepts which have more than one philosophical connotation. Vīrasaivism, therefore, used the term Śaṭṭhāla in as many as ten to twelve or even more connotations. Some of them may be enumerated here. They are: sixfold senses of knowledge, senses of action, sixfold Vīrasaivism, sixfold stages of life, sixfold ontological categories, sixfold inner senses, sixfold viewpoints, sixfold yogas, sixfold attributes, sixfold śūdrakhyas, sixfold spell, sixfold śāngas, sixfold śinge, sixfold knowledge, and so on. These consist of both the empirical and transcendental categories. Each concept as a Śaṭṭhāla is very important and needs special treatment.

The traditional pandits of the school interpret the term Śaṭṭhāla only in the sense that it is a mystic method. They have no other interpretations of it. But a metaphysician, by survey of the philosophical literature of the school, can give a number of interpretations.
1. People may wonder if the metaphysician explains the traditional pendants' interpretation of Satsthala, i.e. Bhaktsthala, Mahesvarasthala, Prasadisthala, Prana-lingsthala, Saranasthala and Aikysthala which could be supported by quoting a number of texts, in a different way from the way the pandit does.

The exposition made by pendants about the term Satsthala is incomplete. For, what the pendants enumerate in their explanation of the term Satsthala is constituted of Aangasthala which forms a part of Satsthala in any form of Satsthala based either on the sthala, or on dharma, or on aşıkara. Therefore the exposition made by pendants is incomplete and is not an adequate exposition.

The adequacy of the exposition consists in giving the complete idea of Satsthala. By 'giving complete idea' it is understood that these six sthales or Aanga-sthala have their counterpart Aangasthales without the mention of the latter the answer is incomplete. As
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the Aṣṭasthala are said to be Ṣaṭṭsthala so also Lingasthala are said to be Ṣaṭṭsthala. So by Ṣaṭṭsthala we mean both these sets. As Aṣṭasthala - a Ṣaṭṭsthala constitutes of Bhaktasthala, Maheśvarasthala, Prasādisthala Prānaliṅgisthala, Sāraṇasthala and Aikyaṣthala, so also Lingasthala - a Ṣaṭṭsthala consists of Ācāryaṅgasthala, Guruṅgasthala, Sivaṅgasthala, Jādaṃṅaṅgasthala, Prānaliṅgasthala and Mahaṅgasthala. The Aṣṭasthala and Lingasthala together form Ṣaṭṭsthala. Or Ṣaṭṭsthala, to put it in a right manner, is divided into Aṣṭasthala and Lingasthala. So when one of the two is stated to mean Ṣaṭṭsthala it will not be in accordance with the real sense of the term. It is, for this reason, the dialectician is right when he raises objection to the kind of explanation.

2. The metaphysician explains Ṣaṭṭsthala means Bhaktasthala, Maheśvarasthala, Prasādisthala, Prānaliṅgisthala, Sāraṇasthala and Aikyaṣthala which are 'Ṣaḍaśivārya' as the Saiva gamas state.

---
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The metaphysician further shows how this interpretation is not bereft of the difficulties. Because the 'Sadaisvaryas' presuppose the 'one' that possesses those Aisvaryas (i.e. good attributes). They imply, in other words, the substratum. Therefore, Sañsthala needs to be understood as One that has Sadaisvaryas. They are related by a special relation called Janasvaya.

3. The Sañsthala is understood that it is a group of Sañsthalas, namely, Shaktisthala, Mahesvarasthala, Prãstidisthala, Prãpalingisthala, Sarapasthala and Ekysthala. The metaphysician explains that they are 'Saqvidha' (i.e. six modes). They are prthivi, ātma, teja, vāyu, ākasa and ātma (i.e. earth, water, fire, air, space and self).

The metaphysician again makes investigation to know deeper nature of 'Saqvidha' whose modes are these or what are the nature and function and their relations; if they are the consequences of a ground, what is the nature of the ground? These are some of the problems that crop up by the kind of explanation. Hence this needs further deeper analysis of the subject matter.
The metaphysician states that Shaktasthala, Mahesvarasthala, Pratisthala, Prapaliñgasthala, Sarangasthala and Aikyasthala are the sixfold objects of the senses and also they are the senses.

