

The Dravida Maha Bashya of Sivagnana Yogi.

A REVIEW.

Authority – Vedas and Agamas.

In his introduction, the commentator discusses two important subjects, namely the scriptural authorities bearing on religion, and the characteristics of an universal religion. He points out that some Vaidikis hold that the Vedas alone form the authority and not the Agamas, and that some Saivas hold that Agamas alone form the authority and the Vedas do not form as good authority as the Agamas. Against the views of both, he cites Sri Nilakanta Sivachariar and Appaya Dikshitar, prominent Vaidikis who held in their books, Nilakanta Bashyam, Swarkamani Dipika and Siva Tatva Vivekam that Agamas form equally as good authority as the Vedas. He cites Haradatta Sivachariar and Umaphathi Sivachariar, prominent Saivas who in their works Chaturveda tatparya Sangraha and Paushakra Virutti have upheld the authority of both Vedas and Agamas. He quotes the following passage from Nilakanta Bashyam.

“Former Acharyas (Teachers) maintain that this Adhikarana is intended to set aside the theory, advanced in parts of Siva-Agama, that Siva, the Parabrahman, is a mere efficient cause. On the contrary, we see no difference between the Veda and the Sivagama. Even the Vedas may properly be called Sivagama, Siva being the author thereof. Accordingly, Sivagama is twofold, one being intended for the three (higher castes), the other being intended for all. Siva alone is the author of both. That He is the author of the Veda is declared in the following passages of Sruti and Smriti. “He is the Lord of all Vidyas.” “(The Veda) is the breath of the mighty Being.” “of these eighteen Vidyas of various paths, the original author is the wise Sulapani Himself. So says the Sruti.” Elsewhere also the Paramesvara Himself is thus spoken of. Wherefore the author being the same, both teach the same thing and are alike authoritative.

“Or the question may be viewed thus: - The Vedas and the Agama are both authoritative inasmuch as we find, in both alike, Brahman, Pranava, the Panchakshari, Prasada and other Mantras; mention of Pasu, Pati, Pasa and other things, such lofty Dharmas as the smearing of ashes, the wearing of tripundra, worship of Linga, the wearing of rudraksha, and all other such things. The author being the same and both expounding the same thing, they are not opposed to one another. Wherefore we maintain that this – Adhikarana refers to the Yoga Smriti of Hiranyagarbha which speaks of Isvara as the mere efficient cause. Therefore, this adhikarana is properly intended to overthrow the Hiranyagarbagama or, as someone says, there is nothing objectionable (in this adhikarana being made to refer to Sivagama) inasmuch as it is intended to remove an incidental doubt arising with reference to the teaching of the Sivagama itself, just as the doubt concerning the origin of Akasa will be removed. Any how our conclusion is that Isvara is not a mere efficient cause.

The Dravida Maha Bashya of Sivagnana Yogi

He quotes from Siddhiar the following verse.

வேதநூல் சைவநூலென்றிரண்டே நூல்கள்
வேறுரைக்கு நூலிவற்றின் விரிந்தநூல்கள்
ஆதிநூலநாதியமலன்றரு நூலிரண்டும்
ஆரணநூல் பொதுசைவமருஞ் சிறப்புநூலாம்
நீதியினாலுலகர்க்கும் சத்தினி பாதர்க்கும்
நிகழ்த்தியது நீண்மறையினொழி பொருள்வேதாந்தத்
தீதில்பொருள் கொண்டுரைக்கு நூல்சைவம் பிறநூல்
திகழ்பூர்வஞ்சிவாகமங்கள் சித்தாந்தமாகும்.

“The only real books are the Vedas and Saivagamas. All other books are derived from these. These books are eternally revealed by the perfect God. Of them the Vedas are general (பொது) and given out for all; the agamas are special and revealed for the benefit of the blessed, and they contain the essential truths of Veda and Vedanta. Hence all other books are Purvapaksha and Saiva Agamas alone form Siddhanta.

In the previous verse, St. Arul Nanthi had pointed out the distinction of *Muthal Nul*, *Vazhi Nul*, and *Sarbhu Nul* and what they are. Tolkappiyam defines *Muthal Nul* as books revealed by the Supreme Being devoid of Imperfections. *Vazhi Nul* agree with *Muthal Nul* in its conclusions, but may vary in other details. *Sarbhu Nul* while following the two former may differ from both.

Vedas and Agamas, as they expound all truths, form the Revealed books. Those who possess God’s grace alone can fathom their meaning. Others try to interpret in their own ways and found various schools. Smritis and Puranas and Kalasastras form *Vazhi Nul*. The Vedangas and upangas form *Sarbhu Nul*. The distinction of Vedas and Agamas as general and special was first brought out by St. Tirumular in the famous verse.

வேதமோடாகமம் மெய்யாம் இறைவனால்
ஓதும்பொதுவும் சிறப்பு மென்றுன்னுக
நாதன்உரையிவை நாடிவிரண்டந்தம்
பேதமதென்னிற் பெரியோர்க்கபேதமே.

“The Vedas and Agamas are both of them true, both being the word of the Lord. Know that the first is general and the latter special. Both from the word of God. Where difference is perceived, when examined, between Vedanta and Siddhanta, the great will perceive no difference.”

The commentator calls them senseless people who would cite certain texts in condemnation of the Veda. He quotes the author of Siddhanta Prakasika who interprets these as referring to Purva Mimamsa, Vaisheshika and Nyayika and to Ekatma Vada or Maya Vada and not to be made applicable to the Veda as a whole, whose essence is the Agama. He replies to those who quote certain texts from the Puranas etc., in condemnation of the Agamas, and points out that these only refer to Pasupata and other heterodox schools and not to the true

The Dravida Maha Bashya of Sivagnana Yogi

Saiva Agama or the Siddhanta. In this comment on அவையடக்கம் of St. Meikandan, he classifies various Indian Religions, as புறப்புறம், புறம், அகப்புறம் and அகம்.

புறப்புறம். Extreme Heterodox.

Lokayata
Bauddha
Madhyamika
Yogachara
Santrantika
Vaibhashika
Jaina

புறம். Heterodox.

Tarka including Nyayika and Vaishesika
Purva Mimamsa
Ekatma Vada
Sankhya
Yoga
Pancharatra,

அகப்புறம். Partly Heterodox and partly Orthodox.

Pasupata
Mavirata
Kabala
Vama
Vairava
Ayikya Vada

அகம். Orthodox.

Pashana Vadam
Pedavadam
Sivasama Vadam
Sankranta Vadam
Iswara Avikara Vadam
Nimitta Karana Parinama Vadam

The Saiva Siddhanta falls under none of these, standing supreme above all. And the books of this school are the 28 from Kamika to Vathula. It will be apparent that each of these heterodox and orthodox schools like Kapala and Vama etc., have each their own special agamas, and opponents of Saiva Agamas are only too prone to cite texts condemnatory of these other Agamas or tantras, against the Saiva Agamas themselves. For this position, he refers to the authorities contained in Vayu Samhita, Sanatkumara Samhita, Kurma Purana and Mahutagama.

The Highest Truth and the Universal Religion.

We may now consider why the Vedas are called General (பொது) and the Agamas special (சிறப்பு) and why the truths contained in them constitute the Highest Truth and Universal Religion or Siddhanta. Sivagnana Yogi points out that the distinction herein referred to should not be confounded with the distinction of logicians into general and special. The distinction is that of Thatastham and Swarupam in Sanskrit. "General" refers to the subject which has to be mastered in our Bhandha condition, by means of our human study and reasoning. "Special" refers to the subject understood after we had obtained God's grace by means of these studies and by our clear inward experience of the actual truth. The processes involved are what are called கேட்டல், சிந்தித்தல், தெளிதல், and நிஷ்டை in Tamil, and Sravana, Manana, Nidhidyasana and Nishtai in Sanskrit. Hence the Vedas in general are called பொது and Agamas special.

Authorities are of various grades.

Even among the Vedas, Upanishads like Subala etc., may be called பொது, Upanishads like Chandogya பொது and சிறப்பு, Upanishads like Atharvasika, Atharvasiras and Swetaswatara சிறப்பு. Among Agamas, Mrigendra and Paushkara can be called பொது, and Sivagnana Bodha பொது and சிறப்பு. Generally speaking, the Vedas may be likened to the Sutra and Agama to the Bhashya or commentary. The Sutras being obscure, the true meaning can alone be grasped by the commentary, and in the Agamas we have the commentary composed by the highest authority, the author of the Vedas themselves.

But it should be apparent that in the Vedas, there are various views of life and religion expounded and which may not all be reconcilable with one another. How is this to be accounted for? And especially when we regard this as the revelation of the one true God? God, as the Heavenly father of all his creatures, has the welfare of everyone before him; and though the truth be one, it is not such as can be understood at once by everyone.

As Adhikaries are of various grades.

Men, as they are constituted, are of every grade of moral, intellectual and spiritual development. In a single family of several children, though everyone has the same facilities for improvement, yet everyone does not avail himself of all the facilities and does not derive the same benefit. They have not the same capacity physical or intellectual or moral for work and progress; and finally they are landed in several stages of life, one becomes an artisan, one becomes a trader and one becomes a great professor, and another a lawyer and another a spiritual teacher and another becomes a moral wreck. In the immense diversity of life that prevails in this vast world, disparity in power and spirituality is immeasurably greater. And the true method of uplifting them would be by providing easy stages which they can understand and ascend, and so reach the final landing. This is what is called the Sobhana Murai or method, Sobhanam meaning a ladder.

The Dravida Maha Bashya of Sivagnana Yogi

The Sobhana Murai.

It will be difficult to convince the Lokayata wallowing in the mire of vice and self-indulgence of the highest spiritual truths, but it will be easy to preach to him as Max Nardon does to seek pure pleasures and the highest enjoyment the world can afford him, freed of vice and voluptuousness and consistent with other's rights; and he can readily perceive that this mode of enjoyment is really more lasting and the better one than the one he was following, in his own self-interest. The next would be to induce him to believe that to get rid of pain, and attain to the highest happiness, the truer mode of plan would be to forget one's own selfish joy and to minister to other's wants and in fact to forget self. This will induce one to the highest ethical perfection which is reached in Buddhism. The man reaching this stage will naturally think if his position is at all satisfactory, and whether the world can generally follow his lead, and whether a belief in a future spiritual existence is not necessary. The Sankhya then postulates a soul and with pradhana, he proves that nothing more is needed to explain our existence or secure our salvation. A further philosophical search induces that the postulate of a soul is not possible unless we postulate a God. And we have the various theistic schools commencing with Nyaya and Yoga. Differences here arise as to the nature of the Highest and the unknown and unknowable God. People try to identify It with this or that existence, or Power or Deity and with one's own self or soul. They try to give and clothe him with our own human perfections and sometimes even with our human imperfections.

The Four Paths. The Way for all.

We call Him our Lord and Master, we call Him our Father, we call Him our Friend and we say we are one with Him. All these mark different stages of spiritual growth. And it different stages of spiritual growth. And it will be seen that each rung is a true rung in the ladder and is a truth and unless this truth is reached, it cannot lead to the higher truth. The all seer is his Supreme Beneficence has therefore revealed the Vedas and Agamas, so that every man finds spiritual nourishment according to his needs.

From the Lower to the Higher all beneficial.

The commentator quotes Taithiriya Upanishad in which the aspirant is gradually led to change his belief in Annamaya kosham as Brahman, to Pranamaya, Manomaya, Vignanamaya and Anandamaya etc. He quotes the authority of Suta Samhita that all these paths are true and are as it were rungs of the ladder. This view of looking at truths is not exactly the same as the viewing of the different facets of a crystal. The same light would proceed from each facet.

The Tree and its parts, all useful, and organic whole.

The man in the lowest rung has in no way differ any glimpse of the Highest light. He in fact would not recognize any such light. It is part of the same structure and the structure is not a mechanical one. Kumara Guru Paraswamigal gives a beautiful illustration of this in his *Pandara Mummani Kovai*.

முற்படுமாயை முதற்கரைநாட்டிற்
பற்பலபுவன பகுதிபற்றி
யீரிருகண்ணாற் றெழுதரம்வகுத்த
வாறேழிரட்டி நூறாயிரத்த
செயற்படுசெய்களி னுயிர்ப்பயிரேற்றி
யூழெனப்பட்ட தாழ்புனற்படுகரிற்
றெய்விகமுதலாச் செப்புமும்மதகு
மொவ்வொருமதகா வுடனுடன்றிறந்து
தாகமென்னுந் தனிப்பெருங்காலிற்
போகமென்னும் புதுப்புனல்கொணர்ந்து
பாயுமைம்பொறிபாம் வாய்மடைதிறந்து
பருவம்பார்த்து வரன்முறைதேக்கலு
மிதத்துடனகிதமெனு மிரண்டுற்றிற்
புதுப்புனல்பெருகிப் புறம்பலைத்தோட
வார்புனலதனை மந்திரமுதலா
வோரறுவகைப்படு மேரிகணிரப்பி
விளைவனவிளைய விளைந்தனவறுத்தாங்
கொருகளஞ்செய்யு முழுவனாகி
மாநிலம்புரக்கு மாசிலாமணி
ஞானசம்பந்த ஞானதேசிக
நல்லருட்டிற்றத்தா னம்பிநீயே
பல்லுயிர்த்தொகுதியும் பயன்கொண்டுகெனக்
குடிலையென்னுந் தடவயனாப்ப
ணருள்வித்திட்டிக் கருணைநீர்ப்பாய்ச்சி
வேதமென்னும் பாதபம்வளர்த்தனை
பாதபமதனிற் படுபயன்பலவே.

அவற்றுள்

இலைகொண்டுவந்தனர் பலரேயிலையொரிஇத்
தளிர்கொண்டுவந்தனர் பலரேதளிரொரீஇ
யரும்பொடுமலர்பிஞ்சருங்காயென்றிவை
விரும்பினர்கொண்டு கொண்டுவந்தனர்பலரே
யவ்வாறுபு மிவ்வாறுபயப்ப
வோரும்வேதாந்த மென்றுச்சியிற்பழுத்த
வாராவின்ப வருங்கனிபிழிந்து
சாரங்கொண்ட சைவசித்தாந்தத்
தேனமுதருந்தினர் சிலரேயானவர்
நன்னிலைபெறுதற் கன்னியனாயினு
மன்னவர்கமலப் பொன்னடிவிளக்கிய
தீம்புனலமுத மார்ந்தனனதனால்
வேம்பெனக்கொண்டனன் விண்ணவரமுதே.

The Dravida Maha Bashya of Sivagnana Yogi

“In that primeval land of ancient Maya
whence the various worlds were evolved
were divisions and subdivisions
made of four, and seven, and 82 lacs.
In fields so divided been sown the seeds of life.
From the deep waters of Karma,
and through the three sluices of
Adi Deivikam, &c., was the water of Bhoga drawn
in the channel of Desire (Thrishna Tanha)
and led at the proper time through the gates of the five senses.
Then from the springs of pleasure and pain,
did the waters flood and overflow
into the 6 tanks of mantra etc.
Thus didst thou, become the husbandman who grew
and reaped the crops and protect
the world, (O Masilamani,
O Gnana Sambantha, Gnana Desika.)
Thus didst thou, O beneficent Lord,
intending the salvation of countless souls,
out of thy abiding love, plant the seed
of love in the field of kudelai,
and water it with the grace, and produce
the Tree of Veda. From this tree
were derived various benefits by various people,
of these.

“Some took the leaves, other took the sprigs, rejecting the leaves; others again rejecting these, took the bud, flower, tender fruit and green ones, as each one desired. Proving useful as they did these six parts of the tree, few were they who chose the ripened fruit, sweet and rare, growing on the top of Vedanta, and pressed the juice called Saiva Siddhanta and drank such ambrosia. Myself, though unfit to share their bliss, will drink the sweet water from the wash of their golden feet. Hence I regard as bitter the ambrosia of the Gods.”

The Veda is the tree, an organic whole, with leaves, flowers and fruits, giving to each what he wants and is in most need of. The man who alone needs leaves will be most highly satisfied if he gets them and would not even look at flowers or fruits though they are equally within his easy grasp. There are some men and women who would prefer a raw fruit to a sweet one, in certain conditions of their physical body.

Causes of Bigotry.

When a man is suffering from fever, the doctors will forbid sweet fruit, as his stomach cannot receive it. This will account for the attitude of some persons who will not see or appreciate truth when others readily perceive it. We wonder why a Tyndal or Huxley would not believe in God and why Gladstone held some beliefs in Theological questions. Each is satisfied with his own position and the other's position does not savour well to him.

The Dravida Maha Bashya of Sivagnana Yogi

Need for sympathy and toleration.

The mind has not reached that development and grace of God had not fallen on him. This view leads one occupying a higher position not to look down upon the other, but to look upon him with sympathy and kindness and just to wait for a chance when he can lift him into his own rung. The man who occupies the highest eminence sees everything with his own eyes and each in its place and can have nothing but the highest good will and toleration to everyone. If the others are condemned sometimes, it is simply to everyone. If the others are condemned sometimes, it is simply to reply when these occupying the lower rungs attack one another and him in the highest rung.

An Illustration.

The commentator instances the case of the blind men who went to see the elephant and who quarrelled among themselves, each one saying it was like a pillar or a brush or a sieve. Our innate selfishness and ignorance and pride and prejudice stand in the way of our living in perfect accord and mutual good will. Our favourite illustration is the scene in a Railway platform when fresh passengers try to get in, are resisted by those already in, and when after the successful intrusion, they recognize each other's mutual relations and friends and become fast friends themselves.

