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I.8 **CONCLUSION**

**IMPORTANCE OF SARVAJÑĀNOTTARA:**

Though Sarvañānottara is not one of the 28 main Agamas, it has been recognised as an important Agama and it has received the attention of scholars from the early times. Bhatta Rāmākanta of 11th century has quoted from Sarvañānottara in his commentary on Matanga-Agama. Aghora Śivācārya, who holds Bhatta Rāmākanta in high reverence, might have been led to attach importance to Sarvañānottara in view of Bhatta Rāmākanta's references to it and possibly thus a commentary came to be composed composed by him on Sarvañānottara. Vidyāranya quotes from Sarvañānottara in his commentary called Tātparya Prakāśika on Sūta Samhitā. S.S. Suryanārayana Sāstri thinks that Śrikanṭacārya, the propounder of Śivādvaita must have been familiar with an Agama of such importance as the Sarvañānottara. ¹ Śivāñānayogin in his Śaiva Paribāsā quotes extensively from Sarvañānottara to establish his view, as against that of Aghorāsiva, about the status of the soul in the state of liberation. Besides

translating the work in Tamil, he is also stated to have written a commentary on the Agama though both are not traceable. In recent times, Muthiah Pillai wrote a commentary in Tamil on the Jñānapāda portion of the Agama.

Apart from the contents of Sarvajñānottara, one factor that has enhanced its importance is the tradition that the Agama was expounded by Śiva to his son, Śaṃmukha. S. Suryanārāyana Sastri write: "The Sarvajñānottara as its name implies is the culmination of all wisdom. The doctrine expounded herein is taught by Śiva not to other sages as in the remaining Agamas but to his own son, Subramanya; that is taken to be a mark of the higher grade of the wisdom inculcated."¹ P. Muthiah Pillai avers that the Kamika, Pauskara Agamas are more concerned with the refutation of rival schools than with the exposition of the Siddhantic view-point, whereas Sarvajñānottara chiefly concerns itself with the exposition of the Siddhānta and for these reasons, in matters of doubt, the texts of Kamika and Pauskara Agamas should be interpreted in consonance with Sarvajñānottara. He also mentions that

---

¹ Vide S.S. Suryanārāyana Śastri, Śivādvaita of Appayyar Diksta, p. 35.
Sarvajñānottara is referred to in Vāyusamhitā as ‘Sarvāgamottaram’.  

**SIGNIFICANCE OF THE CONTRIBUTION OF AGHORASĪVĀCĀRYA**

Polagam Sri Rāma Sastrī, an authoritative exponent of Advaita Vedānta of recent times, has made a significant observation in the course of his introduction (bhūmikā) to the publication of ‘Aghorasīvācārya Paddhati’ brought out by Śivāgama Śiddhānta Paripaḷanasaṅgha, Devakottai in 1927 and it is worth being quoted in full:

> “याधवचियमानवाऽऽिष्करसामयुक्तमेव सुविद्य, देवियान सोह्यासाधनम्, ज्ञाने तु ततैवतम इत्यादिः कृतिप्रकृति विविधतयु प्रोक्तिविधिनत काशिति सिद्धान्तभिततमज्ञीचकार, तत्रायि भूयांस्रोत्त्रेवाषु जैपान्तिकानुप्रामाणिकैलक्षेत्र अयुपासागर परमाचार्यं इत्यजत्तक्यायि विषयं विशेषितः” ॥

Although this revered preceptor has advanced some views which are not in conformity with the Siddhānta doctrine

1. Vide SJO by P.M. Pillai, p. 5
2. Vide Kriyā karmadyotikā, p. 5
like (a) similarity with Śiva in the state of Liberation
(b) Dīksā as the principal cause of Liberation and
(c) Jñāna as only subsidiary to Dīksā, he has been accepted
as an authority on most of the matters of Siddhānta and
there can be no doubt in regard to this point.

As indicated in the foregoing observation, the nature
of the state of Śiva during liberation and the role of
Dīksā ushering in liberation are the two doctrinal view-
points with which Aghoraśivācārya's name has been pro-
minently associated and they are only mentioned here.

Śaiva Siddhānta is an avowedly dualistic school and
the Jīva is eternally distinct from Śiva. In the face
of assertions in the Āgamas that Jīva experiences 'abheda'
with Śiva in the state of Mokṣa, the dualistic philosophers
have tried to explain it away in two ways and rejected the
advaitic unity of Śaṅkara's school. According to one view,
Jīva manifests similarity with Śiva in the state of
liberation and this is called Śivasamata. The other view
is that Jīva experiences oneness with Śiva though he is
not non-different from Śiva and this is called Śivaikya
Aghoraśivācārya's name is permanently associated with the
first view and almost all later day siddhantins including
Śivāgrayogin advocated the second view.