The sixfold senses and their objects need explanation. The six senses are nosika, resane, nayana, tvaça, śrotra, and mana. The objects of these are gandha, ruci, rūpu, aspara, sabda and sukha-dukkha. The first five objects are the qualities of the five great elements. The senses that sense these qualities are the products of the five great elements. They are prāhvi, appu, tejas, vīyu, ekās. The sixth sense is the subtle form of all these. The sixth sense, namely, manas perceives sukha-dukkha. They are the qualities of the jīva. Manas perceives not only the inner objects but also the data collected by the senses of knowledge and makes it available to the jīva. So mind functions in two realms. One is the realm of objects beyond the senses and the other world outside. Thus there is no difference between the senses and their objects. The kind of theory of the origin of the senses and the knowing their objects entails a problem which is not felt by the traditional Pandit as he does not explain. He simply asserts.

If the term Satsthala is sixfold senses and objects of
senses, the problem felt by him entails exposition.
One of the problems is about knowing and the other is that of unity. One is to show in what way is it different from the Nyāya theory or idealistic monists' theory. So the term Śatsthala is wrought with difficulties.

5. The metaphysician states that Śatsthala is sixfold knowledge. Bhakṣesthala is matijñāna, Mahesvarasthala is arutajñāna, Prasādisthala is manasparipūrṇajñāna, Pṛṇalīṅgsthala is avadhijñāna, Sarṇasthala is kevalajñāna and Aikyasthala is mahājñāna.

This is interesting to note it from some other point of view. What he wants to know is still more interesting. It is one of the most important interpretations of Śatsthala across which the metaphysician comes. From the point of history of philosophy it throws light on how is it different from or what is the relation between this sort of epistemological theory of the Jains or is the Śatsthala school having its own interpretation of each of the terms. How does the term Śatsthala give the sense of unitariness of knowledge and what kind of validity does this presuppose? These are
some of the problems to be met with. This new dimension of the term adds new difficulties. So this needs further clarification.

6. The metaphysician argues from 'Agama' that the term 'jaṭasthala' is a spell called 'Sadakṣaramantra'. This spell consists of six syllables. They are Ona, na, maḥ, si, va, ya. They are the six parts of the mantra. 'Māntra' and 'Liṅga', as the 'Agama' identifies them, are one and the same. So 'Liṅga' constitutes of these six syllables. This is the structural explanation.

He further wants to know more about the term referred to. He wants to know what is it that 'one'? What are the 'six' in the 'one', in other words, is it 'six' or 'one'? What is the meaning and how does this appear are some of the problems to be understood in the connection. So this opens a new chapter in the system of metaphysics of jaṭasthala.

7. Jaṭasthala is 'Sādākhya' as the metaphysician says. The etymological meaning of the term Sādākhya is:

sādākhya-yaṁ bhavaṁ yatēḥ prabhṛti sad iti prakhyā, says
Abhinavagupta in Pratyabhijñāvimarsini (III.1.2). They are six in number. They are Karmanādakhyā, Kartraśadakhyā, Mūrtisādakhyā, Śivasādakhyā, and Sahāsādakhyā. They have the synonyms in Śaṭṭhala Siddhānta. They are Bhaktasthala, Mahāśvārasthala, Pratādiśthala, Viṭāliādīsthala, Jeraṇasthala and Alkhasthala respectively.

The first Śadakhyā called Karmanādakhyā is Jñāti-sruti. The next four - Kartraśadakhyā, Mūrtisādakhyā, Śivasādakhyā, and Śivasādakhyā constitute the Liṅgārasti, whereas the Sahāsādakhyā forms Śivapraya. Karmanādakhyā, i.e., Śivapraya is Bhaktasthala and it constitutes twenty-five categories. These are also called Avidyātattvās or the gross categories. These are twenty-five, but not like the Śankhya categories nor of those Viśistādvaita nor of Kashmir Śiva nor of Śivasiddhānta categories. Kartraśadakhyā, Mūrtisādakhyā, and Śivasādakhyā, constitute Śivapraya. They are also called Vidyātattvās. These are subtle form of the Avidyātattvās (i.e. gross categories). Sahāsādakhyā forms Śivapraya which is the casual form of the Vidyātattvās.

This is the Śaṭṭhala in its threefold form. Existence
begins with the causal form which is the evolute of the conscious form in the Śūnya or Śaṭṭhala.

The metaphysicist wants to know more about the details of the categories which form as many as three kinds of categories. They are as good as three systems of categories. This gives rise to the doubt whether it is one system or three systems; if one, in what sense is it said to be one; is it realism or illusionism? These are some of the difficult problems. So the term Śaṭṭhala needs clarification according to him.

