

UDDUPPIDDY AMERICAN MISSION COLLEGE



PAST PUPILS'
ASSOCIATION

PROFESSOR **ALAGAI AH
THURAIRAJAH**

COMMEMORATION
LECTURE



"The concept of Advaita in Saiva Siddhanta"
delivered by

Dr. N. GNANAKUMARAN B. A., M. A., Ph. D.
(Senior Lecturer in Philosophy, University of Jaffna)

on

11-06-1997

Naganathan Gnanakumaran

B. A. (Hons.) Kelaniya; M. A. (Jaffna); Ph. D. (Jabalpur)
(Senior Lecturer in Philosophy, University of Jaffna)

Dr. Naganathan Gnanakumaran had his early education at Vada Hindu Girls' College, Point Pedro, Saiva Pragasa Vidya-salai, Point Pedro and Hartley College Point Pedro. At the University of Kelaniya he followed the Special Arts Degree in Philosophy (1974—1977) and obtained the Master of Arts Degree in Philosophy from the University of Jaffna (1981 — 1983). The Indian Council for Cultural Relations awarded a scholarship to carry out his Ph.D. degree at Rani Durgavati University, Jabalpur.

He has published a number of articles in recognized Journals in Tamil and English. He had already published three Books, viz 'Bharathi Portia Arulampala Swamikal' 'Saiva Siddhanta Telivu' and 'Nayantharu Saiva Sidhanta' his credit. He was awarded with the Sri Lankan Sahitya Academic Award for his work "The Saiva, Sidhanta Telivu.

Specialised interests of Dr N. Gnanakumaran are in Saiva Sidhanta, Vedanta and Western Philosophy. He received a fellowship to Uppsala University Sweden in 1993—94.

Miss S. Vellupillai,
B. Sc., Dip-in-Ed.
PPA, U. A. MC

யா/உடுப்பிட்டி அமெரிக்கன் மிஷன் கல்லூரி

பழைய மாணவர் சங்கம்

நடத்தும்

முன்னாள் தலைவர்

பேராசிரியர் அழகையா துரைராசா

அவர்களின்

3ஆவது நினைவஞ்சலிக் கூட்டம்

இடம்: உடுப்பிட்டி அமெரிக்கன் மிஷன் கல்லூரி

பேராசிரியர் அழகையா துரைராசா

ஞாபகார்த்த மண்டபம்

காலம்: 11-06-1997 புதன்கிழமை மு.ப. 10-00 மணி

தலைவர்: Dr. மு. தங்கராசா B. V. Sc.

நிகழ்ச்சி நிரல்

1. இறை வணக்கம்

2. தலைமை உரை

3. அதிபர் உரை

4. நினைவுப் பேருரை

கலாநிதி நா. ஞானகுமாரன்

B. A. Hons (Kerala), M. A. Jaffna, Ph. D. (Jabalpur)

சிரேஷ்ட விரிவுரையாளர், மெய்யியல்துறை,

யாழ். பல்கலைக்கழகம்

“சைவ சித்தாந்தத்தில் அத் துவிதம்”

5. நினைவுப் பரிசில்கள் வழங்கல்:

6. நன்றியுரை

மேற்படி நிகழ்விற்குத் தவறாது சமூகம் தந்து சிறப்பிக்குமாறு தாழ்மையுடன் கேட்டுக்கொள்கின்றோம்.

பழைய மாணவர் சங்கம்

உடுப்பிட்டி அ. மி. கல்லூரி

A Forward by the Vice President

Our Association is greatly privileged to bring out the publication of the lecture delivered by Dr. N. Gnanakumaran of the University of Jaffna entitled "The concept of Advaita in Saiva - Siddhanta" on the third commemoration day (11-08-1997) of our founder President late Professor A. Thuraiajah.

Professor A. Thuraiajah's observation was that the foreigners thought that the Hindus were all VEDANTISTS because of the work done by Swami Vivekananda and Saint Rama Krishna's disciples in the Western countries.

To clear out this wrong notion from the minds of the Westerners he encouraged the Scholars of the Saiva-Siddhanta to go abroad, conduct Lectures and Seminars and to publish their work in English language.

In this regard Professor A. Thuraiajah encouraged Dr. N. Gnanakumaran of the University of Jaffna to do Research and conduct Seminars on Saiva - Siddhanta for a year at the Upsalla University in Sweden.

This is the reason why we invited Dr. N. Gnanakumaran to deliver a lecture on chosen topic which was of great interest to Professor A. Thuraiajah.

Dr. Sivakolundu Srisatkunarajah
B. Sc(Cey), Ph. D. (U.K)
Vice President, U. A. M. C., P. P. A.

Prof. A. Thurairajah

Memorial Prize - District Level

This prize is awarded annually for the best performance in the Mathematics stream at the G. C. E. (A/L) Examination in the Jaffna District.

Recipient of Third Memorial Prize:

MASTER WESLEY THEVASUTHAR THEVARAJAH

Parents:

Late Mr. A. Thevarajah
(Research Chemist, Cement Factory, K. K. S.)

Mrs. Queeni Ariyamalar Thevarajah
(Retired teacher, Methodist Girls High School Point-Pedro).

Brothers and Sisters:

1. Ms. Princes Mery Thevatharsini B. Sc.
Teacher, Chundikuli Girls' College, Jaffna.
2. Mr. Mercy Thevasobini Varakunan
Research Engineer, National University of Singapore.
3. Ms. Grace Thevathayalini
(Undergraduate, Physical Science, University of Jaffna.)
4. Master Samuel Thevathayalan
(Student of Seminary School)

School Education:

1. Year 1 to 5 at J/ Vada Hindu Girls' College, Pt. Pedro.
2. Year 6 to 13 at J/ Hartley College, Pt. Pedro.

Educational Achievements

1. Year 5 Scholarship — 186 marks
2. Year 6 — 13, ranked first in all the term tests.
3. Obtained Distinctions in all eight Subjects at the the G. C. E. (O/L), and was awarded the "INFOTEL" Scholarship in 1994 by Peoples' Bank for best performance in the Jaffna District.
4. Obtained four A's in all the four subjects at G. C. E. (A/L) and ranked First in the Jaffna District (Aggregate marks — 331)
5. Won many prizes and certificates in English Day Competitions and Mathematics — Quiz Contests.

We wish him a bright future

P. P. A., U. A. M. C.

Memorial Prize of
Prof. A. Thurairajah
at School - Level by Colombo Branch

This prize is awarded annually for best performance in Mathematics stream at the G. C. E. (A/L) examination at U. A. M. C. and Sponsored by the P.P.A. Branch-Colombo.

Recipient of Third Memorial Prize-School Level

Master: Arunthavarajah Alageswaran

Parents: Mr. Thuraiyappa Arunthavarajah
(Mason)
Mrs. Ambika Arunthavarajah

Brothers and sisters:

Ms. Anusia, student (A/L) at U. A. M. G. C.,
Uduppidy.

Master A. Ajanthan, year - 7, at U.A.M.C.

School Education and Achivements

Year 1 to 13 at U. A. M. C. He obtained 3A, B in the G. C. E. (A/L) held in August 1996 and obtained an aggregate marks of 308.

In the G. C. E. (O/L) held in Dec. 1995 obtained 5D, 3C.

He actively participated in Sports, Drama and other cultural activities.

He functioned as the sub. Head Prefect of the School.

We wish him a bright future.

P. P. A. U. A. M. C.

முதல்வரின் சிந்தனையில்....

“என்று புறந்தருதல் எந்தலைக் கடனே
சான்றோனாக்குதல் தந்தைக்குக் கடனே”

என்று புறநானூறு கூறுவது போல, இக் கல்லூரியில் கல்வி கற்கும் இளஞ்சிறார்கள் அனைவரும் சான்றோராக வரவேண்டும் என்று அயராது உழைத்த எமது பழைய மாணவர் சங்க முன்னாள் தலைவர் பேராசிரியர் துரைராசாவை எவரும் எளிதில் மறந்துவிட முடியாது. தான் தவழ்ந்து விளையாடிய பாடசாலை தலை நிமிர்ந்து நாட்டிலே நிற்க வேண்டுமென உள்ளத்தால் ஒழுகியவர். இந் நாட்டின் சிறந்த பொறியியல் விஞ்ஞானியாகிய அன்னார், இந் நாட்டிற்கு மட்டுமன்றி அனைத்து உலகத்திற்குமே ஆற்றிய தொண்டு அளப்பரியது.