While commenting on verse 15 of Bhoja's Tatva-prakāśikā Aghoraśivācārya explains 'yojayati pare tatve'. as pare pade - Šivasāmyarūpe yojayati. The logic advanced in support of this view is that the Jīvā intrinsically possesses the attributes of Šiva but because of maya they are non-manifest and when through Sādhanā, maya is overcome, the attributes of Šiva become manifest and that is liberation.

This view is severely criticised by others, who think that to subscribe to this view is to place Jīva on par with Šiva and it would be anamolous to think that there are as many Šivas as liberated souls. Šivāgrayogin has raised technical objections to the concept of 'Śivasamatā' and established his viewpoint sivaikyam by quoting relevant verses from Sarvajñānottara.

This controversy over relatively a minor viewpoint was pursued with a vehemence hardly justifiable and writers like the author of Mukti Nischayapperurai have
even doubted Aghorasiva's stature as a preceptor acquainted with the tradition.

The view that Jīva experiences Śivasāmyam in moksā was actually not propounded by Aghorasiva though he had adopted it. Śūta-saṁhitā, a far earlier work, which Sri Śaṅkara is reported to have studied several times before composing his commentary on Brahma Sūtras has discussed this view fully and rejected it in favour of the advaitic view that Jīva is absolutely non-different from the Supreme in the state of liberation. In view of the above, the criticism of Aghorasva seems to be less than justified.

In regard to the view that Dīkṣā alone is responsible for bringing in liberation and Jñāna plays a contributory role, Aghorasiva definitely accords unique role to Dīkṣā and he has also adequately explained his reasons for this view again and again in his vr̥tti on Sarvajñānottara.

As has been correctly assessed by Polagam Rāmā Sāstri, Aghorasivācārya has been regarded as an authoritative preceptor and if Sri Vidyāranya of the 16th century
quoted him in his chapter on Śaiva Siddhānta in Sarvadarśana Saṅgraha to explain Bhoja's verses from Tattvapraṅkasikā, what further proof do we need about his stature in the Śaiva Siddhānta School.

We now pass on to the main aspects of the teachings of Sarvajñānottara.

THE DOCTRINE AND PHILOSOPHICAL THOUGHT IN SARVAJÑĀNOTTARA

The distinction between pati and Śivam:

Even in the enunciation of the main categories of the Śaiva Siddhānta System, Sarvajñānottara makes a significant departure from all other Āgamas. If the other Āgamas mention only three categories, namely, Pati, Paśu and Pāśam, Sarvajñānottara mentions 'Śivam' as additional category. The verses 54 and 57 of Jñānapāda mention the two categories distinctly and describe their nature:

"Patiḥ sadāsivojñeyo srsti samhārakārakah
Śivavastu-param tasman mantrātito niranjanah.
Nirāmayo nirādhāro varnarūpa vivarjītah.

1. SJO, Sl. 22, p. 39
The observations of S. Suryanārayana Śāstri on this particular teaching of Sarvajñānottara are worth being noted.¹

"Unlike the main body of Śaiva doctrine, it distinguishes four principles instead of three, Śaiva the fourth being other than Pati (The Lord). The Pāśu (The bound soul) and Pāśa (the bonds). Pati is the Lord, who engages in the five-fold activity of creation, sustentation, destruction, concealment and the bestowal of grace, in relation to the world. Śiva is unconnected with the world. In the language of advaita, pati is Saguna-Brahman or Īsvara while Śiva is Nisprapāṇcha Brahman. The description of Brahman approximates to that of Nirguna-Brahman; for He is said to be stainless (nirañjana, nirāmaya) free from colour (Class?) and form (Varṇarūpa Vivarjite) and so on. But He is not to be identified with Nirguna Brahman; for, there is some positive characterisation too of Śiva as omniscient (sarvajña) omnipresent (sarvaga) peaceful (Śānta), the self of all (Śarvātmā) and so on. Thus, though He is higher than Pati, who is the Being that brings about creation

¹. The Śivādvaita-Nirmaya of Appayya Diksīta by S.S. Śaistri, p. 35
and destruction (Sṛṣṭi-Samhāra-Kāraka) and is, otherwise, known as Sadāśiva. He is not identical with the characterless Brahman of the advaita. And the doctrine propounded cannot be identified with pure advaita either; for, so far as one can judge, this seems to be specifically mentioned and condemned. 'Some with confused minds' it is said 'Declare the doctrine of mere non-difference'.