Universal Religion defined by St. Arul Nanthi Sivachariar.

St. Arul Nandi accordingly postulate his view of a universal Religion and truth in the following verse and we would like to compare with it if any other great writer had given his definition.

ஓதுசமயங்கள்பொருள்உணருநூல்கள்
ஒன்றோடொன்றொவ்வாமலுளபலவுமிவற்றுள்
யாதுசமயம்பொருள் நூலியாதிதிங்கென்னில்
இதுவாகுமதுவல்லவெனும்பிணக்கதின்றி
நீதியினாலிவையெல்லாமோரிடத்தேகாண
நிற்பதியாதொருசமயம்அதுசமயம்பொருள் நூல்
ஆதலினாலிவையெல்லாமருமறையாகமத்தே
யடங்கியிடுமவையிரண்டுமரனடக்கீழடங்கும்.

“Religions, postulates and text books are various and conflict one with another. It is asked which is the true religion, which the true postulate and which the true book. *That is true Religion, postulate and book which not possessing the fault of calling this true and the other false, (and not confliction with them) comprises reasonably everything in its own folds.* Hence all these are comprised in the Vedas and Saiva Agamas. And these are imbedded in the Sacred Foot of Hara.”

The Dravida Maha Bashya of Sivagnana Yogi

Claims of Saiva Siddhanta.

And the claim is made boldly for Saiva Siddhanta that it contains the highest expressions of Truth and all the elements of a Universal Religion. Siddhanta is primarily a logical term meaning the true end or conclusion, the thing proved as against the point refuted Purvapaksha. And in any Tamil lexicon, it will be found – that the word Siddhanta without any adjunct means the Agama philosophy or Saiva Siddhanta. We only instance this to show how the claim put forward by the Saivas have become current coin of the realm.

The testimony of Kumara Gurupara.

Kumaraguru Swamigal speaks of it as the சாரங்கொண்ட சைவசித்தாந்தம், Saiva Siddhanta which is the essence of all religions, the highest fountain of all hopes.

The Trumpet note of St. Thayumanavar.

St. Thayumanavar speaks of it as Samarasa Gnanam and Vedanta Siddhanta Samarasa Nanneri. Nanneri means true path, and Samarasa means the essence of all in all.

In the following verses.

செப்பரீ யசமயநெறியெலாந்தந்தம்
தெய்வமேதெய்வமெனுஞ்செயற்கையான
அப்பரிசாளரும: தேபிடித்தாலிப்பால்
அடுத்தவந்நூல்களும்விரித்தேயநுமானாதி
ஒப்பவிரித்துரைப்பரிங்ஙன்பொய்மெய்யென்ன
ஒன்றிலையொன்றெனப்பார்ப்பதொல்வாதார்க்கும்
இப்பரிசாஞ்சமயமுமாயல்லவாகி
யாதுசமயமும்வணங்கியல்பதாகி
இயல்யென்னுந்திரியாமலியமமாதி
யெண்குணமுங்காட்டியன்பாலின்பமாகிப்
பயனருளப்பொருள்கள்பரிவாரமாகிப்
பண்புறவிஞ்செளபாநபக்ஷங்காட்டி
மயலறும்ந்திரஞ்சிக்கைஓசோதிடாதி
மற்றங்கநூல்வணங்கமெளநமோவி
அயர்வறச்சென்னியில்வைத்துராஜாங்கத்தி
லமர்ந்ததுவைதிகசைவமழகிதந்தோ
அந்தோவீதிசயமிச்சமயம்போலின்
றறிகுரெல்லாநடுவறியவணிமாவாதி
வந்தாடித்திரிபவர்க்கும்பேசாமோனம்
வைத்திருந்தமாநவர்க்குமற்றுமற்றும்
இந்த்ராதி போகநலம்பெற்றபேர்க்கும்
இதுவன்றித்தாயமவேறில்லையில்லை
சந்தானகற்பகம்போலருளைக்காட்டித்
தக்கநெறியிந்நெறியேதான்சன்மார்க்கம்

The Dravida Maha Bashya of Sivagnana Yogi

சன்மார்க்கஞானமதின்பொருளும்வீறு
சமயசங்கேதப்பொருளுந்நானென்றாகப்
பன்மார்க்கநெறியினிலுங்கண்டதில்லை
பகர்வரியதில்லைமன்றுட்பார்த்தபோதங்
கன்மார்க்கமிருக்குதெல்லாம்வெளியேயென்ன
எச்சமயத்தவர்களும்வந்திறைஞ்சாநிற்பர்
கன்மார்க்கநெஞ்சமுளவெனக்குந்தானே
கண்டவுடனானந்தகாண்டலாகும்

சைவசமயமேசமயஞ் சமயாதீதப்பழம்பொருளைக்
கைவந்திடவேமன்றுள்வெளிக் காட்டுமிந்தக்கருத்தைவிட்டுப்
பொய்வந்துழலுஞ்சமயநெறி புகுதவேண்டாமுத்திதரும்
தெய்வசபையைக்காண்பதற்குச் சேரவாருஞ்சகத்தீரே.

in exultant language, he proclaims the University of Siddhanta and invites everyone to partake, before ever our bodies perish, of the great flood of joy of Limitless Sivabhoga which is ever rising and flowing over, telling them that the time was ripe for seeking that condition of Love which will secure us the grace of that Gracious Supreme Light, which is One, which is All and which is the Life of life, and says that people find nothing objectionable in the Holy Presence of Limitless Light in the great Temple of Chidambaram and every person of every creed and sect bows down before that Presence, and that he himself found immeasurable joy in that Presence.

Vadalur Ramalinga Swamigal.

The late Ramalinga Swamigal of Vadalur, the author of the famous verses which are sung in every Tamil household, a man who in life was an impersonation of all love, emphasized this aspect of Siddhanta by calling his Sabha *Samarasa Sanmarga Sabha*; and he created a large and loving following among people of all creeds.

Siddhanta appreciated by all.

In our own exposition of the system, we have had the warmest sympathy and approval of Dwaitis, Vishistadvaitis and Advaitis, Christians and Mahomedans; and one Catholic Missionary blessed us saying that God will give us Grace to spread this truth. Our gratitude is specially due to Christian Missionaries who have taken up the study of Saiva Siddhanta with great earnestness in recent years and who have contributed various papers on the subject. We have already referred to the great authority of Reverend Doctor G. U. Pope, who speaks of the Saiva Siddhanta as “the choicest product of the Dravidian Intellect.

Options of Christian Missionaries.

The Saiva Siddhanta is the most elaborate, influential and undoubtedly the most intrinsically valuable of all the religions of India.” Rev. Mr. F. Goodwill follows with the

The Dravida Maha Bashya of Sivagnana Yogi

remark “Those who have studied the system unanimously agree that this eulogy is not a whit too enthusiastic of free worded. That the system is *eclectic* is at once apparent.”

Reverend Mr. W. Goudie writes in the Christian College Magazine as follows: -

“There is no school of thought and no system of faith or worship that comes to us with anything like the claims of the Saiva Siddhanta.”

“This system possesses the merits of a great antiquity. In the Religious world, the Saiva system is heir to all that is most ancient in South India, it is the Religion of the Tamil people by the side of which every other form is of comparatively foreign origin.”

“In the largeness of its following, as well as in regard to the antiquity of some of its elements, the Saiva Siddhanta is, beyond any other form, the religion of the Tamil people and ought to be studied by all Tamil Missionaries.”

“We have however left the greatest distinction of this system till last. As a system of religious thought, as an expression of faith and life, the Saiva Siddhanta is by far the best that South India possesses. Indeed, it would not be rash to include the whole of India, and to maintain that judged by its intrinsic merits, the Saiva Siddhanta represents the high watermark of Indian Thought and Indian life, apart of course from the influence of Christian Evangel (Reverend Mr. Gondie in the Christian College Magazine xx-9).

Reverend G. M. Cobban writing in the Contemporary Review said “We find much truth both in books and men; so much as to surprise the student and delight the wise Christian Teacher.” He wrote to us that he translated long ago *Tiruvartupayan* or Light of Grace of St. Umapathi Sivacharya and which he still loved.

Reverend Mr. Goodwill speaks of its *eclectic* character and one will perceive that the word “eclectic” is but the translation of the words *Siddhanta Sara* and *Samarasa*. And we offer a proof of this from the mouths of some great Oriental Scholars who never heard of the Siddhanta.

Oriental Scholars puzzled over two books.

In all the vast number of Vedantic works, two books long puzzled oriental scholars, as to their purport. They could not easily identify it as the text book of Sankhya, Yoga or Vedanta, Dwaita, Advaita, or Vishistadvaita. It seemed a jumble so to speak. Monier Williams was the first, we believe, to point out that they represented an ancient *Eclectic* School of thought.

The Bhagavat Gita and Svetasvatara.

“The Bhagavad Gita commented on by the great Vedantic Teacher Sankaracharya, may be regarded as representing the *eclectic School of Indian philosophy*. As the regular systems were developments of the Upanishads, so the Eclectic School is connected with those mystical treatises, through the Svetasvatara Upanishad. This last is a comparatively modern Upanishad, but whether it was composed before or after the Bhagavad Gita, *the design of both is evidently the same. They both aim at reconciling the conflicting views of different systems, by an attempt*

The Dravida Maha Bashya of Sivagnana Yogi

to engraft the Sankya and Yoga upon Vedanta doctrines. Although, therefore, the order of creation and much of the cosmology of the Sankya system are retained in both, the sovereignty of the soul or spirit of the universe (*Brahman*, neut.) with which Krishna is identified, as the source and end of all created things, and yet wholly independent of all such creations, is asserted by both.”

Professor Max Muller, in his introduction to the Svetasvatara Upanishad strongly maintains “that no argument that has as yet been brought forward seems to me to prove in any sense of the word its modern character.”

Accordingly, Professor MacDonnell takes a more correct view and states “of the eclectic movement combining Sankya, Yoga and Vedanta doctrines, *the oldest representative is the Svetasvatara Upanishad*. Much more famous is the Gita.”

Proof of the claim of Saiva Siddhanta.

Professor Garbe also subscribes to this view of the *eclectic* character of the two books in his Philosophy of ancient India. Now the Gita has been interpreted by different schools and Svetasvatara by Sankara and his followers. And Vaishnava writers derive the largest number of their authorities from this Upanishad. It has to be noted also that of the quotations from the Upanishads occurring in the Gita, the largest number are from the Svetasvatara. And it is a well-known fact that Svetasvatara is the highest authority of the Saiva school of writers, and hence it has been often called a modern and sectarian Upanishad, though Max Muller argues against this view, and points out the use of such terms as Siva, Hara, Rudra, Bhagavat, Agni, Aditya, Vayu, was much more ancient than the use of the terms Atman and Brahman etc. If therefore the Saivas claim this Upanishad as their own, and this with Gita are the only clear text books of an ancient eclectic school, does not the old claim of Saiva Siddhantis that their school is an *eclectic* school proved without doubt. Anyone can see the truth of the remark of Professor Monier Williams that “it is scarcely too much to say that the creeds indicated by these two terms Saivism and Vaishnavism constitute the very life and soul of modern Hinduism,” and he points out that these are not incompatible creeds. We must suppose also that modern Hinduism represents historically its most ancient traditions and faiths in some measure or other; and either the most ancient eclectic school represented by the Gita and Svetasvatara Upanishad is represented in modern Hinduism or it is not. But it will be absurd to suppose that this old school perished and it has left no modern representatives. Every out-worn creeds like the Buddha, Jains, Sankya and Purvamimamsa etc. had been systematized, and it would be strange if this systematization of the philosophy which claimed to be the *sara* and *essence* of all systems did not proceed apace. We are glad to note that Professor R. W. Frazer emphasized this eclectic character of the Saiva Siddhanta philosophy at the last meeting held in the rooms of the Royal Asiatic Society to do honour to Reverend Doctor G. U. Pope.

A Proof of the antiquity.

We will now touch on the essential features of this Samarasa Siddhanta Philosophy. Before we do so, we would invite the attention of the reader to the article on Svetasvatara Upanishad contributed to the Madras Review and reprinted in volumes IV and V, of the

The Dravida Maha Bashya of Sivagnana Yogi

Siddhanta Deepika. A brief sketch of the ancient history of Indian Religious and Philosophical schools in general appears in the first part of this article, and will form a necessary introduction to this paper also.

One proof however of its antiquity we will give here. The language of its technical terms, whether philosophical or religious are derived from the ancient Vedic Sacrifice. The terms, Pathi, Pasu and Pasa, are exactly the words used to describe the Medha Pati or Yagna Pati or Pasupati, Supreme Deity presiding at the Sacrifice, the animal or Jiva offered in Sacrifice and the ropes used to bind the Pasu to the Yupa or Dwaja-stambha. *

[* Compare the following passages:

Tasmath Rudraha Pasunamadhipateh (Rig veda)
Ghthapathim Medahpathim Yagnas Sadham (Rig Veda)
Pritivyobhavah, Apachcharvah Aguerudrah Vayur Bhima
Akasasya, Mahadevah, Suryasyograh Chandrasya somah
Atmanah Pasupathihi (Rig Veda)

Yajurveda Samhitas.

1. Chitham Sasethanena Bhavam Yakna *Rudram* Thanimna *Pasupathim*, Sthoola hridiyena *Agnim*, Hridayena *Rudram*, Lohithina *Sarvam*, Mathas nabhyam *Mahadevam* Anthahaparsvenow shistahanam singini kosabhayam

(1st Kanda – 4 prasna. 36 Anuvaha. 37 Panchasat.)

This occurs also at the close of the IIIrd prasna of Taithiriya Aruna saka (very near the Purusha Sooktha.)

(Gives some of the names of the Lord as Astamoorthy.)

2. Pasonam sarma asi sarma yajamanasya sarma me vacha *Eka Eva Rudro Na Dwithyaya Thasthe Akhus the Rudra Pasnuh Tham Jushasva*. Esha the Rudra Bhagaha *Saha Swasra Ambikaya* tham Jushasva Bheshajam Gave Asvaya Purushaya Bheshajam. Atho Asmabhyam Bheshajam Sabheshajam. (1st Kanda – 8 Prasna 6 Anuva 10 Panchasat.)

(Says that Rudra is the only Lord without the second. He is the panacea for all ills.)

3. Yatha Asathi Sugam Meshaya Meshyai Ava Amba *Rudra Adhimahi* Ava *Devam Trayambakam* Yatha Naha Sreyasaha Karath – Yatha naha Vasyasaha Karath – Yatna naha Pasumathaha Karath yatha naha Vyava sayayath Thryambakam yaja *mahe* Sugandhini Pushti vardhanam urvarukam iva *Bhandanat Mrutyormukshiya* Ma mruthath – Esha the *Rudra* Bhagaha. Tham Jushasva. Thena Avasena Paraha Moojuvatha Athya Wathatha Dhanvane. *Pinakasthaha Krithivasaha*. (1st Kanda. 8th Prasna. 6th Anuva. 11th Pancha.)

(Shows that Triyabaka is the releaser from bonds. He is the wielder of Pinaka and is clad in elephant skin.)

4. Asoonam Vrihinam *Rudraya Pasupathaya* Gavidhukam charum.

(To Rudra, the Pasupathi, is the food cooked with milk.)

5. *Bahuroopaha pasavaha* Prajapathireva *Pasun* Prathijanayathi, *Atma-Vai Purushasya madhu*. *Madhu Agnow Juhothi Atmanam Eva* thath yajamanaha Agnow Prathidadathi. Pankathahapasavaha *Atmanam Eva Mruthyoha Nishkriya Pason Avarundhe*. (IInd Kanda. 3rd Pras. 2nd Anuva. 14th Pancha.)

The Dravida Maha Bashya of Sivagnana Yogi

(Pasus are of different forms. Atma is the honey for Purusha. Atma is sacrificed as oblation. He is vouchsafed for immortality.)

6. Brahmavadino Vadanthi Sathu Vai Yajetha yaha yagnasya Arthya Vasiyam syatha Bhoopathaye svaha, Bhuvanapathaye svaha Bhoothanam Vasiyam syatha Bhoopathaye svaha, Bhuvanapathaye svaha Bhoothanam pathaye svahayath Agnaye svishtakrithe Avadhya Bhagad yena eva thath Rudram SamardhyathiEsha Vai Rudrasya Dik svayam Eva Disi Rudram Niravadayatha. Pasavaha Vai Poorva Ahuthayaha Esh Rudra yat Agnihi yat porva Ahuthihi Abhijuhuyath. Rudraya Pasoon Apidadyath. Apasuhu Yajamana Syath, Athihaya Poorva Ahuthihi Juhothi Pasoonam Gopithaya.” (IInd Kanda, 6 Pras. 6th Anavas 32 to 3 Panch.)

(Rudra is the Pathi of the world (Bhu), of worlds (Bavana) and all Bhootha. To Him all pasus must be offered.)

7. Pasavaha Vai Ida Svayam Adhathe kamam Eva Atmana Pasoonam Adhathe Nahi Anyaha kamam Pasoonam prayachathe Va cha pathaye tvahutham Yath Agnow Juhuyath Rudraya pasoom Apidadyath. Apasahu Yajamanaha Syath Vachahapathaye tvahutha (IInd Kanda 6th Pras. 8th Anuva 42 to 43 Panch.)

(To Rudra the Pathi of speech, all pasus must be offered.)

8. Sahadhyayathi sa Isvaraha Rudraha Bhoothva Prajam pasoon yajamanasya samayithoha yamhi pasum. (IIIrd Kanda 1st Pras. 3rd anava. 10th panch.)

(Isvara as Rudra gave to the priest the pasus.)