மறைந்த பேராசிரியரை நினைவு கூருவதற்கும், அவருக்கு நன்றிக் கடனைச் செலுத்துவதற்குமாக வருடந்தோறும் எமது கல்லூரி நினைவு தின விழாவை கொண்டாடுவதோடு, நினைவுப் பேருரைகளையும் நிகழ்த்தி வருகின்றது. அந்த வகையிலே இவ்வருடம் பேராசிரியர் விரும்பிய இந்து சமயக் கோட்பாடுகளில் ஒன்றாகிய ‘அத்வைத சிந்தனைகள்’ என்ற தலைப்பில் கலாநிதி என். ஞானகுமாரன் அவர்களால் நினைவுப் பேருரை நிகழ்த்தப்பட்டது. மிகுந்த அறிவாளியான பேராசிரியர் ஆடம்பரம் எதுவுமின்றி மிக எளிமையாக எல்லோருடனும் பழகும் இயல்புடையவர்.

“பெரியாரை வியத்தலும் இலமே
சிறியாரை இகழ்தல் அதனிலும் இலமே”

என்ற பண்டைத் தமிழ் பண்பாட்டிலிருந்து கடுகளவேனும் விலகாத அன்னாரது வழியில் அனைவரும் நடைபோடுவோமாக,

உடுப்பிட்டி அ. பி. கல்லூரி,
உம்பிட்டி,
02-08-1997.

இ. நடராசா
அதிபர்.

The Concept of Attuvitam (Advaita) in Caiva Cittantam

N. GNANAKUMARAN

Introductory Note

I feel greatly privileged on the invitation to deliver this Third Memorial Lecture in the name of late Prof. A. Thuraijah, former Vice - Chancellor of the University of Jaffna and the former President, Old Boys Association of Uddupiddy American Mission College, Udupiddy. Prof. A. Thuraijah was an Outstanding scholar as well as an efficient administrator. He was able to keep the University functioning against many odds during the most difficult period in Jaffna. In addition to his valuable service to the University of Jaffna he was engaged in several Community development activities. This includes his participation in activating schools development through the Old Boys Association and other effective means.

I take this opportunity to record my sincere thanks to the organizers of this Memorial lecture, especially Dr. S. Srisatkunarajah, for giving me this opportunity to deliver this lecture. The concept of advaita in Saiva Siddhanta. In fact, this lecture itself creates the pleasant memories of Prof. A. Thuraijah in me who helped me to undertake this said research. The title of this memorial lecture is the main

research subject for me in Uppsala University, Sweden. He wished me for a successful trip to Sweden in 1993. It was a sad experience to meet him at the Navaloka hospital after the completion of my programme in Sweden. All are history now. But I trust that the pleasant memories of Prof. A. Thurai-rajah never perish from any individual who was associated with him.

The concept of *advaita* (non dual) occupies a prominent place in the Indian Philosophy. A number of philosophers namely Sankara, Ramanuja, Madhva, Sri Kantha and Nimbarka define the concept of *advaita* in different ways in order to fit with their own philosophical doctrines. These doctrines are called Kevaladvaita, Visistadvaita, Dvaita, Sivadvaita and Dvaitadvaita. Caiva Cittantam is also no exception to this approach. Meykanta Tevar's interpretation of the concept of *attuvitam* (non dual) is completely different and it claims it to be the correct one. Owing to this, Caiva Cittantis call their doctrine as *Cutta-Attuvitam* (pure non-dual), but *attuvitam* implies the meaning of non-separateness (*pravinmai*) instead of non dual according to Caiva Cittantam.

Etymological explanation of attuvitam

Before analysing the concept of *advaita*, let us examine the etymological meaning of the word *advaita*. The Sanskrit word *advaita* can be divided into two parts, viz., prefix of 'a' and *dvaita*. The prefix 'a' means (negation) and the word *dvaita* means (dual). Therefore, the word *advaita* means non-dual. *Attuvitam* (*advaitam*) is a Tamilised form of Sanskrit *advaita*. According to the explanation of Civanana Cuvamikal,

a well known commentator on *Civanana potam* in the eighteenth century, in the event of the consonant 'n' disappearing in the Sanskrit word of *nattuvita*, the Tamilised form of *attuvitam*, with the 'a' prefix, comes into usage in Tamil. It is a fact to note that in a few instances the word *nadvitiyaya* occurs in *Yajur Veda*¹ and *Svetasvatara Upanisad*.² These are the two instances where the word in its original form *nadvitiyam* could be seen. The word now in use has got elision of the 'n' prefix and becomes *advaita*. The earlier modified form of *advaitiyam* occurs in *Chandogya Upanisad*,³ *Mandukya Upanisad*⁴ and *Guadapada Karika*⁵. The 'a' in the Sanskrit prefix gives six different connotations.⁶ These connotations could be classified as follows.

1. abhava (apavam) (absence)

Example. prakasa (brightness) - aprakasa (absence of brightness)

¹ *Yajur Veda*, 1-8-6 eka eva rudro na dvitiiyaya tathe.

² *Svetasvatara Upanisad*, 3-2, eko hi rudro na dvitiiyaya tathe

³ *Chandogya Upanisad*, 6-21, ekamevadvitiiyam

⁴ *Mandukya Upanisad* 7 santam sivam advaitam caturtham atma
Mandukya Upanisad, 12. amatras caturthavyayaharya
prapancopasarnas 'sivo 'dvaita

⁵ *Gaudapada Karikas* 1, 10, 16, 17: 2.18, 36: 3-18.

The term *nadvaya* becomes *advaya* as found in *Kaivalya Upanisad*, 19 and in the *Gaudapada Karika*, verses 2-35, 4.45 and 4.80 etc.

⁶ *Sabdakalpadruma* gives six different connotations.

2. sadrsya (catiruciya) (similarity)
Example, ak (moving like a serpent)
3. bheda (petam) (difference)
Example. kala (time) - akala (untimely)
4. alpata (atpatai) (insignificance)
Example. uttama (noble) - adhama (ignoble)
5. aprasastya (appiracastiyam) (inferior)
Example, saguna (with qualities) - aguna
(without qualities)
6. virodha (virotam) (opposition)
Example: dharma (moral)-adharma (immoral)

The significance of the 'a' negation

'A' negation of advaita literally means 'no two' or 'not two'. But with the context of a text it would convey all the philosophical meanings which have been interpreted by the philosophers of different schools. Therefore, the 'a' negaive prefix has been taken to mean differently by different schools.

The three kinds of negations, namely inmai (absolute negation), anmai (reciprocal negation) and marutalai (sense of contrariety) get notable place in Tamil. The negation of inmai, anmai and marutalai correspond to abhava, sadrsya and virodha in sanskrit respectively. The sense of inmai in the negation gives total or absolute negation. In the example of appirakacam, a + pirakacam (brightness), the 'a' negation implies total negation. While the word pirakacam means brightness the word appirakacam means the absence of brightness. Therefore, it is a clear fact that 'a' negation negates the brightness totally in the said example.

The sense of anmai in the negation subtly differs from the sense of inmai. In the example of appiramanan, a + piramanan (Brahman), 'a' negation is not implying total negation. It means that though he is a Brahman, he is not a Brahman. In other words, we can infer that though he comes under the Brahman class, he is not treated as Brahman due to the violation of duty of a Brahman or some other reason. The sense of inmai clearly exposes the meaning of absolute negation of brightness or the absence of brightness in the first example. Contrast to this, sense of anmai is not a total negation, even though it negates. These examples clearly show the different aspects between the sense of inmai and anmai negation. The sense of marutalai gives the opposite meaning of the thing or quality. In the examples of atarmam (immoral) a + tarmam (moral), aniti (injustice) a + niti justice) and aniyayam (unreasonable), a + niyayam (reasonable), the 'a' negation gives just opposite meaning of the word. Therefore, 'a' negation of marutalai renders opposite meaning in those instances.

Sankara, Ramanuja and Sri Kantha interpret the 'a' negation, in the word of advaita, in the sense of abhava. Contrast to this, Caiva Cittantis interpret the 'a' negation in sense of anmai. Kacivaci Centilnataiyar says that in addition to Caiva Cittantis the Vaitika Pacupatar and Vaisnavar advocate the sense of anmai negation.⁷ But it is not clear about the two mentioned schools' standpoint on the sense of anmai in the negation as we don't find any further evidence for it.

⁷ Nilakanta Civaccariyar. *Piramma Cuttira Civaituvita Caiya patiyam*. Tran. Kacivaci Centilnataiyar (Madras: Centilnata Cuvami press, 1907) p. 74.

If we take the word of advaita in the sense of the inmai, it would mean one or not other than one which leads to the meaning of non dual. If we take the sense of anmai, it would mean non difference (verinmai) or non separateness (pirivinmai). While explaining the word of advaita, Kevala dvaitis and Visistadvaitis accept the sense of inmai in the negation of 'a'. Contrast to this, Caiva Cittantis advocate the sense of anmai in the negation of the 'a' in attuvitam.