Further, S.S. Sastri thinks that the Niranvaya Upāsakas referred to by Śrikanthācārya might be the devotees of Śiva as distinct from the devotees of Pati, the Lord engaged in five-fold activity. He observes in his "The Śivadvaita of Śrikantha" in the section entitled "The Sarvajñānottara as the possible ground of Śrikantha's position": 'Now it is possible that Śrikantha was expounding nothing more than the doctrine of this Āgama, though he cited the Jābāla Śruti as being appropriate to the Vedānta that he was commenting on. On this construction, the texts about niranvaya-upāsakas

1. Vide. Introduction to the Śivādvaita Nirmaya of Appayya Dīksita by S.S. Sastri, p. 35
may refer to the devotees of Śiva, as distinct from those who contemplated the Lord engaged in the five-fold activity.¹

ADVAITIC CONTEMPLATION AS MEANS OF REALISATION

An interesting feature of this Āgama is the insistence it lays on the advaitic mode of contemplation as means of liberation. A number of verses in Svātma-sāksātkāra-upadesa-prakārā in the Jñānapāda deal with this subject:

iyorśām śvarūpādibhūtām sarva-śvarūpānto murobhūtām.
śvarottarasthānasāṁhitāh sarvārtaparī saṁśītāh
śvarottaraśāntītirtha vādāmśanānavijñātāh.

Ahām eva paramesvārāṃbhavattatprabhavatam.
śvarottaraśāntītirtha śvarūpāntatāmśanānavijñātāh.

Yā śivaṃ śoḍhāmśevasi ātmaśāntahāvatvamāhatah
abhedatmanarākṣakām sarvāntamāheṣvarvajñātāh
sarvāntamāheṣvarāni saṁśītāh
śoḍhāntarāṇe pradānena śāntiprajñātāt nāmāvajñātāh.
śvaśāntīstaya tu yajñināh
sarvaśāntya pradānena vikramaśāntitya c ca.²

¹. The Śivādvaita of Srikantha by S.Suryanarayana Sastri, p.302.
². Vide SJO, Vidyā Ca.2, Sl. 4,5,8,13,14,15, P.48 to 59.
Contemplation of Śiva as distinct from self is also expressly forbidden.

अप्रभास्यं श्रीव्र अन्यं परभासविदयं यह एकस्मृतः
एवमप्यास्येन मोक्षात् न श्रिव्रवानुपुष्टात्
श्रीव्रदन्यास्तवहस्तवानं पुद्धर भावो विवर्णयेत्"

In fact, one of the lines above very much resembles the Jabala Sruti Viz. 'tvam vā ahamasya bhagavo devate
aham vai tvamasi'. which prescribes the vyatihāra mode of contemplation.

Though the verses cited above and other verses in the said prakaraṇa are unambiguously advaitic, Śaiva Siddhanta commentators on Sarvajñānottara have interpreted these passages otherwise. Neither Aghorāśiva, who is avowedly hostile to Advaita nor preceptors like Śivāgrayogin who are supposed to be sympathetic to Advaita hold that Jīva is identical with the Supreme in the state of liberation. Advaitic state of liberation

1. Śju, Vidyā Ca.2, Sl. 12, 13, p. 56,57.
means for Śivāgrayogin a state in which Jīva is united with Śiva. In that state of union, Jīva is partaking the bliss of Śiva.

If the advaitic state of oneness is not attained in the state of liberation, why at all the advaitic mode of contemplation is prescribed in the text?

Aghorasiva's attempts to explain away the passages are far from satisfactory, nor his criticisms of Advaitic doctrine of oneness (of Śaṅkara) are justified. Some of his observations are worth being taken note of:

While commenting on the line "Yah śivah sahameveti adaitam bhāvayet sādā."¹

Aghorasiva says:

１. SJO ca.2. Ś1. 13. p. 58.
２. Vide Com. on SJO. p. 53
In the same context, he also says:

"तत्र शिवाङ्कर्षणविनात्मनं तव मृत्युदाशयां सचित्कण्डुपुरं
उक्तं तत् स्वाभिप्रेरण सह भवदक्षिण्य परिकृत्य
सान्ध्यालस्यस्वयं पवित्रकमलनं प्रकरणं रोक्तं प्रतिपाद्यते।
न तु परस्मिन सहात्मनं एक्यार्द्धिकृतं बालिनं
साहित्यं तत्र शरणसमानोपपाविवेकदात्राः प्राक्तनं
समस्तप्रकरण विवेकदात्र अपांश्यलक्षणां दूषित्तिष्ठित्वा
दक्षिणक्त प्रकरणं पश्चादि पवार्श्च्य श्वर्त्त सत्त्वामुख्यं
पास्कार्य भेदं तद्यथ क्य निरामिश्र द्रव्यं।"