9. Imam pasum pasupathe the Adya Badhnami, Agne suktithasya Medhye Anumanyasva suyajayajaam Jushtam Devanam Idam Asthu Havyam Esham Ise pasupathihi pasoonam chathushapdam uthacha Dvipadam Nishkritoyam yagniyam Bhagam Ethu Rayaha posham yaja manasya santhu aye badhyammam Anubadhyamanaha Abhyaikshanta Manasa chak shushaeha Agni Than Agne pramumokthu Deva Ye Aranyaha pasavaha Visvaroopaha Viroopaha Vayuhu than Mumokthu Enasaha Visvath Munchatha Amhasst Samitraraha Upethana yaganam Devebhirinvitam pasat pasum prathimnuchata Badndhat Yagnapathim paryadiithi pasam pramumokthu Etham Namaha pasubhyaha pasupathaye karomi Aruthi yatnam Adharam krinomi yam dwishmaha Thasmim parathimunchami pasam Tvam U the Dadhure Havyavaham (IIIrd Kanda 1st Pra. 4th Anuva.)

(To Pasupathi I now tie this Pasu. By His approval (commands), all the gods partake of the food. He is the Lord of the biped and quadruped. Let the priest attain felicity. The Pasoos have forms and no forms. Let Vayu release them. Let the Lord release us from the world, sin, from bondage. To thee I offer the oblation.

10. Prajapathya Vai Pasavaha Thesham Rudraha Adhipathihi Yat Ethabhyam Upakmothi Thabyam Eva Enam pratiprochya Alabhathe Atmanaha Anavraskaya. (IIIrd Kanda, 1st pras. 5th Anuva. 15th panch.)

(Rudra is the pasupathi of all pasus created by Him.)

11. Hiranyagarbhas Samavartha Agne Bhoothasya Jataha pathireka Asith Sa Dahora prithvim Dhyam utha imam kasmai Devaya Havishna Vidhema ----- ya pranatha Nimishatha Mahitva Ekaha Ith Raja Jagataha Babhoova Ya Ise Asya Dwipada chathushpadaha kasmai Devaya Havisha Vidhema, Yaha Deveshu Adhadevaha Ekaha Ekahakasmai Devaya Havisha Vidhema. (IV Kanda, 8th pra. 31 to 34 panch.)

[The above prayers are addressed to the Almighty one, to Him who produced Hiranyagarbha in the beginning and one of the Mantras occur in the Swetasvatara ya Ise Asya Dwipadachathuspada etc. This is the 13th Mantra in the 4th Adyaya Sweta. The 12th Mantra is “yo Devanam prabhavascha udbhavascha Visvadhiko Rudro Maharshihi Hiranyagarbham pasyatha Jayamanam” and the 21st and 22nd Mantras are prayers to the same Almighty. In all these Rudra is the appellation given to the Almighty.]

(Hymn to the Almighty creator – Lord of the biped and the quadruped. He is the one sovereign Lord of the universe.)

The Dravida Maha Bashya of Sivagnana Yogi

12. Imam Mahigunsihi Dwipadam pasoonam Sahasraksha Agne Mahigumseehi Paramevyoman pasoonam Dwipadam Chathushpadam. (IV. Kanda. 2nd pra. 10 to 44 panch.)

(Pasus are the one-legged and the two-legged. The Lord's seat is the Parama Vyoma. (chidakasa.))

13. Yo naha Marthaha Vasavaha Durhripayuhu Thiraha satyani Maruthaha Jighamsath *Druham pasam* prasamuchishtatha pishtena Thapasa Hanthasha Manusheshu the asmath pasan pratimumchanthu Ambasha santapanaha Madiraha Madayishnavaha. (IV. Kanda 3rd pra. 13 to 32 panch.)

(Refers to the Pasa Vimoch and attainment of peace.)

14. In the Satarudriya the Lord is denoted as Pathi "Namohiranya Bahave Sonanye Disameha pathaye Naom Namovriksheshbyo Harikeshebhava pasoonam pathaye, namonamosasapinjara tvishiunthe pathinam pathaye, Namonamobabulusaya Vityadhine Annanam pathaye, Namonamoharikesayopa vithine pushtanam pathaye, Namonamobhavasya Hetyai Jagatham pathaye, Namonamorudrayathathavine, kshetranam pathaye, Namonamomassoothayahanthayaya Vananam pathaye Namonamama. Rohitaya sthathaye Vrikshanam pathaye, Namonamomantrine vanijaya Kakshanam pathaye, Namonamobhuvanathaye Varivaskritha yowshadhanam pathaye Namonamouchairgashaya Akrandayathe paththinam pathaye Namonamama, Namassahamanya Nivyadhina Aryadhinam pathaye Namonamama, Kakubhaya nishangina Sthenanam pathaye namonamo, nishangina Ishudhimathe Thaskaranam pathaye namonamo, Vanchathe Parivanchathe Sthayoonam pathaye namonamo nicheraye paricharavaranyanam pathaye namonamo Srukavibhvo Jighagunasadhbyo Mushnatham pathaye namonamosi Madbhyo naktham charatbhyaha prakruthanam pathaye namonamo ushnishine Gricharaya Kuluchanam pathaye namonamam. (IV. Kanda. 5th pra. And 3 Anuva. 5 to 7 Panch.)

(Pathi of everything in this world.)

15. Namobhavaycha Rudrayacha Namasarvayacha pasupathayecha namonilagrivayacha.

(Pasupathi.)

16. Vajrena Evanam Brathrayam Avakram papm athi Rudrasya Gana pathyath Ithyaha Rowdraha pasavaha Rudrat eva pasoon Nithyehya Atmane karma kuruthe. (V. Kanda 1-2-7 and 8)

(The Pasus are of Rudra. With the pasus (obtained) from the Rudra, one does karma for the welfare of Atma.)

17. Vishnymukha Vai Devaha chandobhiriman lokan Anapajayam Abhyajayan Atmanam Eva Varuna Pasath muchathi. III. 2-1-3.)

(Devas with Vishnu and others transcended this world by the power of Chandas (Vedas).)

18. Pasurvai Esha yath Agnihi yonih khalu Vai Esha Pasor Vikriyanthe. (V. 2-10-1.)

(This agni is Pasu. This is the birth place of the pasus.)

19. Rajjoonam Vyavruthyow Mekhalaya yajamanam Dikshayeth. (VI. 1-8-41.)

(By means of this cord one must initiate the priest.)

20. Rudra Vai Esha yath Agnihi Yajamanah Pasuhu yath Pasum Alabhya Agnim Manyethe, Rudraya Yajamanam Apidadyath. (VI. 3-5-28.)

(To Rudra must be offered even the sacrificial priest (Yajamana).)

21. Yatha bandanath Mumushana utkrodam kurvathe yevam Yajamana Devabandhanat mumuchanaha. (7-5-9-28 and 29.)

The Dravida Maha Bashya of Sivagnana Yogi

(The gods too wish the release form banda as the men.)

Taithirya Brahmana:

22. Pasurva Esha yath Asvaha Esha Rudraha yath Agnihi Rudraya pasoonapi dadyath (I Ashtaka I prasna 5th Anuvaka 43 Dasini.)

(Rudra is this Agni.)

23. Pasavo va Ethani Havimshi Esha Rudraha yath Agnihi yathsadya Ethani Havimshi nirvapeth Rudraya pasoon Apidadyath Apasuryajamanasyat I ashtaka 1st prasna 5th Anuvaka 50-51 Dasinis.

(These havis (oblations) are the pasus. This Rudra is Agni. To Rudra all pasus must be offered.)

24. Rudraha khalu va yesha yath Agnihi yath gam Anvavarthayeth Rudraya pasoon Apidadyath yagnenaiva yagnam Samthanthi, Bhasmana padamapi vapathi Santhyai. 1st Ashtaka 5 prasna 3 Anuvaka 16 Dasni.

(These havis (oblations) are the pasus. This Rudra is Agni. To Rudra all pasus must be offered.)

25. Saka medhaihi Trayambakai Rudram Niravadaya ha Saka medhaihi pratisthapayathi. (1-6-815 Dasini.)

(With the Trayambaka mantra, Sakamedha should be offered to Rudra.)

26. Pasoonam Dhrutyai yo bhoothanam Adhipathihi Rudrasthanthi chavo Vrisha (III. 3-2-9 and 10.)

(Rudra is the Lord of all being.)

27. Siveyam Rajjurabhidhai Agniyana upa sevatham (III. 7-4-36.)

(This Rajju (cord) belongs to Siva (or auspicious.)

28. Yastha Atma pasushu pravishtaha. (III-7-5-44.)

(One Atma entered into the Pasus.)

29. Amurthra Amushmin loka Bhoopathe Bhuvanapathe Mahatho Bhoothasyapathe Thaithiriyaya Sakha Upanishad.

(In the other world, He is the Bhoopathi, Buvanapathi and pathi of the beings.)

30. Ya Eko Rudra uchayathe.

(He who is one is called Rudra.)

31. Pasugum thagumchakre Vayavayan Arunyan gramyaschaye

(Birds, beasts, and men became pasus.)

32. Rudrameva Bhaga deyena Samardhayath. Sarvatha Eva Rudram Niravadayathe.

(Everywhere should Rudra be propitiated. His portion should be offered.)

33. Speaking of the Lord in the sun it is said "Namo Hiranyabahave Hiranya Varnaya Hiranya roopaya Hiranya pathaye Ambikapathaye Umapathaye Pasupathaye namo Namaha.

(Pasupathi.)

34. Speaking of the mental yoga it is said, yagnasyat Atma Yajamana srudhpathni sariram Idhmum Hridayam yoopaha kama Ajyam Manyuhu Pasu.

The Dravida Maha Bashya of Sivagnana Yogi

(Manyu is pasu. Heart is this Yupa. Atma is priest. Sraddha is wife.)

35. Ethe Sahasram Ayutham Pasa Mrithyormarth yaya Hanthave

(These are the several, thousand and ten thousand pasas.)

36. “Namo Rudraya pasupathaye Mahathe Devaya Trayambakaya. Sarva Isanaya Vajrine Grunine Kapardine Namo Namaha, (Sama Veda.)

(Namaskara to Rudra, Pasupathi. (Addressed to the Lord within the sun.))

37. Ethesha Yascharathe Brajameshu yatha kalam chahuthayohi Adadayan Tham nayanthe Ethaha sooryasya Rasmayo yathra Devanam Pathi Eko adhivasaha. (Mundaka.)

(All things offered in the fire reach the Pathi of the Devas.)

38. Pasushu Panchavidam samopasitha Aja Hunkaro, Vayaha prasthasro, gava udgatho Asvaha prathihasro, Purusho Nidhanam, Chandogya II.

(Pasus are 5, goats, birds, cow, horse and Purusha.)

39. Swetasvatara.

1. Gnatva Devam Muchayehte Sarva pasaihi

2. Visvaroopika pasam.

3. Ajamdhravam sarva tatvair Visuddham Gnatva Devam muchyathe sarva pasaihi.

4. Sunirmala Imam prapthim Isano Jyothi ravyayaha.

5. Sa Eva kalo Bhuvanasya goptha visvadhipassarva Bhoontheshu Goodhaha Yasmin yuktha Brahmarsha yo devatascha Thamevam Gnatva Mrithya pasam chinathi.

6. Visvuskeyakam pariveshti tharam Gnatva Devam Muchyche sarva patithi.

7. Tiamisvaramam Paramam Mahesam Tham Daivathanam Paramantha Daivatham pathim pathinam Paraman Purusthath.

8. Thath karamam Sankhya yogadhigamyam Gnatva Devam Muchyathe Sarvapasaihi.

40. Dhyana Nirmatha bhyasat pasam Dahathi Panditha (Kaivalya.)

41. Vrathamethah Pasupatham pasu pasa vimokshaya. (Atharvasiras.)

Mahabharata when speaking of Gokarna kshetra says “Keralam Samathekramya Gokaranam Abhithogamath Adyam pasupathesthanam Darsanadeva Mukthidam yatra papopi Manujaha Prapnothyabhayadampadam.” A mere sight of this primeval temple of Pasupathi gives Mukthi. There even a sinner attains to the condition (or place) which gives “fearlessness.”

The modern Saivite Temple is the representative of the ancient Yagna Sala, with the Linga (Pasupati) and Nandi (freed Pasu) and Yupa or Dwajastambha. When after the days of Kena Upanishad, the belief in Indra and Vayu and a Varuna and Agni was given up and the worship of the one Supreme Brahman, the Lord of Uma Haimavati was set up, the Saivite Temples arose. The Vedic Rishis underwent Diksha or consecration before commencing a Soma Sacrifice (Vidyaranya always interprets soma, as Siva and Uma.) In the Mahabharata, we find

The Dravida Maha Bashya of Sivagnana Yogi

Upamanyu, Krishna and Arjuna and others undergoing *Diksha* before commencing the invocation of Siva. The Mahabharat and Gita speak of Nirvana and Brahma Nirvana as the Highest goal to be attained. The Saivite consecration ceremonies are called also Diksha and the highest ceremony is the Nirvana Diksha. Siva is the Brahmin among gods, * and his form is that of the Brahmin or Rishi, Yogi or Muni with his Jata etc. That Siva was the God of the two Highest castes in the days of Mahabharata and before is well pointed out by Professor Lassen and other Scholars.

[* மறையோர்கோல நெறியே போற்றி – Tiruvachaka.

Brahmano Bhagavan Rudrah, Kshatriyo Vishnu Ruchyateh, Brahma Vaisya iti proktah Vrishalasth Purandarah Sankaras Sarvadevasa. – Parasara Purana.]

The divisions of the book.

Turning to the Book before us, the 12 Sutras are divided into 2 divisions, பொது (general) and சிறப்பு (special), and the first division is divided into Pramana Viyal and Lakshana Viyal. The second division is divided into Sadana Iyal and Payan or Palan Iyal. Each Iyal or Adhyaya consists of 3 sutras. And the first sutra takes up the question of the proof of the existence of God and how the world is created by him and why it is created.

The argument from evolution and design.

As the seen material universe spoken of as he, she and it undergoes the three changes of origin, development and decay, this must be an entity created or evolved by God. During the time of Samharam it must return into Hara. And therefore during creation, it must come out of Hara. Therefore, it is that the one Supreme is Hara who is the author both of creation and Samharam. The reason for the creation and destruction and re-creation is because of the existence of Anavamala.

The material universe consists of *Thanu* (bodies of all beings.) *Karana* (internal and external senses), *Bhuvana* (the worlds and systems), and *Bhoga* (enjoyments and sensations). All these are material and are liable to change, growth and decay and reproduction. By creation is meant not production out of nothing, but evolution of forms from the formless matter, and *Samharam* is not destruction but it means resolution into its primordial elements. As the seed is imbedded in the earth concealed, so is maya concealed in God before differentiation. When the same seed is warmed and pervaded by the Light and Power (sakti) of God, the seed sprouts and develops and matures into the Tree of the world. But as we say விரையொன்று போட்டால் சுரையொன்று முளையாது, this creation is in accordance with the unchangeable laws of Karma which in the next Sutra is spoken of as the handmaid of the Agna Sakti of the Supreme Being.

Reasons for the creation of the world.

The reason for this creation and dissolution has to be known. Various answers are given no reason is possible and no reason can be given. God's ways are mysterious. God does it for his sport, for his pleasure; He wishes to see his reflection in his creation. But these do not carry conviction with it. The answer given here is this. From the existence of the world, we argued the existence of a creator. From another fact found in this world, we infer the reason of such creation. It is the existence of evil, or sin, imperfection or ignorance, Avidya or Anavamala, and the necessity for its removal furnishes the true reason. There will be necessity for creation as long as there is Evil in this world “மலத்துளதாம்”. Of course persons could be found to deny the very existence of this evil. If it be real, however, God could not have been the conscious author thereof.

The fact of evil.

It could not have come into this world in spite of Him after He created the world as perfect, and willed it to be perfect. It could not inhere in Him, as He is Light and this is Darkness. It could not inhere in the world, as it is material and insentient, and evil or ignorance is a conscious experience. And in man, we have the sentient being in whom this evil inheres and who sins and suffers.

There are objections to calling this sentient being a fresh creation, a creation out of nothing. It could be derived from matter or God. In the former case it is materialism. In the latter case, there are various modes and various theories. Some would call man a reflection of God and real. Some calling it a reflection would make it unreal. Others would argue further, that the unreality itself is unreal and therefore the reflection man is God. They would speak of man as a part, a particle, a spark or a ray of God, an emanation of Him and so on.

What is Jiva? Various views.

If this reflection or spark of God is unreal, nobody need bother himself about perfecting or purifying this unreality. If real, the phenomenon of evil or impurity inhering in Him has to be accounted for. And why did God evolve himself into man, brute or worm? One learned writer argues there is no evil, it is merely the illusion of man in looking at himself in God through the network of time, space and causality.

Objections.

But why should God divide himself into man and brute and worm and cover himself with this network. Because He wants to know himself and see himself and realize himself by means of his reflections, in the upadhi of maya, as we do in a mirror. But if one wishes to see the beauty of his face in a mirror, he would naturally choose a good mirror. But if he chose a bad mirror which distorted his face in all sorts of ugly ways, whose fault could it be? It could not be the fault of the bad mirror which he consciously chose. We could not attribute to the most intelligent Brahman such fault in not choosing such a vessel in which He can see himself and know himself to the best advantage.

