

A-4
THE
VEERASHAIVA WELTANSCHAUUNG

Dr. Paul Brunton

Ph.D.

for favour of review and opinion
from.

W.R.K. Sthal

15.3.1943.

1941

SHRI KUMARASWAMIJI, B. A.

Published by Mr. V. R. KOPPAL, M. A., B. T.
NAVAKALYANAMATH, DHARWAR.



Printed by Mr. S. B. HARIHAR,
Manager, Tontadarya Press, Dharwar.

This is from
a scholar
style of
which is
anschaung
ance between
Will and the
pointed out.
shaiva ph
make it more
presentation does
on the
originality,
mineness.

I know t
is Sattwic,
wickedness;
vice or weak
sterling cha
sincere wo
eld himself f
Holiness t
an occasi
Veerashai
Indian Ph
address ha
as it exh
een and W
tribution to
miji to get
me to pub

PUBLISHER'S NOTE

This is from the pen of Shri Kumaraswamiji, an accomplished orator, a scholar and a saint who gives a splendid exposition in superb yet sober style of the Veerashaiva philosophy, the *summum bonum* of which is Shaktivishistadwaita. This is the Veerashaiva Weltanschauung, the rational metaphysics that maintains a perfect balance between spiritualism and materialism, between the dynamism of Will and the conservatism of Truth, as the learned Swamiji has pointed out. The alert thinker has endeavoured to present the Veerashaiva philosophy in the light of Western metaphysics so as to make it more intelligible to the modern mind. This intelligible presentation does anchor not in the dogmatic assertions of religionists but on the logical arguments of rationalists. Herein lies his originality, for originality as Ruskin says, is not newness but genuineness.

I know the Swamiji at close quarters. He is a young *Sanyasi* who is Sattwic, self-less and even stern without any hurt or ill-will or wickedness; buoyant, blissful and even benign without any laxity or vice or weakness. In him one can find a harmonious blending of the sterling character and the sparkling intellect. He is a very silent and sincere worker, prone to hate publicity and more scrupulous to shield himself from the public dart. But the event that forced upon His Holiness to commit to writing his original and inspiring thoughts was an occasion when he had to deliver a public address on "The Veerashaiva Weltanschauung at Adyar under the auspices of the 16th Indian Philosophical Congress held at Madras in December 1940. The address had a deep impression on the learned audience in as much as it exhibited a fine study of the comparative philosophy both Eastern and Western. Many a savant opined that it was a new contribution to the philosophic thought and as such requested the Swamiji to get it printed and published. As a result, I have the good fortune to publish this book-let in order to place it before the public.

Navakalyanamath
Dharwar, March 1941

}

V. R. KOPPAL

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Shri Arabindo Ghose ... *The Life Divine.*
- Sir James Jeans ... *The Mysterious Universe.*
- C. E. M. Joad ... *Guide to Philosophy.*
- Henri Bergson ... *Creative Evolution.*
- F. H. Bradley ... *Appearance and Reality.*
- G. W. F. Hegel ... *Phenomenology of Mind.*
- Schopenhauer ... *The World as Will and Idea.*
- Herbert Spencer ... *First Principles.*
- William James ... *A Pluralistic Universe.*
- A. Wolf ... *Recent and Contemporary Philosophy.*
-

HIS HOLINESS
SHRI KUMARASWAMIJI, B. A.



BORN
1909

GRADUATED
1932

TAKEN ORDERS
1933

The Veerashaiva Weltanschauung

Veerashaivism is generally considered to be a phase of the Agamanta. In the twelfth century Karnatak witnessed an unprecedented revival in Veerashaivism. The precursor of this revival was Sri Basava, the Prime Minister to a Jain King named Bijjala who ruled over Kalyan (1157 to 1167) a city of historic importance, about sixty miles from Gulbarga in the Nizam's Dominions. The magnetic personality of Sri Basava attracted towards him persons of all shades and sympathies from all parts of India ranging from the prince to the peasant. As a consequence there was an assemblage of about three hundred Veera Shaiva saints and mystics, whose sayings in Kannada language stand unrivalled in point of gracefulness of melody, forcefulness of movement and peacefulness of mystery. It is gratifying to learn that there were about sixty women mystics in that assemblage amongst whom was Akka Mahadevi, the beacon-light. The pithy and powerful sayings of these Veerashaiva mystics or the Sharanas (शरणः) as they are called, are compared sometimes by great scholars like the late Mahamahopadhyaya R. Narasimha Acharyaru to the sayings of the Upanishad seers. The sayings of these Sharanas i.e. the supermen of the Lingayat Faith, then, are spontaneous and a direct outcome 'of the divine afflatus springing from within the result of inspiration through God-intoxication'. Hence they breathe the spirit of a God-intoxicant one characterised by redeeming love and refreshing knowledge. Although Veerashaivism is a phase of the Agamanta, it underwent radical changes in the hands of Sri Basava and his colleagues to such an extent that it became Lingayatism - the special Faith of the Karnatak Veerashaivas - the philosophy of which will be our immediate concern.

Robert Arch, the renowned modern philosopher, defines philosophy as "the attempt to think rigorously and consistently about the world which undeniably is there". Viewed in this light, philosophy is the rationalisation of sense-experience since that sense-experience has been the foundation on which systems of thought are built. Thought, in its real sense, is regarded as the result of suspended action, which the subject does not allow to proceed to its full realisation. The thought or intellect then, is a purely practical faculty which has been evolved for the purpose of action. What it does is to take the ceaseless living flow of which the Universe is composed and to make cuts across it, inserting artificial gaps or stops in what is really a continuous and indivisible movement. But this continual movement does not proceed without interruption. At a certain point the flow of life is interrupted, part of it falls back. This backward or inverse movement of the flow is matter. It is upon this backward movement of life that the intellect focuses our attention. But when we conceive of reality after the model which the intellect presents to us, we fall into error. The way to grasp the true nature of reality, to realise it in fact, is through Intuition which is conscious of itself, of its own real nature as perpetual change. Hence thought is an imperfect instrument and cannot envisage the whole of life. It conceives a static universe in which the free fluidity of life is arrested. Philosophy as thought construction then, lands us in the realm of contradictions of mind and matter, reason and instinct, spirit and sense in which we are hopelessly lost. It raises impassable barriers by its method of approach. A new orientation is therefore necessary. And this is possible when philosophy is no longer confined to systematisation of thought and its logic, but embraces life and its intuition.

Bergson tired of intellectual constructions approaches philosophy from the view point of life. Idealism and realism, spiritualism and materialism cease to have any serious interest for the prophet of life, because thought and life are diametrically opposed in Bergson. He sees the limitation of intellect and therefore, bases his philosophy upon intuition. Intuition and life are to him identical and life is an ever-creative flow, which reason or intellect cannot discern or grasp, for intellect conceives a static universe and the contradictions inherent in it. For Bergson Reality is 'a creative impulse of endless Duration'. "If," says he, "our existence were composed of separate states with an impassive ego to unite them, for us there would be no duration. For an ego which does not change does not endure, and a psychic state which remains the same so long as it is not replaced by the following state, does not endure either". Hence Bergson arrives at the truth that we ourselves are beings who endure *not through change, but by change*. It is through intuition that we may become conscious of our oneness with reality as a whole, may realise the creative urge within us of the stream of universal life of which reality consists. According to Bergson, intellect is unable to seize over this reality which is a creative impulse of endless duration. For it is only an instrument evolved by one kind of living beings—the vertebrates—to aid them in coping with their environments and has a certain utility in that restricted sphere. Other creatures can push on their career without it and there is no reason to suppose that it can throw any light on the profounder problems of life. It is only intuition which enables us to grasp the nature of that perpetual change, that duration which is the very heart of reality. This view of the intuitive approach to life, as opposed to the intellectual, constitutes the most original feature of Bergson's philosophy.

The Sharana is a prophet of life divine, not a philosopher of logic. He feels that philosophy, as thought construction must fall short of the true interpretation of life divine, since it reveals itself through different planes, some of which are beyond the access of thought. He does not see life through compartments and therefore does not suffer from the limitations of logical thinking, because by virtue of intuition he is able to comprehend Life in its entirety. He believes in the gradual unfoldment of the life-power that reveals a divine plan and a structure and thought in its highest sense is only an instrument to register that plan and structure. Philosophy in this sense is progressive, in as much as the finer manifestation of life brings out finer phases of thought which reveal the delicate net-work of the life divine. The best way of approach is to brush aside the method of building up a construction and to live the life and to accept the philosophy that life teaches. The Sharana finds that the contradictions of philosophy can be set aside and are easily reconciled when we approach philosophy through life. For according to the Sharana, philosophy is more a revelation of the supramental super-conscious force than a rationalisation of sense-experience of Berkley and a realisation of subconscious energy of Bergson. His philosophy is, therefore, not a finished product of thinking but an expression of living in tune with the finest urge of life Divine. But here is felt a wide divergence between the Sharana and Bergson. The Sharana views life from above while Bergson sees it from below. To the former, it is super-conscious attended with intuitive joy; to the latter, it is subconscious accompanied by instinctive energy. To the one, the life is a constant urge of the dynamic divine; to the other, it is a stress and a stir, a ceaseless flow - the *Elan vital*.

Bergson describes the nature of this *Elan vital* as the force of consciousness. He calls it the vital fluid which is the creative

continuity of the cosmos. He establishes the continuity of the cosmic process by making the past integrated with the future by memory. Memory is continuous with life; it is not only the power of retention but also the force of progress. It accumulates the past in itself and rolls on towards the future. Because memory is continuous with life man looks before and after, backward to the conservative past and forward to the creative future. Bergson has truly said that unconscious or instinctive memory represents the power of creation as well as the power of conservation; for the action of the unconscious is far more unerring than the ambitious but purblind action of the conscious mentality. The tree is more perfectly guided than man in its restricted sphere, in as much as it lives unambitiously according to nature and is passive in the hands of the inconscient. Mind enters in to enlarge the field of activity, but also to multiply errors, perversities, revolts against nature, departures from the instinctive guiding of the inconscient Self which generate the vast element of ignorance, falsehood and suffering in human life. The hope of unerring activity according to Bergson lies then, in putting in tune with the unconscious memory which is more clearly indicative of the true nature of life than conscious memory.

It is to the credit of Bergson that he has discovered the life principle, the subtle force of existence which is superior to the principle of birth and death. He makes the instinctive memory—which is the very essence of life—the thread upon which the continuity of our successive lives is arranged, precisely because it is itself undying. If the thing-in-itself offers an aspect of *elan vital* to Bergson it presents a face of *will-to-live* to Schopenhauer. For him will is the essence of the world; Life is only the mirror of the will. Life accompanies the will as shadow the body. So long as we are actuated by the *will-to-live*, we need have no fear of ceasing to live, even in the presence of death. For him

the form of life in reality is really only the *present*, not past nor the future. He is therefore concerned neither to investigate the past antecedent to life nor to speculate on the future subsequent to death. He simply seeks to know the present that being the sole form in which the will manifests itself. If one is satisfied with life as it is, one may confidently regard it as endless and banish the fear of death as illusive. This *will-to-live* is to him the sole reality which he describes as follows: "If we observe the strong and unceasing impulse with which the waters hurry to the ocean, the persistency with which the magnet turns ever to the north pole, the readiness with which iron flies to the magnet, the eagerness with which the electric poles seek to be reunited and which like human desire, is increased by obstacles; if we see the crystal quickly take form with such wonderful regularity of construction if we observe the choice with which bodies repel and attract each other if we observe all this, I say, it will require no great effort of the imagination to recognise, even at so great a distance, our own nature. That, which in us pursues its end, by the light of knowledge but here in the weakest of its manifestations, only strives blindly and dumbly in a onesided and unchangeable manner, must yet in both cases come under the name of will."