"शरणसमस्तप्रकरणं श्वर्त्तसयानुपयजनं एव ज्ञातं
सहित्यम् श्रुत्मरणस्य पत्यादि भेदस्यानुप्रस्तृतं भेदस्य
भौगोलिकस्याध्यक्षकवाक्यं न्या आनि विभजय विषयमान
प्रकरणं प्रकृतिविवेकदात्र।"

Aghorasiva's view is as follows: Jīva should contemplate himself as Śiva and Śīva, in this context, refers to

1. Vide Com. on SJO. p. 58.
2. Ibid. p. 58
only the Jīva in the state of liberation when he is omniscient, omnipresent etc., Jīva undergoing samsāra should contemplate his exalted nature in the state of liberation. On the other hand, if identity with Śiva is deemed to be taught, there would be several incongruities. Neither the Supreme Śiva nor the Self is non-dual. If identity is meant all the scriptures would be false and the earlier portion of Sarvajñānottara would be inconsistent. The distinction between Pati, and Pasu and Pāsam would be without justification and the conclusions would be entirely opposed to logic.

Śivagrayyogin of 16th century, who wrote an independent commentary on Sarvajñānottara, (which, of course, is not traceable) intended to lean towards Advaita; but, from the standpoint of Advaita Vedānta, his view also is equally unsatisfactory. In his Śaiva paribhāṣa, the author refutes the Śiva-sāmya Vāda advocated by Aghora-śiva and concludes

“किं-च सर्वायामस्वरूपांश्चेद एव पर्यथानाम्।
नर्मदानिधिसिद्धाद्वारम् तत्निनिः।
किं-च शिखरिकीनिः
शिखराः सिद्धान्नदबुधः एव सोक्ष्य।
तस्तिव स्वामिनः पःमशिला-भेदः ज्ञात्वा महेन्दिति-स्तितम्
श्रीमत् सर्वज्ञातिनौ निर्तिवमिषु
बोधित्त्वात् तथा हि सर्वज्ञातिनौ वचनाशि।”

1. Śaiva paribhāṣa of Śivāgra Yogin, p. 159
After quoting the fourteen verses commencing from

कोडशी सत्यात्मा देवं स्वातिन्म स्वातोमुनि

he observes

“एतेषाः वचनान् स्वयं प्राचीन संबंधाय सहता
प्रयोगान द्वेतपरतं रचितान्यकदेशीर्या व्याख्यानम्
श्रीश्री न समस्तानि कृति स्वभावान्तर व्याख्यानि
उस्मात्र भूष प्रतिपादितम्”

Though the author has refuted the interpretation of Aghorasiva referred to by him as 'ekadesi', we are not able to understand how the advaitic slokas quoted by him have been interpreted by him inasmuch as his commentary on Sarvajñānottara is not traceable.

**LIBERATION AS A STATE OF POSITIVE BLISS**

Is liberation a state of positive bliss or mere absence of misery? In regard to this subject, the teaching of Sarvajñānottara is perfectly clear. The

1. SJO, Vidyā, ca. 2. Śl. 4-18, pp. 48-60

2. *Śaiva paribhāṣā* of Sivāgra Yogin, Ch. 5, p. 160.
relevant verses are:

\[\text{निर्विदर्थमिविज्ञातं भीतधर्मिनिष्ठकर्मा} ।

\[\text{निर्विदर्थमिविज्ञातं हेतुवृद्धांत विनितिमा} ।

\[\text{तत्स्यं परमं प्रोक्तमं आलोकिकमनोपमम्} ।

\[\text{नित्यविज्ञातं मनोवृद्धिः निवन्तियेत} ।

\[\text{यदायायुक्तं भाष्यं तदायुक्तं सुक्षमं} ।\]

Aghorasāva while commenting on the above lines, explains happiness 'dukhka-nivrtyātmakāṁ' which means that absence of misery constitutes happiness. It passes one's understanding how the sukhaṁ described in the text itself as param and anuapamam is merely a negative state.

