NOTES

CHAPTER I


2. Hiremath: 1968: 102 (Basavannana Vacana)


5. The first two Śūnyasampadanes were written in about 1420 A.D. and 1495 A.D. by Siyagnaprasadi Mahadevayya and Kencavirannodeyar, respectively (Tipperudra Swami:1973:30-31).

6. Others also in the sequence of disciples from TS have made their own contribution to the development of Viraśaiva thought. For instance, Ghanalingadevaru and Svatantra Siddhalingesvara have composed their own vacanas (Mahadevappa:1974:88;Basavaraju:1971:41) which have now been published under the titles Ghanaligadevara Vacanagalu and Svatantra Siddhalingesvarana Krtigalu (see Malledevaru:1975, and Shivamurthy Sastri:1950). Others have at least preserved, edited and classified the vacanas of earlier saranas, and also tried to propagate the messages underlying them (Basavaraju:1971:41-42).

7. Some authors hold that when the involution takes place, it does not go all the way back to the state of the original one (sarvasūnyanirālambasthala), but stops at the stage of what is called the Mahālīnga state where the manifest creation becomes unmanifest. In this unmanifest state the world is said to exist in a subtle form, it is not totally dissolved. Whether this process is really a cyclical one is a moot point.

CHAPTER II

1. The problem presented in the above passage was expressed by Suarez long ago (in De Scientiar

2. Swinburne makes a difference between a weaker and a stronger sense of immutability (1976:212). In the weaker sense, “a person is immutable” means that he cannot change in character. Thus to “say of a free and omniscient creator that he is immutable is simply to say that, while he continues to exists, necessarily he remains fixed in his character”. In the stronger sense “to say
that God is immutable is to say that he cannot change at all. The doctrine of divine immutability
in this sense is often combined with the doctrine of divine timelessness”.

CHAPTER III

1. Kretzmann develops his argument by taking a hint from Casteneda’s paper entitled “‘He’: A

2. Francks argues that (1979:396) the second requirement is not the same as the first
requirement, but subsumed under the first. He says “...God must not only know everything, and
must know everything equally well, but further, he must at all times be giving his full attention to
every item of his infinite knowledge”. Further he says, if God is omniscient, he must think
actually about me, and how I felt, as opposed to just having information at his finger tips. “If
God is not actually thinking about me at this moment, then he is not taking care of me as I would
like him to”.

3. Hoffman (1979:433-434fn) objects to this argument of Pike. “This peculiar analysis certainly
fails to provide a sufficient condition of omniscience, since it does not require an omniscient
being to know all the propositions, but to believe them. However, since Pike only makes use of
the claim that if a being is omniscient, then he believes every true proposition, this mistaken
analysis does not affect the soundness of his arguments”.

4. This third assumption of Pike that God’s beliefs are unchanging, is dispensed with by
Hoffman (1979:434fn). Hoffman does not see how this assumption is put to any use by Pike.
However, I feel that Pike does make use of this assumption in arguing his case. Traditional
theologians assumed that God is omniscient and immutable. Omniscience includes the knowledge
of future events as determinate. If God does not foresee the future events as determinate then
God’s knowledge is changing, so he is not immutable. In order to maintain God’s foreknowledge
together with his immutability these theologians must accept the knowledge of determinate facts.
Thus they say all events are present to God in totum simul (total simultaneity). God is as the
centre of a circle. He sees events of past, present and future directly. Anything he knows at one
time is something that he knows at all time. Therefore, Pike is right in making the assumption
that God’s beliefs are unchanging, on the ground that he foresees future events as determinate, to
show thereby that human freedom is contradicted.

5. The absurdity is this - If the statement “It is within Jones’ power to do X” means “There is a
possible world in which Jones’ does X”, then its negation “It is not the case that it is within Jones’
power to do X” would have to mean “It is not the case that there is a possible world in which
Jones does X.” But the latter consequence is absurd. “Though it is not within my power to jump
over a 10’ fence, there is some possible world in which I do just that. That I jump over the fence
is a logical possibility; it is just that it is not within my power to do it” (Pike:1977:213).