8. The Śaṭṭhala is a mystic method consisting of six stages, namely, Bhaktsthala, Mahesvarsthala, Prasādisthala, Prapaliṅgsthala, Śaranasthala and Aikya-thala. These are the six steps that are to be climbed to reach the highest state.

The metaphysicist wants to know the metaphysical basis for these six steps. He wants also to show that the exposition without this is incomplete. The inadequacy of this method as commonly understood is brought to light by Cemmevasaṃs as back as eight
hundred years ago. The nature of the psychological category is still to be investigated. Thus the term Šaṭsthala as a method is full of difficulties. This needs further investigation as understood by the metaphysician.

9. The metaphysician states that Bhaktsthala, Vahesvĕrnasthala, Frenădisthala, Ṛţapalăingisthala, Saragasthala and Likeyasthala are Šaṭsthala in the sense of six viewpoints.

He is not satisfied with this assertion. He wants to know in what sense these form a unity of the system. Are these six viewpoints analogous to the six viewpoints we find in the orthodox system? If they are different one has to show them as such.

So the explanation is wrought with difficulties.

10. The Šaṭsthala means Ādaḥaracakra, Svādhīṣṭhačakra, Maṇipūrakacakra, Saṭkatačakra, Viśuddhičakra and Īḍānācakra. These are Bhaktsthala, Vahesvĕrnasthala, Frenădisthala, Ṛţapalăingisthala, Saragasthala and Likeyasthala respectively. So Šaṭsthala is pādābhiva. It is a way up and a way down.
He further wants to know what is the 'way up' and 'way down' and the difference in them. The ādhāras work either in the way the kundalini or Kājyoga works. The working of the ojas, states the metaphysician, is quite different from the above said yogas as the metaphysical notion and the initiation differ. The energy or the Šaktipāta is quite new in this yoga. Therefore knowing more about the ojas and Šakti that works on the basis i.e. substratum is important factor. This simple enumeration is not enough. More we know about them is knowing more about the Šatsthala. There is ample material that helps us to know and that throws light on the nature and function of Šatsthala.

11. The Šatsthala is the duplication of trividhānīyas. The trividhānīyas are: tyāgānā, yogānā and bhūgānā. Tyāgānā constitutes Šaktasthala and Mabesvarasthala, yogānā constitutes Prasadisthala and Pranālinjisthala, and bhūgānā constitutes Jānapasthala and Likeyasthala. So Šatsthala is jādeṃs. This is the doctrine of body in Šatsthalaśiddhānta as there is in Buddhism.

The metaphysician is more curious to know about the bodies. There are three prefixes. They are tyāgānā
i.e. renunciation, yoga i.e. union or separation and bhoga i.e. absorption. These are psychical functions.

So the doctrine of body as understood and explained by the traditionalist is not satisfactory. According to the metaphysician it opens a new chapter. It is akin to the modern psychological theory of sublimation. The doctrine of body gives idea of a successive growth of the complete personality. So the deeper investigation is demanded.

12. The Bhaktasthala, Mehesvarasthala, Prasadisthala, Prapalingisthala, Sarapasthala and Sikyasthala are sixfold Virassesava. The sixfold Virassesava is the duplication of Tannaga, Visesa and Wirabhero Virassesava.

The metaphysician makes further investigation that whether this classification is based on rituals or ethics or metaphysics, or it is a process that gives continuous whole are some of the things to be known by the term Satsthala. It has no meaning unless these are explained and it is said to be simple assertion.

13. The Satsthala is nothing but the Jajarama. They are Bhaktasthala, Mehesvarasthala, Prasadisthala, Prapalingisthala, Sarapasthala and Sikyasthala according
to Śivānubhavasūtra (IV, 36) and Vedāntasāra Viśvaśīvamāṇi. Śivānubhavasūtra is based on Śaivārṇavas, whereas Vedāntasāra Viśvaśīvamāṇi is a compilation work consisting of excerpts from Veda, Upaniṣad, Purāṇa, Āgama, Āntartika, etc.

The metaphysician wants to know whether these are in the sense of the Vedic Āsturāmāra based on the age and functions attached to each, or they are different. Do they imply Vāpaś like the Vedic Vāpāraśīma? If they are different, in what sense?

These are some of the problems to be dealt with. So the term Śatāsthala is not understood if these are not explained.