The Dravida Maha Bashya of Sivagnana Yogi

The perfect cannot seek to know himself in the imperfect and the ignorant and the wicked and sinful and sorrowing and suffering. If all this is a play of His and no such distinction, as the imperfect, the wicked and sinful and sorrowing and suffering, and all this is hallucination, myth, non-existence, why should any man aspire to be a good man, a perfect man; a jivanmukta; why should he *realize his identity* with the absolute? If God, in trying to realize Himself (for his sport or for what?) became man and woman and brute, look at the bother of this man, woman or brute, doing good acts, acts without attachment, real tapas, Yoga and Gnana to realize his identity with the Absolute! What guarantee is there that after all this bother, the jivanmukta may not again be differentiated from the Absolute into a man, woman, or animal? How senseless and vain all these efforts seem, how ignoble the purpose of creation and evolution? To the question why does the perfect become the imperfect, which question is stated in all its various forms, vulgar and highly philosophic, one writer answers that this question is an impossible one; it should not be put at all! We have already pointed out how inconsequential this question and answer is. But the same question has been put in and answers attempted by other learned men who belonged to the same school! And these answers are various and conflicting in themselves. Of those, Swami Vivekananda gets most glory. His answer is "I do not know." Mr. Mukopadhyaya replies that the Swami is wrong and that the perfect does not become the imperfect, God does not become man. Man is only a reflection and as such, cannot be God. According to the *Brahmavadin* man is a reflection, is unreal, but unreality itself is unreal and as such, man is God. And so no question arises of the perfect and the imperfect. According to Paul Deussen, the answer is, "The never ceasing new creation of the world is a moral necessity, connected with the doctrine of Samsara." "A moral necessity, for *Atman*? What a *contradiction in adjecto*!" exclaims his critic Dr. Hubbe Schleiden. "*Atman*, as we all agree, is that which is beyond all necessity and necessity that is causality reigns or exists only in our manifested world, of *individual* consciousness of any sort." "And the critics own explanation is that existence is the manifestation of the will to exist and this will is *trishna*, *tanha*, the desire for enjoyment? Well, whose will, we ask, who desires for enjoyment? The Absolute, the Satchidananda, or any other? What call this hell on earth an enjoyment for Him?" We leave our learned doctor to fight out Professor Deussen by himself and proceed to state another learned lady's opinion. If we remember correctly, she said, Iswara evolves into man and brute to gather experience, to improve himself by means of his animal sheaths and that there would be no perfect Brahman at one time, it goes on improving itself day after day. And that if the Veda repeats the cry that there is a bourne from which there is no return, no return, it is a mere make-believe. And all these are learned expounders, and who is right? Can we ask this question or is our question captious? The Siddhanti's answer is that the question itself is based on a fallacy, an assumption. The fact assumed is that the perfect becomes the imperfect. Is this a fact proved? Does God really become man and brute? What is the proof of this, let alone Vedic texts and the desire to reach a high sounding philosophic unity? It is this fancied desire to generalize everything into one, that led the Greek philosophers to postulate number and water and fire as the final and ultimate cause of all things. Why not leave bad, good and evil as they are? Why should you refer the evil to the good, impure to the pure? Will not silence in this respect be golden? Will not Mownam in this case be real gnanam?

The Dravida Maha Bashya of Sivagnana Yogi

The Three Padarthas.

It is therefore seen that the world of matter and the world of sentient souls could not be traced to a particular origin, either out of nothing or out of God. We could not trace it to other causes than themselves. We could not explain them by reducing them to other elementary substances than matter and mind. If we do so, we meet with various difficulties, and hence we pause here. We take them as existing facts, final facts which do not admit of further explanation. We find man sinning and suffering. There are ready means of perfecting himself provided by means of this material world in which he can well act and will and progress. And means are provided by a most Beneficent Loving Lord. These are the three Padarthas or Postulates of this School. Pathi – God, Pasu – Soul, and Pasa comprising maya (matter), anavamala (ignorance) and karma. We call them three because we cannot resolve them one into another. But what is the relation of these three? And what is the nature of God and the Soul. These form separate topics of enquiry.

Nature of God.

Regarding the nature of God, which is spoken in this System by names Pathi, Pasupathi, Hara, Siva, Rudra etc., the simplest definition given in Sivagnanabotham is that He is Siva Sat or Chit Sat. These are the component parts of the word Satchidananda. All that we can know material. We do not know God and cannot know Him. The moment we can know Him; He will become one with matter. Therefore, He is other than matter, i.e., Pure Chit or intelligence. But if we cannot know, is he non-existent? No, He is a positive Existence, Sat. In as much as this creation was for the benefit of man by a loving Father, it is inferred He is Ananda, all love. God as Pure Being and Intelligence is immeasurable and unknowable, but as Love and Light He can be understood and approached by man. St. Meikandan says that God pervades everything with his Chit or Arul Sakti just like the Light of the sun, and so establishes his relation with the souls and the world. Hence the connection of the 2nd sutra with the first. As pointed out by the commentator, the second sutra, defining Chit Sakti, by which alone the relation between God and man and the world is established and by whose Power alone re-births are induced. With this, we may compare usefully the definition of God as Spirit. Light and Love by Bishop Westcott in his commentary on the Epistle of St. John.

(1) God is spirit. The statement obviously refers to the Divine nature and not to the Divine personality. The parallel phrases are a sufficient proof of this. God is not a spirit as one of many, but ‘spirit.’ As spirit, he is absolutely raised above all limitations of succession (time and space) into which all thoughts of change and transitoriness are resolved.

(2) God is light. The statement again is absolute as to the nature of God, and not as to His actions (not ‘a light’ or ‘the light of man.’) The phrase expresses unlimited self-communication, diffusiveness. Light is by shining; darkness alone bounds. And, further, the communication of light is of that which is pure and glorious. Such is God toward all finite being, the condition of life and action. He reveals Himself through the works of creation which reflect His perfections in a form answering to the powers of man, and yet God is not to be fully apprehended by man as He is.

The Dravida Maha Bashya of Sivagnana Yogi

(3) God is love. In this declaration the idea of ‘personality’ is first revealed, and in the case of God, necessarily of a self – sufficing personality. The idea of God is not only that of an unlimited self-communication, but a self-communication which calls out and receives a response, which requires the recognition not only of glory but of goodness. And this love is original and not occasioned. It corresponds to the innermost nature of God, and finds its sources in Him and not in man. It is not like the love which is called out in the finite by the sense of imperfection, but is the expression of perfect benevolence. (Westcott’s “Epistles of John,” pp. 160-1).

Siva is not one of the Trinity.

Sivagnana Yogi further points out that Hara, Siva, or Rudra of the first Sutra is not to be confounded with the Rudra of the Indian Trinity. In the working out of the cosmogony, the Saiva system postulates 36 tatvas from Suddha maya to earth. The ordinary systems, Sankhya, Ekatma Vada, Pancharatra enumerate tatvas up to (24), all these being derived from Mulaprakriti or Pradhana.

Beyond these come, Purusha tatva (25) composed of Vidya (26), Ragam (27), niyati (28), Time (29), Kala (30), which five are derived from Asuddha Maya (31). Beyond them come Suddha Vidya (32), Ishwaram (33), Sadakkiam (34), Bindu or Sakti (35) and Nadam or Siva (36); (Vide table at p. 244 Vol. 1).

All these proceed from Suddha Maya, the original Maya called kudilai or Kundalin Sakti, which is so highly spiritualized and fine and powerful as to be identified with the Chit-Sakti of the Lord Himself. As these evolve, they form different worlds and they have their resolution. Various Powers and Principalities preside directly over these different worlds; and the lowest world is our present one, proceeding from the gross Mulaprakriti, intended for the class of souls called Sakalar, who comprise from Brahma and other Gods to men and sentient beings in this earth. This world is called the Guna world, Mulaprakriti consisting of the three gunas, Satva, Rajas and Tamas, the worlds above being Nirguna. The Gods who preside over this world are the three Deities Brahma, Vishnu and Rudra, and they are Saguna, as also the various Souls of this world. No doubt these mighty Gods have highly perfected material bodies composed more of Pure Satva Guna than other elements. Still they have a material clothing just as any other man.

Saguna and Nirguna.

But the Supreme God of this School is not *Saguna* but transcends guna, and hence called *Gunatitan* and *Nirguna*. The terms *Saguna* and *Nirguna* being translated personal and impersonal usually, have caused endless confusion. The meanings of the words Saguna and Nirguna are themselves interpreted variously by different Schools, and Christian writers are not all agreed about the meaning of the word *Personal*.

Personal and Impersonal.

We have however fixed the meaning of the words Saguna and Nirguna, as enveloped in matter and therefore limited, and as transcending matter, therefore, absolute and Limitless.

The Dravida Maha Bashya of Sivagnana Yogi

We accept Emerson's definition of Personality who says it signifies True Being, (Sat) both concrete and Spiritual. It alone is original Being. It is not limited. Personality is that universal element that pervades every human soul and which is at once its continent and fount of Being. Distinction from others and limitation by them results from individuality (Ahankara or Anava) not Personality (Sat). Personality pertains to the substance of the Soul and individuality to its form. Another Christian writer (Rev. J. Ivorach) points out that the absolute and unconditioned. Being is Personal, is not a contradiction in terms, such as a round square, but that it will be true as when we say a white or Crimson Square. "When we speak of the absolute we speak of it as a predicate of Pure Being; we simply mean that absolute Personal Being is and must be self-conscious, rational and ethical; must answer to the idea of spirit. Why may not the absolute Being be self-conscious? To deny this to Him would be to deny to Him one of the perfections which even finite beings may have." St. Meikandan stated this truth long ago, in the following words.

"When the soul unites itself to God and feels His Arul, God covers it with His Supreme Bliss and becomes one with it. Will He not know with the soul what is understood by the soul itself?" (XI. 1-6)

And our St. Tirumular states it in similar terms.

நானறிந்தன்றே யிருக்கின்ற தீசனை
வானறிந்தார் அறியாது மயங்கினர்
உளனறிந்துள்ளே உயிர்க்கின்ற வொண்கடர்
தானறியான்பின்னை யாரறிவாரே.

"That day I know my God, the same was not understood by the Devas. The Bright effulgence lighting the inside of my body and soul, it is said does not know. Who else can know?"

Sivagnana Yogi notes under Sutra 7, this supreme knowledge of God has to be distinguished from the limited and relative consciousness of the soul called சுட்டறிவு or objective consciousness, it is to be understood only as negating this kind of சுட்டறிவு or objective consciousness, as nothing is objective to God.

God can therefore be Nirguna and Personal. And we can therefore appreciate Professor Max Muller's difficulty when he tries to understand the God spoken of in the Svetasvatara, Deva in the passage quoted below, he says, is the nearest approach to our own idea of a Personal God, though without the background which Vedanta always retains for it, and that it seems at first contradictory the existence of a God, a Lord, a Creator, a Ruler, and at the same time, the evidence of a super-personal Brahman.

"He is the one God hidden in all beings, all pervading, sarva Bhutadi Antaratma, watching over all works, dwelling in all beings, the witness, the perceiver, the only one, *Nirguna*."

The Dravida Maha Bashya of Sivagnana Yogi

“He is the one Ruler of many who seem to act but really do not act.” “He is the eternal among eternal, the thinker among thinkers, who though one fulfils the desires of many.”

“The sun does not shine there, nor the moon, and the stars, nor these lightnings, and much less this fire. When he shines everything shines after him, by His light all this is lightened.”

“He makes all, he knows all, the self-caused, the knower, the time of time, who assumes qualities and knows everything, the Master of Nature and Man, the Lord of the three *Gunas*, the cause of the bondage, the existence and the liberation of the World.” (VI. 2 to 16.)

In another place III, 15 and 16 &c, the gender changes frequently passing from the masculine to the neuter. Of course some try to interpret that the seer in one half of the verse contemplated the Impersonal Nirguna Brahman and in the other half of the Saguna Brahman, Isa or Iswara or Siva. This will be ridiculous. Dr. Thibaut had pointed out that the author of the Vedanta Sutras does not contemplate the distinction of a Saguna and Nirguna God, not that any such distinction did not exist at the time; but if the author of God, it was of the Highest One, and not at one time of the Higher God (in Sutra,) and of the lower God (in the 2nd Sutra). If he spoke of God as the creator &c of this world, it was only of the Highest God and not of a Saguna God. Hence it has to be note in connection with the *Pati* postulated by the 1st Sutra of Sivagnanabhoda, He is not one with the Trinity but one above them and the commentator quotes various verses from the Devaram and Tiruvachakam, in which God is spoken of as மூவர்கோன், Lord of the Trinity, and who became the three, and where people who mistake Him for One of the Trinity are admonished in strong terms. We have treated of this at length in our article on ‘some aspects of the Godhead’ in Vol. II of the Siddhanta Deepika. We have also pointed out that the Siddhanti addresses God as He She, and It, in all the forms of speech available to him, and that God is neither Male nor female nor neuter, பெண், ஆண் அலியெனும் பெற்றியது போற்றி.” Praise be to the Lord who assumes the nature of male, female and neuter.”

பெண்ணாகி யாணாய் அலியாய்ப் பிறங்கொளிசேர்
விண்ணாகி மண்ணாகி இத்தனையும் வேறாகி

“Was Male, Female, and neuter,
Was Heaven with gleaming lights and Earth
And was none of these, - Tiruvachakam.”

God is accordingly addressed as Siva, Sivah and Sivam, Sankara, Sankari, and Sankaram, Deva, Devi and Devam, without any change of Personality in the consciousness of the devotee.

Sivagnana Yogi refers to the sloka 13 in Appaya Dikshita’s Sivatatva viveka and the commentary thereon in which the God’s nature as Gunatita is fully described.

The Dravida Maha Bashya of Sivagnana Yogi

In the second Sutra, the topics discussed are the relation of God to the world, the question of the evolution and resolution of the world and how it is brought about. As in the previous Sutra it was mentioned that God created the world &c., the questions arise as to how He links himself to the world, whence the world is created and by what power, and how and why souls are born and reborn. In connection with these questions, the nature of 'advaita,' the nature of Karma and Maya Malas, and the nature of God's Chit and Sakti are discussed by the commentator. In regard to the first question, we have not got the full commentary of Sivagnana Yogi, but reference made to his views on this question as they are set out in his commentary of the sixth Sutra.

The text postulates that God is one with the souls. (Abheta) and different from the souls (Betha) and one and different (Betha-betha) “அவையே தானேயாய்.” Of course it is felt at once that this postulate contains a contradiction and a puzzle. But is there no means of getting rid of this contradiction, and getting a clearer understanding of the subject. The usual similes given by the various Schools, are such as gold and ornament பொன்பணிபோல்பேதம் and light and darkness (இருள்ஒளிபோல்பேதம்) &c, and it will be seen at once no reconciliation is possible with these Betha and Abetha Schools. But St. Meikandan rejects these similes and gives others instead, in which a reconciliation is possible. His similes are body and mind (உடல் உயிர் போல் அபேதம்) (including the simile of vowel and consonant), the sun or light and the eye கண் அருக்கன்போல்பேதம், the soul or mind and the eye (கண்ணொளியின் ஆன்மபோதம்போல் பேதாபேதம்). In all these instances, though a difference in substance may be felt, an identity is also perceived. These objects cannot be separated, one is not the other, and yet one could not exist or act without the other. The union here is not like that of any union or relation that we know of two material objects in the world, but is that of two substances in different planes like mind and body and yet coming into union and oneness. And we know how Dr. Bain got puzzled over this unique union, and felt the contradiction that existed on the conjunction of matter the extended, and mind the unextended and complained that there was not even a single analogy to illustrate this union. And we refer our readers to our article on 'vowels and consonants' or Mind and Body in Vol. II. P. 13.

It was the merit of St. Meikandan to fully illustrate and illuminate the subject for the first time, and the greatest distinction of his philosophy consists in the peculiar view of *advaitam* postulated by him, differing from all the views of the different schools, and yet harmonizing them all, so as to make it an universal system of philosophy. We strictly follow the Vedic Text “Ekamevadvitiyam Brahma,” “Ekameva Rudranadvitiyaya tasteh,” and say God is one and only one without a second, but not so as to deny the existence of other substances besides God in relation, but just as we can say there is only the letter A, and no other letters like consonants. We have stated how this view was nothing new, in a sense, but this philosophy should have existed from the very beginning of the Tamil language when they named vowels and consonants as உயிர் உடல், or உயிர் மெய், meaning mind and body.

The Dravida Maha Bashya of Sivagnana Yogi

Advaitam.

As the commentator points out, the word was taken by all the Schools as implying the negation of two things taking the இன்மை and மறுதலைபொருள் of the negative prefix, and it was St. Meikandan who brings out the அன்மைப்பொருள், non-difference that existed between two distinct things. The question did not arise as to the existence of substances and as to how many of them, but they arose in connection with the Mahavakya texts, ‘Aham Brahmasmi,’ “Tatvamasī” “Vignanam Brahman” which are postulates regarding the individual soul or self and God, in the first and second and third persons, I am god, Thou art God. He is God.” And says the commentator.