This *will-to-live* or Ding-an-sich is for Schopenhauer the cosmic will that presents itself to us objectively under the form of the great natural forces : gravitation, heat, light, electricity, chemical affinity etc. It manifests itself as the organising power of life in vegetables and animals and finally as human self-consciousness and sociability. These, says he, are what is really meant by the Platonic ideas and they figure in his philosophy as first differentiations of the primordial will, coming between its absolute unity and the individualised objects and events that pervade all space and time. Will, in Schopenhauer is the primal reality which objectifies

itself in the form of ideas; the Platonic ideas are therefore the objectifications of will. What Plato calls ideas are, in the real sense, the fine spiritual values and creative types. He fails to see that these values are, at bottom, the expressions of will. Schopenhauer is therefore right in emphasising the truth that the Platonic ideas are the objectifications of cosmic will. But in Schopenhauer's philosophy there is no super-conscious and transcendental back-ground of will, in Veerashaiva philosophy there is. The world is the objectification of will in both, but while Schopenhauer in this objectification sees the spontaneous play of an inconscient will, the Sharana reads into it the play of super-conscious and transcendent will. Because of Schopenhauer's lack of vision to divine the luminosity of this transcendent will, irrationalism and pessimism have crept into his system.

Will is a supreme fact in Veerashaiva philosophy, but it is the Transcendent Will termed Chit-Shakti (चित्शक्ति) the delight of which lies in moving in the ether of supreme Awareness. Even the cosmic will and instinctive memory always seek guidance from the transcendent will, for in it is truly revealed the free character of Chit-Shakti as the primal existence. The cosmic will has cosmic purpose, but the transcendent is really a spontaneous movement in delight. This reveals the nature of the ultimate Reality which is pure existence pure in self-awareness, pure in self-delight; and the transcendent will of this ultimate reality is movement in self luminous delight. Hence it rises above all transfigurations, and an acquaintance with it is necessary to realise the movement of will beyond the cosmic transfigurations, beyond mundane and super-mundane history. When the channel of communion is established between the individual and the transcendent will, the movement in man becomes truly free from any necessity and purpose. Then alone can he understand that

behind the cosmic will lies the transcendent which is especially a movement in pure delight. But this delight is not to be achieved by gradual process; it is one with life; the more the delicacy of life is realised, the greater the delight is felt. This conception of life as delight has introduced both rationalism and optimism in the system of the Sharana.

The Sharana holds then, that there is only one divine conscious Force that dominates all existence. The other forces in the universe are its play in its restricted expression either inner or outer. This Divine Shakti in its process of expression bifurcates, as it were, into an instinctive memory of Bergson and an effective will of Schopenhauer. But the divine will is transcendental for it transcends them both. Though the Sharana emphasises the luminosity of this transcendent will still he does not make it personal for it transcends all relative knowledge and experience. It is this divine will which takes forms in its descent or condenses itself into dynamic centres, but in itself it has no form but only expression. Of this divine will Sri Arambindo gives a graphic account and a vivid description as follows:— "This supreme Prakriti is not merely a presence of the power of spiritual being immanent in cosmic activities. For them it might be only the inactive presence of the all-pervading self, immanent in all things or containing them, compelling in a way the world action but not itself active. Nor is this highest Prakriti the avyakta of the Sankhyas, the primary unmanifest seed state of the manifest active eight-fold nature of things, the one productive original force of Prakriti out of which her many instrumental and executive powers evolve. Nor is it sufficient to interpret that idea of avyakta in the Vedantic sense and say that this supreme Nature is the power involved and inherent in unmanifest spirit or self out of which cosmos comes and into which it returns. It is that but

it is much more; for that is only one of its spiritual states. It is the integral conscious-power of the Supreme Being, Chit-Shakti, which is behind the self and cosmos."

We have already seen that, for Bergson, Reality is a creative impulse of endless duration. For him as for Schopenhauer, the thing-in-itself whether in man or in external nature, is irrational impulse, the *elan-vital* which is an ever-changing, ever-developing Force behind the movement of evolution expressing itself in all the manifold forms of life. This Force, says Bergson, is not material, but is the very stuff of which our consciousness is made; it is in fact the force of consciousness whether it be sub-conscious, subliminal or super-conscious. Thanks to the genius of Bergson for he echoes in this the sense of the transcendent will of the Sharana. Bergson has the philosophic genius to see that *elan vital* is more dynamic than personal and hence the idea of personality could not appeal to him. But he has not the insight to see the impersonal and transcendent aspect of conscious Existence. Hence his philosophy has removed the ordinary localisation of change to a centre. This absence of anything central has been the weak point of Bergson's philosophy. It sounds very well that it is a life of freedom ever-active, ever-creative, ever-progressive; but this ever-growing life is felt to be in a centre in order to manifest meaning in movement. The loss of this central touch makes knowledge and life meaningless. The Sharana makes the transcendent will dynamic but with reference to a centre. Now this reference of will to a centre at once changes its character.

The Sharana allows Will or Shakti a very significant position no doubt; he makes it the supreme principle of expression. But Shakti in Veerashaiva philosophy has a locus in Shiva, the Absolute Truth, and the Sharana finds almost an identity between Shiva and Shakti, between

Truth and Will. The Divine appears to him to have a dynamic aspect but to address the Absolute only as dynamic is not to state the whole truth. Behind the dynamic aspect of the Absolute is the static which is the 'datum of consciousness' the 'centre of movement'. "Though the Absolute" says Herbert Spencer, "cannot in any manner or degree be known, in the strict sense of knowing, yet we find that its positive existence is a necessary datum of consciousness; that so long as consciousness continues we cannot for an instant rid it of this datum; and that thus the belief which this datum constitutes, has a higher warrant than any other whatever. This conclusion which objective science illustrates, and subjective science shows to be unavoidable is also the conclusion which reconciles Religion with Science." Spencer admits the existence of the Absolute in unequivocal terms and he also admits equally the incapacity of the formal mind or intellect to grasp the absolute Truth. Bradley essays to show that every category of the formal mind or intellect, every merely empirical fact of our experience is self-contradictory, and can only find a *truly rational* solution in a unitary Absolute which, in itself, must necessarily be completely harmonious and free from all self-contradiction. "Ultimate Reality" says he, "is such that it does not contradict itself.....and it is proved absolute by the fact that, either in endeavouring to deny it, or even in attempting to doubt it, we tacitly assume its validity." The formal mind or intellect is unable to explain the Absolute much less to experience it; this inability of the formal mind to experience the Absolute has compelled William James to forsake it in favour of Bergson's *Intuitionism*.

"For my own part, I have finally found myself compelled to give up the logic, fairly, squarely, and irrevocably. It has an imperishable

use in human life, but that use is not to make us theoretically acquainted with the essential nature of reality. Reality, life, experience, consciousness, immediacy, use what word you will, exceeds our logic, overflows and surrounds it. If you like to employ words eulogistically.....you may say that reality obeys a higher logic, or enjoys a higher rationality. But I think that even eulogistic words should be used rather to distinguish than to commingle meanings, so I prefer bluntly to call reality if not irrational then at least non-rational in its constitution and by reality here I mean reality where things happen, all temporal reality without exception.

.....I have now to confess that I should not now be emancipated not now subordinate logic with so very light a heart, or throw it out of the deeper regions of philosophy to take its rightful and respectable place in the world of simple human practice, if I had not been influenced by a comparatively young and very original French writer, professor Henri Bergson. If I had not read Bergson, I should probably still be blackening endless pages of paper privately, in the hope of making ends meet that were never meant to meet, and trying to discover some mode of conceiving the behaviour of reality which should leave no discrepancy between it and the accepted laws of the logic of identity."

Bergson gives an able and brilliant contribution to the knowledge of practical function and limitations of intellect in its association with matter, and advocates a new method in philosophy, that of commencing with 'the intuition of immediacy.' "These fleeting intuitions" he says, "which light up their object only at distant intervals, philosophy ought to seize, first to sustain them, then to expand them and so unite them together.....Thus is revealed the unity of the spiritual life. We recognise it only when we place ourselves in intuition in order to go from intuition to the intellect, far from the intellect we shall never pass to intuition.....Let us then concentrate attention on that which

we have, that is at the same time the most removed from externality and the least penetrated with intellectuality. Let us seek, in the depths of our experience, the point where we feel ourselves most intimately within our own life. It is into pure duration that we then plunge back, a duration in which the past, always moving on, is swelling unceasingly with a present that is absolutely new."

We may see by this that Bergson has realised, by virtue of an intuition, that the great World-process, the great push of evolutionary Life, the great *elan vital* becomes more and more real, the more we grasp duration in its wholeness and completeness as what we live; not what we think. "We do not think real time" says he, "but we live it because life transcends intellect." In the treatment of time Bergson however, parts company with nearly all previous philosophers. For the Idealist School in general, time is only a form under which mind, essentially timeless, enjoys self-consciousness. For Bergson, on the contrary, the impulse behind all things is time, in fact the only time worthy of the name. He finds 'Reality itself' in Time hypostasised as duration; and duration he tells us, "is the continuous progress of the past which gnaws into the future and which swells as it advances." This description of duration compels us to regard it not as being made in successive layers of past, present and future, nor as a here and a there, but as something out of which these are produced when it is sectioned, as it were artificially cut across by the intellect; something, in fact, which is a *continuum*, a kind of *substance* of events, or an "ether of events" as professor Whitehead calls it "The continuity of nature," says he, "is to be found in events, the atomic properties of nature reside in objects. The continuous ether is the whole complex of events; and the atoms and molecules are scientific objects, which are entities of essentially different type to the events forming the ether."

This is the main thesis of Bergson's philosophy, and he is prone to believe in an Absolute postulated as being eternally in the making, or a Reality in the flux of things. Thus he says, "The flux of time is the reality itself, and the things which we study are the things which flow.....by following the new conception to the end, we should come to see in time a progressive growth of the absolute, and in the evolution of things a continual invention of forms ever new." In other words, it is duration as the continuous progress of the past which gnaws into the future and which swells as it advances. But a question arises here: what is there in the future to "gnaw into" if it has no content? Moreover, how can the universe grow or swell by the addition of new worlds unless the substance is already there or 'given' out of which these new worlds are formed? Bergson admonishes us to accept this physically, but whether physically or metaphysically, some substance must necessarily be 'given' in the first instance. On close scrutiny an Absolute in the making involves just as many metaphysical difficulties and contradictions as a static Absolute. Bergson seems to be dimly conscious of this. For in his *Time and Free Will* he says, "We can thus conceive of succession without distinction, and think of it as a mutual penetration, an inter-connection and organisation of elements, each one of which represents the whole, and cannot be distinguished or isolated from it except by abstract thought. Such is the account of duration which would be given by a being who was ever the same and ever changing, and who had no idea of space." Yes, the Absolute is ever the same as Being, and ever changing as Becoming.

The absolute, then, presents to us a dual aspect—dynamic or an aspect of the perpetual Becoming, static or an aspect of the permanent Being. Being always implies meaning, for in movement lies the meaning of all things. To be meaningless is to be beingless. There are many

different levels of knowledge and reality (which have their places and mutual relations in the entire system of Knowledge. This knowledge is everywhere present in the universe as an ordering intelligence by which the One manifests the harmonies of its infinite potential multiplicity. Without this ordering intelligence the manifestation would be merely a shifting chaos, precisely because the potentiality is infinite. If there were only infinite potentiality without any law of guiding truth and harmony, the world would be nothing but an inexplicable illusion or Maya of Shankara. But the knowledge or the intelligence that guides, possesses in its own being the vision of the truth and the law of harmony that governs each potentiality. Each thing in Nature whether animate or inanimate, self-conscious or unconscious is regulated in its being and in its operations by an indwelling Vision and Will. To us this universal intelligence seems sub-conscious or inconscient because we are not conscious of it; but it is neither sub-conscious nor inconscient to itself, rather profoundly and universally conscient. Therefore each thing seems to do the work of intelligence, because it obeys, whether unconsciously as in the plant or half-consciously as in man, the real idea of the universal Mind that has a cosmic vision which is all-comprehending, all-pervading and all-inhabiting.