From the exposition given above it is evident that the term Śatāsthala is a central concept without which the study of the school is meaningless. The study brings to light the unity of the system. The term Śatāsthala covers both ontology and epistemology. This gives an opportunity to Dialectician to ask whether reality is one or many and also to ask the question how do you know it to be so. The further investigation from a particular angle gives the idea of the nature of
Reality which is necessary and the work of introducing
the term Sastrahala will not be complete unless we look
at it from this point of view. An attempt is made here
to show that 'Sastrahala' is the Absolute, and it is
not the mystic method alone as supposed by most of the
scholars who wrote in Viarsaivism. This is very neces­
sary to avoid the errors in philosophy which are
usually metaphysical and psychological as the modern
scholars in Indian philosophy point out.

One of the arguments, to show that the 'Sastrahala'
is the Absolute, is from the name-words. This is a
modern logicians way (Nyay-Nyaya padhati) of doing
as Bhattacharya states in his treatise of Nyayayyva
in the Cultural Heritage of India Vol.III on p.145.

'Name-word' (nāma-sabda) has to be used to refer individ­
dual cases or particulars. It is also used to refer the
universals. Both are the objects in the case. Some of them
are to be verified by the sense faculties and there are
others to be verified mentally. So 'name-words' are words
that give correct or right knowledge of physical and spiri­
tual objects. The 'name-word', from which the

5 Name-words are those words which are the names of
the vyagya or contents of the knowledge. The name­
words have no operation at the time of the produc­
tion of the knowledge of the object. They operate
only when use has to be made of the knowledge. cf.
The Nyaya sutras of Gosame, p.334 Ed.(Tr) S.C.,
Vidyabhusana, 1939.
argument is to be begun in 'Satstha-siddhanta'. The term 'siddhanta' which is suffixed to the word 'Satstha' presupposes that it is about Truth or Principle, as 'Siddhanta' means well deduced or reasoned out conclusion. We have similar philosophical terms like 'advaita-siddhanta', 'visishtadvaita-siddhanta', 'dvaita-siddhanta', etc. All these mean that 'Siddhanta' is about Reality. And also it is clear that each 'name-word' is quite different from the other as it has a peculiar connotation standing for a peculiar Reality which makes it a unique siddhanta. Therefore 'Satstha' does not mean reasoned out mystic method, or a conclusion drawn about a mystic method. Hence, 'Satsthala-siddhanta' has a meaning, as the 'name-word' means reality—either empirical or transcendental as the case may be.

2. We have another 'name-word' 'Satsthala-nirnaya' which is used by the writers indiscriminately. It is used as an epithet e.g. Sannabasavanna, a mystic thinker of the twelfth century, was called 'Satsthalanirnaya paramavatara'. He is called so because it was he who wrote a manual on the categories, namely, 'Karaṇa-hasuge'. The title of the book consists of 'Karaṇa'
and 'hasuge'. The word 'kārāṇa' means categories and the word 'hasuge' means analysis. So it is an analysis of categories. He wrote on nature and function of Reality. He is, therefore, the highest incarnation of those who reached conclusion about Śaṭṭhala i.e. Reality.

He is called so because he is one of those that gave verdict in preferring one of the forms of jāṭṭhala-method in accordance with the nature of the Reality.

The form of the Ṣaṭṭhala method, he advocated, was accepted by almost all the mystics of the twelfth century.

In this sense also, he is the chief protagonist of the method that leads to Reality i.e. Ṣaṭṭhala. The path called Śaṭṭhala-mārga supports the above explanation about the 'mārga', and the goal i.e. Śaṭṭhala. Because 'Śaṭṭhala-mārga' like 'Devasyāna' is the mārga-way to Reality or Deity. As the Devasyāna means the way to Deva so also 'Śaṭṭhala-mārga' is a way to Śaṭṭhala-Reality. The problem to be settled by Činnabasavaṇṇa was due to maniness or multiplicity of the ways to Reality which is common in each of the paths to Reality belonging to different schools or traditions. Reality is one, the ways to reach are many. When we use the
word ‘Saṭṭhala mārga’ we mean thereby that it is in some way qualified by Reality e.g. Dvaita-mārga, Advaita mārga are similar examples we find in other systems.

We find most of the modern Kannada writers mean by the term Saṭṭhala a mystic method. So we are forced to have still deeper investigation. The kind of conclusion they draw might be either due to uncritical investigation if at all it is done or due to the ambiguity caused by the use of a single term for 'sixfold method' and 'Reality'. We have all the difficulties in case of method and Reality both when we view it as 'sixfold' which are involved in the problem of unity and plurality. This needs an independent treatment. Apart from these we have other problems to face.