மற்றென்னையோ அத்துவிதமென்னும் சொற்குப்பொருளெனியிற்சித்தாந்த
சைவருரைக்குமாறு காட்டுதும், ‘அது நீயாகின்றாய்,’ எ-ம், அது நானாகின்றேன், எ-
ம் ‘அதுவிது வாகின்றது,’ எ-ம் மூவிடம்பற்றி நிகழும் தத்துவமசி முதலிய
மகாவாக்கியங்களைக்கேட்டவழி அது வென்பது ஒருபொருள் நீயென்பது
ஒருபொருளாகலின் ஒருபொருள் மற்றொறுபொருளாமாறி யாங்ஙனம் என்றும்
ஐய நீக்குதற்கு எழுந்ததாகலின் அதுவிதுவாதற்கேதுவாய்,
அவ்விரண்டிற்குமுளதாகிய சம்பந்தவிசேடமுணர்த்துதலே யத்துவிதமென்னும்
சொற்குப்பொருளென்றுணர்ந்துகொள்க

“If you ask what then is the meaning of the word *Advaitam* I will show how Saiva Siddhantis explain it. On hearing the great texts called Mahavakya Tatvamasī, &c., which are used in the three persons, we see that these sentences speak of. ‘That, as one substance and ‘Thou’ as another, and enquire, how one can become the other, the answer is given to remove this doubt, by stating *how one can be the other and what relation subsists* between these two, and the word *Advaitam* is used to express this peculiar relation.”

The word does not mean one or non-existence of two or more, but is used to express the peculiar relation that exists between two distinct things and which can become one and we had long ago called attention to this meaning in our very first work, and before we had any chance of seeing this luminous exposition of Sivagnana Yogi, and we observed, Vide Sivagnanabotham p. 17.

“Though in all these cases, an identity is perceived, a difference in substance is also felt. It is this relation which could not be easily postulated in words, but which may perhaps be conceived, and which is seen as two (Dvaitam) and at the same time as not two (Advaitam); it is this relation which is called Advaitam, ‘a unity in duality,’ and the philosophy which postulates it the “Advaita philosophy.”

Of all the mass of Vedic and Theosophic literature that has come into existence during the last 2 or 3 decades, there are none that equal the writings of Professor Kunte for real insight into the nature of Hindu Philosophy, and critical acumen. And his summary added at the end of the first pada of the first Adhyaya of His translation of the Brahma Sutras is a most beautiful and original one, Wonderful as it may seem, both Sivagnana Yogi and Kunte exactly propound the same questions and give the same answer. He shows how there are texts in the Upanishads

The Dravida Maha Bashya of Sivagnana Yogi

which support the dualistic and monistic view, and the mainstay of the monists are the Maha Vakya texts and these texts are the great stumbling block in the path of dualists, and he shows that their interpretation cannot bear an examination, because the texts evidently do not admit of it, and all that they say is simply beside the mark.

“What is to be done? There are doubtless a few texts in the Veda which support the Pantheistic views. Most however support the Theistic principles. But so long as Pantheistic texts are not explained, the proposition that the Vedas do not touch Pantheism cannot be accepted. Again, the adjustment and interpretation of these proposed by the Theists cannot be accepted because of their being farfetched and forced. But we do not see how the few Pantheistic texts come in the way of Theism because we believe that though they be interpreted as the Pantheists do, yet they support Theism. How can this be? And he proceeds to show how this can only be understood in the light of Yoga. After instancing the various forms of Bhakti, (Chariya and Kriya), he says, “But there is a special feature of such adoration – a feature not included in any of these. It is the ecstatic condition of the spirit, a condition which can neither be explained nor understood without an illustration. Let the reader realize the love a mother has for her child. A mother or her child sometimes experiences a state of mind, an indescribable state. That which either of them expresses can alone convey an idea of their feelings when they are in the ecstatic condition. The mother directly addresses the child thus, ‘Oh my piece of gold, Oh, my soul, Oh my life, can I eat you up’” **“தின்பன் கடிப்பன திருத்துவன் தானே.”** Under these circumstances, the mother forgets that her body is different from that of her child, which experiences the same feeling. Such an *identity* is the form of the ecstatic condition of the mind. This is a special feature of adoration. This sort of *ecstatic identity* the *Yogis feel*. Hence in the Veda and in the upanishads, the Pantheistic doctrine of the identity of the human spirit and the Supreme Spirit, *if united is enunciated in this way*. Again the Brahma Sutra of Badarayana does not inculcate it.” And he explains further below. “The characteristic feature of the Indian Vedanta is its recognition of spirit power, as it is explained in the Yoga Sutras which systematically lay down the following propositions. That the Supreme Spirit, or God is *related* to the human Spirit, that the human spirit has very *great potential powers* and that of certain methods of living be adopted, it can *call out its powers* and become *actually able to know the past and the future*, and that the spirit disenthralled from the flesh is ultimately *absorbed in one sense* into the Supreme Spirit. The Yoga system is properly the back bone of the Vedanta.”

And we have pointed out in another place, Vol. II, page 199, that the Yoga pada is not merely the back bone of Vedanta, but it is Vedanta itself.

It is not well understood that the word Upanishad really means the same thing as ‘Yoga.’ Yoga means the Sadana required for bringing the Soul and God in Union; and the Upanishad is also the teaching of the Sadana whereby man comes nearer and nearer to God, by destroying the bonds that bind him. The root meaning (*upa-* near, *ni-* quite, *sad-* to perish) is hit off to a nicety in the famous line in Tiruvachakam. “The House of God,” 7th verse, **சென்று சென்று அணுவாய்த் தேய்ந்துதேய்ந்து ஒன்றாம்,** “*nearer and nearer to Thee I drew, wearing away atom by atom, Till I was one with Thee.*” And in the passage we quote below (chandog 1-1-10) and in several others, the word Upanishad is used as a synonym for Yoga. And this derivation really explains the scope of an Upanishad, a misunderstanding of which has led to no end of confusion. The Siddhanti takes the Upanishad as the text-book of the Yoga Pada or School.”

The higher stage or Pada being the Gnanapada, the words, Upanishad, Vedanta, Yoga, Saha-Marga or Sohamarga or Hamsa Marga are all synonymous; and as Vedanta strictly means, Yoga, the words, Vedanta and Siddhanta are contrasted, Siddhanta meaning the Gnana marga or Pada, though it embraces all the remaining padas, Chariya, Kriya and Yoga. The practice involved in the Mahavakyas texts in thins Soham Bavana, or Sivoham Bavana, and when this practice is matured, the soul stands in complete allegiance to the Supreme one, renouncing all idea of self and self-action, then can the soul say “I am all the world,”

The Dravida Maha Bashya of Sivagnana Yogi

யானேயுலகென்பனின்று – Sivagnanabotham 2-1-4) “In me everything originated, in me everything established, in me everything merges. That secondless-Brahm am I” (Kaival up. 21.)

As Professor Kunte speaks of *the potential power of man* by calling out which, he can become one with God, Sivagnana Yogi, dwells at great length, and too frequently on this special characteristic or power of man whereby man can be said to become God; and this power is the power of the soul *to become that to which it is united*, அதுவதுவாதல் in the language of St. Meikandan, சார்ந்த்தன் வண்ணமாதல் in the language of St. Arul Nandi Sivacharya, and யாதொன்றுபற்றின் அதன்யியல்பாய் நின்றல் in the language of St. Thayumanavar and this power is likened to that of the crystal or Mirror.

Says Professor Henry Drummond: -

“*All men are mirrors* – That is the first law on which this formula (of sanctification or corruption) is based. One of the aptest description of a human being is that he is a mirror.”

This illustration is to be originally found in the Upanishads and Gita.

“As a metal disk (mirror) tarnished by dust shines bright again after it has been cleansed, so is the one incarnate person satisfied and freed from grief after he has seen the real nature of himself.” “And when by the real nature of himself, he sees as by a lamp, the real nature of the Brahman, then having known the unborn eternal God who transcends all tatvas, he is freed from all pasa.” (Svetas up. ii. 14, 15).

“From meditating (abhidyanath) on Him, from joining (yojanath) Him, from becoming (tatvabhavat) one with him, there is further cessation of all maya in the end.” (Svetas up. i. 10)

“As a flame is enveloped by smoke, *as a mirror by dust*, as an embryo is wrapped by the womb, so this (soul) is enveloped by it (desire).” Gita. iii. 38.

And St. Meikandan has this stanza (viii. 3. a)

பன்னிறமேகாட்டும் பனிங்கேபோ லிந்திரியத்
தன்னிறமே காட்டும் தகை நினைந்து - பன்னிறத்துப்
பொய்ப்புலனை வேறுணர்ந்து பொய்பொய்ய மெய்கண்டான்
மெய்ப்பொருட்டுத் தைவமாம் வேறு.

“The soul, who after reflecting that the knowledge derived from the senses is only material, *like the colours reflected on a mirror* and that these colour like sensations are different from itself, and after perceiving next false knowledge as false, understands the Truth will become the servant of God, who is different from such Asat.”

The principle of this receives its exposition in the Sankhya and in the Yoga Sutras, by means of this illustration of mirror and colours.

The Dravida Maha Bashya of Sivagnana Yogi

Though it (soul) be unassociated, still there is a tingeing (reflectional) through non-discrimination, for there is not a real tinge in that which is unassociated (with tincture or anything else), still there is, as it were, a tinge; hence the tinge is treated as simply a reflection, by those who discriminate the tinge from the soul which it delusively seems to belong to.

“As is the case with the Hibiscus and the crystal there is not a tinge, but a fancy that there is such.” Sankhya aphorism. vi. 27, 28. Garbe’s translation.

In the words of Professor Max Muller, this is how the subject is treated in the Yoga Sutras.

“Now a man is like this or that, according as he acts and according as he behaves and so will he be. A man of good acts will become good, a man of bad acts bad. He becomes pure by pure deeds, bad by bad deeds.

“As is his desire, so is his will; and as is his will, so his deed. Whatever deeds he does, that he will reap.”

“To whatever object man’s own mind is attached, to that he goes strenuously with his deed.

“He who desires the Atman, being Brahman, he goes to Brahman-That atma is indeed Brahman.” (Brihadar, IV. Iv. 5, &6).

The familiar statement of it in Sanskrit is ‘*yat Bhavan tat Bhavati*’ and the following passage occurs in the Mahabharata (Santi Parva. ccc. 32) yadrisaisannivasate, yadrisamschopa sevateh, yadrigachechcha bhavitam tadric Bhavati Purushah. “A person becomes like those with whom he dwells and like those whom he reverences and like to what he wishes to be.”

Herbert Spencer calls this union as one of absolute identity. And this is almost the language used by St. Meikandan, ‘அது அது ஆதல்.’

As the Upanishad writers, Sankhyans, and Yogins, and Siddhantis state this principle and base on it their scheme of Salvation, so does also Professor Henry Drummond in his remarkable address entitled “The Original Life,” based on the text from St. Paul.

“We, all, with unveiled face, reflecting, as a mirror, the glory of the Lord, are transformed into the same image, from glory to glory, even as from the Lord Spirit.”

He paraphrases the sentence as follows, “We all reflecting as a mirror the character of Christ are transformed into the same image from character to character – from a poor character to a better one, from a better one to one a little better still, from that to one still more complete, until by slow degrees the perfect image is attained. Here the solution of the problem of sanctification is compressed into a sentence, reflect the character of Christ, and you will become like Christ,” or as we will say, reflect the image of God in yourself, and you will become God like, or God.

The Dravida Maha Bashya of Sivagnana Yogi

But how is the poor character to be made better and better, or the reflecting image clearer and clearer? It is by cleansing the mirror (soul) freer and freer from dirt, and bringing it more and more in line with the effulgent light, that this can be effected, and when the mirror is absolutely perfect and nearest, the light shines brightest, and so overpowers the mirror, that the mirror is lost to view, and the glory and Light of the Lord is felt. For, observes the learned Professor truly, “What you are conscious of is the ‘glory of the Lord.’ And what the world is conscious of, if the result be a true one, is also the glory of the Lord. In looking at a mirror one does not see the mirror or think of it, but only of what it reflects. For a mirror never calls attention to itself – except when there are flaws in it.” These flaws are the colours of the Siddhanti who compares them to the maya or body. In union with the body, it is the body alone that is cognized, and not the mirror-like soul. In union with God, the Glory and Light alone is perceived and not the mirror like soul either! And the Professor declares, “All men are mirrors - that is the first law on which this formula (of sanctification or corruption) is based. One of the aptest descriptions of a human being is that he is a mirror,” and we must beg our readers to go through the whole pamphlet to note how beautifully he draws out this parallel.

He notes the second principle which governs this process, namely, the law of assimilation or identification. “This law of assimilation is the second and by far the most impressive truth which underlies the formula of sanctification – the truth that men are not only mirrors, but that these mirrors, so far from being mere reflectors of the fleeting things they see, transfer into their own inmost substance and hold in permanent preservation the things that they reflect. No one can know how the soul can hold these things. No one knows how the miracle is done. No phenomenon in nature, no process in chemistry, no chapter in Necromancy can even help us to begin to understand this amazing operation. For think of it, the past is not only focussed there in a man’s soul, it is there. How could it be reflected from there if it were not there? All things he has ever seen, known, felt believed of the surrounding world, are now within him have become part of him in part are him – he *has been changed into their image.*”

The Professor instances from Darwin, how in the working out of this principle of association and assimilation or identity in the human and animal evolution, persons ever associated with pigs get piggy faces, and with horses horsey faces. In the case of a husband and wife when they have been perfectly loving, it has been found to effect a complete assimilation of their features. Such is the power of the human mind, both a demerit, and a merit; it can lower itself to the very depths of the brute, or it can rise to the very height of Godhood. This law is spoken of in our text books as the law of ‘Garuda thvanam.’ The writer of the book “Spiritual Law in the natural world’ (Purdy Publishing Co, Chicago) observes that, ‘all who have made a study of the cause of all things have become so *at one with it*, as to have causing power, for it is an invariable rule, that *we become like what we study or are closely associated with.* We become so like people, with whom we live constantly that often the expression of face and sound of voice grow similar, and even the features grow alike. Sometimes a child will look more like its nurse than its mother.” And the whole book is an exposition of this principle, and it holds out as a Sadana for spiritual elevation, that a man should firmly believe that there is no world, no untruth, no sin, no sickness, no death and he is a child of God, that there is only His Truth, Power Love and Presence in this universe and nothing but this, that he is not material

The Dravida Maha Bashya of Sivagnana Yogi

but spiritual and he is the reflection of God, the image and likeness of God, and then he can truly conquer sickness and death, and become truly the Son of God. This is exactly the Sohambavana or Sivohambavana. And the following verse of St. Arulnanthi Sivacharya sums up the whole teaching.

கண்டவிலை யல்லேனோனென்று கன்றுகானாக்
கழிபரமு நானல்லேனெனக் கருதிக்கசிந்த
தொண்டினொடு முளத்தவன் தன்தன்றானின்ற கலப்பாலே
சோகமெனப் பாவிக்கத் தோன்றுவன வேறின்றி
விண்டகலு மலங்களெல்லாங் கருதியானத்தின்
விடமொழியுமதுபோல விமலதையுமடையும்
பண்டைமறைகலுமது நானானேனென்று
பாவிக்கச் சொல்லுவதிப் பாவகத்தைக் காணே.

“Say ‘I am not the world,’ and separate from it. Say also ‘I am not the unknowable supreme one.’ Then unite with Him indissolubly by loving Him in all humility, and practice soham (‘I am He’). Then will He appear to you as yourself. Your mala will all cease, just as the poison is removed by *garudathyana*, and you will become pure. So it is, the old Vedas teach us *to practise this mantra ‘Aham Brahmasmi,’ ‘I am He.’*”

As this right knowledge of difference and non-difference of ourselves with God and the “universe” is essential for our Salvation, Srikanta discusses these questions in his Bashya on the Sutras II, i. 21 to 23 and we quote the whole of these passages and he quotes and beautifully reconciles the numerous betha srutis with the Mahavakya texts.

The Sutrakara raises and refutes an objection to the foregoing theory: -

(Jiva) being mentioned (to be one with) the other, there follows an incongruity such as neglecting what is good. (II. i. 21).

(Objection): - Because in the words “That thou art,” and “This A’tman is Brahman,” “Jiva, the effect, is mentioned as one with Brahman, the cause, it has been shown that they are not distinct from each other. In that case it would follow that the all-knowing and all-pervading Paramesvara undoes the universe for His own good and creates it for His own evil. Then it may be asked, how is it that Isvara, who is all-knowing and of unfailing will, and who knows that the pain of jiva who is no other than Himself is His own pain, engages in the creation of the universe, which as leading to samsara is an evil, and does not abstain from creation for His own good. Accordingly, once it is proved that Jiva and Paramesvara are one, there follows this incongruity, that Paramesvara, though all-knowing, is guilty of a want of sense in so far as He abstains from what is good to himself and engages in what conduces to His own evil. Wherefore it does not stand to reason that Jiva and Isvara, the causes and the effect, are one.

(Answer): - In reply we say as follows:

But (the Cause is) superior, because of the mention of a distinction, (II.i.22).

The Dravida Maha Bashya of Sivagnana Yogi

Though the cause and the effect are one, the Cause is declared in the S'ruti to be superior to the effect, to the sentient and insentient universe, in such passages as the following:

“Superior to the universe is Rudra the Mighty Sage.”

So a distinction is also made between Jiva and Paramesvara in the following passages:

“But he who controls both, knowledge and ignorance, is another.”

“The one God rules the perishable (Pradhana) and Atman.”

“Thinking that Atman is different from the Mover (the Lord).”

“Two birds, inseparable friends, cling to the same tree.”

“Two Brahmanas ought to be known, the superior and the inferior.”

“There are two, one knowing, the other not-knowing; both unborn; one strong, the other weak.”

“He is the eternal among eternal, the sentient among the sentient.”

“Having entered within, He is the Ruler of the creatures.”

“Know then Prakriti is Maya, and the great Lord the Mayin.”

“From that the Mayin sends forth all this; that the other is bound up through that Maya.”

“When he sees the other, the Lord, contended.... then his grief passes away.”

“He is the master of nature and of man, the lord of the three qualities.”