The philosophy of Nature as advanced in the teleological argument tends to destroy the conception of nature as mechanism and brings in the organic view which finds a plan and a purpose in the world-process. The attempt to treat nature as "closed to mind" has led in the case of Bertrand Russell to a return to the scepticism of Hume, and in the case of Whitehead to a renewed attack on the problem of knowledge. From a view which declares the world essentially organic, it is but a next step to one which declares the world essentially

mental, and which sees in cosmic and terrestrial history the struggle of mind to rise from rudimentary levels to larger and wider reaches of Over-mind. This brings us to the cosmological argument which really presupposes the ontological as Kant preceived. The essence of the cosmological argument is this: nature, world or universe is not a self-explanatory system; in order to interpret it we are compelled to postulate the existence of a Mind which is not identical with nature." The foundations of materialism as well as mechanism of nature have now been destroyed by the results of the research into the atom and the equally revolutionary views of space and time to which physics has been led. But the position into which we are led by the more recent study of nature is obliging us to face the question whether we are not forced to postulate Mind as the ultimate reality and conceive nature as a complex thought. To such a conclusion at least Sir James Jeans and professor Eddington seem to tend. "Mind," says Eddington, "is the first and most direct thing in our experience; all else is remote inference." We have, he adds, an acquaintance with the "mental and spiritual nature of ourselves, known in our minds by an intimate contact transcending the methods of physics." Hence the cosmological argument in the more technical language of philosophy, is an attempt to show a necessary "transcendent reference," which proves the existence of Mind beyond the living beings of experience and beyond the process of history.

Hegel arrives at the conception of Absolute, the supreme synthesis, by resorting to the method of a necessary transcendent reference which is reflected in his Dialectic that gives us the key to his whole system. To him 'the real is rational, and the rational is the real'; and the development of reality proceeds like a dialectic. Some thought occurs: *thesis*.

It is opposed by another thought: *antithesis* which also proves to be inadequate. But a third harmonises what is true in the first two: *synthesis*. If we clarify our conceptions of truth and falsehood- that is, subject them to the purifying fire of dialectic we shall see that they change their content with our point of view, that their content is not fixed, but fluid. Thus says Hegel, "The bud vanishes with the appearance of the blossom, and one may say that the one is contradicted by the other; the fruit again proclaims the blossom a spurious form of the plants' existence, the truth of the one passes over to the other. These forms are not merely distinct, but crush each other out as being mutually incompatible. But their fluid nature constitutes them none the less momenta of that organic unity wherein they not alone cease to conflict, but in which one is as necessary as other, which equal necessity makes the life of the whole."

Hegel's dialectic discloses itself on analysis as nothing but the prolongation or in a sense the perfection, as regards its Form, of Fichte's dialectic. Fichte had shown that the *in-itselfness* of the one plane of consciousness, was the *for-itselfness* of the next plane. Hegel however, brings out into lucid light a point on which Fichte was somewhat doubtful but which Plato and Aristotle had recognised, to wit, that the negation of the opposite is not absolute, but is rather double-sided- that is, that the opposite or preceeding moment is no less preserved than abolished in the succeeding moment. Hegel's aim is to show that the mind is logically compelled to force its way on and on until it arrives at the stand-point of absolute knowledge. The Absolute, although it contains within it the synthesis of all contradictions considered as Absolute, of course transcends its own immanent contradictions. Absolute knowledge is the resting point in which all contradictions are at once preserved and abolished, in the language of Hegel.

Hegel takes a definite stand on the formal and actual side of knowledge or consciousness as ultimate and defines the real as rational. The Real is nothing but a synthesis of thought-relations, each of which, taken by itself, and apart from the whole into which it enters, is abstract, and therefore unreal. The ultimate principle of all knowledge is the pure form of unity of consciousness, the "Synthetic Unity of Apperception" of Kant, the "Pure Ego" of Fichte, the "Final Subjective Form" of Whitehead. This is the "concept": *Begriff* of Hegel. But the synthesis so stated is, by itself formal; it is a unity of thought of consciousness as such, and of nothing else except thought or consciousness. But thought or consciousness is its nature relative; for it implies a striking-out of relations, a fixing of contrasts, a limitation of a conscious state, which is in its turn nothing but the limitation of another conscious state, and so on to *ad infinitum*. But the infinity is not that of an infinite straight line run at a tangent to a circle, but rather that of the circle.

In the preface to the *Phenomenology of Mind*, Hegel observes, "The truth is the whole. But the whole is the essence which completes itself in its development. It may be said of the Absolute that it is essentially *result*, that not before the *end* is it that which it is in truth; and here-in consists its nature, that of being Reality, Subject or Self-becoming. However absurd it may appear to regard the Absolute as in essence, result, a very little consideration will correct this appearance of absurdity. The beginning, the principle or the Absolute, as it is primarily and immediately spoken of, is only the universal." This train of Hegel's reflection testifies to the truth that the universe is penetrable to thought: an unknowable thing-in-itself does not exist; indeed, the intelligible reality of things is just what we

know best. But Hegel places conscious reason not at the beginning of things but at the end of evolution. The rationality of things is immanent, not transcendent. The absolute or the real which is rational is to him, not transcendent but immanent.

The Hegelian doctrine of the *Begriff* or *Idee* gives the key to his whole attitude. *The concept* or *Thought*, the completed act, *thinks itself*. It is not the 'I' which determines itself as *thought* but the *thought* which determines itself as 'I'. But this 'I' which knows and which recognises itself as 'knowing' can never itself become wholly object to itself; rather it is involved as necessary implication in the nature of all objects of consciousness. This 'I' therefore cannot be regarded as *act*, but must be the Power or Potentiality of knowledge or thought. In other words, if the 'I' which knows is not exhausted in the act of knowing, it must be conceived as the infinite ground of that *act*. If infinite, it cannot be itself actual; since an act is, by its definition, something determined or finite. The so called "act of self-consciousness," discovers itself when closely viewed as the mere vanishing point of Time, and hence that for which Time is, can never be actual; that is Thought as commonly understood; but if not actual it must be potential, that is power or possibility of thought. As professor Green contends, the ground of actual experience can never be conceived as itself Actual but always remains the pure Potential. This power or possibility of thought is pure Existence, the source and support of all things, the datum of consciousness, the centre of thought-movement and the final resting place of all our experience.

To Hegel *Experience* is only object of consciousness. If he sees in *experience* only an object of consciousness, Bradley finds in it the very essence of Existence. 'Immediate experience,' says he, "is

at once an immediate feeling a knowing and being in one." For Bradley with 'immediate experience' as his starting-point ventures on a distinct and bold adventure and makes a new departure in the realm of philosophy. "Reality" says he, "is one experience, and experience exhausts all reality; and that ultimate reality must be self-consistent and harmonious." He finds the clue to the Absolute in *Experience*, and he observes that 'knowledge' and even 'self' are inadequate to express the fulness, the all-inclusiveness of the absolute. In every act of knowledge it is the Absolute that manifests itself; but as an act, as a process, knowledge is partial and does not represent its full nature. The Absolute's experience must comprehend all things in space and all events in time in one undivided and timeless vision.

Time and space according to the metaphysician have only a conceptual and not a real existence; but since all things and not these only, are forms assumed by the Absolute in its own consciousness, the distinction is of no great importance. Time and space are that one Absolute viewing itself in extension, subjectively as time, objectively as space. In actual fact mind measures time by event and space by matter; but it is possible in 'immediate experience' at a higher remove to disregard the movement of event and the disposition of substance and realise the pure movement of Self-existent Force which constitutes space and time. And to a higher consciousness than mind which should regard past, present and future in one view, time might well offer itself as an eternal present. And to the same consciousness not situated at any particular point of space but containing all points and regions in itself space also might well offer itself as a subjective and indivisible extension. Time and space in the sense in which the ordinary mind understands them, have therefore,

nothing to do with the infinite and eternal character of the Absolute. Bradley is right in calling the Absolute *Supra-personal* since it transcends the process of evolution, for the Absolute "has no history of its own though it contains histories without number."

Among the moderns, Bergson and Bradley, inspite of the imperfections in their systems, stand out as two bright luminaries in the philosophic firmament. Bergson with an 'immediacy of intuition' and Bradley with an 'immediacy of experience' proceed on parallel lines to demonstrate the dynamism of will and the conservatism of Truth. But the Sharana comes in to effect a synthesis between Bergson and Bradley; between will and truth; between dynamism and conservatism by saying that the Absolute or God is the impersonal personality; that it is at once transcendent and immanent, static and dynamic. The static aspect of the Absolute is called Sthala (स्थल), Shiva (शिव) or Linga (लिङ्ग); and the dynamic aspect of it is called Kala (कला), Shakti (शक्ति) or Jangama (जंगम) in Veerashaiva Philosophy. This Shakti is the dynamic divine Will which is the personality of the Absolute-Truth or Shiva-Linga; for the *Shwetashwetaropanishad* describes this will as the very soul of God hidden in the modes of its own workings. This divine Will exists, therefore, in God by the relation of identity that is Samarasya (सामरस्य) which has been expressed very vividly by the Sharanas in their sayings: and one of the sayings of Basava in this connection runs thus — "As submarine fire is hid in the waters of the seas, as a ray of ambrosia is hid in the moon, as fragrance is hid in the flower, as affection is hid in the maiden, so is Truth hid in the heart of Will. O Lord of the Spiritual Unification". The Sharana therefore emphasises the integral unity of Shiva and Shakti and does not commit himself to the extremes of Shakti completely withdrawn into Shiva or Shiva completely losing

itself into Shakti. This integral association of Shiva-Shakti is to the Sharana a greater and a higher truth and hence if he is alive to the dignity of silence, he is equally alive to the dignity of stress. This attitude makes his position somewhat different from that of the Agamas which lay more emphasis upon the impersonal aspect of Shiva-existence and characterise the ultimate truth as beyond the conception of Shiva-Shakti. The Sharana does not seem to subscribe himself to this view for he says that it does not exhibit or present the truth of integral existence.

In theology the personality of God offers the same difficulties which we met with in philosophy. The Absolute in its own nature has neither attributes nor personality, for attributes imply their opposites and personality implies otherness or relativity. It is on this account that the distinction has been made by many Christian mystics between 'God' and the 'Godhead'; the former being considered personal that is in the sense of Trinity, whilst the latter is the inexpressible Absolute which cannot be an *object* of either knowledge or worship. Hence the Godhead is the 'Divine Dark', the 'Abyss' the 'Formless' of some of the Christian mystics of whom Eckhart gives an account of it as follows: "All that is in the Godhead is one. Therefore can we say nothing. It is above all names, above all nature. The essence of all creatures is eternally a divine life in Diety. God works. So doeth not the Godhead. Therein are they distinguished— in working and not working. The end of all things is the hidden darkness of the eternal Godhead unknown and never to be known." The conception of God and Godhead of the Christian mystics exactly synchronises or fits in with that of Shakti and Shiva in Veerashaiva philosophy 'God works, so doeth not the Godhead; what does this imply? It implies that it is

Shakti which works, not Shiva; for Shiva, in the words of Eckhart, is the hidden darkness of the eternal Godhead which is the end of all things. But in the words of the Sharana, Shiva is the infinite luminous Silence out of which would emerge the infinite luminous Strength—Shakti, and between Silence and Strength he finds, as we have said, almost an identity which makes it possible for him to unite all the phases of being and all kinds of knowledge.

