

And (He being directly declared as both (I. iv. 25.)

1: some sections of the Vedāntas, the Parames'vara is directly declared to be of the form of the universe as its material cause, and to be the Lord of the universe as its efficient cause, To explain: just as the passages such as "Rudra is above the universe" indicate His being the Lord of the universe, in the same way such passages as "All verily is Rudra"* declare that, as the material cause of the universe, He is also of the form of the universe. In the s'ata-rudriya, He is declared to be the Lord of the universe, in the section beginning with "Bow to the Golden-armed" and closing with "Bow to the Lord of robbers",† and from there up to "Bow to the leaf-born and to the one born in the cluster of leaves" He is declared to be of the form of the universe. Elsewhere, too, the s'ruti declares Him in both the aspects:

"Brahman was the forest, Brahman became that tree; Brahman governed the worlds, holding them in their place"‡

In the Atharvas'iras, he is described to be of the form of the universe in the subsequent portion. Wherefore He being directly declared to be both, it is but right that the Supreme Brahman, Siva, who is Parames'vara, is both the universe and the Lord of the universe, as the material and the efficient cause thereof.

The sūtrakāra says that there is yet another authority:

Because of His creating (it out of) Himself (I. iv. 26)

He made it out of himself by himself.‡ Thus, it is seen that Parames'vara made Himself to be of the form of the universe. Wherefore He is the material as well as the efficient cause.

(Objection:)—Paramasiva is quite free from all trace of evil. He is the unlimited ocean of all excellent attributes; His glory is infinite and eternal, and He is above the universe. How can such a being ever become the Prakriti, the universe which is the basis of all illusion and change, and which has to be avoided as an evil?

By transformation (I. iv. 27)

It is quite explicable how Paramasiva, the efficient cause, who is the Bliss, ever pure, and who by nature is the unsurpassed Good, should assume the form of

the universe as the material cause thereof, by transforming Himself into the *chit* and *achit*, or sentient and insentient, forms of existence.

(Objection:)—Ah! Transformation (*parinama*) means change in the form of the cause, inasmuch as *parinama* is defined to consist in a change from one form to another form. How is Parames'vara thus subject to what is regarded as an evil?

(Answer:)—True; but transformation (*parinama*) can take place in such a way that the Efficient Cause is not affected by the change, notwithstanding that He is the Prakriti or material cause.

(Question:)—What is this unique transformation? We are curious to know what it is. Please explain.

(Answer:)—Listen; we shall explain.

"When it was dark, when there was no day, no night, no existence nor non-existence, then was Siva alone by himself. That is the Imperishable, the Adorable (Light) of the sun; and from Him, Wisdom Ancient went forth"*

At the time when all this was darkness, without the light of the sun and the moon, without the division of day and night, devoid of the individual names and forms, undifferentiated into gross and subtle forms of the sentient and the insentient, into existence and non-existence, then there was Siva alone left by himself, without a second, self-luminous, with the potentialities of the sentient and the insentient existence inseparable from His being. That was then the Imperishable, Supreme Being; that too the Adorable light, as in dwelling in the sun, the primary source of the sun's light. From such a Being, wherein was latent the whole external universe of the sentient and the insentient existence, went forth the ancient supreme wisdom, the spiritual energy (*jñanasakti*), secondless, eternally existent,—the Great Flash of light dispelling all the then darkness. Then "He desired, 'may I become many';‡ then, Parames'vara the Cause, embodied in the subtle form of the sentient and the insentient being which was undifferentiated yet in name and form, willed that He should become embodied in the sentient and the insentient existence differentiated in name and form. And then "all this did He create, and whatever else there is,"‡—He differentiated from himself His body, the sentient and the insentient being in its subtle form. Then having

* Mahanarayana-up. 16.

† Sata-rudriya 5.

‡ Taitt. Brahman 2-8-9

§ Taitt. up. 2-7.

* Svetk. up. 2-18

† Taitt. up. 2-6.