“Of these creatures (pasus), the Pasupati is the Lord.”

Wherefore quite superior to the universe is Brahman, otherwise called Siva.

(Objection): - By establishing non-duality in II.i.15, and duality in II.i.22, you have only proved duality and non-duality of Brahman and the universe.

(Answer): - No; we do not establish that sort of Visishtadvaita which takes the form of duality and non-duality. We are not the advocates of an absolute distinction between Brahman and the universe as between a pot and a cloth, because of its opposition to the sruti declaring that they are not quite distinct from each other. Neither are we the advocates of an absolute identity as of the mother-o-pearl and silver one of them being illusory; for, it is opposed to the sruti which points to a difference in the inherent attributes of Brahman and the universe. Nor do we hold to duality and non-duality, which is opposed to the nature of things. On the other hand, we maintain that the unity of the conditioned Brahman – as the cause and the effect – is like that of the body and the embodied, or like that of the substance and its attribute. By unity of Brahman and the universe, we mean their inseparability like that of clay and the pot as cause and effect, or like that of the substance and its attribute. A pot, indeed, is not seen apart from

The Dravida Maha Bashya of Sivagnana Yogi

clay, nor is the blue lotus seen apart from the colour blue. Similarly, apart from Brahman, no potentiality of the universe can exist; nor is Brahman even known apart from His potentiality of the universe just as fire is not seen apart from its heat. Whatever is not known apart from something else, the former must ever be conditioned by the latter, and this latter is naturally one with the former.

Wherefore Brahman who is in no way separable from the universe is said to be one with the other. And there is a natural distinction between the two; so that the supreme Brahman is ever higher than the universe. As to their distinction as the cause and the effect, it has been already explained in II.i.9. Wherefore this theory is quite unopposed to the Srutis declaring distinction as well as non-distinction.

And as in the case of stone etc.; it is incongruous, (II, I, 23,)

(Objection): - Under all conditions, Jiva and Isvara are one, because of the Srutis declaring non-duality.

(Answer): - No, because of an incongruity. Jiva and Isvara cannot be identical, because, like the insentient stone, timber, grass, etc., the jiva also is, on account of ignorance etc., said to belong to quite a distinct class from the Isvara who is possessed of such attributes as omniscience. Therefore, Isvara is a distinct entity from Jiva. Thus even the Jiva, sentient as he is, cannot be identical with Isvara owing to this difference, that the latter is superior. Much less can the insentient existence which is essentially different be identical with Isvara. From all stand points of view by Sruti, Smriti and reasoning, we see that the omniscient and omnipotent Paramesvara is quite superior to the whole universe, sentient and insentient though as His own emanation, it is not altogether distinct from Him.

He brings out the non-difference more by means of the simile of body and mind in his commentary on I. ii. I.

“All this is Brahman, as beginning, ending, and breathing in Him; and therefore let a man meditate on Him.”

This passage may be explained as follows: The origin, existence and end of all this depends on Brahman. All this, both the sentient and the insentient existence, is verily Brahman, and therefore let a man meditate on Brahman tranquil in mind. Just as water bubbles which have their origin existence and end in the ocean, are found to be only forms of that ocean, so, too, that which depends for its origin etc., on Brahman associated sakti must be made up of Brahman and nothing else. Nothing distinct from Him is ever perceived. Accordingly, in the Atharvasiras it has been declared by Isana as follows:

“Alone I was at first. (alone) I am and shall be,
there is none else distinct from Me.”

And then was declared by Him in the words “I am Brahman,” that the whole universe is His own form. And in the words “He entered the more hidden from (or *than*) the hidden one”

The Dravida Maha Bashya of Sivagnana Yogi

etc., His entering into the universe is given as a reason for the whole universe being His own form. Thus, this universe having no origin, existence or end outside Brahman, it is not a quite distinct thing from Brahman. Accordingly, the learned way: -

“His saktis or energies form the whole world, and the Mahesa or the Great Lord is the energetic (Saktiman). Never can energy exist distinct from the energetic. Unity of these two is eternal, like that of fire and heat, in as much as unseparateness always exists between energy and the energetic. Wherefore the supreme energy belongs to the supreme Atman, since the two are related to each other as substance and attribute. The energy of heat is not conceived to be distinct from fire and so on.

Vayu-Samhita, too; says:

“From Sakti up to earth, (the whole world) is born of the principle Siva. By Him alone, it is pervaded, sa the jar etc., by clay. His variegated supreme Sakti, whose form is knowledge and bliss, appears as one and many, like the light of the sun.”

The following passages of the sruti speak of Para-Brahman as possessed of infinite powers of creating, ruling and maintaining the world, all inherent in Him.

“His supreme Sakti is spoken of as manifold, inherent endowed with the activity of knowledge and life.”

“One verily is Rudra, - they were not for second – who rules these worlds with the powers of ruling.”

In short, on the authority of Sruti, Smriti, Itihasa, Purana and the saying of the learned, the Supreme Sakti – whose manifold manifestation this whole universe of chit and achit is, whose being is composed of Supreme Existence, Intelligence and Bliss and is unlimited by space and time – is inherent in the nature of Siva, the Supreme Brahman, and constitutes His own essential form and quality. Apart from Sakti He cannot be the Omniscient, the Omnipotent, the cause of all, the all-controlling, the all adorable, the all-gracious, the means of attaining all aspirations, and the omnipresent; and, moreover, such grand designations as ‘*Mahesvara*’ the Supreme Lord, ‘*Mahadeva*’ the supreme deity, and ‘*Rudra*’ the expeller of pain, cannot apply to Him. Thus it is Brahman whose body is the whole sentient and insentient universe, and who is denoted by all words. Just as the word ‘blue’ denotes not the blue colour only, but also the lotus which is of blue colour, so does the word ‘universe’ also denotes Brahman. Therefore, such passages as “All is Rudra verily” teach that Brahman is denoted by all words. Accordingly, the passage “All this, verily is Brahman” refers to Brahman whose body the whole of the sentient and insentient universe is. The universe being thus a form of Brahman and being therefore not an object of hatred etc., let everyone be peaceful at heart and worship Brahman. This doctrine is clearly expounded even in the puranic texts such as the following: -

“The body of the God of Gods is this universe, moving and unmoving. This, the Jivas (Papus) do not know, owing to the mighty bondage. They say sentiency is Vidya, and insentience Avidya. The whole universe of Vidya and Avidya, is no doubt the body of the Lord, the Father of all; for the whole universe is subject to Him. The word ‘sat’ is used by the wise

The Dravida Maha Bashya of Sivagnana Yogi

to denote the real and the good, and 'asat' is used by Vedic teachers to denote the contrary. The whole universe of the *sat* and the *asat* in the body of Him who is on high. Just as, by the watering of the roots of a tree, its branches are nourished, so by the worship of Siva, the universe which is body is nourished. Atman is the eighth body of Siva the Paramesvara, pervading all other bodies. Wherefore the whole universe is ensouled by Siva. If any embodied being whatsoever be subjected to constraint it will be quite repugnant to the eight handed lord; as to this there is no doubt. Doing good to all kindness to all, affording shelter to all – this, they hold is the worshipping of Siva.” And so on.

Brahman being all-formed, it is but right to say “all is Brahman” and “let everyone be peaceful and worship Brahman.” Wherefore it is Brahman who in the opening passage is stated to be the object of worship, that is also spoken of as Manomaya, as partaking of the nature of manas, and so on. Neither should it be supposed that the partaking of the nature of manas is a characteristic mark of a samsarin; for Brahman may limit Himself by assuming a shape which can form an object of worship.

The eight difference then between the way the subject is treated by Srikanta and St. Meikandan has to be noted. Srikanta calls this relation following Badarayana as one of cause and effect and smells of Parinama though the illustration of body and mind would take it out of such relation Sivagnanaswamigal distinguishes between two kinds of *Tadanmiyam*. One substance appears as two as Guni and Guna, substance and attribute. This is one kind.

Two substances becoming one by absolute identity is another kind of *Tadanmiyam*. The former kind is barely called *Tadanmiyam* and the latter kind is more specially distinguished by the name of 'advaita.' And the significance of the word is to point out the non-difference, following the 'அன்மைப்பொருள்' and the texts of St. Meikandan and St. Umaphathi' declare respectively. “அத்துவிதமென்றசொல்லே அந்நியநாத்தியை உணர்த்துமாயிட்டு” “The word advaita means *ananyatva*” “பிரிவரு மத்துவிதமாகும் சிறப்பினதாய்” “The glorious doctrine of advaita postulating *inseparability*.”

Sivagnana Yogi notes other kinds of relationship from which he distinguishes the 'advaita,' such as 'aikkam' ஐக்கம், (union, as of river water and Ocean water, of the ether in the pot and the ether in air, the substance is one only); *Samavaya*, (Union as in sun and light) *Saiyogam*, (union as of different fingers in one hand); *Sorupam*, (resemblance in some particular); and 'anirvachanam') Relation which cannot be described).

In distinguishing *advaita* therefore from an *abhetha* relationship like, 'aikkam,' and a *Bethabeta* relationship like *Tadanmiya* and *Samavaya*, and a *bheta* relationship like *Saiyogam*, he points out that in *Advaita*, we may notice all these different aspects of difference and non-difference, and hence it is that our sages in describing these particular aspects illustrate them by such examples அலைகடலிற் சென்றடங்குமாறுபோல், as the river merging in the sea, வானத்தில் வானும் மணத்தில் மணமும் போல், as ether in ether, and smell in smell, பண்ணையுமே ரையும் போலப் பழமதுவு மெண்ணும் சுவையும்போல் as sound and tune, fruit and sweetness நீரு மிரதமும் போலாங்காண் அரனாரருள் as water and

The Dravida Maha Bashya of Sivagnana Yogi

sweetness is the grace of God.” இரும்பைக் காந்தம் வலித்தாற் போலியைந்து and sweetness is the grace of God.” As the magnet attracting the iron” and our Yogi warns as not to mistake such similes whenever they are used. And the only simile by far which exactly describes ‘advaita,’ is the simile of “eye and soul,” ஆன்மபோதமும் கண்ணொளியும் as found in the texts.

காணும் கண்ணுக்கு காட்டு முளம் போற்
காண வுளத்தைக் கண்டு காட்டலின்

(Sivagnanabotham Sutra XI)

காட்டக் கண்டிடும் தன்மையுடைய கண்ணுக்
கேயுமுயிர் காட்டிக் கண்டிடு மாபோல
வீசுனுயிர்க்குக்காட்டிக் கண்டிடுவன்

(Sivagnana Siddhiar XI, 1)

அறி வொளிபோற் பிறிவரு மத்துவிதமாகும்

(Sivaprakasam Sutra, 7)

This *advaita* is also described as *Suddadvaita*, to distinguish it for Kevala advaita, Vishishtadvaita etc., and the epithet *Suddha* simply means unqualified by each terms as ‘Kevala’ etc. And that is the purport of the Srutis, he quotes the following texts.

“திலத்தின் கண்ணே தயிலம்போல் முதல்வன் எல்லாபொருளினும் அகமும் புறமுமாய் விரவிநிற்பன்.” “As oil in Sesame seed, the Lord is present in all things, inside and outside.”

“ஆன்மா எதனை பற்றினான் அதன் அதன்வண்ணமே தன்வண்ணமாக் கொண்டு அது அதுவாய் நிற்பன்.” “Whatever is the soul united to, it becomes that assuming the nature of that as its own.”

“நீரு மெண்ணையும்தோல ஒன்றற்கொன்று தூல தூக்குங்களா மியல் புடைமையின் அதுபற்றி வியாப்பியமும் வியாபகமுமாய் நிற்பனவாம்.” “As like water and oil, one is gross and one subtle, they stand in union Vyapaka (container) and as Vyappiam (contained).”

The first text is in Swetaswatara Upanishad and we could not identify the other texts though we have quoted similar texts in our article on ‘Advaita to appear in the “New Reformer.”

This advaita union of the soul on the one hand with mala, is said to be its artificial or செயற்கை relation, and its union in God on the other hand is said to be its natural or இயற்கை relation.

Sivagnana Yogi next discusses question relating to the *anubhava* of the soul in God, and he begins with quoting the text that “Sivanubhava is Sivanubhava.” And he meets the first

The Dravida Maha Bashya of Sivagnana Yogi

objection raised, to the effect that if the soul has such experience, such will be material, by saying that as the knowledge of God is itself not to be compared to our ordinary human knowledge, and as it is only derived by thought without thought, so this anubhava is also derived similarly by ‘சுட்டிற்றந்து நின்றனுபவித்தல்.’ and we have shown in our notes to Sutra XI (Sivagnanabotham English Translation) how this Sivanubhavam is Svanubhavam and though the soul it is that enjoys, its being not conscious of such enjoyment is what saves it from the experience introducing any duality.

Our Yogi further shows that this Sivanubhava is blissful, and is therefore called *Anandam* and *Parama-sukam*, and the word *Ananda* is derived from *Nandam* (Cf nandi) with the addition of the upasargam ‘A’ and this is derived by the knowledge of soul of the Blissful and Perfect Glory of the Lord covering and clothing it on all sides, and soaking through and through its inmost nature.

In answer to *Sivasamavadis*, he points out that the word does not mean the equality of the two Padarthas as soul and God, in as much as God is incomparable, having neither equal nor superior and that there can be no such substance which can be said to cover God, in the same way no darkness can cover the sun, and the real significance of the word is that in our Sadana, we must so prepare ourselves by purification that the whole light of God can cover and clothe us fully leaving no facet uncovered, just as a crystal should be covered fully by the ruby light.

If any think or facet was left out, it will reflect something other than God and enter into *Bhandam*. This full clothing in the Glory of God is becoming Siva Samam, or equal to God.

This will close the discussion on *advaita* and before we do so, we will refer our readers to the opinion of a great Sanskrit scholar, who though a follower of Sri Sankara perceives the absurd lengths to which that philosophy has been drawn, and defines *advaita* exactly like the Siddhantis as meaning *ananyatva* (inseparability) and not *eka* or *abinna* or *abheda* and we make therefore no apology for quoting his opinion at length. Says Manilal N. Dvivedi in his “Monism or Advaitism.”

“Thus all is reducible, according to the Advaitavada, into one primordial substance which, for the present, we may continue to call *Prakriti*. The next step, the most difficult one, is to assert that *Prakriti* and *Purusha* are one and the same thing – *dead matter*, as such, is nowhere to be found, nor is ‘*mind* (purusha) ever to be seen without it. In other words, mind without matter and matter without mind, (thought without being and vice versa) is a logical as well as natural absurdity and all *dwaita* – duality – is an entire misconception. There is no *dwaita* – duality. We are to mark the carefulness with which the expression is chosen. All is A-Dwaita, not all is Eka (one i.e., *duality* is *denied*, but the convertibility of matter and mind, is *not asserted*. * [*See the Brahmasutra Book II, VI where both are said to be ananya inseparable) but not Abhinna (one) see also the Bhamati.] Herein will appear a sharp line of distinction between *Monism* and *Advaitism*. But this distinction will appear on careful consideration, to be more imaginary than real for, where Advaitism maintains the *inseparability* of mind and matter, Monism maintains the possibility of deriving the former from the potentialities of the latter. Either way,

The Dravida Maha Bashya of Sivagnana Yogi

nothing more nor less is asserted, nor indeed, can be asserted, than the *inseparability of mind and matter*. This view of the Advaita naturally leads to the question. What is the *nature* of the two terms of this unity? The *Adwaita-Vada* does not recognize the distinction of mind and matter to consist in the phenomena of *force* or *energy*, nor even in the manifestation of the “*mysterious vital force*”; for these it agrees with monism in regarding as sufficiently explicable from the potentiality of matter. To be brief, force or vital force is the *Prana* of *Adwaitism* – a kind of *vayu*, sensation, volition, and reason, the functions of mind, are in a sense deducible from matter. But, the very elementary notion which is the counterpart of matter, is *knowing* – gnana. It being so, we must finally dismiss and clearness, as it is incapable of conveying to us the idea of the antithesis of *knowing* and *not knowing*, implied by the terms mind and matter in *Adwaitism*. Mind, as understood by *Adwaitism*, is not the *ultimate* and *simple* result of our analysis of nature; but it is an intermediate complex phenomenon or organic development. *Adwaitism* defines the ultimate and simple factor of all our knowledge as *that which while cognizing phenomena remains itself unaltered and unaffected*. * [* Brhadarnyaka] The eye which does not change with changing phenomena it perceives, may be the ultimate fact of our intellectual perceptions’ but as its conditions – shortness, blindness, dimness etc. – are cognized by the mind which, for the time, remains unchanged, the mind may, in all probability, be this fact. But the mind i.e., volition, reason, feeling etc., is cognized, in its turn, by a something which is not cognized by anything else, for it is unique and unchanging. This something, then, is the ultimate, unique, self-cognizant and constant fact of all our perceptions, the fact which underlies all nature, in and *through* which everything is. There is no ignoring it, for in the very act we admit it. It is the very essence (*esse* Being) of Nature. It is unconditioned, and therefore indescribable; it is unique and constant, therefore eternal. In its uniqueness there is no diversity and therefore no evil as such, it being the result of duality! The pure *esse* is all bliss, all love the *unity* that knows no limit (*parichheda*) either *qualitative* or *quantitative*. It is *its* neither he nor she. Of it is all *Being* (*sat*), all thought (*chit*), all joy (*ananda*). These three words *sat*, *chit*, *ananda* are an approximate expression of the Inexpressible, Ineffable Reality – Thought Being. Thus we see that we must not call it mind, nor even soul; for soul implies individuality – limit (*parichheda*) which the unlimited and unconditioned knows not. Let us then call it by its proper Sanskrit name, *chit*. Thought as contradistinguished from matter, the indescribable Being. We shall shortly have to replace the word matter also, by an equally significant *Sanskrita* correlative of *chit*. What is matter? What is *prakriti*? The question is already answered when we say that it is never independent of *chit*. We can never conceive of matter but *in* and *through chit*, and can therefore never say *what it is*. *Ignoramus* is the only way out of the difficulty. And yet do we say that it *does not exist*? Again *Ignoramus*. Matter *exists*, but not as an ultimate and simple invariable fact of our perceptions like *chit*, for it takes on itself in any changes of *name* and *form*. Though the limited character of our subjective nature denies to us real knowledge of matter per se, we cannot rid ourselves of all idea of its objectivity. It is neither *existent* nor non-existent, that is, it does not exist in the same sense as the horns of a hare. It is neither *esse*, nor *n-esse*; neither *sat* nor *asat* – it is Indescribable. We are only cognizant of the various *shapes* it passes through, but of its nature as matter we know absolutely nothing. We know that it is, we do not know that it is not, we *must* call it indescribable. And why is it so? It is, and it must be so from the very necessities of our nature – from *chit* being never apart from *matter*, and matter being never separate from *chit*. Thought and Being are always inseparable;

The Dravida Maha Bashya of Sivagnana Yogi

subject and object are always one. All our knowledge, in fact consist of *chit* and forms of matter. The former *constant* and *eternal*, the latter *changing* and *non-eternal*; both always inseparable, whence the text “this universe is a compound of Truth and untruth, Real and unreal.” * [* Brhadamyaka] We have in this short analysis tried to examine the nature of *chit* as well as *matter*, and have arrived at the following results. Of *chit* we have seen that it is unconditioned unique, eternal and therefore free from evil. Of matter, which is a complex phenomenon, we have determined that: -

(I) It is a thing of which we know nothing;

(II) It is indescribable;

(III) It passes into many shapes which alone are cognizable and form, besides *chit*, the circle of the *knowable*, which comprises all our sciences.