The Sharana characterises this integral association of Shiva-Shakti in terms that attract by their sublime simplicity and rich suggestiveness. The former is the supra-cosmic transcendence, the latter is the cosmic infinity. The one is the infinite Silence, the other immanent sublimity. Between these two the Sharana has attempted a harmony by saying that cosmic infinity is the appearance of the supra-cosmic reality which it really transcends. The cosmic infinity has no absolute existence, it is in fact the concentration of the transcendence; being a concentration it is more seeming than real. It is only relatively real. This Shakti is therefore conceived as creative, conservative and destructive from the cosmological view point; as redemptive from the theological view point and as supra-subject from the epistemological view point. But Shiva transcends this immanental sublimity or Shakti. It is the infinite luminous silence, the silence that resides in the heart of all things. It illumines all, but in itself as an object always eludes our grasp. This Silence is the plenum of being and consciousness; it is also the delight of freedom. This infinite Truth has the sense of fulness, ever completeness and freedom. But "it is fulness without content, completeness without fruition or growth, and freedom without resistance or tension." And the Will moves in the sphere of this luminous Silence, in the atmosphere of supreme awareness.

It is therefore an out-flow from the Supreme, a divine movement of the Eternal and an immanence inherent in the Infinity.

It is this integral association of Shiva-Shakti or Shaktivishishtadwaita (शक्तिविशिष्टाद्वैत) that is the Veerashaiva "Weltanschauung" — the world view of a Veerashaiva. For he views the whole world as an expression of the divine Will under the stress and guidance of the divine Truth. In the idea of the Sharana, the world is therefore an objective fact, a real modification but one which makes no difference to the essence of Truth. For the totality of objects or Srishti is the becoming of Shiva in the extension of its own being Shakti. And this Shakti has two modes of its force of consciousness 'intensive in self-absorption, extensive in self-diffusion.' It is the diffusion of the self-existent Shiva in term and stuff of its own being that we call the becoming or Extension in classical philosophy; and it is the intensive mode of the same Truth in idea and intelligence of its own existence that we call the being or Thought in classical philosophy. Bruno identifies God with Extension which is the supreme unifying principle of a universe extending through infinite space. Descartes, on the other hand, identifies God with Thought; he conceives God as a thinking being rather than as an extended substance. For Spinoza, the Hebrew philosopher, thought and extension are obverse and reverse of the one infinite Power inherent in God the only true reality of which they are merely appearances. "God" says Spinoza, "is a Substance consisting of infinite attributes, each of which expresses his absolute and eternal essence." But of these attributes two alone, he tells us, thought and extension are known to us at present, so that our ignorance infinitely exceeds our knowledge of reality. What a profound mystic truth it is! It would be gross anthropomorphism to impose the

limitations of our knowledge on the infinite being of God, manifested through those very attributes as unlimited Power. The infinite of co-existence, which is Extension, the infinite of causal procession, which is Thought, suggest an infinity of unimaginable but not inconceivable Power of which the one divine Substance consists. Does not this identity of God and Power of Spinoza echo, in its nature, the integral association of Truth and Will or Shiva-Shakti of the Sharana ?

The whole world and life is, as we have seen, an expression of the Divine Will under the stress and guidance of the Divine Truth. But the problem of Life is not the same as the problem of Mind. Life itself is immeasurably more than thought or psychic activity. The mind is only an instrument of Life; and thought only one of its functions; whatever is known only by the formal mind is limited by the 'categories' in just the same way that what is seen by the eye is limited by its structure. Life is a continuous flow whereas the formal mind is a constant fund. Thus all forms of life manifest in their own appropriate degree and kind that Will which is eternally inherent in the one substance Principle. Life and consciousness manifest in physical matter just as motion does; but to suppose that they can *originate* in a complex of atoms and molecules is as irrational as to suppose that motion can originate with the formation of those atoms. Motion may be said to be individualised in the atom, but the motion which is thus confined is still part of a larger whole, part of the electro-magnetic motion of the Ether. The internal motion of the atom neither originates in the formation of the atom, nor is it disconnected from its source. Similarly the life and consciousness of any combination of atoms stands on precisely the same basis having its source and origin in the Will of the One. It is this Will of God that conducts the universe; and it expresses finer

forms in the gradual unfoldment of life which accounts for the different kinds of energies set in a hierarchy—physical, vital, mental and even supra-mental.

The trans-valuation of the physical, vital and mental under the influence of the Divine static and their movement and functioning in the Divine dynamic are the great promise of Veerashaiva philosophy. The spiritualisation of matter is a great advance in the Lingayat Faith. Plato seeks supreme satisfaction in the world of 'ideas'; to him the impress of matter upon spirit is tormenting. The Bible maintains an apparent duality or polarity of our nature and keeps spirit and matter eternally apart treating matter as illusion and spirit alone as reality. The Vedanta and the Sankhya equally condemn the movement of matter and seek rest in quiescence of spirit. In spite of an attempt to divinise life's movement, the Vedanta, by allowing a distinction between relative and absolute, discourages the hope of harmonising dynamic spirituality with transcendent quietism. Even the Agamas extol Shiva-hood as the final consummation of life; the sensible is set against the super-sensible and a division between spirit and matter is conceived to exist. But in the synthetic philosophy of Veerashaivism the integral association of Shiva-Shakti cannot allow any division to subsist between spirit and matter; for they are as it were the highest and lowest terms of the great mysterious Life which is "brooding in action, active in thought, energetic in stillness, creative in repose; full of a mastering intention in what appears blind and unconscious." Hence in the Lingayat Faith divinisation of life is considered as the desirable end or consummation.

The obliteration of the division between spirit and matter, body and mind, the sensible and the super-sensible not through any arbitrary means but through the infusion of infinite Power, introduces a new meaning into spiritual life and values. Matter, in fact, is an illusion

of intellect; for "intellectuality and materiality have been constituted in detail, by reciprocal adaptation. Both are derived from a wider and higher form of existence." From the standpoint of life there is no matter but only the play of spirit through different grades of expressions. Matter is therefore not static but plastic, and with the constant touch of the transcendent force or Chit-Shakti it dissolves its stiffness and exhibits its pliability so that it can be a safe vehicle for spiritual expression. Humanity has long suffered under the illusion of a distinction between body and mind. Descartes had represented mind and matter as two antithetical substances with not a note in common. Nevertheless he maintained that communications between them, took place through a part of the brain called the pineal gland. But the Sharana cuts through this narrow isthmus and denies the possibility of any mechanical manoeuvre by supplying the missing link of the mysterious Force. To him the transcendent Will is the only reality, which can break through the limitations of the physical body provided it is open to the supreme touch and can so transform it as to be a fit recipient of the inflowing divine energy. "The limitations of the body are a mould; soul and mind have to pour themselves into them, break them and constantly remould them in wider limits till the formula of agreement is found between this finite and their own infinity." Because we are accustomed to think in terms of intellect, we are committed to this kind of dualism. Bergson opines that intellect represents in a statical form what is really living and dynamic; and if, instead of having our guidance from intellect, we take our inspiration from life, the cast of existence would appear fundamentally different. Bergson is the protagonist of intuitionism and he would exhort us to look at life from the view point of intuition. Viewed in this light what happens? Matter ceases to exist. What is matter? It is nothing but the inertia of life.

If, however, we succeed in setting aside this inertia materiality would fade away and life would feast on dynamism.

This possibility of spiritualising matter makes the connection between heaven and earth direct. The Kingdom of God is not to be sought beyond but here. To quote Du Prel: "We are not temporarily and spatially divided from that beyond, we are not first transposed there by death, but are already rooted therein, and what divides us therefrom is merely the subjective barrier of the threshold of sensibility. This threshold thus limits, consciousness and therewith self-consciousness since both are products of evolution, their capacity for further evolution suggests itself at once." The true spiritual effort lies then, not only in evolving ourselves into the deeper, richer and vaster provinces of the supreme consciousness but in striving to make the sensible the channel of expression of spirit. The whole movement of life is to be directly related to the transcendent Energy; for by being thus related the movement grows in fulness and perfection. Then the minutest events have a setting in the mysterious life; and in the Lingayat Faith the meaningless-ness of life and its illusion are replaced by its richness and actuality. Nothing in life is meaningless, nothing in it is purposeless since every movement in life is the expression of bliss and beatitude; and their so-called uneventfulness or discord originates from isolation from the whole setting and our inability to read the divine purpose in life. Thus Bradley tells us: "We can find no province of the world so low but the Absolute inhabits it. Nowhere is there even a single fact so fragmentary and so poor that to the universe it does not matter. There is truth in every idea, however false, there is reality in every existence, however slight; and where we can point to reality or truth, there is the one undivided life of the Absolute."

To the Sharana Reality is not only divine mystery but also divine history. The reality urged by an inner divine compulsion, evolves the whole world out of itself, and in the course of evolution it reveals the divine purpose through different phases of life. This is an approach to the position taken up by Croce and Gentile, the Italian philosophers, who insist on the ultimate reality of time and on the extreme importance, therefore, of history as the progressive attainment of self-consciousness by the world spirit. The world-movement is therefore, in Veerashaiva philosophy, not an illusion but an integral play. Bergson also places 'real movement' in a region which has no relation to extension — that is to say in 'a qualitative multiplicity, with no likeness to number.' The Sharana sees the world as a spontaneous movement in the transcendent Will and the world-process or play is an expression of dynamic fulness in integrity. Shankar denies any reality to this movement and in his philosophy the integral play is only a temporary concession to the theological attitude. Vaishnavism has the insight to conceive of movement as born of delight but it makes a distinction between the cosmic and the supra-cosmic movement i.e., between the Antaranga lila and the Bahiranga lila. But the Sharana views the life's movement as ever creative and ever complete; and the joy of completeness is the joy of harmony, for in the infinite life which is ever complete and ever accomplished the sense of harmony is never lost; even if there are changes—and there are incessant changes in infinite life—they take place according to the law of harmony.

Spiritual dynamic fulness is the greatest conception in Veerashaivism. In Indian thought dynamism of life has not received due recognition; because spirit and matter have been kept in an unhappy wedlock with an insistence on the liberation of spirit from the tyranny of matter. The source of life and energy is not material, but spiritual;

but the basis, the foundation on which the life and energy stand and work is material. The material conditions of life are therefore essential, although other conditions are equally essential to higher forms of development. We live, in Wordsworth's famous phrase, by admiration, hope and love. That is true ; but it is also true that we live by bread, and can neither hope, nor love, nor admire unless we satisfy our thirsting and hungering instincts. The higher instincts are realities : realities as much as the bodily appetites and the pains and pleasures of which nobody can really doubt the existence. The Sharana is fully alive to this material mode of life and he believes matter in accordance with Bergson, to be the inertia of life given as the first condition of our fulfilment on the physical plane. Spirit and matter, in his idea, are as it were the summit and base of life. To raise up the material to the spiritual is his *Ideal*; for by meeting of the two, the Energy which starts from one and generates the other is enhanced and fulfils itself. In other words, his ideal is to spiritualise matter through the descent of the divine dynamic Will or Chit-Shakti. Hence the liberation of spirit from the tyranny of matter which is considered to be the high ideal in Indian thought does neither loom large in his mind nor attract his attention. Not liberation but transfiguration of every movement of life, not sublimation of primordial instincts and crude impulses but spiritualisation of all the forces in man is the greater ideal to him. In this greater ideal which the Sharana calls it the Sarvangalingasthala (सर्वगलिगस्थल), all the beauties and harmonies of the mysterious infinite Life are thrown open to man and every movement of being shall be felt as divine. Life is to be completely divinised and humanity be installed in a divine society. This is the promise of Veerashaiva philosophy.



For favour of perusal and opinion.

VRKSHal
15.3.1943

QUINTESSENCE OF LINGAYAT RELIGION

By Shri Kumarswamiji, B. A., Navakalyanamath, Dharwar.