The term Saṭṭhala is sixfold method or sixfold yoga as the traditional writers presume. But this is not only the meaning which is shown already. Therefore the inquiry to be made is on the basis of ‘name-words’ (nāmapada): 'Saṭṭhala-pravṛtti-mārga' and 'Saṭṭhala-nivṛtti-mārga'. again it is a linguistic puzzle as the term has been put to two uses differing
one from the other. The suffixes 'nivṛttimārga' and 'pravṛttimārga' help us to decide whether the term 'Sāsthala' means Reality or mystic method. Both the suffixes presuppose the application is concerned with 'cosmic' and 'psychic' beings (Brahmāṇḍa and Īndāṇḍa).

The term 'Sāsthalapraṇvrētti' means involution of the Being (in either senses) when the Being changes into Becoming. So also 'Sāsthalanivṛttī' means evolution of the Being i.e. when the Becoming begins to change into Being. The former is the downward journey of the Being and the latter is the upward journey of the Becoming. Therefore Sāsthalapraṇvrēttimārga and Sāsthalanivṛttimārga presuppose that these are of Reality and not of method. So Sāsthala is the Reality.

We may quote parallel examples from Greek philosophy. Heraclitus is one of the philosophers who speaks of the upward and downward journeys of Reality. There may arise problems in connection with journey - why this journey, is it logical or temporal, is it outside of the Being as the ordinary use of the term journey means and so on which are to be met with.
There are a few more 'name-words' that deserve attention. They are Satsthalaajhanasaranata, Saistha-
vaamanagalu, Satsthalaathantha, Satsthalaajhani, etc. We find such name-words, similarly, in the literature of
other systems, the Brahma-sutra, Veda, Upanisad in
Vedic literature and Ekottaraganika, Aguttaranika in
Buddhist literature. Both types of 'name-words' refer
to the kind of reality, which deserve considerations.
They play a very important role in the world of thought.
The following exposition makes this clear.

The words such as Brahma, Upanisad, and Veda mean
the ontological category. This is one of the fractions
of Sabda (word). The name words give us the epistemological category. Thus the function of word throws
light on the ontology and epistemology at once and the
same time, according to some of the metaphysical schools.
So the 'name-word' such as Brahma-sutra clarifies the
meaning of the ontology and epistemology. So also the
term Satsthala vaamanagalu mean the same thing. Because
the vacanas are pithy sayings like mantras. The term
'Satsthala' means both reality and knowledge. There is
another word that supports it. It is 'Satsthalaajhane
The 'name-words' such as 'śrīkottarakīśa in Buddhism, 'śatapatha Brāhmaṇa in Vedic literature have parallel 'name-word' in Śatsthāla Siddhānta e.g. Ekottarasatsthala. We have Noorondappa where Noorondu is equivalent to Ekottarasata in Kannada. Giving name to persons presupposes that it is of God and christining God's name is auspicious. So the term Ekottarasatsthala like Śatsthāla is Reality. The number five in Buddhism and six in Vaishnavism are important. The number five in Buddhism signifies the five-categories that constitute men as it is called 'pañcasakanda'. The number six similarly signifies the six categories that form the personality of men as it is called Śatsthāla. Śatsthāla
in this sense are five great elements and the self. These are Śaṭsthala or Śaṭakanda. This is called pīṇḍāda. Pīṇḍāda is the miniature of Brahmāṇḍa. So whatever is the content of Pīṇḍāda is the content of Brahmāṇḍa. Therefore these categories form the constituents of the Brahmāṇḍa. This does not mean that this is a pluralism. Because they are the evolutes of a single category. So it is monism or non-dualism. This is from the point of view of ontology. Greek thinkers also made use of the 'name-words' to show that the numbers signify ontological categories.

It is explained epistemologically. These six categories are the objects of knowledge. The means to know them are also six. They are five senses and mind. They are thus the objects of knowledge and the means to know the objects. The modern symbolic logic is the logical growth of the number systems. Thus the number governed the life of man and of the world to put in the language of Pythagoras. This way of knowing is 'idiritparasuvudu' i.e. it is placing things before oneself and finding.

A diagram can be drawn on the basis of a text showing how the number six is used.
These are the Śaṭsthāla or six-stages of evolution which is based on the text: Ekottarasatāsthālā.