As we mentioned earlier, the concept of advaita gets prominent place in Indian Philosophy, especially among theistic schools. Almost every theistic school tries to explain their final goal or final achievement of the life as joining with God or achieving the state of God. As they explain these aspects, they are compelled to describe clearly the status between the soul and God in liberation. It is a critical state to describe those facts without logically contradicting their philosophy. Not relating the soul with God in the final stage also creates confusion. At the same time, maintaining duality between God and the soul also creates contradiction on the concept of liberation in which the soul enjoys the supreme bliss of God and experiences the pure consciousness that is ascribed to God. To avoid these problems various schools try to interpret the concept of advaita differently.

Philosophical significance of the advaita concept

Sankara (788-820 A.D.) establishes the Vedanta Philosophy which mainly centred on advaita doctrine. Due to this it is also called Advaita Vedanta.

According to Sankara, advaita means non dual reality. Non dualism is the ultimate reality that is Brahman. For him, dualism is mithya (illusion). His whole philosophy could be summarised in the following sentences. *Brahma satyam, jagan mithya; jivo brahmaiva na parah* (Brahman is reality, the world is mere appearance and the individual soul none other than Brahman). He explains the 'a' negation in the sense of abhava. Brahman is the absolute reality and other than Brahman is mere appearance only. All perceived multiplicity of the world must partake of unreality. The world, Atman, Isvara etc are various appearances of Brahman according to Sankara. These are not ultimate reality. The ultimate reality is non dual Brahman. Not undermining the ideas of the *Veda* and *Upanisads* but combining his ideas with those of *Veda* and *Upanisads* Sankara explains his assumption of non dual Brahman with the help of advaitic concept. His explanation of advaita is called Kevaladvaita (absolute non dual).

After Sankara's period, Ramanuja (1017 - 1137 A. D.) had the advantage and opportunity to criticise Sankara's non dual concept. Ramanuja never totally reject the advaitic concept of Sankara. Ramanuja takes his stand little different from that of Sankara and preaches the doctrine of Visistadvaita (qualified non dualism) Like Sankara, he accepts the sense of abhava in the negation of 'a' in advaita. Vasudeva or Narayana is the highest and Supreme reality according to Ramanuja. But he refutes the appearance theory of Sankara. He emphasises that the soul and the world are real and not mere appearances. Further, he elaborates on the relationship among the Lord,

the world and the soul. It is called aprthaksiddhi (inseparability). Ramanuja tries to remove the mistakes which Sankara overlooked in his philosophy. He gives more emphasise on religious aspects than Sankara. Owing to this, he has to accept the reality of the world and the soul. For Ramanuja, the souls and the world are the parts of the Lord's body. The Lord is one and non dual. But both individual soul and the world are subordinates and dependent on the Lord. Moreover, they become the Lord's attributes as well as real entities.

After Ramanuja's period, Madhva (1199-1278 A.D) establishes the Dvaita Philosophy. He emphasises dualism and opposes the concept of non dual, advaita. While Sankara and Ramanuja explain the non dual, advaita, Madhva refutes their arguments by saying that the word advaita never implies the meaning of non dual, monism (ekam - oneness). Madhva takes the sense of marutalai for the 'a' negation in advaita. Even though, the Vedas say that Paramatman is only one and the oneness opposes to dual, it never negates the existence of other than Paramatman according to Madhva. He says that if they want to emphasise the fact that one is the real and dual is non existence, then the word ekam (oneness) is more appropriate than the word advaita which means non dual. The *Vedas* and *Upanisads* use the word to mean other way and imply the acceptance of the concept of dualism according to Madhva. Therefore the word advaita gives some indirect emphasis on the sense of advaita.

While Visistadvaita gives prominence to Lord Vasudeva and establishes qualified advaita, Sivadvaita gives prominence to Lord Siva and speaks about qualified advaita like Visistadvaita. Sivadvaita also accepts the sense of inmai in the negation like Ramanuja and confirms the non dual aspects of Siva. They emphasise that the Lord Siva is non dual reality which has the qualified aspects with him.

Attuvitam according to Caiva Cittantam

While Kevaladvaitis Visistadvaitis and Sivadvaitis take the sense of inmai and Dvaitis take the sense of marutalai in the negation of 'a', Caiva Cittantis emphasise the sense of anmai in the negation of 'a'. Meykanta Tevar's interpretation of attuvitam makes a significant contribution to Caiva Cittantam. He refutes the explanation of attuvitam in the sense of inmai that especially demonstrated by Sankara. Caiva Cittantis insist that the prefix of an 'a' negation coming in front of derivative noun from numerals (ennuppeyar) takes only the sense of anmai instead of inmai. This aspect could be seen in the example of anekam (many). The word ekam (one) is a derivative noun from numeral word and with the addition of the prefix of 'a', it means many. Like wise, Caiva Cittantis emphasise that the same rule could be applicable to the word of attuvitam as dvaita is a derivative noun from numeral word⁸. Therefore, attuvitam could be explained only in the sense of anmai, according to Caiva Cittantis.

The two different words, such as illai (not)⁹ and allai (not)¹⁰ denote the meaning of inmai and anmai

respectively in Tamil. The word *alla* (not)¹¹ also denotes the same meaning of the word *allai* and gives clear demonstration to the sense of *anmai* in the negation. This meaning of *alla* is clearly exposed and illustrated in the following. The *Sacred Kural* of Tiruvalluvar.

Porul *alla varrai* porulen runarum
marulan manappirappu.¹²

The delusion whereby men deem that the truth which is not that is the cause of hapless birth)¹³

The word *alla* gives the meaning of *anmai*. Here, the phrase, *porul allavarrai*, indirectly indicates that there are two kinds of things which exist and

⁸ Meykanta Tevar's *Civananapotam* and Civanana Yokikal's *Civananapatiyam*. (Madras: Curiyanarkovil atinam, 1922) p¹⁰⁰

⁹ M. Winslow. Winslow's a Comprehensive Tamil and English Dictionary (Madras: Asian Educational Services, 1989), p.108.

The word *illai* derives from the root *il* and expresses the total or exclusive negation of the thing or quality.

¹⁰ Winslow. Winslow's... p. 43

The word *allai* derives from the root *al* and expresses a partial negation of the quality or thing or action in question and invariably implies the existence of some other.

¹¹ *alatu* and *anru* are the singular form of the *alla*.

¹² Tiruvalluvar *The Sacred Kural*. Tran. G U. Pope (Madras Asian Educational Services, 1992) kural 351, p. 48.

¹³ J. M. Nallaswamipillai. *Studies in Saiva Siddhanta* Madras: The South India Saiva Siddhanta works Publishing Society, 1984)... p. 246.

negates a kind of thing which misleads one to think that other way, by the word *alla*. If the word *illai*, replaced *alla*, then the whole meaning would be changed and it would imply the non-existence or absence of the said thing. If we take the example of *itu pal alla* (It is not milk), it implies that it is something else other than milk. But if the word *alla* replaces the word by *illai*, then it would mean that it is not milk and gives nothing else other than implying the absence or the non-existence of milk. In other words in the first sentence, the reality of the said thing before us is not questioned. In the second instance, the reality of the said thing presented before us is denied.

Meykanta Tevar who accepts the reality of God, soul and the world, takes the sense of *anmai* negation, for *attuvitam*. Advaita Vedantis interpret the word *advaita* as non dual, that is oneness. But Meykanta Tevar refutes that the word *attuvitam* cannot mean oneness (*ekam*). He explains the contradictory aspects of the words *attuvitam* and *ekam* as both cannot denote the same meaning that is oneness. In the text *ekam evadvitiam*,¹⁴ if both *ekam* and *advitiam* mean one, then there is redundancy. Even if it comes as reduplication (*atukkuttotar*) in order to emphasise a particular sense then the reduplication, traditionally occurs with the same word only and not with different words. Therefore, he clearly distinguishes the term *attuvitam* from *ekam* and defines *attuvitam* as negating the separateness of the two. He says that (the word *attuvitam* expressed the non-separateness

¹⁴ *Chandogya Upanisad.*, 6-2-1.

of the two things. (15). Moreover it is the clear *ekam* means one. *Caiva Cittantis* use the word *ekam* to denote either oneness or *Civan*.¹⁶ *Meykanta Tevar* uses the word *ekam* to emphasise the oneness aspects in *Civananapotam*. In a number of places he uses the following word, *ekamay*,¹⁷ *ekanaki*,¹⁸ *ekam*¹⁹ to denote this aspect It is clearly mentioned in the following usage (He, who pervades everywhere, takes neither oneness nor dual aspect) ²⁰*Tiruviyalur Uyyavanta Tevar* also uses word *ekam* in his *Tiruvuntiyar* in the sense of stressing aspect of oneness. ²¹ But in later period especially *Umapati Civaccariyar* uses the word *ekam* to denote *Civan* who maintains the aspect of one ness.²² In the text, the phrase, *Brahman ekam* means that *Brahman* is one. But it is not necessary to mean that there is nothing else other than *Brahman*. *Caiva Cittantam* conceives *attuvitam* as *anvaya* Non Different. *Attuvitam* is a non dual relationship between two entities and not *ekam*.