And lastly, as to the relation of *chit* and matter we have seen that *chit* and *matter* are not separable, thought and being are one, and the universe consists, therefore of the real and the unreal mixed together.

In its three aspects, *prakrti* has three different names (I) Agnana, (II) Anirvachaniya, (III) Maya. The first name, *A* (not) gnana (knowing), may naturally lead one to believe that it is the *negation* of gnana; i.e., mere blank, ignorance; but as the foregoing explanation must have clearly shown, it is not the negation of anything, but a *positive entity* of which *we know nothing*, and it is therefore called Agnana, for want of a better word. Though Agnana is opposed to gnana which is *chit*, it is not destruction of the latter, for it is not a negation, but a positive substance which exists in and of *chit*. The second name *Anirvachaniya* (indescribable), though plain enough, has also caused equal confusion. We have seen that *prakrti* is neither existence (*sat*), nor *non-existence* (*asat*); and is therefore indescribable. This is twisted in a manner to make this state appear as absurd as possible by saying that it is equal to the assumption of a positive middle between *sat* and *asat*, which cannot logically follow. The third name *Maya* is like Agnana and *Anirvachaniya*, a bone of contention among the various scholastic philosophers of India, and has given rise to such cob-webs of impenetrable metaphysics that those who do not care to look deeper are easily led to regard the whole philosophy as mere nonsense. *Maya* means illusion; *prakrti* is an illusion no doubt, but not an illusion in the sense of having no basis to stand upon. This basis cannot be *chit* which is never variable; but it is itself – the indescribable, as we shall just see. Inasmuch as it passes into *many shapes* without allowing us to penetrate the veil that covers it, it is nothing more nor less than an illusion; but that it must *exist* is a necessity of thought, and its existence in *some form* cannot be an illusion. The subtleties of scholastic metaphysics suggest that it is an illusion out and out, *chit* being sufficient to send forth these illusions from within itself. Nothing can, however, be further from the truth which this philosophy teaches. In the first place *chit* is formless, constant, unique. How in the world can this pass into any shapes? We may be, and are, conscious of the illusion, in and through it of course; but the source of the illusion is not to be sought out of itself but *within* itself. Hence *Maya* does not mean illusion out and out, but illusion so far as the many *names* and *forms* of *prakrti* are concerned. * [* See especially a brief verse (20) in the *Drgdrasya viveka*

The Dravida Maha Bashya of Sivagnana Yogi

of *Bharatirtha* appended to my *Rajayoga*.] But though there is thus a substratum for this illusion, *apart from chit*, it does not subvert the theory of the *Advaita*, for in the very beginning of our explanation we have shown that *Advaita* does not mean the existence of a *single substance*, nor even the unity of the matter and mind, but their inseparability. *Advaita* means, *non-dvaita*, *non-duality*, Thought and being are inseparable, not one. This idea is expressed by the word *Brahma* (something large enough, unlimited), a name common, as it must be to *chit* as well as *prakrti*, for both are inseparable. The universe is *Brahman*, so then, *prakrti* is *Agnana*, *Anirvachaniya*, *Maya* † [† The two aspects of *Prakrti Agnana* and *Maya* are sometimes called its two *Saktis* (powers); viz., *Avarana*, that which covers, conceals its *real nature*; and *Viksepa* that which makes it *throw* out of itself many *forms* the covert and overt actions of matter, as we shall call them.]

As contra-distinguished from *chit* it is called *jada* (dead matter), which name we shall, hereafter, adopt for matter. *Chit* and *jada* are inseparable, and are, therefore, *Brahma*, the sole Ineffable Reality. *Brahma* is called *Brahma* the unconditioned, which requires no explanation. It is called also *Atman*, which, being generally translated by the word *self*, for want of a better one is likely to be misunderstood. Some argue that the sages of the Upanishads believed that every object has a *self*, and all the *self's*, so to speak, being one are called *Atman*, by way of expressing the *reflective* notion. This language is ambiguous, if not wrong. *Self* implies individually which is a foreign to the nature of *Brahma*, but as all individuality is in and of *Brahma self*, soul-individuality is said to be the same as, inseparable from, *Brahma*. It is in this double sense of *self* and *Brahma*, of the inseparability of the two, that the word *Atman* is used. It is something like the Platonic *Demiurges*, not this or that *self*, but the supreme *self*, the unconditioned *Brahma*. So then, just as *Prakrti*, *Agnana*, *Anirvachaniya*, and *Maya*, * [* There is one more name, *Avidya*, which is only a minor technicality, and will be explained further on.] are names of *jada*; *Gnana* and *sat* are names of *chit*; and *Brahma*, *Bhuma Atman** [* These three are not always used strictly in this sense, for we sometimes find them used for more *chit*, as opposed to *jada*.] are names of the inseparability of the true, the universe as a whole, *Advaita*. We have thus seen what simple scientific meaning *Advaita* bears, notwithstanding the many metaphysical subtleties which uselessly mystify its import. This philosophy recognizes no *duality*, and asserts no *unity*, but maintains inseparability, whence the name *Advaita*, non-duality, - in other words, not *A-bheda* - unity, but *Ananyatva* - inseparability. Real knowledge is the knowledge of the *Advaita* - the *gnana*; for *Brahma* is the only Reality, in all time and all places of its true factors *chit* is the only thing constant and unique * [* That *chit* is unique and constant is proved by an appeal to experience. If it were changing, all our knowledge of the past as connected with the present, in such forms as I who was a child are now a man, would be impossible even the unity of our sleeping, dreaming and making experience will be broken. Hence it is the absolute; even *Relativity* is knowable through it - *Panchadasi*.] and perfectly knowable; *jada*, though inseparable from it is not knowable in itself but through the names and forms* [* *Svarajya-Siddhi* of *Suresvar*.] is assumed; and it therefore, not constant, but illusory. All substances, whether inorganic or organic, are known to exist as subjects or objects of joy, only because they possess *chit*; *sat*, and *ananda*. These three which are constant, plus name and form (*Maya*) which are not constant, constitute *Brahma*, the whole of the universe, the absolute Reality, the true *Advaita*.”

The Dravida Maha Bashya of Sivagnana Yogi

If this is Vedanta, as we know it to be, we may declare as Srikanta Sivacharya declared more than thousand years ago, that there is no difference between Vedanta and Siddhanta, Veda and Agama and that this is Vedanta Siddhanta Samarasa.

The whole mischief, as will be perceived, of the idealist school is in taking the prefix A, in such words as *advaita*, *agnana*, *avidya*, *asat* &c., as signifying negation, (இன்மைப் பொருள்) instead of the அன்மைப் பொருள், and we have long ago pointed that such words as *asat* does not mean non-existence as so frequently translated but only “*other* than sat.” And the mark of changeability pointed out by M. N. Dvivedi is thus brought out by our Yogi. “அங்ஙனமாகவும் ஒரு தன்மைத்தாய் நில்லாது காரிய அவத்தையில் தூலமாய் விளங்கி நின்ற பிரபஞ்சம், காரண அவத்தையிற் சூக்குமமாகிய சத்திவடிவாய் விளங்காது நிற்கும் வேறு பாடுடைமை மாத்திரை பற்றியன்றே பிரபஞ்சம் அசத்தெனப் பட்டது.” “Is not the universe called *asat*, as it is not constant, is apparent to us as effect but non-apparent when reduced to its original cause, as Subtle Sakti.”

Nothing is new under the Sun and one favourite objection to the theory of *advaita* as expounded here and which we quoted from a modern writer and which we replied to at pages 30 to 33 in our edition of Sivagnanabotham, we find to be centuries old.

This objection is restated by Professor Deussen in the following words.

“The existence of God will be precluded by that of space, which is infinite, and therefore admits of nothing external to itself, and nothing within save that which fills it,” i.e., matter, (the most satisfactory definition of which is “that which fills space.”)

(Philosophy of the Upanishads, page 45).

This objection which is so learnedly put is answered by our Yogi in almost scathing terms.

“இன்னும் அவர், பசுபாசங்கள் மெய்பொருள் என்பார், முதல்வன் வியாபகத்துக்கு நூனதை கூறுபவராவர், யாதினாலெனின், ‘பசுபாசங்கள் உள்ளவிடங்களில், முதல்வனிருப்பிடையறவுற்று அவன் வியாபகம் குறைவுறுதலால்’ என்றிங்ஙனம் ஆசங்கை நிகழ்த்தாநிற்பர். இன்னோரன்ன ஆசங்கைகளை அவர் பிராகிருத அவயவகண்டப் பொருட் பயிற்சியினால் நிகழ்த்துகின்றார். என்னை அவயவமுடைய கண்டப்பொருளன்றி நிரவயவ அகண்ட சச்சிதானந்தப் பொருள் மற்றொன்றால் இடையறவுற்றுக் குறைவுனதாதலாறொன்க. ஆதிபகவனாகிய இறைவன் நிரவயவ அகண்ட சச்சிதானந்த முதற்பொருளாகலின், அவன் அநாதியே தன்போல நித்தியமாய்த் தனக்கு வியாப்பியான சித் அசித்துக்களில் யாண்டுங் கலந்து நிக்க மறத் தன்பூரணத்திற்கு நூனதை யாதுமின்றி யவையே தானாய் நிற்கும் பெற்றியுடையனாமென்க இனி அப்பெற்றி, உயிர்களால் இற்றென அறியவும் ஒதவும் வராத சொருபமாம். அற்றாகவினன்றே சுருதிகளும்

The Dravida Maha Bashya of Sivagnana Yogi

அவன் சொருபவியல்பு வாக்கு மனசாதீதம் என்றும், அநிர்த்தேசியம் என்றும், அங்ஙனம் முறையெடுத்து ஓய்ந்தனவென்பது. வாக்கு மனங்கழிய நின்ற மறையோனே என்னும் தமிழ்வேதமும் அக்கருத்தே பற்றியெழுந்தது. வளி தீ, நீர் நிலமென வொன்றற்கொன்று தூலமாகி நிலை பெறும் பூதங்கள் நான்கிற்கும் சூக்குமபூதமான ஆகாய மிடங்கொடுத்து வியாபகமாய் நிற்கும் பெற்றியே மக்கட்குற்றறிதற்கு அரிதாகிய நுண்பொருளாம் ஆனபின் நிரவயவ அகண்ட சத்தாயும் ஆந்தமாயுநிற்கும் பரப்பிரம முதற்பொருள் பசுபாசங்கட்டு அந்தரியாமியாயும் வியாபியாயும் பூரணமுற்று நிற்குஞ் சொருபவியல்பை, மாயா தனுகரணங்களாற் கட்டுற்று அவற்றினாபகாரத்தானும், சுத்தமாயா வரதவிருத்திகாரிய சத்த சமூகமான வேதமுதலிய கல்வியறிவு மின்மினிவிளக்குத்தானும் சிறிதறிவு விளங்கி, அங்ஙனம் விளங்கிய சிற்றறிவு மாத்திரையானே, நாம் பிரமமென்று தருக்கி இறைவன் திருவருட்கயலாய்க் கேவலமுற்றுழலும் பசுபோதப் புவ்விஷயிர்கள், நாமறிந்தாமென்றொப்படுதலும், பசுபாசங்கள் மெய்ப்பொருளாயின அவற்றிளிருப்பான் முதல்வன் வியாபகத்திற்கிடையறவு முட்டுற்று நூனதை புகுதருமென்று பாண்டித்தியம்போல அபிநயித்துக்குதர்க்க நிகழ்த்தலும் புல்லறிவுமுதிர்ச்சியாவதல்லது மற்றியாதாமென்க.”

“Again, they say that those who assert the reality of *Pasu* and *Pasa* (souls and matter, & c.,) will be ascribing a defect to God’s omnipresence because where these *Pasu* and *Pasa* exist, there will be no place for God. This objection is pressed by them from their knowledge of finite material objects possessing extension. For this reason, that, except for extended finite objects, there is no limitation arising from the existence of other objects for the unextended infinite Satchidananda God. As the Supreme One is the unextended (Niravayava) infinite Satchidananda, He is eternally in inseparable union and one with the eternally existing Chit and Achit contained in him, and so this omnipresence will in no way be subject to any defect. This nature of His is such as no mortal can know or describe. Hence it is the great Vedas get tired in describing “Him as beyond reach of thought and speech,” and as ‘Anirthesiam.’ In this sense again do the Tamil Vedas speak of Him as ‘The Supreme One of the Vedas beyond reach of thought and speech.’ It is difficult for man to grasp the subtle manner in which even among material objects, air, fire, water, and earth one grosser than the other, are all contained in the subtle Akas. How thou can man, who being bound in body and senses formed of maya, and gaining with this help and the little intelligence, which can be compared to the light of the firefly, derived from the study of the Vedas and other arts, etc., formed of Sabda arising from the *Suddha Maya Nadha Vritti Karyam*, think they have known everything, and think they are God, but are really ignorant being only puffed up with *Pasabheda*, how can he understand the nature of Parabrahmam who bring the unextended, infinite sat, chit, and ananda is omnipresent in all souls and matter and is antaryami?

The Dravida Maha Bashya of Sivagnana Yogi

“That such men should come forward as having known everything, and pose as great pandits and with such illogical arguments as above, what can this be due to, but to great ignorance.”

The purvapakshin sees no way of getting out of the difficulty than by postulating the unreality of matter; and he thinks “the existence of God is conceivable only if the universe is more appearance and not reality (mere maya) and not the *atman*; and it breaks down irretrievably, should this empirical reality; wherein we live, be found to constitute the true essence of things, and the clinching argument by which this thesis is supported is quoted from the Professor above. But as we pointed out in our note to the 2nd sutra in Sivagnanabodham, it is a contradiction to call space infinite, as without the idea of finiteness, the notion of space is inconceivable, and if it is matter that fills space, being extended, mind is intelligence or chit and being unextended and space less can be present in matter, without being obstructed by matter and though we could not easily conceive how mind and body, the unextended and the extended are in union, a union which Bain characterises as a puzzle and as a contradiction yet the fact of union cannot be disputed. And we had pointed out how the conception of omnipresence is itself derived from the existence of matter. So where the difficulty present to the mind of the Purvapakshina can be thus easily removed, why should they go to the extent of whittling away the existence and reality of mala. According to Advaita Siddhanta (we thought we had brought the word into use, but our Yogi uses the word at p. 116 as “our Advaita-Siddhanta” besides formulating its reality and its underivability as an effect, nothing else is asserted. As illustrated by the analogy of vowels and consonants, its dependence on mind, its inseparability, its insignificance and powerlessness independent of mind are all admitted. If there is anyone antagonist whom the Sutrakara attacks more than another, it is the Kapila Sankhya. The Sankhya admitted the existence of matter and souls, Prakriti and Purusha. What he denied was the existence of God. And the way he denied was this matter was independent of mind, and it possessed potentialities and powers independent of mind, and it could evolve and resolve by its own motion, matter solely existed for the salvation of man; and so no God was required who performed the five functions. Kapila accomplished this by solely asserting the independence of matter; and the sutra kara struck at its root by denying its independence, and shows everywhere how without God, matter existed not and could not be brought into being and could not evolve as without the vowel, no consonant can come into being and have any power. The Sutrakara did not deny the existence of Purusha and Prakriti, but there existed *another*, on which this was dependent. And the word ‘Another,’ ‘anyata’ has thus become a mark or technical term denoting God; and the Sutrakara discusses it in the antaradikaram in Sutra 21 of the first Pada of first Adhyaya. And Dr. Thibaut translates it as follows.

“And there is *another* one (i.e. the Lord who is different from the individual souls animating the Sun &c.) on account of the declaration of distinction.”