6. (51a) is a part of (51), which shows something is within one’s power.
(51a) It is within Jones’ power to refrain from doing X at T2
(51b) God existed at T1
(51c) God believed at T1 that Jones would do X at T2

8. This kind of necessity being discussed here is quite different from other kinds of necessity - logical, physical, or causal. According to this sense, a proposition P is necessary at a time T if and only if P is true that it is not coherent to suppose that any agent by his action at or subsequent to T can make P false. This is being discussed by Swinburne:1977:Ch.13.

9. The rigorous account of when statements superficially about the past really are totally about the past, is discussed in detail by Swinburne in his *Space and Time*, Ch.8.

10. For the discussion of the perfectly free see Swinburne:1977:Ch.8.

11. This preceding paragraph is a mosaic of translations from *De Veritate* 2, 12.

12. As Stump and Kretzmann hold, no “temporal entity could satisfy that description, and so no temporal entity could be a perfect being” (1984:4). Stump and Kretzmann agree with Duns Scotus to the claim that entities existing only at an instant could satisfy that description; but hold that strictly instantaneous temporal existence is theoretically impossible (1984:27:fn.7).


13A. “In the impartite Siva’s heart five sūdākhyas (materials for the creation of the world), such as Mahāsūdākhyā, Śivasūdākhyā, Amūrtisūdākhyā, Mūrtisūdākhyā, kartusūdākhyā, and karmasūdākhyā, were born. From Karmasūdākhyā Brahma was born and this Brahma were born mankind, angels, and demons, egg-born, and the womb-born; indeed, all movable and immovable things. All these were made by the will of Siva ...” (SJ:63).

“When the God of his own accord “thought of becoming and that thought conceived of maya, and this fashioned attachment, and that, in turn, created all the elements, from these the entire world was born. All these come to be and cease according to Thy word ...” (SJ:64).

“The formless Siva-principle, existence-consciousness-bliss, eternal and perfect of its own accord became the Mahalinga, ... in the Linga’s heart, as a tree grows out of the seed, with the Linga uniting with its own icchasakti becoming the author of the world’s beginning, existence, end, and turning into the partite and impartite. What is that world? Enwombing in himself the fourteen mansions, seven seas, the islands, seven mountains, the entire host of planets, and the orbits of the stars, the cosmic egg was formed; that is, look you, the making of the world ...” (SJ:67).

“The dissolution of the earth is in water, that of water is in fire; of fire in air, of air in space, of space in soul, of soul in Mahalinga. All these, in Mahalinga being borne, in Mahalinga only shall dissolve; in It all embryos shall dissolve; all principles; the Siva principle alone, which is the basis of dissolution and of progress, is eternal...”(SJ:72).

The point emerging from all these vacanas is that there are spatial and temporal parts within God’s being according to TS.

14. “Because enwombing in thyself six angas and six lingas, six bhaktis and six saktis, all these Thou wast the Existence-consciousness-bliss, the eternal [perfect], immaculate, I call Thee Impartite Siva-principle” (SJ:32).

15. Five acts: creation, preservation, destruction, veiling and benediction belong to Siva (SJ:71).
16. "Ere worlds on worlds were yet, one and only [supreme great thing] existed in Itsell alone: not conscious of Itself, not conscious of any other thing, no consciousness was yet in it. This vast unconscious thing becoming conscious of Itself, became the consciousness; and this assuming five attributes: existence, consciousness, bliss, perfection and eternity, became the formless Siva-principle. The single formless Siva-principle, by mere vibration of its energy divided into two. wherein Liṅgasthala is one, the other Aṅgasthala. And thus it operates as anga and Liṅga, worshipped and the worshipper (SJ:39).

CHAPTER IV

1. How it is not possible to conceive more than one God is considered later in this section.

2. Compared to panentheism, other doctrines in which one or more of the five factors are omitted are called by Hartshorne and Reese (1976:17) 'truncated doctrines'.