¹⁵ *Civanaanapotam*, aphorism 11. etu.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, aphorism - X and *Tiruvaturupayan.*, 6-2.

¹⁷ *Civananapotam*, aphorism 11-1-2; XI-1-2.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, aphorism - X

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, aphorism II - 4 etu.

²⁰ *Ibid.*, aphorism, 11-4-etu

²¹ *Tiruvuntiyar* - *ekanumaki*

²² *Thiruvaturupayan.*, 6.2 Ekan: 9.4 Ekan

Meykanta Tevar explains that the word *attuvitam* implies three different aspects, namely *onray* (being one with) *veray* (being different from) and *utanay* (being together with). With the above explanation of *attuvitam* Meykanta Tevar tries to prove his concept of the relation of *pati* (God) to *pacu* (soul) and God to *pacam* (the world). *Attuvitam* is not understood as non dual. There are fundamental differences, among God, soul and the world. These differences can never disappear. Therefore, non-separateness is more appropriate than non-dual as the meaning of the word *attuvitam*.

Civan is being one with the soul and different from it and is together with it. This is a unique concept of the immanence and transcendence of *Civan*. Meykanta Tevar states the three different stages in the second aphorism *avaiye taneyay* (those become himself), ²³ which expands in accordance with the law of reduplication (*iratturamolitalan*) and takes the form of *avaiyeyay* (becomes they), *taneyay* (they become himself) and *avaiyetaneyay* (they become himself), that implies God is being one with them and different from them and together with them. ²⁴

Further to this, he uses the example of a grind stone, which is formed of black sand together with lac, to explain the *attuvitam* relation of God to soul in *Civananapotam*. The grind stone (*uraikal*) normally used by the gold smith to verify the stand or the genuinity of the gold by rubbing the gold with grind

²³ *Civananapotam*, aphorism II.

²⁴ Meykanta Tevar's *Civananapotam* and *Civanana Yokikal's Civananapaliyam*... p. 93.

stone. (The stone is being one with lac. when it is melted and mixed together with).²⁵ In grind stone, lac is being one with the black sand and different from it and is together with it also. Likewise, the relationship between God and soul becomes evident in the stage of onray, veray and utanay.

The same idea could be seen in the following devotional songs of Tirunanacampanar, a seventh century Caiva saint. (who is the cause for the end and begining is one, male and female are two, attributes are three, unchangeable *Vedas* are four, elements are five, tastes are six, sounds are seven, direction are eight and who stay at Vilimmilalai, is one with it and different from it and together with it.)²⁶ Though he uses the concept, he fails to uses the word *attuvitam* in the above context. Moreover, we fail to find the wording of *attuvitam* and the detail or the elaboration of this idea in Tirunanacampanar's whole works or othes, *nayanmars* works. Tirukkataavur Uyyavanta Tevar's *Tirukkalirruppatiyar* is the next notable work, which contains the idea of onray, veray and utanay, before the *Civananapotam* of Meykanta Tevar. Uyyavanta Tevar belongs to the thirteen century. He mentions the concept in the following verses (Observe that the Lord who causes the end, one with it, becomes two and unchangeable eight kinds, different from it and together with it, as his, poss-

²⁵ *Civananapotam*, II-4.

²⁶ Tirunanacampana *nayanar Tevaram*. Volume-1, Nanacampanar (India: Institut Francis de Pondichery, 1984), verse, 109. p. 11.

essing form and see his ever attachment with it.²⁷
 (Concerning this, Arulnanti Civaccariyar says that
 (Civan becomes all and different from them and
 together with them).²⁸

According to Caiva Cittantis the word *attuvitam* emphasises the fact of non separateness (*pirivinmai*) or non - difference (*verinmai*). From the word *attuvitam*, it could be inferred that the things are dual in nature though the two things stay together as non different things in a state. The three aspects of *onray*, *veray* and *utanay* are also explained to correspond the three different states namely, *apetam*, *petam* and *petapetam* respectively by Cittantis. While they illustrate the *attuvita* relationship between God and soul or between God and the world, they identify the state of difference (*petam*) in nature of substance and the state of difference and non difference *petapetam* in name of action. Therefore, Caiva Cittantis say that the *attuvita* relationship includes all the three states. It is a notable fact that each of these three state of relationship is accepted by the three prominent schools in India. Sanskara's Advaita Vedanta advocates the relationship of *apetam* and Madhva's Dvaita gives importance to the relationship of *petam*. Ramanuja's Visisadvaita advocates the relationship of *petapetam* in this regard. Therefore, it may be correct to say that Caiva Cittanatis had the great advantage and opportunity to accommodate a portion of earlier thinkers' ideas and able to formulate a well acceptable and logically sound interpretation of *attuvitam*. It looks like a

²⁷ *Tirukkaliruppati*yar, verse 86.

²⁸ *Civanana Cittiyar*., verse 2-27.

peculiar way to admit and accommodate different kinds of relationship as the meaning of the word *attuvitam*. It is logically possible and is not contradictory in itself.

The above idea is clearly exposed in the following introductory verse in *Civappirakacam* of Umapati Civaccariyar.²⁹ "(We expound here the beauty of Saiva Siddhanta, the cream of the Vedanta, whose excellent merit consists in its exposition of the *advaita* postulating an inseparable relation like body and soul, eye and the sun, the soul and the eye; supported as it is by the dharma of highest authoritative books, and unlike the *bheda* and *bhedabheda* and *abheda* relations illustrated; respectively, by light and darkness, word and meaning, gold and ornament, set forth by other schools, and which is further supported by perfectly logical methods, and is light to the truth seekers and darkness to others."³⁰

Tirukkatavur Uyyaavanta Tevar says that (Civan caused the relationship of *petam*, *apetam* and *petapetam*)³¹. The same kind of idea could be seen in Arelnanti Civaccariyar's *Civnaana Cittiyar*. He mentions that (Civan maintains the relation of *petam*, *apetam* and *petapetam* and becomes one with it and different from it and together with it.)³²

²⁹ *Civappirakacam*, verse 7.

³⁰ J. M. Nallaswami pillai. Studies in... p. 245.

³¹ *Tirukkaliruppati*, verse 82.

³² *Civanaana Cittiyar*, verse 1-27.

Meykanta Tevar illustrates the *attuvitam* relationship between God and soul with some examples. He takes the example of body and life relationship to explain the relationship between the God and soul. (As the body and the life joined together and the life responses to the body's name give the comparison that even though God is joined together with soul is different from soul.)³³

Further to the analogy of body (*utal*) and life (*uyir*), Meykanta Tevar explains the relation of God to soul. (It is said that there is only one means one only and this one is the Lord. You who say 'there is one' is the soul bound up in bonds. If one, that is God, is not, beside God nothing else will exist as when we say that there will be no consonants when the vowel is not there).³⁴ In the analogy of vowel and consonants are compared to the life and body respectively. According to *Nannul* grammar rule, the vowel becoming one with the consonants is natural union.³⁵ It is obvious that the souls will not have the functioning ability without the Lord, according to Caiva Cittantis. This aspect leads to the relation of God to soul as different and non-different. It is a notable fact that Meykanta Tevar postulates his second aphorism, in which he says that (God is one with them and different from souls and the world.)³⁶ The soul and God are diff-

³³ *Civananapotam*, aphorism II-1-1

³⁴ *Ibid.*, aphorism II-1-2.

³⁵ *Nannol Mulamum Cankara Namaccivayar Uraiyum* Dr. U. Ve. Cavinataiyar nūnilyam, (Madras: 1991), sutra 204, p. 134.

³⁶ *Civananapotam*, aphorism II.

erent in their nature yet they are inseparable. If they be one then there is no need to seek union. At the same time, if they separate then they could never attain the bliss in union or *cayucciyam*. It is in fact, neither one nor two but as *Vedas* mention it is *attuvitam*. Therefore, Caiva Cittantis explain the relationship between God and soul as a case of distinct, uniting inseparably. This idea could be seen in *Tiruvārulpayan* of Umapati Civaccariyar also³⁷ (If it is one, it will not unite; if it is two, it will not join together; therefore, it is neither one nor two. (Arulnanti Civaccariyar also advocates the same view in his *Irupairupatu*. He says that (He becomes neither one nor two nor the negation of either.³⁸ It leads to the interpretation of the three different states as *petam* *apetam* and *petapetam* relation of *attuvitam*. In another work of his, Civanana Cittiyar, he says that Civan is one with soul and different from it)³⁹ and (together with it)⁴⁰.