A religion, in an esoteric sense is a *quality of life*; the soul of Lingayat religion so far as its esoteric side is concerned is to be sought in Lingāṅga-Sāmarasya, the integral association of God and Soul, the technique of which is Shatsthala (षट्स्थल). The history or evolution of humanity, as we are able to read it to-day, discloses as its primary phase a gradual development of physical organism. The rise of organic forms out of what we term the inorganic world, and a slowly increasing complexity of structure through plant and animal to man characterises a biological process. And modern science, in so far as it is physical in its scope and biological in its function, may be regarded simply as a somewhat higher degree of this primary recognition of a material environment and necessity. In the second phase we have the emergence of that faculty which we call Mind: passing from its earliest manifestation as a mere instinctive knowledge adapted to the more immediate needs of the physical organism, into that higher quality which we apprehend as a rational mind or intellect. As man rises from physical necessity to an intellectual need and desire which later on finds expression in that deeper inquiry into the nature of life and consciousness, philosophy comes to play its part. From outward and known physical effects we pass to the search for an inner and subjective cause. But this is neither a final stage nor is it

the highest quality of our life. As a further stage we have the growth and development of a moral and spiritual sense, born of a gradually evolving intuition and perception of a deeper order of things than that of merely physical and material, and of a certain relationship of the individual to the larger cosmos by which we are environed and of which we are a part. It is this inner perception or quality of life which is broadly classified under the term Religion; the dawn of a moral sense, of ideas of duty, sacrifice, virtue and above all of Intuition.

Thus in a certain sense we may say that Philosophy is higher than Science and Religion is higher than Philosophy; that each of these expresses not merely an additional quality in our life which the other lacks, but also a quality which is deeper in our nature and further in our evolution. The province of science is to garner facts, to observe, to record, to classify and to demonstrate. Science is an exact and experimental knowledge of the relation and proportion of things in all regions in which facts can be observed and experimented. It endeavours to formulate the laws which govern phenomena of the physical universe, but in doing this it leaves untouched—the great problem of our life and consciousness. Philosophy takes the facts which science brings to light and states them in larger terms. It states the real fundamental problem of the relation of consciousness itself to this external world of phenomena, the living vital fact of the existence of subject or Knower, and the relation of this subject to the external world as the object which is known or perceived. But Religion with its inner perception of the cosmic order, unites subject and object through the comprehension of common self-existence. In man's great quest for truth it is always a deep and an indefinable intuition which gives rise to what presently becomes a clearly formulated science and philosophy; and deepest of all in our nature lies

the intuition of religion. Religion then is that quality of soul which prompts it to a passionate search for the source of its existence from which it is separated in consciousness and towards which it is continually moving. The stronger this intuition becomes the higher becomes its expression in the individual as morality, duty, sacrifice, virtue, love; and these not as something enforced by law but as the spontaneous outflow of the soul from its own nature. These are the foundations of all social as well as of all individual well-being. When they decay, when the religious ideal becomes feeble or obscured, the individual, the community or the nation falls into decadence and death.

Lingayatism is essentially a Religion, the soul of which as we have said is to be sought neither in Panchāchāra nor in Āshtāvarana, but in Lingāṅgā-sāmarasya, the technique of which is Shatsthala. Panchāchāra and Āshtāvarana are the historical forms in which an inner quality of the religious soul expresses itself from time to time as creed or dogma or worship. And these historical forms must of necessity be imperfect and mutable. No greater mistake can be made than to suppose that any finality can be arrived at in them any more than in science or philosophy; for nothing that can be stated by the formal mind is more than relatively true. In this sense, even Lingāṅgā-sāmarasya and its technique Shatsthala would be merely the findings of the formal mind since the final religion is formless and creedless. It is participation in the One Life which is "no respecter of persons". But the clear and pressing demand of the present age is that formulated religion as presented by its authoritative exponents, should be rational; by which this much at least is meant, that no presentation of it shall come under the reproach of being antagonistic to the known facts of nature and experience.

This demand is something more than the demand for a restatement or reformulation of old beliefs. It is a demand for a total abandonment of a method of religion which rests merely on tradition. It is now clearly recognised that any religion worth the name must rest on a much more stable foundation of history; that it must in fact rest on nothing less than the evolution of human thought and not on particular events whether true or otherwise. Individual systems may found on particular events, but individual systems are no longer required by enlightenment and reason; nothing short of universal principles which are true for all time and may be experimentally demonstrated at any time, can satisfy the present demand on the part of those who have read the book of nature and of history in a wider and nobler vision. Thus the demand is for actual knowledge of our spiritual life and powers as well as of our physical nature and environment. It is not the demand for a religion which shall pilot us as individuals safely to Heaven, but for one which shall enable us to realise in ourselves here and now the Divine powers which duly belong to us in our own deeper nature in its oneness with the whole of the cosmos. It is the demand which shall enable us to realise in an actual consciousness and quality of life that unity of the individual with the Man and of Man with the Universe. Let us in this larger light study the formulated Lingayat Religion.

Lingadhāraṇa-Chandrikā is a treatise written with a view of establishing the efficacy and veracity of wearing Linga which is the distinctive mark of Lingayats. Nandikeshwar, the author of the Lingadhāraṇa-Chandrikā begins with an exposition of Linga both in its internal and external forms:

- १ ज्योतिर्लिङ्गानुसन्धानरूपान्तर्लिङ्गधारणप्रतिपादनम् ।
- २ इष्टलिङ्गरूपवद्व्यलिङ्गधारणप्रतिपादनम् ।

The study of Linga as adumbrated by Nandikeshwar demands a dual approach, one the psychological and the other cosmo-logical. We do not mean, by a cosmo-logical approach, an enumeration of the 36 principles which are the common stock of the Shaivas, Veershaivas and even of Shāktas, but we mean an appreciation of the cosmos both in its idea and form from the stand-point of Trio—matter, life and spirit—as revealed by science, philosophy and religion. Matter is form and there is no form which does not express a life; spirit is life and there is no life that is not limited by a form. Hence the manifested universe is Kuruhu (ಕುರುಹು) a cosmic form instinct with life and informed by spirit.

This spirit is the self of the cosmos which is infinite and indefinable. If this infinite and indefinable self is, it is necessarily a pure Existent Sat (ಸತ್) or Iruhu (ಇರುಹು). It cannot be summed up in any quality or quantity nor is it any aggregate of forms or a formal substratum of forms. If all forms, qualities or quantities were to disappear this would remain. Existence without quantity, without quality, without form is not only conceivable but it is a one thing we can conceive behind these phenomena. When we say it is without them, we mean that it exceeds them, that it is something into which they pass in such a way as to cease to be what we call form, quality, quantity in the movement. So all things that are conditions and appearances of the movement pass into that from which they have come and there, so far as they exist, become something that can no longer be described by the terms that are appropriate to them in the movement. Therefore we say that the pure existence or Iruhu is an absolute and in itself unknowable by our thought, although we can go back to it in a supreme identity that transcends the terms of knowledge. Hence the pure Existence is an omni-present Reality which is the

truth of all life and existence whether absolute or relative, whether corporeal or incorporeal, whether intelligent or unintelligent. The Reality is one and not a sum or concourse; but this Unity in its nature is indefinable. When we envisage it by the human mind we are compelled to proceed through an infinite series of conceptions and experiences. And yet in the end we are obliged to negate our largest conceptions, our most comprehensive experiences in order to affirm that the Reality exceeds all definitions. We arrive at the conclusion that from it all variations begin, in it all variations consist, and to it all variations return. All affirmations are denied only to lead to a wider affirmation of the same Reality. All anti-nomies confront each other in order to recognise one truth in their opposed aspects and embrace by the way of conflict their mutual unity. The pure Existent or Sat is the one besides which there is nothing else existent; Iruhu is the be all and end all.

Philosophy is an intellectual search after the fundamental truth of things; the search conducted with consistent and a rigorous thinking culminated in the discovery of Sat as the self of things. If philosophy is an intellectual search after the fundamental truth of things, Faith is an attempt to make that truth of things dynamic in the soul of man. To wear Ishtalinga always upon body is a distinctive mark of the Lingayat faith. Linga, as explained and understood by the Sharanas, is the materialisation of Sat both in idea and form. Ishti (इष्टि) means worship and it is only Sat the highest God-head that deserves worship. To carry Ishtalinga always upon the body is to instil it with the presence of God; when the very cells of body thus get saturated with the idea of the omni-present Reality the human body itself becomes Linga-rūpa.

The conception of Linga both in idea and form deserves special notice. We have already seen that Sat is self

of things and that Linga, so far as idea is concerned, is none other than the Self. Has this God-head no form? Why, the manifested universe is its Form; then Linga so far as form is concerned, must be after the model of Universe. Ah, the form is finite and perishable and has only three dimensions: Yes, the idea is infinite and imperishable and therefore it is the fourth dimension. The finite Universe (ಕುರುಪು) has therefore the infinite Sat (ಅಕುರುಪು) as its source and support. Ān (ಆನ್), in Dravidian language, means source and support, and Ātam (ಆತಮ್) stands for the finite universe; the compound word is Ātamān (ಆತಮಾನ್) the corrupt form of which is Ātman in Sanskrit. Thus observes Father Heras, "In the old Dravidian language the word very likely was Ātamān, a compound word, Ātam-ān. Now Ātam in ancient Tamil means underworld and Ān means Lord. Ātamān, therefore, means 'the Lord of the underworld.' This word while passing into Sanskrit lost the second short A and by a natural reaction lengthened first A thus becoming Ātman". We would, therefore, without any fear of contradiction, like to say that Linga is Ātman.

The conception of Linga as a symbol of the universe in a spheroidal form is quite an old one. The mind of the ancient man dallied lovingly with the universe in which it lived, moved and had its being; the ancient man being endowed more with an astral vision saw naturally the hidden side or the fourth dimension of the universe which enabled him to portray Linga as at once, greater than the great and smaller than the small. For the astronomers of to-day our whole universe is similarly the three dimensional surface of an enormous sphere, a sphere with more than three dimensions. The obvious regression of the Nebulae is the result of an expansion of space in which they are situated, and this expansion of space, in turn, depends upon the lengthening of the radius of the world

sphere. And so, the whole universe would expand, as gas expands. This expansion doubles the distance of the Nebulae from us, according to Eddington, every 13 hundred million years, and according to the French astronomer Mineur, every 2 thousand million years. If astronomy proves the enormous greatness of the universe, physics, on the other hand, with its theory of atom, has reduced the universe to an inconceivable smallness. "An atom is a centre of force, a phase of electrical phenomena, a centre of energy active through its own internal make-up and giving off energy or heat or radiation." An atom is, as Lord Kelvin says a vortex ring or a centre of force and not a particle of which we understand as tangible substance. This ultimate particle of matter is now demonstrated to be composed of a positive nucleus of energy surrounded—just as is the sun by the planets—with many electrons or negative corpuscles. The elements differ according to the number and arrangement of these negative electrons around their positive nucleus, proton, and they rotate or move around this central energy of electricity as our planetary system rotates round the sun. Thus an entire solar system, as Prof. Soddy has pointed out is to be seen in an atom. In these theories of the universe advanced by astronomy and physics we find a perfect justification of the description of Linga as the greatest of the great and the smallest of the small (अणोरणीयान् महतो महियान्).

Is it not gratifying to read in this light, in the light that Linga is Ātman, the following passages in the Chāndōgya and Brihadāranyaka Upanishads? "This self within the heart is smaller than a grain of rice, smaller than a corn of barley, smaller than a mustard seed, smaller than a canary or the kernel of a canary seed (and let us add, smaller than an atom). This self within the heart is greater than the earth, greater than the sky, greater than heaven, greater than all these worlds." Does not the saying of Basava strike a similar chord?

ಜಗದಗಲ ಮುಗಿಲಗಲ ಮಿಗಿಯಗಲ ನಿಮ್ಮಗಲ. ಪಾತಾಳದಿಂದತ್ತತ್ತ ನಿಮ್ಮ ಶ್ರೀಚರಣ. ಬ್ರಹ್ಮಾಂಡದಿಂದತ್ತತ್ತ ನಿಮ್ಮ ಶ್ರೀಮುಕುಟ. ಅಗಮ್ಯ ಅಪ್ರಮಾಣ ಅಗೋಚರ ಲಿಂಗವೆ, ಕೂಡಲ ಸಂಗಮದೇವಯ್ಯ ನೀವೆನ್ನ ಕರಸ್ಥಲಕ್ಕೆ ಬಂದು ಚುಳುಕಾದಿರಯ್ಯ !