The Reality that has the power to become many is the Reality called Śaṭsthāla. The term Śaṭsthāla is constituted of 'Śat' and 'sthāla'. The etymological meaning of the term 'sthāla' given by the text is - It is that in which every thing lives, moves and has its being. Every thing is signified by the term Śat which lives, move and has its being in the 'sthāla'. Therefore, the suffix gives the sense that it is the power which is in 'sthāla'. Without a. i.e. Śekti (power) is bayalu (void). It is with the help of this

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stāla</th>
<th>Linga</th>
<th>Angā</th>
<th>Stāla</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>First</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second</td>
<td>Linga</td>
<td>Angā</td>
<td>Second</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third</td>
<td>Three</td>
<td>Angā</td>
<td>Third</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fourth</td>
<td>Six Linga</td>
<td>Angā</td>
<td>Fourth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fifth</td>
<td>Eighteen</td>
<td>Angasthala</td>
<td>Fifth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sixth</td>
<td>Thirty six</td>
<td>Angasthala</td>
<td>Sixth</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The diagram shows the flow from Sūnya to the first sthāla and then to the other sthālas in sequence.
power of it is due to the power it becomes many and also becomes not-many. This term gives, therefore, the sense that the Brahma is having Sakti (i.e., Śaṭ). Thus it has twofold prevṛtti or power called Kāla-sakti and Bhakti-sakti respectively. Coming into being and returning to the original state are two activities - the former and the latter are powers or Saktis respectively. Coming into being is 'Śat' and reaching the original state is 'Āsat'. 'Āsat' is the latent or unmanifest stage of the 'Śat'. In this sense it is akin to the Ṛgvedic 'Śat' but not similar to the Void of Gorgius.

There is, again, a 'name-word' - 'Śatsthalaśāhāni'. We have 'Brahmaśāhāni' another 'name-word' which is equivalent word in Vedānta. Both the 'name-words' are bhuvṛbi compounds. The 'name-word' Śatsthalaśāhāni (Śatsthalaśāhānīcāvullāvānu yāvano avanu Śatsthalaśāhānī) means that it is one who has the knowledge of Śatsthala. Similarly Brahmaśāhāni (Brahmaśāhānīcāvullāvānu yāvano avanu Brahmaśāhānī) is one who has the knowledge of Brahma. Like Brahma the term Śatsthala is Absolute. Virūḍhaka Ṭhāṇḍita in his Gannabesavapuruṣā states that the ānya-brahma which is seccidānanda is Śatsthala. Śatsthala,
Lingga are synonyms. So when we say that He is 'Satsthah-possessor of knowledge of all of
leśnai' we mean thereby the Absolute but not the method.

There is one more term 'Satsthah-bharita'. We have similar name-words like 'Jagad-bharita', 'Lingga-
bharita', etc. These name-words are not having the same connotations. So they may be classified into two classes. The words 'Jagad-bharita' and 'Jarangabharita' form one class, whereas 'Lingga-bharita' forms itself a class. He that fills the world (i.e. Jagat) is called world pervading so means Jarangabhārīta. He that fills Lingga (i.e. Reality) is called Absolute-pervading. So the meaning of each word is not the same.

God is called-world-pervading because, Bṛhaspatyākṣ Upaniṣad states that He created the world and entered into it. Therefore he is also called the indweller of the world. Svētāsvāstāropaniṣad is also of the view that God is the indweller. This leads to Pantheism in one sense and immanence of God in another sense i.e. theistic God's view, is represented by this e.g. Saivism and Vaishnavism. The body of God, therefore, is called Cid-
cit. But the term Lingabharita means quite a different
thing. It is on this principle the doctrine of body of God is founded. This is a new idea and is foreign to the systems like Visistadvaïta and Dvaita, etc. This new idea is conceived by the Viïrasaïvism. According to Viïrasaïvism the devotee dwells in the heart of Siva. He is, therefore, called Lingabharita or Jayastha-bharita which mean, the same thing as they are synonyms. This means transcendence as the Jâgad-bharita is immensity. This school accepts both the doctrines - (1) immensity and (2) transcendence. So the school sees God within and without. So the Śatsthala is the Reality both in the manifested and unmanifested forms. Therefore, Śatsthale-bharita does not mean mystic method as it is commonly understood.

'Satsthale-thakta' is another name-word. It helps to know that the term Śatsthala is the highest metaphysical category and also the category of religion. The difference between the category of religion and that of metaphysics is very very little or narrow. It may, we can say, amount to zero. Devotion is said to be metaphysical devotion in the sense that it is identification of the individual self with the universal self. In the
post-Upanisadic religion devotion is psychological in the sense, that it is a surrender of the individual self to the deity. So it cannot be compared with the non-metaphysical devotion. Devotion is the \textit{Sakti} of \textit{Jiva} which is not different from \textit{Jiva}. It is that aspect of \textit{Jiva} or \textit{St	extasciitilde{a}sthala} which manifests itself into the form of \textit{Jiva} (i.e. \textit{St	extasciitilde{a}sthala}) remains unmanifested. These are the two forms of \textit{Jiva}. Therefore \textit{St	extasciitilde{a}sthala} is the Reality but not the mystic-method.