It is clear from those examples and explanations that though the difference between God and soul are immanent, the relationship of non-separateness cannot be denied between the two entities. Meykanta Tevar tries to illustrate the *petapetam* relation between God and soul in the following example. (Like the analogy of musical note and the musical sound and fruit and its essential taste, the soul becomes united with the Lord, especially in the feet of Lord, who

³⁷ *Tiruvārulpayan*, *kural* 8-5

³⁸ *Irupairupatu*, *verse* 19-9-10

³⁹ *Civanana Cittiyar*, *verse* 2-3

⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, *verse* 2-2

pervades all over. The Vedic text mentions this relation by the word *attuvitam* instead of oneness).⁴¹ The musical sound and musical note cannot be separated as different entities. Like wise, fruit and its essential taste also cannot be separated as different entities. Even though, both things stay as non-separate entities, it could be identified as separate entities. Like wise, even though God and the soul stay as non separate entities, it could be possible to identify them as separate entities according to *Caiva Cittantis*.

It is a notable fact from the above mentioned examples that God is being one with the soul and different from it and together with it. Like wise, *attuvitam* relation could be seen in the relation between *Civan* and the world also. *Civanana Cittiyar* describes that (the Lord, who transcends like light, becomes one with all the worlds and different from them and is together with them and guides the souls which is innumerable, in obedience to each one's deeds).⁴² The Lord in the process of the evolution of the world is in non-dual relation of identity with the world, different in essence and together in activity. Though identical in this relationship *Civan* stands unaffected by this relationship as he is the unconditioned, unqualified, self luminous Being according to *Caiva Cittantam*.

The explanation of *attuvitam* relation by *Caiva Cittantis* may be peculiar styled. But the arguments

⁴¹ *Civananapotam*, aphorism 11-1-3

⁴² *Civanana Cittiyar*, *vatse* 2-1

of Meykanta Tevar and his followers are most acceptable. Umapati Civaccariyar clearly describes the relation between God and the soul as one with world and different from it and one and different. Before he establishes his ideas, he refutes the defective ideas of other schools. Kevaladvaitis use the analogy of Gold and the ornaments made out of it, to explain the apeta relation between God and the world. Caiva Cittantis criticise that the damage and destruction to the ornaments, made out of gold, affect the God also. This kind of explanation creates confusion that all the affections of the world will affect Civan, according to the above example. The analogy spoils the high image of God. Therefore, it is untenable for Caiva Cittantis.

Dvaitis explain the relationship of petam, between God and the world with the example of darkness and light. Caiva Cittantis refutes this as unsatisfactory example to explain the relation of God to the world. In the example, darkness and light look like just opposite or inimical entities. This aspect creates confusion of the relationship between God and the world. In fact the creation of the world is a gracious endeavour of God. But, the said example creates a drift in this regard

Petapeta vatis explain the relationship between God and the world with the analogy of word and meaning. Though the word and the meaning of it are two different things, it appears to be one when we speak about a word and, its meaning strike us immediately. Like wise, God and the world are related to each other according to Visistadvaita. But

Caiva Cittantam refutes that the word and its meaning could not be separated as two distinct entities. Therefore, these analogy never explains the relationships satisfactorily according to Caiva Cittantis. In consequence to this, Caiva Cittantam suggests that the combination of all these three states, namely, petam, apetam and petapetam, could only explain the relationship of God and to the world satisfactorily. Attuvitam emphasises the meaning of non separateness. In other words, it implies the existence of two things and stresses the non difference of the two things. They explain the apeta relation, that God is one with the world in union (kalappal) on the analogy of body and life. It is like the life and body where two distinct entities are in inseparable union. In the relation of peta. God and the world are different in respect of substance (peruttanmaiya). The relation of peta is explained on the analogy of eye and the sun. The eye sight gets the help of the sun light and it is dependent on the sun-light for its vision. The eye loses its power of seeing things in darkness and it recovers it in sun light. Though light of the eye blends with sunlight, the sun light is different from the eye sight. Caiva Cittantis describes the petapetam relation between the God and the world in the nature of action on the analogy of the soul and the eye. According to Caiva Cittantam, God involves in the creation of the world as an efficient cause. But he is never affected due to the involvement of the world creation. This state of action suggests the significance of peatapetam. In this way, Caiva Cittantam explains the word attuvitam with combining the three fold relationship.

The final goal of our life is attainment of liberation according to Caiva Cittantam. Liberation means that the individual soul becomes one with Civan and experiences the bliss of Civan or Civananta anupavam. Though the soul becomes one with Civan, it yet remains distinct as recipient and enjoyer of Civan's ever lasting supreme bliss. For Caiva Cittntaam. Civan is the nature of pure bliss and His form is full of bliss. The individual soul is wholly absorbed in the bliss of communion with Civan that is described as Civacayucciyaam (one with Civan).

The souls will be for ever at the feet of Civan is a union of two in one with the compound word in Tamil tatalai. The word tatalai consists of the word tal (foot) and talai (head). When the words tal and talai are joined, there results the expression tatalai, that cannot be called a single word or two words. Umapati Civaccariyar uses the tatalai example to explain the state of attuvitam in liberation in which the soul becomes one with Civan.⁴³ Tirumular also utilises the same example to describe the relationship between Civan and the souls in liberation.⁴⁴ According to the example of tatalai, the talai, that denotes the head of the soul, resting under tal, that denotes the blessed feet of the Lord Civan, the true abode of transcendental felicity, that is called mukti (liberation).

Liberation is the state where the soul enjoys Civanantam in the state of attuvita pavanai (form of non separateness). That is to say that the Caiva

⁴³ *Tiruvarutpayan.*, kural 8.4. **tatalai por**

⁴⁴ *Tirumanthiram.* verse 1565, verse 2011, 1521, 2049

Cittantam emphasises only one experience, the bliss of God, Civan in final. Caiva Cittantis use the phrase, *atu, atu atal* (to become that to which it is united) to explain a unity in duality, that is *attuvitam*. This is the relationship which is difficult to understand or postulate in words. Owing to these difficulties, Uyyavanta Tevar raises the question in the following way. Who ever realises that, that is this, He is only I am, and that becomes you, will they say it as dual or one? ⁴⁵ Civanana Cuvamikal says that *civokam pavanai* (form of non-separateness with Civan) leads to realisation of the state of non-difference of Civan to the soul in liberation. Though the soul is one with Civan in liberation, it never becomes Civan in itself according to Caiva Cittantam. In this aspect, Uyyavanta Tevar Tirukkataavur emphasises the fact by raising a question that (we stay as Civan in liberation and are there people in the world who think themselves as Civan?) ⁴⁶ This idea could be seen in *Tiruvuntiyar* as follows: the soul becomes God; without God's grace the soul could not become God; though the soul is eternally soul. ⁴⁷ Manikkavacakar, one of the Caiva Kuravars, narrates his experience of liberation that (my Lord who got rid of my bonds and made me Civan and governed me). ⁴⁸ It is a notable fact that even though

⁴⁵ *Tirukkavirupattiyar*, verse 85.

⁴⁶ *Ibid.*, verse 84.

⁴⁷ *Tiruvuntiyar*, verse 40.

⁴⁸ *Tiruzacakam*, verse accoppattu-1.

he becomes one with Civan, the difference between Civan and himself does not disappear as Civan governs even after he becomes Civam. Tirumular elaborates the same idea in a slightly different way. (He who made me Civam, and gave me his feet order to get ride of fame causes ruin).⁴⁹ In *Civananapotam*, Meykanta Tevar also emphasises that (the soul reaches the Lord in liberation)⁵⁰ Further more, attuvita relationship between Civan and soul could be understood in the sense of non-separatness (pirippinri⁵¹) even in liberation. Further to this, saint Tirumular quotes that becoming one without being one nor two, and becoming Civam is the aim of Cittantam.⁵²

Cutta Attuvitam

The attuvitam relationship is interpreted by Caiva Cittantam in cutta (pure) state only. Meykanta Tevar's interpretation of attuvitam treated as the true interpretation of attuvittam by the followers of Caiva Cittantam. Therefore, they called this by different names. viz, Cutta Attuvitam (pure non dual), Cutta Attuvita Caiva Cittantam (pure non dual Caiva Cittantam), Vaitika Cutta Attuvita Caiva Cittantam (Pure non dual Caiva Cittantam of Vedic tradition) and Vaitika Caiva Cittanta Attuvitam (Pure non dual Vedic Caiva Cittantam) Civanana

⁴⁹ *Tirumantiram*, verse 1569.

⁵⁰ *Civananapotam*, aphorism XI.

⁵¹ *Ibid.*, aphorism II-1-4.

⁵² *Tirumantiram*, verse 1141.