3. Hartshorne and Reese (1976:513) seem to admit that since this doctrine seems to involve series of cosmic states as presented to God, and so, the absolute simultaneity physics now denies (perhaps not in the relevant sense), there is an unresolved problem.

4. We have discussed in Ch.III.A. how God is all-inclusive reality, if he is omniscient

CHAPTER V

1. SJ: 44, 32, 1, 28, 463, 70, 36, 598, 282, 36.

2. SJ: 10, 23, 39, 38, 18, 46, 14, 624, 20, 2, 44, 88, 66, 27, 29, 53, 1, 3.

3. SJ: 1, 2, 3, 4, 7.


5. It is to be noted that when it is said that the individual beings and the worlds are originated at mahalingasthala of God, mahalingasthala includes anɡalingōdbhavasthala and pāncamūrti lingasthala. But it is also said that individual beings are originated at anɡalingōdbhavasthala of God, and at pāncamūrti lingasthala worlds are originated. It is also said that at pāncamūrti lingasthala individual beings are also originated. What we understand from this is that the mahalingasthala is broadly the state where the worlds and the individuals and many factors are originated. It may also be said that when the individual begins are originated it is at the state of God's anɡalingōdbhavasthala.

6. Anɡa: individual; there could be many individuals but they can be grouped into six according to their character, qualities and status - bhakta, maheśa, prasādi, prānalingi, sarana and aikya. In the bhakta state devotion is predominant, in maheśa faith, in prasādi the tranquility, in prānalingi the spiritual experience, in sarana the bliss or surrender and in aikya the union with God. It is also the case that in the process of spiritual development an individual being called bhakta surpasses himself into maheśa, from maheśa to prasādi, from prasādi to prānalingi, from prānalingi to sarana, and from sarana to aikya.
Lingga: God; when God deals with different types of individuals (āṅgas) he is called by different names. That is, he is called Ācāralinga when he deals with bhakta, Gurulinga with maheśa, Sivalīṅga with prasūti, Jñāgamalīṅga with prānaliṅga; Prasādaliṅga with śaraṇa and Mahāliṅga with aikya.

Sakti: power; there are six types of power - power of action (kriyāsakti), power of knowledge (jñānasakti), power of will (īcchāsakti), power of source (ādiśakti), supreme power (parāsakti) and power of consciousness (cicchakī). These powers are associated with God. When God is associated with power of action he is called Ācāralinga; with the power of knowledge Gurulinga and so on.

Bhakti: the above mentioned powers are also associated with an individual. When these powers are sued for the spiritual progress of an individual they are called bhakti, devotion. As there six types of powers there are six types of bhakti - sraddha, niṣṭha, avadhana, anubhava, ānanda and samarasa.

CHAPTER VI


3. PR: 225; AI: 1933: 356; MT: 1938: 72-75

4. MT: 136

5. Whitehead says that every actual entity transcends its actual world, even including God. But this means it adds itself as a new value to existence and since God and God alone fully possesses or precludes every such addition, God "transcends" or excels others in a special or pre-eminent sense", and that is the sense in which, Hartshorne is using the term (1972: 66, In).

6. PR: 529

7. PR: 529

8. PR: 538


10. PR: 528.


14. PR: 521, 523f.
15. MT:128
16. PR:524f, 530
17. PR:524f, 530
18. PR:424f, 530.
19. AI:357.
20. SM;258.
22. RM:94.
23. PR:68.
24. AI:216.
25. AI:342,344.
26. PR:521,532.
27. PR:532
28. PR:73.
29. MT:139ff
30. MT:140ff
31. MT:131, 159, 162-65
33. PR:161; RM:158.
34. PR:134.
35. AI:267.
36. AI:247-251; PR:363.
37. Tait. Up.: iii; Bhagavadgita: vii. 54.
38. Radhakrishnan distinguishes Brahma, the creator-God, from Brahman, the Absolute Spirit.
39. viii. 79 2. viii. 4.7

40. iii 17

41. ix 18

42. viii 92.32

43. Tailor A: *Faith of Moralist* (1931), pp 325-326