And Sri Sankara comments briefly as follows: -

“There is moreover one distinct from the individual souls which animate the sun and other bodies, viz, the Lord who rules within; whose distinction (from all individual souls) is proclaimed in the following scriptural passage, ‘He who dwells in the sun, and within the sun, whom the sun does not know, whose body the sun is, and who rules the Sun within, he is the self, the ruler within, the immortal.’ (Brihad Up. III. 7.9) Here the expression,

The Dravida Maha Bashya of Sivagnana Yogi

‘He within the sun whom the sun does not know,’ clearly indicates that the rules within is distinct from the cognizing individual soul whose body is the sun; With that Ruler within, we have to identify the person within the sun, according to the tenet of the sameness of purport of all Vedanta texts. It thus remains a settled conclusion that the passage under discussion conveys instruction about the Highest Lord.”

Thereupon Professor Kunte observes as follows: -

“Sankaracharya in interpreting this sutra admits that the human spirit is different from the Supreme spirit. But finding such an admission subversive of his system he states in his commentary that brings having the human spirit include the sun, moon and stars, and that God is different from them. Thus sutra is the fountain head of all the controversy between the dualist or theists and the non-dualists or Pantheists. We expected but in vain copious comments on this Sutra from Shankaracharya.”

The text quoted from Brihadaranyaka is only one of 21 similar passages in which God is declared to be * [*Professor Max Muller would prefer to translate the word *antara* as slated as within as ‘different from,’ following Deussen.] within or different from all Achetana and Chetana; and the concluding text makes God distinct for atma or Vignana, the individual soul itself, the individual soul is treated as the body of God.

“He who dwells in Vignana or atma (according to the madhyandiya text) and different from atma, whose body atma is, and who rules atma within, he is thy atma, the ruler within, the immortal.” (III. 7. 2.)

The usual misconception about this text is, and especially of the words ‘he is thy atma,’ is that God and the individual’s own atma are identical. But as the whole text shows, ‘all are but parts of a stupendous whole, whose soul God is.’ This chetana and achetana Prapancha constitutes his sarira, body, and God is the atma within and different from it. So in the case of the individual atma, he also constitutes the body of God, and his soul will be God. So the expression, soul of soul and Life of Life, Light of Light have come into use. So the text ‘He is thy atma’ means simply ‘God is the soul’s soul.’

And to revert to the original theme, Professor Deussen has frequent qualms of conscience whenever he reads such passages in the Upanishads in which God is spoken of as ‘another.’

“Two bright-feathered bosom friends flit around one and the same tree; One of them tastes the sweet berries. The other without eating, merely gazes down.”

(Svet. IV. 6. Mundaka, III.i.i. Rig. I. 164.20.)

“Or when in Svet. I.6, the distinction of Soul and God (swan and drover) is explained to be illusory, and at the same time, the removal of this illusion appears as a grace of the Supreme God, who is thereby contrasted with the soul as *another*.” (Philosophy of the Upanishads p. 178). Professor Deussen gets out of the difficulty by dividing roughly the Upanishads into Pantheistic and theistic Upanishads, and ascribing these sentiments to the latter. Yet he says that Mundaka Upanishad which according to him breaths a pantheistic spirit quotes the above cited passage from the theistic Svetasvatara. And he is not satisfied with this classification as he is conscious that ‘beneath the characters of theism are discerned, half

The Dravida Maha Bashya of Sivagnana Yogi

obliterated those of pantheism and under the latter again those of idealism.” And his concluding consolation is “that the Svetasvatara is a work brim-full of contradictions.” But the Professor’s difficulty is that he could not think any intelligent and correct Philosophy could exist other than Pantheism or idealism, and of course, any philosophy reconciling theism and Pantheism dvaita and advaita, Sankhya and Yoga is not possible. Curiously enough however, the Sutra-kara proves the otherness of God by quoting the Brihadaranya, which Professor Deussen places at the very head of all the Pantheistic Upanishads, and as the most ancient of all. In passing we may observe that in Gita chap. XV. Verses 16 and 17, the distinction we have been noting above of the two Padartas and *another* is also clearly brought out; and we had elsewhere pointed out how verse 16 states the Sankhyan Purvapaksha view and verse 17, the Siddhanta.

We now pass on to the other matters discussed in the second sutra. The theory of Karma is discussed but there is nothing especially noticeable herein, as the theory is common to all the Indian Schools except the Charvaka.

In regard to the theory of Maya, our Yogi has very interesting criticisms to offer.

He calls Maya a power or sakti of God but to be distinguished from His *Tadanmiya* Sakti, as His Will and Intelligence. It should not be confounded even with his Kriya Sakti. It is called hence his *parigraha* sakti. As we write this, our will and intelligence come into play; but the pen with which we are enabled to put down these thoughts in visible form is also our Sakti. The former constitutes our Sakti, indistinguishable from our self and the latter, distinguishable, is the *parigaraha* sakti. Maya is divisible into two, *Suddha Maya* and *Asuddha Maya*. Some say that Asuddha Maya is a product of Suddha Maya, and others that both are original; and there are others again, who call the one *Urdhva Maya* and the other *Atho Maya*. From *Suddha Maya* are produced Pancha kala, and four *vach* and 31 tatvas from time to earth distinguished as Pure or Suddha or Subtle. From Asuddha maya is produced the 31 gross tatvas from time to earth. These tatvas are called general (பொது) and special (சிறப்பு) and general-and-special. The tatvas governing Bhuvana &c. are called General as they can be sensed by all. Tatvas forming Sukshuma Sarira being connected with each individual’s own enjoyment are called special. The tatvas forming the Sthula Sarira are called general and special, as they can be enjoyed by the individual and by others.

The first thing to be noticed in the theory of this School is its postulating 11 tatvas more than any other School. All the other Schools stop with the 25th tatva or Mulaprakriti but the Siddhanta postulates above these much finer and subtler forces of Nature which would give room to anything Western Science could discover even in the far distant future. These are ‘Nadam,’ or Siva tatva, ‘Bindu’ or Sakti tatva, Sadakkiam, Iswaram, Suddha-Vidya, Asuddha-maya, Niyati, Time (Kala), Kala, Ragam, and Vidya.

(Vide table of tatvas p. 243, a, Vol.1)

It will be noticed that in the ordinary scheme, Time is not included. It is such a power that it is the highest postulate of the School of Kala Brahmavadis, when Buddhi and Chittam and Manas are regarded as material products, the Siddhanti does not hesitate to postulate willing and desiring also of matter, and far higher forms of material intelligence called Kala

The Dravida Maha Bashya of Sivagnana Yogi

and Vidya. And the one thing noticeable in all nature is its unvarying uniformity. This is *niyati*. For the textual authorities and order bearing on the subject, please see Srila Sri Senthinatha Iyer's Tatva Prakasa Catechism (Vol. III. P. 205, Siddhanta Deepika). We may however quote the texts from the Svetasvatara and Brihad Jabala, which from want of the key, supplied by the Puranas and agamas, oriental scholars have not been able to interpret at all "Kalasvabho niyatir ichchabhutani yonih purushaiti chintyam", Svetas. I.2. (of this Svabho is Kala, Ichcha and Ragam are synonymous, Bhuta is Vidya, yoni is maya).

"Sivam Saktinj Sadakkiam isam Vidyabya mevacha" Brihad Jabala Up.

We have to note again how this Maya is distinguished in this system from Anavamala or Avidya, and the following definitions from Sivagnana Siddhar will bring out the difference and the distinction.

"Indestructible, formless, one, seed of all the worlds, non-intelligent, all pervasive, a sakti of the Perfect One, cause of the soul's Tanu (body), senses (karana) and of Bhuvana (worlds), one of the three *malas*, cause also of delusion is Maya," II.3.3.

"*Anavamala* with its many saktis, is one. Pervading through the numberless Jiva, as the dirt in copper, it binds them from Gnana and Kriya. It also affords them capacity for experience, and is ever the source of ignorance."

"Do you say that there is no other entity as mala (anava) and that it is only the effect of Maya? Understand well that Maya causes Ichcha, Jnana, and Kriya to arise in the Jivas but Anava causes them to disappear. Anava is inherent in Jivas, whereas Maya is separate from them and besides manifesting itself as the universe, form the body, senses and enjoyments." (II. 5. 1 and 2)

In the illustration of the mirror and the colours the dirt that covers the mirror (jiva) is the anavamala and the colours are the Maya or prakriti. This dirt and colours have to be distinguished from the inherent power or nature of the soul, அது அது வாதற்றன்மை, its becoming one with another; the dirt is in a sense inherent and inseparable, and this peculiar connection is brought out in the simile of copper and its rust, which rises to the surface again and again after we had cleaned the copper. The maya is like the tamarind or sand or earth we use for cleaning the copper. Anava is the cause of the rise of Moha, Matha, Raga, anxiety, Thirst, suffering and vichitra. The effect of maya is to bring these forces into play and action, and make the soul eat the fruit thereof, and then attain to a balanced mind (இருவினை யொப்பு). It acts more like a lamp in darkness (மாயாதனுவிளக்கு); its power is not large and can in no way compare with the light of God, Sivasurya, yet it is the only help and power given to us by God, in our helplessness and misery; and so it is, it is called a power or Sakti of the Lord.

Our commentator first attacks the view that Maya is *anirvachana*. The Purvapakshin explains this as meaning that maya is neither an entity nor a non-entity and further states that chit appears as a shadow (adhyasa) on a mirror (maya), and this shadow appears as earth, water, air, fire, etc., as water is seen in the mirage, and as the snake appears on the rope, and the world

The Dravida Maha Bashya of Sivagnana Yogi

is but the Vivartana of the chit. His reply is that there can be no such logical term which is neither real nor unreal and so cannot be used in philosophy as a real notion, and in the illustration of the mirage and rope, the mirage and rope are real facts, (the mirage being a peculiar condition of the atmosphere), and the simile cannot be used to illustrate the unreality of the world itself. If Vivartana means that one thing appears another, this illusory appearance is no doubt false. But the world in that sense is not false, and the false world cannot arise from the true chit. If maya is anirvachana, its product the world would also be unreal.

Then he states the objection of the Mayavadi that there is no proof of the object world, and its existence could neither be proved by perception nor by inference, and the relation between the perceiving mind and the objects perceived could not be *Tadanmiya*, *Karanakarya*, *Sayyoga*, *Samavaya*, nor *Vishayi* and *Vishaya*. Our Yogi replies to every one of these objections and conclusions that the only proof of the world is by direct perception, and the relation between the mind and the world is that of subject and object, *Vishayi* and *Vishaya*. And it being noted that this relation is *advaita* or *ananyatva*, no question of any reality or unreality, externality and internality need arise at all.

There is a further fallacy in the argument of the Purvapakshin when he calls the shadow or Reflexion of God in mirror or water as the world and souls. This reflexion or shadow is God's presence in all chetana and achetana Prapancha which form His body, 'Yasya Sarira,' and is God himself and not the world, or souls though all this would not come forth unless He 'breathed forth. The mistake is in identifying this reflection or Presence of God with the soul, which latter in the illustration would take the place of crystal or water. The reflection would in no way be tainted by the impurity of the water or crystal, though for the moment God becomes concealed to the soul by the intervention of this veil of dirt or impurity and the soul is denied the Vision Pure 'மாசுறு காட்சி.' This fallacy lies at the root of our ordinary every day conceptions. Don't we call a diamond a brilliant? Is this brilliance its own its svayamprakasa? If so, this brilliance should appear in utter darkness. This brilliance therefore is not seen to be its own, it simply reflects the light of the lamp or the Sun. The phrase of St. Appar, வெண்பளிங்கின் உட்பதித்த சோதியானே, 'The Jyoti fixed inside the white crystal,' God and the soul vividly. In fact, all the Light, and Intelligence and Goodness and Beauty in man and nature is all that of God, and man in himself an empty shell wherein all this Light and Beauty is bodied forth. "The sun does not shine there, nor the moon and the stars, nor these lightnings and much less this fire; by His Light all this is lightened."

St. Manikavachaka says: -

அருக்கனிற்சோதி அமைத்தோன், திருத்தகு
மதியிற்றண்மை வைத்தோன், திண்டிறற்
றியின்வெம்மை செய்தோன், பொய்தீர்
வானிற்கலப்பு வைத்தோன், மேதகு
காலினூக்கங்கண்டோன், நிழறிகழ்
நீரிலின்சுவை நிகழ்ந்தோன், வெளிப்பட
மண்ணிறறிண்மை வைத்தோன், என்றென்

The Dravida Maha Bashya of Sivagnana Yogi

றெனைப்பலகோடி யெனைப்பல பிறவும்
அனைத்தனைத் தவ்வயின் அடைத்தோன், அஃதான்று

Day by day, He to the Sun its lustre gave.
In the sacred moon He placed its coolness;
Kindled in the mighty fire its heat;
In the pure Ether placed pervasive power;
Endued the ambient wind its energy;
To the streams that gleam in the shade their savour sweet;
And to the expanded earth its strength he gave;
Forever and aye, one and millions other than these
All in their several cell hath He enclosed
And yet He was none of these.”

If the crystal diamond is the soul, with its characteristic of becoming one with the other சார்ந்த்தன் வண்ணமாதல், and so Prakasam, or luminous in a sense, God is the Ruby or Emerald which covers the diamond with its own form சார்ந்ததுதன் வண்ணமாதல், Sva-Paraprakasam or self-luminous, and illumining others. As Sivagnana Yogi points out later on, so far as this light of the Ruby or Emerald covers the diamond with its light, so far will it be free, and this is the meaning of the Siva Sama, and it does not mean that soul becomes equal to God in any sense. Man was created in the image of God ‘அனாதி சிவரூபம் ஆகிய ஆன்மா, and getting freed, becomes the very image of God’ ‘அனாதி சிவரூபமாகியவாரே,’ Man sees God, reflects God, becomes God, like, Godly, God.

This will be further explained in the next section, where our Yogi discusses the *Parinamavada*.

Our Yogi points out that God is nowhere called upadana karana or material cause in the Upanishads, and Sri Senthinathier also points out that the word *Parinama* also does not occur in the Upanishads, though the Sutrakara makes it the subject of discussion in I. iv. 27; and Srikanta Sivacharya in his commentary on the sutra, which we quote below, does not accept the ordinary signification of the term which means change of one substance into another but calls it an ‘*Apurva Parinama*.’

Our Yogi says that God is not the material cause and He is the *Parama adhara Viyapaka Nimitta*, He is the infinite support and efficient cause. If God was the material cause of the world, then He being chit, the world of matter should also be chit. When the purvapakshin instanced the case of milk and curds, spider and web, &c. where the cause and effect do not exhibit the same quality, the commentator remarks that what is meant is that quality not different from that of the cause should be present in the milk, and that the web is nor produced from the vital principle of the spider but from its gross material body. He explains the Vedic Texts which declare that when “God is known all this is known,” by pointing out that when God who is the Possessor or Supporter is known all that He is possessed of is known. He quotes from *Nanmanimalai*, the following: -

The Dravida Maha Bashya of Sivagnana Yogi

நுரையுந்திரையு கொய்யது கொட்டும்,
வரைவில் சீக ரவாரியுங் குரைகடல்
பெருத்துஞ் சிறுத்தும் பிறங்குவ தோன்றி,
யெண்ணிலவாகி யிருங்கடலடங்கும்,
தன்மை போலச் சராசரமனைத்து
நின்னிடைத்தோன்றி நின்னிடை யொடுங்கும்.

“Waves and foams, and bubbles minute and endless currents increase and decrease, and rise and disappear into the very wide sea; and so do the worlds of Chara and Achara rise from Thee and disappear in Thee.”

He points out that sea here is not the sea water but the sea space from which all the water and their waves, &c., rise, and God is the Sarva Vyapaka and Taraka or support of maya, and hence God is called the cause of maya as *upachara* as when we call a lotus springing from a bulb as Pankaja ‘born of mud. He quotes from St. Appar and St. Karaikalammayar the following verses.

இருநிலனாய்த் தீயாகி நீருமாகி
இயமானனா யெரியுங் காற்றுமாகி
அருநிலைய திங்களாய் நாயிறாகி,
ஆகாசமா யட்டமூர்த்தியாகி
பெருநலமும் குற்றமும் பெண்ணுமானும்,
பிறருருவுந் தமமுருவுந் தாமேயாகி
நெரு நலையா யின்றாகி நாளையாகி
நிமிர் புன்சடை யடிகள் நின்றவாரே.

“As earth, fire, water, air and ejaman (atma)
As moon, the sun, and space, as Ashtamurti,
As goodness and evil, as male and female, Himself the
form of every form,
As yesterday and today and tomorrow, my Lord with the
braided hair stands supreme.”

(Devaram)

அறிவானுந்தானே யறிவிப்பான்தானே
அறிவாயறிகின்றான்தானே - யறிகின்ற
மெய்ப்பொருளுந்தானே விரிபொழில் பாராகாயம்
அப்பொருளுந்தானே யவன்.

The knower is He, the instructor is He
He is the true, subject and the true object of knowledge
He is indeed the broad earth
And the Akas also is He.

The Dravida Maha Bashya of Sivagnana Yogi

He observes that in as much as God is one and different, (advaita) from the world, all this language is possible; otherwise, the Vedic texts which declare him to be '*Nirvikari*' changeless will be falsified. He points out that though Srikanta Sivacharya stated that God was the first cause, yet his real opinion as stated in the end was as stated herein, and he refers to the concluding passage in Sri Appaya Dikshita's commentary of Sivarkamani Deepika in 'Janmati Atikarana.'