Ouyamikal says that Caiva Cittantam is called Cutta Attuvitam because it gives the pure expression of the truth and does not require any other qualifying words like kevala (absolute), visesa qualified and virotha (opposite)⁵³. In general, Caiva Cittantis say that Cutta Attuvitam only gives pure and clear explanation of attuvitam. Among the fourteen Meykanta Cattiram, Meykanta Tevar's *Civananapotam* gets the pride of place. He explains the concept of attuvitam in the first atikaranam (sub section of the second aphorism and the tenth aphorism of his *Civananapotam*. *Civananapotam*, which (eradicates any kind of confusion)⁵⁴, eloquently leads to pure attuvitam state to all⁵⁵ Arulnanti Civaccariyar praises his guru Meykanta Tevar (who found the non difference for attuvitam).⁵⁶ Tayumana-var, a Caiva saint of the eighteenth century, expresses of him as the one who found the real meaning of the word Attuvitam in the following way: (For the day, when I can reach the feet of my Lord

⁵³ Civanana Cuvamikal, *Mathavae Civanana yohikal Ciyana patiyam*, Ed. S. V. Subramaniam (Madras; Ulakat Tamil Kalvi Tyakkam, 1986), p. 434

⁵⁴ *Civananapotam*, Cirappup payiram, **Mayarvara ...uyar Civananapotam**

⁵⁵ K. Subramaniampillai, *Introduction, Meykanta Cattiram patinankul* (Madras: Caiva Cittanta nuru (patippkkalakam. 1925) p. 8.

cf., *Cantana Cariya Puranacankirakam* of cuvaminata
Tecikar.

ellarum attuvita cuttanillai yiniteyti.

⁵⁶ Arulnanti Civaccariyar *Irappupatu* verse 29.

Meykantar who had realised the truth of the pure attuvitam and which could not be comprehended by persons dwelling in untruth.)⁵⁷

Pantitamani Kanapatippillai, a well known traditional caiva scholar of Yalppanam, says that the vetanta truth of oneness in the stage of liberation is clearly realised and explained beyond doubt by the Caivaites, followers of Cutta Attuvitam.

Though Cutta Attuvitam denotes Caiva Cittantam Vallabhacarya's school of thought is also mentioned as Suddha Advaita (pure non dualism). He belongs to 1479-1530. A.D.⁵⁸ He offers a theistic interpretation of the Vetantam which differs from those of Sankara and Ramanuja. According to Vallabha the whole world is real and is subtly Brahman. The soul and the world are in essence one with Brahman. "The relation between Brahman on the one side and the individual souls and the inanimate nature on the other, is one of pure identity even as the relation of whole and part is. While the difference is subordinated by Vallabha, non difference alone is said to be real."⁵⁹ Brahman and jiva are real and the knower of Brahman is absorbed in Aksara Brahman [object of meditation regarded as the abode of Krishna] and not in Purusottama. If the knowledge is

⁵⁷ Tayumana Cuvamikal. *Tayumana Cuvamikal*. patal Ed. T. Campanta Mutaliyar (Madras: Amerika accakam, 1891), ennal kanni - 4.

⁵⁸ Jethalal, G. Shah, *Shri Vallabhacarya: His Philosophy and Religion*. (India: The Pushtimargiya Pustakalaya Nadiad, 1969), P.³

⁵⁹ S. Radhakrishnan. *Indian Philosophy Volume II* (London: George allen and unwin Ltd. 1960). p 760

associated with bhakti he is then absorbed in Puru-
sottama. This suddha advaita state is higher than
all other states.⁶⁰ While Vallabha explains the non
dualism of Brahman, he refutes the doctrine of maya
of Sankara. Shah says that Vallabha reoriented the
then existing Vaishnava religion, basing it of course
on the cult of Devotion and give it a new name of
Pushti marga, the path of Love and Grace.⁶¹

Though Vallabha is pointed out as the founder
of the Suddha Advaita, he doesnot often use the
word suddha advaita. While explaining the usage of
the word advaita by Vallabha, Shah states the follow-
ing aspects. "Vallabha uses the word suddha advaita
once only in his *Subodhini*, a commentary on the
Bhagavata where he distinguishes between self know-
ledge and God's knowledge. The self knowledge tends
to sublate ignorance, but God's knowledge enables
one to realise non-difference of the soul from Brah-
man. When the self knowledge is assisted by God's
knowledge we have the knowledge, of pure non-dualism.
The word Suddha was added to Brahmavada by
Vitthaleshji, the son of Vallabha."⁶² After Vallabha's
period, Giridhara's *Suddhadvaitamartanda* and Rama-
krishna's *Suddhadvaita Parikskara* are some of the
notable works which contain the expression of suddha
advaita According to Shah. Girithira only Used the
word Suddha advaita most appropriatiely in the sense of
pure non dualism and popularised it⁶³. In fact, Visnvus-

⁶⁰ S. Radhakrishnan, *The Brahma Sutra* (London: George Allen
and Unwin Ltd. 1960) p.22

⁶¹ Jethalal G. Shah. *Shri Vallabhacarya...*p53

⁶² Ibid. p.56

⁶³ Ibid. pp, 26-29.

vamin is regarded by tradition as being the earliest founder of the Visuddhadvaita school which was regenerated by Vallabha.⁶⁴ But this Suddha Advaita should not be confused with the Cutta Attuvitam of Caiva Cittantam which is established well before Vallabha.

The author of *Vaitika Caiva Cuttattuvita Caiva Cittantam* refutes the *Brahma Vidya* editor's statement in 1889 that the Vedic text or other texts only speak about advaita and not any other form of advaita including suddha advaita that seems to be a new name.⁶⁵ The author of the said book emphasises that some other form of advaita could be seen in the earlier texts. The word suddha advaita occurs in the second piramana of *Mantalappirammano* panisad and sivo dvaita in the *Mandukyopanisad* and Advaita Saiva and Sivadvaita in the slokas of 96,166 & 199 of the tenth chapter of *Kailaca cankitai*.⁶⁶

Vetantat telivam Caiva Cittantam.

(clarity of Vetantam becomes Caiva Cittantam)*

As Caiva Cittantam is known as Cutta Attuvitam, Caiva Cittantis call themselves strict attuvitis (follower of Attuvitam). Meykanta Tevar mentions Caiva Cittantis as attuvitis in the last aphorism of *Civananpotam*.⁶⁷

⁶⁴ S. Dasgupta. *A History of Indian Philosophy*. Volume IV (London: Cambridge University Press, 1955). p. 374

⁶⁵ *Vaitika Cuttattuvita Caiva Cittantam*. (Due to the condition of the book, the information about the author, publisher and year of publication are not possible.) p. 101

⁶⁶ Ibid. p. 102

⁶⁷ *Civananpotam*, aphorism XII - 3-1

Apart from that, he gives prominence to the concept of attuvitam and the word attuvitam occurs in his *Civananapotam*.⁶⁸ Before analysing the Caiva Cittanta doctrine, Umapati Civacariyar in the introductory verses of his *Civappirakacam*, emphasises that, attuvitamakum cirappinatay vetantat telivam caiva cittantam, (Caiva Cittantam becomes possessed of eminency in Attuvitam and the clearness of Vetantam)⁶⁹ This verse gets prominent attention by many Caive scholars including Yalppana traditional scholar Pantitamani Kanapatippillai. The interpretation of this verse centred on the explanation of Cutta Attuvitam of Meykanta Tevar.

Tirumular mentions six kinds of antam (end), namely, Vetantam (end of Veda), Cittantam (end of established) Natantam (end of sound), Potantam (end of knowledge), Yokantam (end of meditation) and Kalantam (end of time) in his *Tirumantiram*.⁷⁰ Among these antams, Tirumular says that Cittantam and Vetantam are the prominent antams.⁷¹ Cittantam literally means. Siddha (established) and antam (end), established end. Vetantam means, Veda (the Vedic text or the latter portion of the *Veda* that is *Upanisads*) and antam (end or essence) the essence of *Upanisads*. Like Umapati Civaccariyar, Tirumular says that (Cittantam is the knowledge of Vetantam.⁷²) It is very difficult

⁶⁸ Ibid., aphorism II-cru, 1-2: XII-4-1.

⁶⁹ *Civappirakacam*, verse 7.

⁷⁰ *Tirumantiram*, verse 2329.