An argument from another point of view can be introduced to show that the \textit{\textit{St	extasciitilde{a}sthala}} is \textit{\textit{Parabrahma}}. The argument to show that it is so is based on the attributes of the \textit{\textit{Linga}} or \textit{\textit{St	extasciitilde{a}sthala}}. They are \textit{Bhakt	extasciitilde{a}sthala}, \textit{Mahe	extasciitilde{s}var	extasciitilde{a}sthala}, \textit{Prasad	extasciitilde{a}sthala}, \textit{P	extasciitilde{n}\textasciitilde{a}ling	extasciitilde{a}sthala}, \textit{J	extasciitilde{e}ra	extasciitilde{m}a	extasciitilde{sthala}} and \textit{Aikya	extasciitilde{a}sthala}. They are synonyms for sarva	extasciitilde{n}at\textasciitilde{a}, trupti, suddibodhata, svatantrata, alupt	extasciitilde{s}akti and urdhv	extasciitilde{s}akti respectively. These \textit{\textit{Sakti	extasciitilde{s}var	extasciitilde{ayus}} are the properties of some one. The substratum to which these six belong is called \textit{\textit{St	extasciitilde{a}sthala}}. Hence the term \textit{\textit{St	extasciitilde{a}sthala}} is not a mystic method but the absolute. Apart from this the attributes have no meaning.

\textit{---------------}

6 "\textit{\textit{K	extasciitilde{e}remav	extasciitilde{e}rgama}}, VI. 60-65."
The term Śāṭsthala can be shown that it is absolute or Reality. As we use Bhaktsthala, Mehamversthala, Prasādisthala, Prāṇaligisthala, Sarapasthala, and Śikṣsthala, we also say that it is Ācaralīnga, Gurulīnga, Śivalīnga, Jagemalīnga, Prasādilinga, and Mahālinga. These are also called sāṅkhya which are said to be, according to Śūkmatentra, "nityaṁ satyam sadānandasmṛtyayā kevalaṁ sukhamp" (i.e., eternal true ever blissful, unchangeable one, delight). So it is not a mystic method but the Reality endowed with these attributes. They have two conditions - one that is unmanifest and the other that is manifest.

These are some of the arguments to explain from name-words to show that the term Śāṭsthala means a number of things end also it is the highest Reality but not the mystic method only. We may also show how it is unique by following a quite different way.

If one means by Śāṭsthala either the pantheistic Absolute or the Creator God one is committing a

-----------

7 Śūkmatentra, 1.32.
metaphysical error. Satsthala is not pantheistic. Absolute because Satsthala is much more than the universe as the universe is the power of Satsthala. So Satsthala cannot be identified with the world as in pantheism. Satsthala is not the creator God. The creator God is efficient cause but not the material cause. The creator God is the indwelling principle like the driver in the machine where the world is the machine and the God is the indwelling mover. Though the God accordingly is ever present everywhere cannot be identified with the world like one in the pantheism. The universe, which is composed of conscious spirits (cit) and the unconscious matter (scit), is the body of God. This again differentiates it from the pantheistic view. In both pantheism and theism the notion of immanence is the only notion. But Satsthala view differs from these both. Because the universe is the evolution of the conscious force of Satsthala in its different stages. Thus it is the manifest of the conscious power of Satsthala which knows itself and its source or ground in self-conscious. The universe is the conscious-force like God or Absolute in pantheism. It is self-conscious. Therefore it is both
the machine and the driver i.e. conscious power to guide in the course of evolution appearing to solve the problem that occurs in its course of evolution. So it is guide within. This power knows that it is a power of Ṣaṭṭhala that is born in the Ṣaṭṭhala. So it realises that the Ṣaṭṭhala is transcendent principle. This is the metaphysical nature of Ṣaṭṭhala which distinguishes itself from the other concepts of the absolute. As the pantheistic Absolute and the creator God of theism have their difficulties so also Ṣaṭṭhala has its own difficulties.

From the above exposition it is clear that the terms such as immanent and creator do not mean the same thing in these systems and the Ṣaṭṭhala is a reality to be understood differently.