"This self under the form of mind being light indeed is within the heart, small like a grain of rice or barley. He is the ruler of all, the lord of all, he rules all this what-so-ever exists". In the Gospels, many parables are devoted to the Kingdom of heaven, and this heaven is not only the paradise of the devout people, it is also the divine Self in man. The Kingdom of heaven is at the same time that which is smallest and that which is greatest, and Jesus Christ uses in this connection a similar image. "The Kingdom of heaven is like to a grain of mustard seed, which a man taketh and soweth in his field.....which is indeed the least of all seeds; but when it is grown it is the greatest among herbs and becometh a tree, so that the birds of the air come and lodge in the branches thereof".

It is also interesting to learn that the conception of Linga as a symbol of the universe in spheroidal form is not so far distant from the most ancient and apparently most naive ones, describing our world in the form of an Egg. For we read in the Secret Doctrine:

"In The Egyptian Ritual, Seb, the God of Time, is spoken of as having laid an Egg or the Universe.....The Mundane Egg was placed in Khoom, the water of space, or the feminine abstract principle.....Ra, the mighty one remains in his Egg, during the struggle between the 'children of the Rebellion' and Shoo, the Solar Energy and the Dragon of the Darkness.

We see the idea of Egg present in the Orphic and the Dionysiac mysteries.....Porphyry also shows it to be a representation of the world. In the Orphic Hymns, Eros Phanes evolves from the Divine Egg...The Egg was sacred to Isis; Isis is almost always represented holding a lotus in one hand and in the other a circle and a cross.

Plato in his *Timaeus*, tells us that the universe is a sphere; and with some Greeks, the first born of the world was Dionysus, the God who sprang from the Mundane Egg.

In the Scandinavian cosmogony, the Mundane Egg is again discovered in the fantom Germ of the Universe, which is represented as lying in the Ginnungagap, the cup of Illusion, *Māya*, the boundless and Void Abyss.

We read in the laws of Manu: when the Lord Swayambhū, (self-existing) decided in His mind, to imanate from His substance the various creatures, He produced first the waters in which He laid a germ. This germ became an Egg, shining like gold, and in which the Supreme Being was himself born in the form of Brahma, the father of all beings.

The importance given, in religion and symbology, to certain birds, is due to the fact that they lay eggs. Such is the case for *Kālahamsa*, the swan of Eternity, in India or for Ibis, in Egypt. Even Christians have to this day the sacred birds for instance the Dove, the symbol of holy Ghost."

The author of the secret Doctrine, H. P. Blavatsky, the gifted woman comments in the end as follows: "The symbol of an egg expresses the fact taught in occultism, that the primordial form of every thing manifested from atom to globe, from man to angel, is spheroidal, the sphere being with all nations, the emblem of eternity and infinity."

The origin of Linga then so far as historical study can solve the problem, is to be sought in a symbol of sphere which serves an emblem of an eternity and infinity with all nations. Viewed in this impartial, charitable and catholic light all the attempts of the scholars to explain away the origin of Linga as Lemurian or Mediterranean, as Tibetan or Tamilian, as Asiatic or Atlantic, as Aryan or Dravidian, are merely the offshoots of discursive intellect which only confirms the truth of the proverb; "as the blind saw the elephant".

Having thus proved the truth of Ishtalinga from a cosmological view-point, we now proceed to question the veracity of Jyotirlinga from a psychological view-point. The proper study of psychology is man, the conscious being. But in order to understand the real nature of man, it is necessary first of all to inquire into the nature of consciousness, the reality of which is all that we are sure of. Human consciousness is essentially self-consciousness for even in the simplest process of sense-perception man is aware not merely of a change, but of the consciousness of a change. All human experiences, in brief, consist not of mere events, whether physical or psychical, but of recognitions of such events. What we apprehend therefore is never a bare fact, but a recognised fact; and this recognised fact implies a synthesis of relations in self-consciousness which involves a subject as well as an object. The Recognitive School of Kashmir Shaivism has brought this truth into bold relief. As evolution pre-supposes involution so cognition pre-supposes recognition; man therefore in cognising an object recognises himself, that is, in knowing and becoming aware of any object physical or psychical he knows or becomes aware of his self. Because of this *a priori* state of consciousness man who is essentially a conscious being is termed Jnātā (ज्ञाता), the knower, in Indian philosophy; for he knows the functions of the mind, the senses, the muscles and of himself as the self.

Stout defines consciousness as the awareness we have of ourselves and of our own experiences, as states of the Self - an inner sense - the function by which we perceive the mind and its processes as the sight perceives the material facts. Father Maher defines it as the mind's direct intuitive and immediate knowledge either of its own operations or of something other than itself acting upon it; in other words, the energy of the cognitive act, and not the emotional or volitional acts as cognised. The definition

of consciousness, according to two famous psychologists Stout and Maher approximates to some extent to the Indian idea which holds it as Samvit (संविद्), self-awareness, which is Swayamprakasha, self-illuminating. Perception, emotion and conation are functions of the mind that take place according to mental laws, whether they are or are not illuminated by the light of consciousness. In ordinary psychic experience, this light of consciousness is inextricably interwoven with the functions of the mind; and can be discerned only when it is separated from the mind and contemplated apart from its functions. This pure consciousness (अदुष्य) as apart from the unconscious (अदुष्य) or personal consciousness in the words of William James is Chit (चित्). William James is right in so far as he makes a distinction between pure consciousness and personal consciousness, but on account of his vision being blurred by Pragmatism, he could see consciousness as a perpetual stream and not as a steady light that knows no change.

Consciousness is Spirit that has an inherent power of illuminating the mental and bodily functions which would otherwise remain unconscious. The mind of man is an organ composed of subtle matter and is not immaterial or spiritual. Sensation, perception, volition etc., are in Western philosophy called subjective states and treated as non-material. Indian philosophy analyses them into two factors, namely (1) a mental process internal but not subjective and (2) the accompaniment of consciousness illumining the process. The first is material and the second is immaterial. Mental processes are variously classed: the Sāṅkhya attributes to the mind all psychic life while the Vaiśeṣika regards it merely as an organ of attention. But almost all systems of Indian philosophy are agreed in regarding mind as matter. It is difficult to realise mind to be matter because of the fact that it derives a pseudo-subjectivity on account of its

being an inner organ. When our muscles act our consciousness accompanies the action; but we can in thought separate the consciousness from the muscular action and realise the latter as a phenomenon of matter. But each man can study mental action only in the operations of his own mind, and as these are accompanied by the light of his own consciousness, the separation of these two and the appreciation of the difference of the nature of consciousness and of mental action becomes a matter of difficulty.

Perception then should be clearly distinguished from apperception or consciousness. Plato and Aristotle use such phrases as "the seeing of sight", "the perceiving of perception", "the thinking of thought" to indicate consciousness apart from mental functioning. Kena Upanishad uses strikingly similar phrases "what speech does not enlighten but what enlighten speech" etc. Plotinus, among ancient philosophers first clearly formulated this distinction and calls apperception by the name of *Parakolonthesis* which is strongly reminiscent of Chit-prakāsha (चित्रप्रकाश). "Intelligence is the one thing and the apprehension of intelligence is another. And we always perceive intellectually, but we do not always apprehend that we do so". The idea that consciousness is not a necessary concomitant of mental operations is first clearly enunciated in modern European philosophy by Leibniz, "As a matter of fact our soul has the power of representing to itself any form of nature whenever the occasion comes for thinking about it, and I think that this activity of our soul is, so far as it expresses some nature, form or essence, properly the idea of the thing. This is in us and is always in us whether we are thinking of it or not". Leibniz means to say that all psychic life is in itself unconscious except in so far as the light of consciousness illuminates it and manifests it to the knower. It is this self-luminous consciousness that goes by the name of Jyotirlinga.

Jyotirlinga and Ishtalinga, the self of cosmos and the self of man are identically the same and so are one. The self of man is termed Anga (अङ्ग) which is Chidrūpa (चिद्रूप) the pure Conscient; the self of cosmos is termed Linga (लिङ्ग) which is Sadrūpa (सद्रूप) the pure Existent; and that Anga and Linga are one and the same is proved by the subjective mode of worship (अहंग्रहोपासना). The realisation of the one existence in the apparent infinite multiplicity and complexity through self-awareness is Samarasa, delight equal and equable. Sāmā-rasya is therefore Ānandarūpa (आनन्दरूप). Lingānga-sāmā-rasya then is a technical name of Lingayat religion for the highest God-head, Sachchidānanda (सच्चिदानन्द). The Self of all whether in man or cosmos is an infinite indivisible existence; of that existence the essential nature is infinite, imperishable force of self-conscious being; and of that self-consciousness the essential nature is, again, an infinite inalienable delight of being. God is Sachchidānanda, He manifests himself as infinite existence of which the essentiality is consciousness, of which again the essentiality is self-delight. Delight cognising variety of itself, seeking its own variety, as it were, becomes the universe. "If there were not" says the Taitariya Upanishad, "this all encompassing ether of delight of existence in which we dwell, if that delight were not our ether, then none could breathe, none could live." The cosmic existence of which we are a part is in its most obvious view a movement of force; but that force on close scrutiny proves to be a constant and yet always mutable rhythm of creative consciousness. And this rhythm is in its essence a play of the infinite delight of being ever busy with its own innumerable self-representations. The world-process then, is not a chaos as the materialist holds, but a fairly charming cosmos as the mystic observes. "Creation springs from one glad act of affirmation, the Ever lasting Yea, perpetually uttered within

the depths of Divine nature... The whole creation is the play of the Eternal Lover; the living, changing, growing expression of God's love and joy." It is participation in God's love and joy, penetration in the One Infinite Life that is in the objective of Lingayat religion.

The Divine Existence is pure and unlimited being in possession of all itself, it is Sat; whatever it puts forth in its limitless purity of self-awareness is truth of itself, Satya. The Sat in itself is a spaceless and timeless absolute of conscious existence that is bliss; but the cosmos is, on the contrary, an extension in space and time, a movement, a working-out, a development of relations and possibilities. Then there must be a power of knowledge and will which out of infinite potentiality determines relations, develops the results out of the seed, rolls out the mighty rhythms of cosmic Law. This power indeed is nothing else than the Force of Sat itself, it is Vimarsha-shakti (विमर्श-शक्ति). It creates nothing which is not in its own self-existence, and for that reason all cosmic and individual law is a thing not imposed from outside but from within. All development is therefore self-development, all seed and result are a seed of truth of things and result of that seed determined out of its potentialities. In the universe there is then a constant relation of oneness and multiplicity; both between the One and the Many and among the many themselves there is the possibility of an indefinite variety of relations. These relations are determined, as we have seen, by the inherent power of the Divine Truth. They exist at first as conscious relations between individual souls; they are then taken up by them and used as a means of entering into conscious relation with the Truth. It is this entering into various relations with the One Truth that is the object and function of religion. All religions are justified by this essential necessity and Lingayat religion is no exception to this.