⁷¹ Ibid., vere 2354

⁷² loc. cit., verse 2354

to interpret the meaning of the above phrase as Vetantam and Cittantam are two distinct Philosophies. The same kind of problem arises on the interpretation of the word of Umapati Civaccariyar's Vetantat telivam caiva cittantam. A number of commentators have given different kinds of meaning to the said phrase. Civapparakacar of Maturai interprets the phrase that Caiva Cittantam cleared at the end of vetantam.⁷³ Ciri Citamparanatha munivar says that clearness of Caiva Cittantam which was spelt out at the end of *Veda*.⁷⁴ According to Centilnataiyar, Caiva Cittantam is the clear knowledge of Vetantam which reflects the three entries, namely, God, the soul and the world.⁷⁵ Tiruvilankam interprets Caiva Cittantam as clearly describing Vetantam.⁷⁶ Apart from these explanations, some others, like Kanapatipillai describe that vetantam means *Upanisads* and Cittantam means *Civakamam* (*Sivagama*) and some differentiates Vetantam as denoting the knowledge portion and Cittantam as denoting the devotion portion.

Caiva Citantntam accepts *Vedās* and *Sivagama* as authoritative texts besides the fourteen *Meykanta Cattiram*. According to Tirumular, Caiva Cittantam

⁷³ *Civappirakam* Com. Maturai Civapparakacar (Madras: Caiva nutratippukkalakam, 1969, p.17.

⁷⁴ *Meykanta Cattiram - Civappirakacam*. Com. Citamparanatha munivar, (Madras; Tiruvavatuturai Atinam, 1953, p. 13.

⁷⁵ Centilnataiyar, *Caiva Vetantam* (Maturai: Sri Iramaccantira vilacum, 1920) pp. 352-4.

⁷⁶ *Civappirakam*, Com. Tiruvilankam, (Yalppanam, Publisher not known, 1919), pp. 10-12.

treats the *Vedas* as general and the *Agama* as special, though (both the texts were revelations of truth by God.)⁷⁷ Arulnanti Civaccariyar says (the (the *Vedic* text and the Agamic text are the only two text and other texts are the elaboration of these works)⁷⁸ Generally scholars differentiate the *Vedas* and *agama* as two different texts though Tirumular says that (they are not different for the learned people.)⁷⁹ The same idea could be found in saint Tayumanavar's utterance, that the *Veda* and *Agama* are not two, but one.⁸⁰

While Caiva Cittantam recognises the *Vedas* and the *Upasads* it is mainly based upon twenty-eight sanskrit *Sivagamas* which date to the seventh century A.D.⁸¹ *Sivagamas* clearly elaborate the nature of Civan and other entities. It is worth mention that Arulnanti Civaccariyar quotes that (*Civakamankal* are Cittantam.)⁸² Though *Sivagama* gets prominence in Caiva Cittantam, the *Veda* also finds due place as it comes under the *vaitika* tradion. It is further evidence that the phrase of (Caivism which

⁷⁷ *Tirumantiram*, 2358. *Vetamotakamam meyyam iralvan nul*.

⁷⁸ *Civ annaga Ciriya*, verse 7-15

⁷⁹ *Tirumantiram*, verse 2358.

⁸⁰ *Tayumanava Cuvamikal patel*, mounakuru vanakkam-2.

⁸¹ Richard, H., David, *Rituals in An Oscillating Universe* (New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1989), p. 12.

⁸² *Civanana Ciriya* verse 7-15. *Civakamankal cittantam-kum*.

speaks about faultless ideas of Vetantam⁸³, (faultless Vedic Caivism⁸⁴, (Vedic religion)⁸⁵ and (Vedic Caivism)⁸⁶ emphasising the influence of the Vedic texts. More over Civanana Cittiyar's following statment also confirms the above idea that (Those, who, understand very clearly the meaning of the best in the Vedas, arrives at the stage of Caivam.)⁸⁷ Some of the Agmas also stress the influence of the Vedas in Siddhanta. Suprabhedagama says that Siddhanta is the essence of Vedas and Makutagama says that this Siddhanta is the essence Vedas and Siddhanta, which is well formed, is the knowledge of Vedanta.⁸⁸

According to Civanaga Cuvamikal, the substance of Upanisads like atharvasikai, could be compared with the substance of Sivagama's as in the method of tulaaruntati distance of a star Aruntati). Civanana Cuvamikal says the phrase of vetanta telivam caiva cittantam could be interpreted on the basis of Vedas as general and akamams as special.

⁸³ Ibid., verse 267. Vetantat tijil porul konturaikkum nul caivam.

⁸⁴ Tukulalarupotam verse: 80. kurramila vaitika civam

⁸⁵ Civappirakacam, verse 31. vaitika camayam pakarum.

⁸⁶ Tayumanava Cuvakal patal, Citampara rakaciyam-14-16. vaitika caivam alakitu.

⁸⁷ Civanana Cittiyar, 7-11.

⁸⁸ Centilnataiyar, Caiva Vetantam, op. cit, p. 347.
Suprabhedagama - siddhanto vedasarat vat;
Makutagama - veda saram idam tantram;
vedantartam idam jnana siddhanta paramasupa.

In a general view, it may be correct to say that Vettantam means *Upanisads* and Caiva Cittantam means *Sivagama*s only. Maturai Civappirakacar, Tiruvilankam, Pantitamani Kanapatippillai, Cuppiramaniya and Vacciravelu Mutaliyar take the above view only. Civanana Cuvamikal says that the Vetantam could mean either *Upanisads* as the derivative name (Yokappeyar or Attuvita Vettantam as the arbitrary name (urutippeiyar)⁸⁹ Kanapatippillai says is one place that (Cittantam, that is *Civakamam*, recognises the whole of *Upanisads*, that, is Vetantam, and clarifies the truth of Vetantam.)⁹⁰ In the same article, he gets confused with the above idea and says that (Vetantam is utara Mimamsa and it non dual Vetantam⁹¹ it is worth to mention here that Kanapathippillai had written a number of articles on the title of Vetantat telivam Caiva Cittantam in 1956, 1961, 1978, 1981 and 1984,⁹² Cuppiramaniya published a book on *Vetanttelivam Caivica Cittantam* in 1987.

⁸⁹ Meykanta Tevar's *Civana potam* and Civanana [Yokikal's *Civananapatiyam*... p. 18.

⁹⁰ C. Kanapatipillai. (*Vetantat telivam Caiva Cittantam* (Ceylon, Silvar jubilee malar, 1956), p. 7.

⁹¹ Ibid., p. 8.

⁹² *Vetantat telive Caiva Cittantam* was published in the following magazines and books. Kanapatippillai C. *Vetantat telive Caiva Cittantam (ilakecari Malar, Silvar jublie publication, 1956;*

.....*Vetantat telive Caiva Cittantam Camayak Katturaikal, (Ceylon, Old boys of Caiva Teachers Training College, Tirunelvel. 1961)*

.....*Vantantat telive Caiva Cittantam (Hindu Neri), (Jaffna, Jaffna University, Hindu society, 1978).*

.....*Vetantat telive Caiva Cittantam (Cittivinayakar Consecration Ceremony Magazine) (Negombo, 1981.)*

.....*Vetantat telive Caiva Cittantam (Tirumarul), (Colombo, 1984.)*

We have already mentioned Caiva Cittantam. *Sivagamas* gives prominence to Like Caiva Cittantam, some other schools also accept *Sivagamas* as their main sources. But they are not called as Cittantam. Kashmir Saivism, which thrived in Kashmir and some other northern parts of India, gives important to *Sivagamas*. For Kashmir Saivaities, *Sivagamas* are the voice of God and there is nothing equal to this. They accept sixty four *Sivagamas*. Vira Sivism, which mainly influenced in Karnatka state, also gives prominence to *Sivagamas* and calls them as karputai makalir (women of virtue). From these usages, it is clear that Caiva Cittantam could mean *Sivagama*, in a particular sense only. It is clear that the schools like Caiva Cittantam which accept *Civagamas* never donated them as Cittantam. Furthermore, if we interpret Caiva Cittantam as the clarity of *Upaisads* for the phrase of Vetantat telivam Civa Cittantam, then it Contradicts the acceptance of *agamie* text which is one of the main sources for Caiva Cittantam.

Therefore, it is more appropriate that in the phrase. Vetantat telivam Caiva Cittantam, the word Vetantam should mean specially the philosophy of Vetantam than the *Upanisads*. As we had mentioned before. Pantitamani Kanapatippillai also mentions onethat Veta-ntam means Uttare Mimamsa and interprets the said phrase as Caive Cittantam clarifying the Vetanta truth which emphasises the oneness.⁹³ Concerning this, Tirumular's utterance of Vetanta Cittantam⁹⁴, Cittanta Vetantam,⁹⁵ and

⁹³ Kanapatippillai, Vetantat...p.8.

⁹⁴ Tirumantiram, verse 23 63.

⁹⁵ Ibid, verse 2365.

Vetanta nana Cittantam⁹⁶ could be studied and interpreted in a wider sense.