Sāṭṭhala in Vīrācśivism is not God of theistic schools as this could not be consistent with the line of thought developed therein. Nor do we compare this with the idea of Śiva in the Śankarādvaits which is compared with the God of theists. In the metaphysical sense the God in this system is not the God as understood in the theistic schools.
The above exposition made by arguing from the 'name-word' gives rise to further discussion which is of great value from the point of view of metaphysician. The term 'name-word' implies that it is an 'object-word'. The object word is a 'sense-word'. Therefore 'name-word' is a 'sense-word'. So one may say that all the 'name-words' are sense-words. This leads to the conclusion that 'name-word' is object-word, name-word is sense-word and hence name-word, sense-word and object-word are synonyms.

Though all the 'name-words' are 'sense-words' (imiriya likhita) all the 'sense-words' are not necessarily 'object-words'. Some of the 'name-words' are not 'sense-words' in the sense that they do not refer to the sense to which they owe their origin. In that sense they are 'apra-tyaya' to put in the Nyāya terminology or they have no logical characters.

Therefore there are 'name-words' which share the properties or logical characters which distinguish them from some of the 'sense-words'. Thus 'name-words' and 'object-words' (karma pada) are different from 'sense-words'. 
This does not solve the problem - by identifying the 'name-word' with the 'object-word' on the one hand and by distinguishing the 'name-word' and 'object-word' from some of the 'sense-words'. The identification of the 'name-words' with the 'object-words' gives rise to still subtler type of difficulties.

Because the 'name-words' are 'name-words' they are not necessarily the 'object-words' as the 'object-words' in some cases have a referent of a kind which necessarily 'name-words' have. But there are some of the 'name-words' in whose case we need not look about for objects corresponding to them. In this sense the 'name-words' differ from the 'object-words'. "The essential thing in the understanding of an 'object-word' is that the word shares some of the properties of what the 'name-word' means."

Again we may see that the 'name-words' differ from the 'object-words'. One may tend to see the similarity in the 'name-word' and the sense-word as both of them give scope to look about when we use them. Is then 'scope-for-looking-about' in the case of 'name-word' and
also in the case of 'sense-word' the same? It is a difficulty which helps us to know more about the 'name-word' and it distinguishes it from the 'sense-word' which is also in a sense a 'name-word'. The difficulty we face in each case is to be examined in order to have a clearer picture. There is no scope to look about when we use the 'name-word'. This is same as saying that the 'artha' is different from the 'artha' when we use 'sense-word' and find nothing when we look about.

We reach at this stage the cross road and differ from the Western way.

We may say that the former and the latter, though they have 'no-scope-to-look-about', are not similar in nature. Each word forms a class of its own. In the former case the 'name-word' may be 'sense-word' whereas in the latter case the 'sense-word' is not necessarily the 'name-word'. The 'sense-word' cannot be the 'object-word' whereas the 'name-word', though 'sense-word', necessarily becomes an 'object-word'. This makes a world of difference as each has its own realm of existence. The 'name-word' though similar in Indian and Western philosophy, differs in a quite different sense. Dr. R. J. Vandeyer
shows: "Language as the bearer of knowledge, as the seat of meaning, attracted the attention of scientists and the result was the emergence of a new branch of knowledge in the form of Semantics.

"Semantics thus has its beginning in the negation of human values and of the higher planes of existence. Dogmatic acceptance of verification as the only criterion of existence is the property of science that it has inherited. Higher values of life and the experience of immediate presence are never verifiable in the same way as propositions in the physical sciences are. The application of the same yardstick to two entirely different realms of existence brought about complete distrust in the highest existence. But as far as the verifiable world was concerned sometimes left no aspect of language unexplored, Semantics arose and developed as a science of language confined to the world of experience, as other sciences are. Language as the vehicle or verifiable meaning is the only subject matter which it takes.

This is the line of development of semantics as a science of linguistic meaning in the West. In India the beginning of this science is entirely on a different
footing. Unlike its development in the West in India it arose as a harmonising force between sensuous and supra-sensuous experiences. It neither condemned the higher values nor overlooked the sensuous. Its spirit was always to give proper and balanced emphasis on both."

III. Thus the name-word refers to both the sensuous and the supra-sensuous in Indian philosophy in general and in Satsthala in particular. Therefore the term 'Satsthala' - a name-word presupposes two types of reality. The reality is not two, but it is expressed in two ways. The one that implies is sensuous, the other, supra-sensuous. The supra-sensuous is the subtle form of the sensuous. These two, therefore, are not two realities but the two forms of reality. This is the meaning of the name-word called Satsthala.