We may state the object and function of Religion in another way by saying that Truth is the perception of such a relation and proportion in apparent diversity that this becomes a realised and harmonious unity. There must necessarily be degrees of this perception and it is this graded perception of Truth that justifies the necessity of Shatsthala (six steps of self-realisation) in Lingayat religion. The final perception of the Unity of the whole universe would be the absolute Truth and therefore absolute Reality. Such a final perception, however, would not only transcend anything that we know as thought, but also anything that we know as consciousness. Our perception of Truth or Reality will grow clearer and fuller as we approach to a consciousness of the Unitary nature of all that enters into our experience. We may, by a progressive expanding or a sudden luminous transcendence, mount up to this Truth in unforgettable moments or dwell in it during hours or days of greatest super-human experience. When we descend again, there are doors of communication which can keep always open or reopen even though they should constantly shut. But to dwell there permanently on the last and highest summit of the Divine Truth is in the end the supreme ideal for our evolving human consciousness. And this ideal is nothing short of at-one-ment or Sāmarasya, when the will of Anga becomes united with the will of Linga— which perfect union reveals itself not in self-annulment but in self-fulfilment. Read Urilinga Peddi's saying which is pregnant with the soul of Lingayat religion :

ತತ್ ಪದ ಲಿಂಗವೆಂದರುಹಿ, ತ್ವಂ ಪದ ಅಂಗವೆಂದರುಹಿ, ಅಸಿ ಪದ ಪ್ರಾಣವೆಂದರುಹಿ,
ಅಂಗವೆ ಲಿಂಗ ಲಿಂಗವೆ ಪ್ರಾಣವೆಂದು ಶ್ರೀ ಗುರುವು ಇಷ್ಟಲಿಂಗವ ಕೊಟ್ಟು ದೃಷ,
ಲಿಂಗವ ತೋರಿದ ಬಳಿಕ ತತ್ತ್ವವುಸಿ ಪದ ನಿಮ್ಮ ಶರಣರು ಉರಿಲಿಂಗ ಪೆದ್ದಿ ಪ್ರಿಯ
ವಿಶ್ವೇಶ್ವರಾ.

A religion, in its esoteric sense, is essentially Mysticism suggestive or expressive of a unitary consciousness that

transcends the limitations of intellect. William James speaks eloquently of this characteristic: This over-coming of all the usual barriers between the individual and the Absolute is the great mystic achievement. In mystic states we both become one with the Absolute and we become aware of our oneness. This is the ever-lasting and triumphant mystical tradition, hardly altered by differences of clime and creed. In Hinduism, in Neo-Platonism, in Sufism, in Christian mysticism, in Whitmanism we find the same recurring note, so that there is about mystical utterances an eternal unanimity which ought to make a critic stop and think, and which brings it about that mystical classics have, as has been said, neither birthday nor native land. Perpetually telling of the unity of man with God, their speech antedates languages and they do not grow old". Lingāṅga-sāmarasya, bereft of its technique is mysticism pure and simple that echoes the ancient nay, eternal Wisdom.

But religion has its exoteric side also; as exoteric it is a conventional expression of formal belief; if the esoteric side is the soul of religion the exoteric is its form. Forms of religion, like every thing else in this world of forms, must change and decay. They will have their way and cease to be, as knowledge grows in gigantic strides. New religions, so called, crop up and overlap the decay of old forms and formulas. New teachers, new hierophants arise, and the new wine must be put into new bottles. Yet the old forms may and must persist for many an age. They do so in virtue of their acquired momentum and vested interest as well as from the fact that each does actually, for the time being, express a fundamental fact in human experience. Gautama Buddha was a reformer of Brahmanism and the laws of Manu; yet Brahmanism still holds sway over millions of souls. Notwithstanding Christianity as a reformation of the Jewish

religion and the Law of Moses, Judaism is still the religion of millions of followers and Mosaic tradition. And Basava was a reformer of Shaivism and a revolter of Varnāshrama, yet Shaivism and Varnāshrama have had their spell over millions and millions of souls.

Basava is the founder of Veerashaivism in the sense in which Buddha is of Buddhism and Christ of Christianity. Prof. Sakhare is clear and emphatic on this point. "To the solution of the problem—who is the founder of the Veerashaiva faith? — we have a clue in the very word 'Veerashaiva'. By the time 12th century was ushered in, Jainism and Vaishnavism had gained ascendancy. Shaivism in the South had reached a crisis and time had come for it to rise or to fall. But down it was not to go; for by the time the century had half passed there shot into space a great hero who revolutionised the Shaivite faith in a short space of time. The attempt was heroic and the achievement was brilliant. Shaivism rose triumphant over the trammels of Varnāshrama and the result was Veerashaivism. The hero happened to be the Prime Minister of the then King of Karnatak. He was a Kannada man and what wonder if Kannada became the language of the scriptures of the new heroic religion and Karnatak became the home of the new faith as it is even to-day! That was how the new faith came to be heroically founded and that is why it has come to be called Veerashaiva religion, meaning the heroic Shaiva faith. That was how again Basava became the King of a great religion though the premier of a little province" (Lingadhāraṇa Chandrikā— Preface Page 415-416).

Three things emerge from the labour of Prof. Sakhare: three things of which Navakalyanamatha has already stood as a champion: Lingayatism is the faith professed and followed by the Karnatak Veerashaivas; Basava is the founder of this faith and Vachanashāstra are the scriptures that embody the principles of Lingayatism.

In favour of Personal and Spiritual
Work
15-3-1943

"VEERASHAIVISM— QUO VADIS"

by Shri Kumara Swamiji, B. A., Navakalyanamath, Dharwar.

(The Indian philosophical Congress is an All India Association functioning to devise ways and means for the development of Philosophical studies in India. It is usually held every year under the auspices of the Indian Universities in the week preceding Christmas. In December last it had its sessions for three days (20, 21, and 22) in the Aligarh University.

Shri Kumara Swamiji of Navakalyanamath Dharwar who was known to the Congress by his thought-provoking lecture delivered at Madras last year was invited by Prof. M. M. Sharf M. A. (Cantab), the secretary to the Congress to speak on Veerashaiva Philosophy and Mysticism.

The lecture was announced as a public one in the programme of the Congress sessions with wide publicity through the film and the press with these compliments: "His Holiness is a thinker and speaker of all India reputation and the public of Aligarh is sure to hear a lecture of extra-ordinary merit."

Dr. S. Hadi Hasan M.A., Ph.D., a master of many a subject, a popular figure in the Aligarh University and above all a true Mystic imbuing the spirit of Sufi Mysticism was the Chairman on the occasion. He introduced the Swamiji with many compliments especially referring to his simplicity, sincerity and spirituality and to his fine personality and magnetic vision. Then amidst the cheers of learned Doctors and Professors of Philosophy the Swamiji rose to deliver his speech of which the following is a brief summary.—V.R.K.)

Veerashaivism historically considered is a fine and full-blown flower of Shaivism. The inscriptions of Mohenjo Daro and Harappa have revealed the astounding truth that the cult of Shiva was current as far back as 3000 B. C. To quote Sir John Marshall: "Amongst the many revelations that Mohenjo Daro and Harappa have had in store for us, none perhaps is more remarkable than this discovery that Shaivism has a history going back to the Chalco-lithic age or perhaps even further still, and that it takes its place as the most ancient living faith in the world." Again to quote Dr. Prananath: "The cults of Shiva and mother Goddess had already been shown to be very old. It is interesting to find them current as far as 3000 B. C." The scholars like Father Heras are of opinion that Shiva is the God of the Dravidians or Proto-Indians as he calls them, and it is addressed as the *Lingodbhava-mūrti*, the self-existent truth. The image of Shiva called Shivalinga found in all the Shaivite temples through-out India is only a plastic representation of the self-existent truth. This Shiva-linga or Sthāvara-linga form of worship as we have it in the temples is the characteristic feature of Shaivism. But the distinctive mark of Veerashaivism is *Iṣṭa-linga* form of worship : that is to say, it advocates the wearing of Linga, the idol of Infinity, upon the body of each person so that the body shall be a temple fit for God to dwell in. The Linga worn always on the body of each person becomes symbolic of the presence of God not in the far off heavens but in the very cells of the human body. Thus Veerashaivism does countenance the building of the body in order to serve as a temple for God ; and more particularly of a Cosmic body—the matrix of an epitome or an exhibition of the essentials of all spiritual life in which one can see dramatised not only the cosmic process of the Divine Wisdom, but also the inward experience of every soul on its way to union with that Absolute to which the whole creation moves. It is gratifying to learn that this ancient cult with its art, literature and philosophy, with its adherents numbering about four millions who reside mainly in Karnatak exists even to this day with a frequent production of eminent souls in all departments of life.

The decipherment of the picto-phonographic inscriptions of the Indus Valley has indeed worked as a revelation in the history of Dravidian culture and civilisation, for we come across such significant words as *Ān*, *Ānil*, *Ammā* and *Atam* having a perfect correspondence in *Shiva*, *Sharaṇa*, *Shakti* and *Sṛiṣṭi* all culminating in the Veerashaiva conception of *Iṣṭa-linga*. Many arguments have been advanced, many theories have been formulated by scholars regarding the nature and conception of Linga. Jean Przyluski, the French scholar derives the conception of Linga from *Lāngala*, the plough and he further observes that Linga is of the Austro-Asiatic origin. Some scholars who are under the Āryan influence advance the theory that Linga is said to represent the sacred fire of the Vedic sacrifices, while the temples stand for the sacrificial grounds. These temples again represent our hearts and the Lord is said to abide there in the form of Linga or a glow of effulgence as the Soul of our souls. The third theory derives Linga from Sanskrit root *Likh* which means to sculpture or to paint and Linga means one that sculpts or paints, God being the sculptor of the universe, he is known as Linga. The fourth one advanced by the Āgamas is that Linga is the cause and the principle of the evolution and involution and the Āgamic meaning of the word *Māyā* is that which evolves and involves. But in the Veerashaiva conception, Linga simply stands for a symbol or a mark. It is *Kuruḥu* (ಕುರುಹು) and as such it is symbolic of the pure and perfect consciousness (ಅರುಹು). Even Philosophy speaks of the material and potential contents of consciousness and Theosophy has proved beyond doubt that each definite thought has an appropriate form. According to the Veerashaiva then, Linga is said to represent an appropriate form of a definite and complex thought about God.

God, *Ān* or Shiva is described as *Parāsamvit*, the consciousness pure and perfect. In Western Philosophy the concepts, consciousness and mind are mutually exclusive. They are sometimes used synonymously and a line of demarcation is not to be found till we come to Bergson who declares that mind and matter are correlative. But in Indian Philosophy these two concepts are poles apart from each other. Consciousness is *Samvit*, the enlightene

of the mind and the senses and their operations, whereas mind is *Jada* or unconscious. In other words mind is matter and consciousness is spirit. The eyes see the world when opened and directed towards an object, similarly when consciousness is turned on mental operations the Spirit sees, not conceives the functions of the mind. These mental functions exist whether consciousness accompanies them or not just as the world exists whether beings see it or not. Sight manifests the world to the individual; so the light of consciousness manifests the functions of the mind. Because of this illuminating power inherent in the spirit he is called *Swayam-prakāsha*, self-illuminating. Consciousness is frequently compared to the light by all mystics. The light of the sun reveals itself to us directly and when it impinges upon any object it manifests the existence of the object also. So the spirit reveals his existence to himself and also illuminates a body or a mind he is in contact with, which otherwise would have remained unconscious, unknown and unmanifest. European Idealism makes the manifestation and existence of matter dependent upon the mind. It holds that whether there be a noumenon behind what we recognise as matter or no, it is certain that sensations exist and that as sensations are mental modifications, no objective existence is possible in the absence of mind. Constructive Idealism represented by John Stuart Mill and others admits a permanent possibility of sensations behind the phenomena of objective world but the thorough-going idealism of Berkley does not. Indian thought is a much more profound idealism than these; mind and matter are both objective to the spirit. They are revealed by him without whose illumination they are *Asat*, non-existent, but to himself is always illuminated. Consciousness is an ultimate factor of human experience and cannot be or need not be manifested by anything else. Descartes argued "I think, therefore I am." The Indian philosophers argue "I am, therefore I am."