Kumarakuruparar's narration of the Indian Philosophical system including Caiva Cittantam and Vetantam, on the analogy of a tree in his *Pantaramummanikkovai* is worth to mention here. He says that "Caiva Cittantam is essence of a crushed rare, excellent and ripe fruit, that is Vetantam, which bears on the top of a tree."⁹⁷ In the above analogy Kumarakuruparar describes Vetantam as the excellent and rare ripe fruit and the essence of the said fruit as Caiva Cittantam. Centinataiyar interprets the word Vetantam as Sivadvaita Vedanta. It is a matter of concern how far we could accept the Nilankanta's Vedanta as the true Vetantam as Centinataiyar interprets. But it is a notable fact that neither Kumarakuruparar nor Centinataiyar tries to interpret the word Vetantam in the sense of *Upanisads*. From these it is clear that the word Vetantam means the Advaita Vedanta which emphasises the concept of attuvitam. Therefore, the phrase, Vetantat telivam Caiva Cittantam means that the clearness of Attuvita Vetantam as Caiva Cittantam is eminent. Tayumanavar's utterance that "They do not say the Vetantam and Cittantam are different also affirms the same concept."⁹⁸

Conclusion

From the above arguments, it is clear that Caiva Cittantam contributes a different kind of

⁹⁶ Ibid, vers 2355.

⁹⁷ Kumarakuruparar. *Pantaramummanvikkoai*-569. verse.

⁹⁸ *Tayumanava Cuvamikal patal*, paraparak kanni 206

interpretation to the concept of attuvitam compared to other schools of thought. In fact saint Meykanta Tevar is the first person who explains systematically the concept of attuvitam in the sense of anmai. Attuvitam literally means only non - dual and not oneness (ekam). This aspect was clearly emphasised and explained by Meykanta Tevar and his followers. Attuvita, as we have already seen, means for him, not mere non difference as it does for the Kevaladvaitis, but a union in separateness. While accepting the three entities as real, Caiva Cittantis are able to explain the attuvita concept without logically contradicting it. It is a notable fact that the combined three fold relationship namely, onray, veray and utanay help, them to explain it satisfactorily. It may be also worth to mention here that Caiva Cittantis especially Meykanta Tevar, had the advantage and opportunity of learning and understanding the philosophies of earlier eminent thinkers like, Sankara, Ramanuja and Madhva. This opportunity would have helped him to eradicate other's mistakes and establish a well formed system of his own. This aspect could be clearly inferred from explanation of the concept of attuvitam. Caiva Cittantis maintain that their interpretation of attuvitam is the pure interpretation of truth and called themselves as Cutta Attuviti. Though the interpretation of Attuvitam has a peculiar one, it is neither self contradictory nor unacceptable.

Bibliography

Centilnatuiyar Kacivaci, Caiva Vetantam. Maturai: Sri Iram-
accantira Vila cam, 1920. 382 Pages.

Civanana Cuvamikal. Civananapatiyam. Ed. S. V. Subramani-
yam, Madras: Ulakat Tamil Kalvi Iyak-
kam, 1986, 560 Pages.

Dasgupta, Surendranath. A History of Indian Philosophy.
Volume-IV. London: Cambridge Univer-
sity Press. 1955. 483 Pages

David, Richard. H. Ritual in An Oscillating Universe. New
Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1988
Pages.

Kanapatippillai, C. Camayak Katturaikal. Tirunelveli: Old boys
of Caiva Teachers Training College,
Tirunelveli, 1961.

.....Atvaita Cintanai, Sri Lanka: Pantitamani
nol Veliyittuccapai, 1984. 105 Pages

.....Vetantattelivam Caiva Cittantam: Ceylon;
Ilakecari Silver jubilee Malar, 1956.

Kumarakuruparar Cuvamikal. Kumarakuruparar Cuvamikal
Pirapantat tirattu, Madras Kalaratnaka-
raaccukkutam, Cupakirutuvarutam.

Manikkavacaka Cuvamikal. Tiruvacakam. Com. K. Subramaniyapillai, Madras: B. Irattina nayakkars, 1953. 568 Pages.

Meykanta Cattiram ena valankum Cittanta Cattiram Patinanku Mulamum uraiyum Madras: Caiva Cittanta maka camaja, 1934. 1136 Pages

Meykanta Cattiram Patinanku. Madras: Caiva Cittanta nurpatippukkalakam, Ltd. 1925. 380 Pages

Meykanta Tevar. Civananapotam, Com. Nalankilli. Madras: t Puvalaki Press, 1986. 327 Pages.

Meykanta Tevar Civananapotamum Civananayokikal
Civananapatiyamum.
Madras: Curiyanar kovil Atinam, 1922.
448 Pages

Murukesa Mudaliar, N. The Relevance of Saiva Siddhanta Philosophy. Annamalai: Annamalai University Publications, 1979, 259 Pages

Nallaswami Pillai, J. M. Studies in Saiva Siddhanta. Madras: The South India Saiva Siddhanta works Publishing Society. 1984. 360 Pages.

Nannul Mulamum Chankara Namacciayar Uraiya Ed. U. Ve. Caminataiyar. Madras: Makamakopattiyaya taktar U. Ve. Caminataiyar-nul nilayam, 1991. 463 Pages.

Nikhilanda, Swami. The Upanisads. London: Phoenix House, 1951. 319 Pages.

Nilakanta Civaccariyar. Piramma Cuttira Civattuvita Caiva patiyam. Tran. Kacivaci Centilnataiyar. Madras: Centilnata Cuvamikal accakam 1907. 644 Pages.

Radhakrishnan Sarvepalli. The Brahma Sutra. London: George Allen and Unwin Ltd, 1960. Pages.

.....Indian Philosophy, Volume-II. New York: George Allen and Unwin Ltd. 1971. 807 Pages.

Shah, Jethalal. G. Shri Vallabhacarya: His Philosophy and Religion. India: The Pushtmargiya Pustakalaya Nadiad, 1969, 501 Pages.

Sivananda. Swami. Principal Upanisads Volume - I India: The Sivananda Publication League, 1942, 404 Pages

.....Principal Upanisads Volume - II India: The Sivananda Publication League, 1951. 356 Pages.

Subramaniyapillai, K. (Introduction) Meykanta Cattiram Patinanku. Madras: Caiva Cittanta nurpattippukkalakam, 1925. 380 Pages.

Tayumana Cuvamikal. Tayumana Cuvamikal Patal Ed. T. Campanta Mutaliyar. Madras: Amerika cankam, 1912,. 596 + 13 Pages.

Tirunanacampantanayanar Tevaram - Volume-I Nanacampanantar India: Institut Franais de Pondichery 1984. 429 Pages.

Tirumulanayanar. Tirumantiram. Volume-I Com. P. Iramanapillai, Madras: Caiva Cittanta Nutpattippukkalakam 1969, 604 Pages

.....Tirumantiram, Volume-II Com. P. Irama-
natapillai. Madras: Caiva Cittanta Nu.
pâtippukkalakam, 1969. 604 - 1305 Pages

Tiruvalluvanayanar. The Sacred Kural. Tran. G. U. Pope
Madras: Asian Educational Sevices, 1982.
328 + 80 Pages.

Umapati Civaccariyar. Civappirakacam. Com. Tiruvilankam.
Yalppanam, Publisher not known, 1919.

.....Civappirakacam. Com. Maturai Civa-
ppirakacar. Madras: Caiva Cittantanur-
patippukkalakam, 1969.

.....Meykanta Cattiram - Civappirakacam.
Com. Citamparanata munivar. Madras:
Tiruvavatuturai Atinam, 1953

Vaitika Cuttattuvita Caiva Cittantam (The author, Publisher
and the year of publication are not
available due to the condition of the
book) 196 Pages.

Winslow, M. A. comprehensive Tamil and English Dictionary.
Madras: Asian Educational Services,
1989. 976 Pages.

Uduppidy American Mission College

Past Pupils' Association

Executive Committee 1996/97

- Principal & Patron: Mr. K. Nadarajah
B. A. Dip-in-Ed., M. A.
- President: Dr. M. Thangarajah B. Vs., M.Sc. (S.L.)
Superintendant, Veterinary Hospital, Jaffna.
- Vice-Presidents: Mr. C. Yogasamy
Retired Teacher, U. A. M. C.
- Dr. S. Srisatkunarajah
B. Sc. (Cey.), Ph. D. (U. K.)
Senior Lecturer in Mathematics & Statistics
University of Jaffna.
- Secretary: Miss S. Veluppillai B. Sc., Dip-in-Ed.
- Treasurer: Mr. K. N. Nallainathan B. Sc.
- Asst. Secretary: Mr. V. Theveswaran
- Committee Members: Mr. G. A. Ariyanayagam
Mr. S. Krishnasamy
Mr. T. Muthusamy
Mr. T. Rajaratnam
Mr. K. Thurairajah
- Auditor: Mr. T. Aboorvasingam