‡ Ibid.

created it He entered into it ;” * He entered of himself as their A'tman into the sentient and the insentient which had been differentiated from him. Then “ He became the manifest and the unmanifest, † he became variously transformed into the universe, manifest and unmanifest. Thus as man is a child and then a youth, Brahman whose body is the universe, is the cause and the effect. The s'ruti says.

“ Know verily Māyā as Prakriti, and Māyin (the possessor of Māyā) the Mahesvara.

By that which forms His limb is all this universe pervaded ‡

From this we learn that Māyā the Prakriti (material cause) of all, that Mahesvara is the being endued with It, and that the whole universe is pervaded by His limb, by a portion of Himself, by a piece of his sentient energy (Chit-Sakti) which, when regarded as the enjoyer, is known by the name of Purusha. Just as the hair and nails and the like are not born of the body alone or of Atman alone, so the universe is not born of Māyā alone or of Mahesvara alone. On the other hand,—like the hair and nails being born of the embodied mortals, Purusha, the Prakriti (material cause) of the sentient and the insentient existence comes into manifestation from out of the Parames'vara united with Māyā. From Is'vara this form, are born the Avyakta (the unmanifest the four-faced (Brahma), and so on. And accordingly S'ruti describes Is'vara to be Purusha Himself in the following words

Purusha verily is Rudra.” §

Wherefore it becomes quite explicable how Paramesvara, who endued with the sentient and the insentient nature, forms the cause as well as the effect, according to the several stages through which He passes.

And it is indeed sung that He is the Prakriti (I iv. 26.)

It is directly declared that Paramesvara Himself is the Prakriti of all beings.

Him whose helpmate is Uma ; who is the supreme Lord (Paramesvara), mighty, three-eyed, darknecked, and serene, having mediated thus, the sage

reaches him who is the womb of all creatures, the witness of all, transcending darkness *”

Thus the S'ruti declares that the Prakriti of all creatures is the Parames'vara himself, who is the witness of all, the omniscient; transcending all darkness, above all universe ; associated with Umā, the supreme energy (Parama Sakti). Therefore the Supreme Brahman Himself is the Upādāna (material cause) as well as the nimitta or efficient cause.

Adhikarana 7.

By this, all have been explained ; all have been explained (I. iv. 29.)

This exposition of Vedantic passages, carried on from I. i. 2 till now, forms also the exposition of those portions of the Mantra and Brāhmana which, as speaking of the characteristic marks of Brahman, are of the form of the Vedānta, such as the Purusha-sūkta and the Satarudriya which form integral portions of Karma-kanda ; as also of the Smritis, Itihasas, Puranas, and the sayings of the adepts. Repetition of the words “ all have been explained ” is intended to shew that the adhyaya is over.

Here a doubt arises as to whether the Satarudriya and the Purushasukta which occur in the ritualic portion (Karmakanda), as also the Smritis, Itihasas, and Puranas,—whether they do or do not point to Brahman, when we take into account the various marks by which to ascertain the purport of a scriptural text ; this doubt arising from the sections being of a different character (as devoted to karma).

(Pārrupaksha.) It is proper to maintain that the Purusha-sūkta and the like which occur in the ritualic portion (karmakanda) are devoted to an exposition of jīva, the performer of actions ; and that they do not point to Brahman, because there is no purpose served (by treating of Brahman). Even the smritis, Itihasas, Puranas, and the like do not treat of the oneness of Atman for some of them speak of Brahma as the Parabrahman some, of Vishnu ; some of Rudra ; some, of Sakti ; Some, of Agni ; some of Sūrya ; some, of Vayu ; some of another. As thus, no definite conclusion can be arrived at, these cannot be held to treat of Brahman.

(Siddhanta.) As against the foregoing, we hold as follows :

* Ibid.

† Ibid.

‡ Svata-up. 4-10.

§ Mahanarayanopaniṣad.

* Kaivalya upaniṣad 7.