Śivāgrayogin, a staunch critic of Aghorasāva, refutes the above view and after quoting the verses of Sarva-

\[\text{jñānottara} \text{ cited above remarks: iti sarvajñanottarāgama}

\[\text{vacanena sukhasya pratipādanāt}.\] He also sets aside the view of Aghorasāva in the statement:

\[\text{atra duhkha nivrtyātmakāṁ sukhami kesaṁ cidvyākhyānam}

\[\text{sukhasabda mukhyārtha parityāgo hetvā bhāvādanupapannam}.\]

1. SJ0. Vidya Ch. 2. Sl. 39, 40, 41, pp. 69, 70.

2. Saivaparibhasa by Śivāgrayogin. Ch. 5. p. 163.

3. Ibid. Ch. 5, p. 163.
From the foregoing discussion, one fact becomes obvious that the Śaiva Siddhānta has to turn to Sarva-
jñānottara only for support for the view that Moksā is a state of supreme bliss.

**IMPORTANCE OF DĪKSĀ**

All āgamas insist that Dīksā—initiation by the preceptor is the cause of liberation. Aghorasiva repeatedly stresses that it is Dīksā that is the main cause of liberation and Jñāna is only a subsidiary cause. Śiva himself assuming the form of Guru performs the Dīksā and hence its importance. Sarvajñānottara also states that even as the effect of poison is nullified by Mantra, medicine etc., the bondage caused by the pāśas is countered by Dīksā. The relevant Verse is given below:

\[
\text{mantramūsadhavalairyyadvat sannirodho visasya tu.}
\text{tathā hi sarvapīśānāṁ sannirodhashtu dīksayā}^1
\]

Though Patañjali's concepts are to be found in the Yogapāda of Sarvajñānottara, the Yoga taught in the Sarva-
jñānottara is different from the Āstānga yoga. Generally

---

1. Sūta. Vidyā Ca. 1. 51. 9., p. 24
the Agamas teach the Yoga having 6 parts and Sarvajñaottara would seem to adhere to the same teaching.

\[ \text{prānāyāmas tathā dhyānam pratyāhāro'tha dhāranā tarkaścāiva samādhiśca sadaṅgo yoga ucyte.} \]

Prānāyāma, Dhyāna, Pratyāhāra, Dhāranā, Tarka and Samādhi constitute the six limbs of the yoga of the Śaiva Siddhantins. Yama, Niyama and Āsana of Pātañjala-Yoga have been left out and it is significant that it has been recognised as one of the limbs of Yoga by the Siddhāntins.

TO CONCLUDE:

Sarvajñaottara is a significant āgama and its teachings relating to the vital concepts of Siddhānta have profoundly influenced the development of Siddhānta doctrine. It has pronounced Advaitic bias. Its description of nature of liberation, prescription of Advaita bhāvanā as means of liberation, emphasis on Dīksā are the noteworthy aspects of teachings.

1. Matanga paramesvarāgama. Ch. I. Sl 6, p. 248
Aghorasiva of the 11th century was a great theologian who bridged the two traditions, Sanskrit and Tamil, of Siddhānta. Rohan A. Dunwila, on the contribution of Aghorasiva writes:

"The shared issue between Aghorasiva and these theologians is preservation of the transcendent from the taint of the phenomenal. However, Śrikumāra's conception of emanation within Śiva frustrates the very purpose for which these emanation takes place - the plunge of the transcendent into the phenomenal. To maintain the integrity of transcendence, Aghorasiva borrows the Sankhya model of Difference, and strictly reinforces its principle that self-differentiation is possible only in unconscious substances and not in the conscious (Śiva). He also adopts the Logicist theory that whatever is composed is an effect, and that the effect has an intelligent cause which does not in any way share its characteristics. Thus having demonstrated the untransformable transcendence of the conscious by Sankhya principles, and having subjected inconscient Matter to the causality of God through Logicist principles, Aghorasiva goes on to assert his own position of the inner duality of Supreme Śiva, the Godhead known in its absolute aspect as Energiser and its relative one as Energy".¹

¹ A. Dunwila, op. cit. pp. 77-78.
Naturally, as a confirmed dualist, he would have felt that if the strong advaitic bias in SJO was not effectively diluted, the cause of Siddhānta would suffer and hence might have been impelled to write a Vṛtti on SJO.

He had both ardent admirers and vehement critics. Notwithstanding the vehemence of his critics, his deep erudition, profound scholarship and contribution to Siddhānta philosophy have left significant imprints in the Siddhānta literature.

In his own words:
advaitavādi madāvārana bhedaśilah,
Śrīmāghora śivadesika kesāyindrah.

SJO, Vidyā. Ch. 8. Sl. 26, p. 138