An integral intuition into the nature of Consciousness as an ultimate factor of human experience shows us that it is indeed one in essence but also that it is capable of an infinite potential complexity and multiplicity in self-experience. The working of this potential complexity and multiplicity in the One is what we call from our point

of view manifestation, creation, world or becoming or *Atam* in the Dravidian terms. The agent of this becoming is always the self-conscience of the Being. The power by which the self-conscience brings out of itself its potential compexity and multiplicity is termed *Ammā* or *Chit-shakti*; and being self-conscious is obviously of the nature of the Will. But not will as we understand it, something exterior to its objects other than its works labouring on material outside itself, but will inherent in the being, inherent in the becoming one with the movement of the existence, self-conscious will that becomes what it sees and knows in itself. By this Will the worlds are created. *Ammā* or *Chit-shakti* is the inherent power of illumination of *Ān* or Shiva. What heat is to the fire, light to the sun, moon-light to the moon Shakti is to Shiva, *Ammā* to *Ān* and even as these are intrinsic and ever-abiding in the fire, sun, and moon, so is the divine power to God. This divine power or energy is even inseparable from and in nature one with Shiva, nay it is the very Soul of the Lord himself. This *Ammā* is termed *Jāta-Vedas*, "That which has a right knowledge of all births. It knows them in the law of their being in the relation to the other births, in their aim and method, in their process and goal, in their unity with all and their difference from all. It is this Divine Will that conducts the Universe."

This supreme nature, *Chit-shakti* or *Ammā* is then the "Infinite, timeless conscious power of *Ān* or Shiva out of which all existences in the cosmos are manifested and come out of timelessness into time." But in order to provide a spiritual basis for this manifold universal becoming *Ān* or Shiva formulates itself as *Ānil* or *Sharāṇa* by the presence and power of its inherent divine energy or *Ammā*. In the manifestation which is thus put forth from the Supreme, *Ānil* or *Sharāṇa* is the silent observer of the multiple existence. It is always one with *Ān* in the consciousness of its being, and yet different from it only in the power of its being; different not in the sense that it only supports the one power in multiplicity and complexity of movements. But we must be careful not to make the mistake of thinking that this *Ānil* is identical with *Jīva* or the human soul, manifested in time. For the *Jīva* is the basis of the multiple exis-

tence or rather it is the soul of multiplicity we experience here. In the words of the Gita *Jiva* is the *Kṣara-puruṣa* the mutable which enjoys change and division and duality. But *Ānīl* is the *Akṣara-puruṣa* the immutable soul which is our real self, our divine unity with God, our inalienable freedom from that which is transient and changing. It is by realising our oneness with this *Ānīl* or *Akṣara-puruṣa* that we get freedom from ignorance, freedom from the chords of desire, freedom from the imperative law of works. There is a pregnant saying in the ancient wisdom that Father is born of the Mother as Son; sonship, not servanthship is the secret of realization. This son is *Sharaṇa* or *Anga* in the Veerashaiva terminology, and Shiva is born of *Chit-shakti* as *Sharaṇa*. In this highest dynamis *Ān* and *Ānīl*, Shiva and *Sharaṇa*, *Linga* and *Anga*, are integrally associated. This relation of *Linga* and *Anga* spells a great mystic truth that God and soul are ever distinct, yet ever united. If unity is eternal and unchangeable duality is persistently recurrent. The soul's union with God is a will-union, a mutual inhabitation and not self-mergence which leaves no place for personality; for personality survives even in union with God. This mysterious union-in-separateness of God and soul is a necessary doctrine of all sane mysticism. *Ānīl* or *Anga* then exists in *Ān* or *Linga* by the relation of identity-in-adaptability.

In order to provide a field of work for the manifestation of the Supreme, *Ammā* or *Chit-shakti* urged by an inner impulse of vast consciousness formulates itself as *Atam*, the becoming or *Sriṣṭi* for the totality of things is the becoming of the Lord in the extension of his own being. This double principle of being and becoming is natural to the Shakti as the double principle of *Anga* and *Linga* is germane to Shiva. What the Europeans call Nature is only this becoming or *Atam* and this *Atam* or *Sriṣṭi* is only an outward executive aspect of *Ammā* or Shakti. Because of this deep and momentous distinction between *Ammā* and *Atam*, between the two natures phenomenal and spiritual, the Veerashaiva has been able to erase the incurable antinomy between the self and cosmic nature and therefore, to him unity is a greater truth, multiplicity a lesser truth, both of them are a truth and neither of them is an illusion.

For he looks upon this world or *Atam* as being produced by an act of will, and as such he looks upon it as a field of work given for the soul to educate its will and to burn the illusions of desire into an illumination of joy.

We are now in a better position to understand the title of the lecture, "Veerashaivism - *quo vadis*": Veerashaivism whither goest thou? To this question we would answer that it goes to formulate a theory of four units or entities *Ān*, *Ānil*, *Ammā* and *Atam* or *Shiva*, *Sharaṇa*, *Shakti* and *Sriṣṭi*, out of which it evolves a connected and co-ordinated view of life in conformity with the experience of all the mystics. That there is an integral association between these four great terms is clear enough, but that association is not in the nature of a division but a distinction to which the necessity of metaphysical thought has irresistably driven us. This is the reason why we prefer to address Veerashaivism as the doctrine of four units or entities that is mirrored in the conception of *Iṣṭa-linga*. Just as the theory of Relativity with its conception of the four dimensional continuum has wrought a change in method in the field of Physics and brought a hinge to the science of Mathematics, so this theory of integral association with its doctrine of four entities innovates a radical change in the study of Metaphysics and introduces a real hinge to the art of Mysticism.

Now it remains for us to show by diagrams how the Veerashaiva conception of *Iṣṭa-linga* represents an integral association of these four great terms *Ān*, *Ānil*, *Ammā* and *Atam* or *Shiva*, *Sharaṇa*, *Shakti* and *Sriṣṭi*. *Atam* or *Sriṣṭi* is in the words of the Gita, *Aparā-prakṛiti* or in the words of the Āgama *Adhō-sriṣṭi*, the lower creation, characterised by the consciousness of multiplicity. Multiplicity is the play or varied self-expansion of the One, shifting in its terms, divisible in its view of life, by force of which the one occupies many centres of consciousness, inhabits many formations of energy in the universal movement. It is this *Atam* or *Aparā-prakṛiti* upon which the Veerashaiva looks as an objective world-process, as a progressively emergent evolutionary process of the self-expression of the Divine Will working through the divine history towards ever greater and ever higher expression of the transcendant delight.

Wherever there is movement, life and mind are seen to be present involved or evolving; therefore, life and mind have some kind of material form as the initial condition of their activities. In this lower creation then, there are three principles: Matter, Life and Mind. These three matter, life and mind or in more popular Indian philosophical terms *Tamas*, *Rajas* and *Sattva*, when represented by a diagram, appear as a triangle. *Atam* or *Adhō-srīṣṭi* is therefore represented by \triangle .

Ammā or *Chit-shakti* is in the words of the Gita *Parā prakṛiti* or in the words of the Āgama *Ūrdhva-srīṣṭi*, the higher creation characterised by the consciousness of unity. Unity is the fundamental fact without which all multiplicity would be unreal and an impossible illusion. Multiplicity is implicit or explicit in unity without which unity would be either a void of non-existent or a state of blank repose. In this consciousness of unity all is in all, each in all and all in each, inherently by the very nature of conscious being without any effort of conception or travail of perception. There the spirit manifests as pure in existence, *Sat*, pure in self-awareness, *Chit* and pure in self-delight, *Ānanda*. *Ammā* or the *Parā-prakṛiti* who is the very soul of the Lord is therefore described as *Sachchidānandamayī*. To represent this supreme state of consciousness again a triangle is needed. But one should mark the subtle difference and the shade of meaning between *Ammā* and *Atam*. *Atam* is *Sattva-rajastamōmayī*, while *Ammā* is *Sachchidānandamayī*. *Atam* is *Aparā-prakṛiti* the lower or phenomenal nature, while *Ammā* is *Parā-prakṛiti* the higher or spiritual nature. Yet these are not isolated from each other, but integrally associated with this difference that the triangle which represents *Ammā* is placed upon the triangle represented by *Atam* in a vertically opposite direction. When thus represented the diagram will assume this form X

Between these two creations, linking them together is the world or organisation of consciousness, of which the intuitive truth of things is the foundation. In all the activities of man which ramify into a search for truth in science and philosophy, an appreciation and creation of beauty in art, a struggle for the good life in morality is ingrained an essential condition. Throughout man feels or intuites

as if he is in the presence of an Other, as if he is in relation with an object. Of course, this subject-object relation is fundamental in every kind of experience; but in our spiritual activities there is that essential condition of the added feeling or intuition that the other who is not wholly Other, a Beyond that is within, is in some way responsive to us. Mysticism is, therefore, the complete development of this intuition of responsiveness which is implicit in all our spiritual activities and as such, suggests the possibility of another world, the world of fourth dimension.

This world of the fourth dimension is in popular Indian philosophical term *Maharlōka* or the world of large consciousness. The principle of this *Maharlōka* is intuitional Idea, not intellectual conception. The difference between the two is this that intellectual conception not only tends towards form, but determines itself in the form of the idea and once determined, distinguishes itself sharply from all other conceptions. Pure intuitional idea sees itself in the being as well as in the becoming. It is one with the existence which throws out the form as a symbol of itself and it therefore carries with it always the knowledge of the truth behind the form. Its nature is *Driṣṭi*, seeing, not conceiving. "Viewed from this standpoint, the intuition of change or duration of Bergson, the stream of consciousness of James, a harmonious all-complete experience of Bradley, and the religious insight of Whitehead cannot give us a true vision of reality which is only Presence and revealed to us in intuition." One who has attained this *Driṣṭi* or intuitive eye is called *Ānīl* or *Sharaṇa* or the Seer who is represented by a straight line since he has run at a tangent to the vicious circle of birth and death, to the trivial round of old habitual ideas and associations. In the third stage then the diagram takes on this form X^- This straight line is drawn to the right side along the line representing *Sat* or pure existence since the intuitive ideas originate in it with an insistence on the right angle of vision.

The last that remains to be represented is *Ān* or Shiva. It is the transcendent Reality, the pure Absolute, the supra-cosmic Infinity. In the words of Theology it is the ineffable and uncreated Light; in the words of the Christian Mystics it is Godhead, the Divine

Dark, the deep abyss; in the words of Veerashaiva Mystics it is the infinite luminous Silence and in the words of the Sufi Mystics it is the dawn of Nothing. It is itself its own world its own universe; of any other than itself it can form no conception. It knows not length nor breadth nor height, for it has no experience of them; it has no cognisance even of the number two; for it is itself one and all being really nothing. How to represent it! Words come out baffled, it defies all definition and description. Yet the humble attempt of the human mind to represent it ends in a zero. So it is represented by zero or *Shūnya*. And as it heads the list, the zero or *Shūnya* is placed on the top of the diagram of the third stage. The figure in this stage then will assume this form $\overset{\circ}{X}^-$ This is an appropriate form of a definite and complex thought about God. Gentlemen, see how profound, how noble, how pure and perfect is the conception of Linga in Veerashaivism. It is in this direction of giving a connected, a co-ordinated and a complete view of the final and fundamental Reality that Veerashaivism goes: Veerashaivism *Quo Vadis!*

(In his concluding remarks Dr. S. Hadi Hasan paid a good many glowing tributes of which few are recorded here below :—
 “About ninety per cent of what the Swamiji said is fresh news to me as well as to the audience He gave a nice treatment of the subject in a lucid style so eloquently and so graphically that one is forced to admit him as a first rate speaker in India..... He threw new light on the most intricate subject and solved the knotty problems by simple symbols. He associated Mathematics with Philosophy and Geometry with Mysticism in a singularly charming manner and in so doing he almost set us on a new path and thus proved himself to be an original thinker..... I would like him to travel over the Western countries to disseminate his illuminating and inspiring thoughts on Veerashaiva Philosophy and Mysticism which is little known to the world. The impressions of his lecture linger on and echo reverberations, and I request the Swamji to put it in print... On and on my own behalf behalf of the Aligarh University I thank His Holiness heartily and hope that this will not be his last visit to our University.” V. R. K.)

13-2-1942