udaya and *pralaya* in the Spanda-śāstra

Hirohisa TODA

The doctrine of *spanda* is well known as a characteristic view of Kashmiri Śaivism as is the doctrine of *pratyabhijñā*. There are broadly speaking two opinions among modern scholars about the relation between the system of Spanda and that of Pratyabhijñā: either they are independent systems or the former is a branch-system of the latter. In this paper, I will illustrate an instance of modification of the original doctrine of *spanda* by the later commentators.

〈1〉 In *Spandakārikā* (abbr. to SpK) 1, Śaṃkara is extolled as following: We praise that Śaṃkara (=Śiva) by whose opening (*unmeṣa*) and closing (*nimeṣa*) [of eyes or will-power] there is production (*udaya*) and destruction (*pralaya*) of the world and who is the source of the glorious powers of the wheel of energies. According to Kallaṭa's *Vṛtti*, the equivalents of *udaya* and *pralaya* are respectively *utpatti* (occurring) and *saṃhāra* (withdrawing). He explains the point of the next verse (SpK 2) to be that any transmigrators (*saṃsārin*) are nothing but Śiva Himself. And yet he considers Śiva to be the cause of arising and continuing of the world in reality. He might have recollected the three great functions (*kṛtya*) attributed to the Supreme God, commonly known by the terms *sr̥ṣṭi* (creation), *sthiti* (maintenance) and *saṃhāra* (dissolution) respectively assigned to Brahmā, Viṣṇu and Rudra in the Hinduism. Then he seems to use the terms *udaya/pralaya* simply to mean 'production/destruction' in an ontological context. The following verses deal with various phases of *spanda* concerning the way of liberating realization. At the conclusion (SpK 51):

When he (the fettered soul) is firmly established in one place (the highest principle), then controlling the emerging (*udaya*) and merging (*laya*) of it (*puryaṣṭaka*) he achieves the state of the enjoyer (*bhoktṛtā*); therefore he is the

lord of the wheel [of energies].

Here *udaya/laya* (*pralaya*) show a pair of opposite directions of the transition along the principles or categories (*tattva*) corresponding to each stage of *yogin*. We often find the terms *udaya/pralaya* in such a soteriological sense in Śaivāgama and similar treatises. Thus, Kallaṭa uses *udaya/pralaya* in two different contexts, that of ontology and that of soteriology. He thinks that each phenomenon of *udaya/pralaya* is real as it occurs; that the world is produced and destroyed in reality.

⟨2⟩ Utpaladeva is practically the founder of the Pratyabhijñā-system. A basic idea of the system is the doctrine of *ābhāsa* that every thing is a manifestation of real existence within the Supreme Subject of Consciousness and is real as it manifests. In the third chapter of his *Īśvarapratyabhijñā-kārikā* (abbr. to IPK) and its *Svavṛtti*, he attempts to connect views of the Pratyabhijñā-system with descriptions of the Śaivāgama. For instance, he explains that *īśvara* and *sadāśiva*, the fourth and the third principles (*tattva*) of 36, are respectively the outward opening (*unmeṣa*) and the inward closing (*nimeṣa*) (IPK 3,1,3). He refers to Brahmā, Viṣṇu and Rudra as the rulers over *srṣṭi*, *sthiti* and *saṃhāra*, while he insists that these functions of the gods belong to the lower sphere of manifestation (*ābhāsa*) with diversity of objects (IPK 3,2,1). He intends to connect his views with the doctrine of *spanda* (IPK 1,5, 13-14). Utpaladeva explains the doctrine of *ābhāsa* and connects views of the Pratyabhijñā with the earlier literature belonging to Śaivism.

⟨3⟩ Rājānaka Rāmakaṇṭha interprets SpK in line with Kallaṭa's *Vṛtti* for the most part. In his own *Vivṛti*, *udaya* is expressed in other terms such as *utpatti*, *udbhava*, *utpāda* and *prādurbhāva*, and *pralaya* is expressed in such terms as *vināśa*, *vyaya*, *kṣaya* and *astamaya*. Their meanings do not deviate far from Kallaṭa's ideas. However, we should not overlook the fact that Rāmakaṇṭha was a direct disciple of Utpaladeva. It is likely that he produced his commentary on SpK under some influence of the doctrine of *ābhāsa*.

〈4〉 Bhagavad Utpala attempts to validate the doctrine of *spanda* by quoting from Vaiṣṇava scriptures along with Śaiva sources, and tries to show their compatibility. He was either a contemporary of Utpaladeva or lived after him. It is probable that his view is influenced by the doctrine of *ābhāsa*, as can be inferred from the synonyms of *udaya/pralaya* used in his commentary on SpK. He admits the real creation and destruction of the world because he uses the word *jagat-sṛṣṭi-saṁhāra*, etc. He also accepts the three great functions (*kṛtya*). He regards *udaya/pralaya* as a pair of soteriological courses to be realized by the Tantric *yogin* who aims at both enjoyment (*bhoga*) and liberation (*mokṣa*). He attempts not only to connect the Vaiṣṇava tradition with the Śaiva, but also the doctrine of *ābhāsa* with that of *spanda*. More noteworthy is that he interprets *udaya/pralaya* in two different contexts regarding ontology and soteriology in the same way as does Kallaṭa.

〈5〉 Abhinavagupta quotes from SpK in his *Īśvarapratyabhijñāvimarśinī* 1,5,14 to explain the concept of *sphurattā* (luminous vibrating) in IPK, and he identifies *spanda* (or *spandana*) with his key term *vimarśa* (intentional act of consciousness) being equivalent to *svātantrya* (free will). He regards *spanda* broadly as a dynamic principle ruling various phases of the universe such as physical movements, mental functions, transcendental divinity, and so on. But he emphasizes the concept of *vimarśa* or *svātantrya* rather than that of *spanda*, making efforts to systematize unsettled views on *pratyabhijñā* into a consistent philosophy. In other words, the doctrine of *spanda* is not important for him, and it is replaced by the doctrine of *vimarśa* or *svātantrya*. He also attempts to connect the Pratyabhijñā with the Śaivāgama, as did Utpaladeva. In IPV 3,1,3, partially quoting SpK 1, he explains that *īśvara* and *sadāśiva* are respectively *unmeṣa* and *nimeṣa* causing the *udaya* and *pralaya* of the universe, and he calls both of them 'pure *spanda*'. He generally follows Utpaladeva's innovative views, while he elaborates the Pratyabhijñā-system discreetly compromising with other systems or traditions.

〈6〉 Kṣemarāja was eminent for his extensive and profound knowledge

in expounding various texts. He defines *spanda* as the power (*śakti*) of manifestation (*ābhāsa*) which causes contraction (*saṃkoca*) and expansion (*vikāsa*) leading to subjectivity and objectivity in every phase of both pure and impure categories, and as the power that simultaneously has a pair of relative aspects namely *unmeṣa* and *nimeṣa*. According to his *Spandanirṇaya* on SpK 1 it is to be expounded that the *udaya* of the world is emanation (*sarga*) with diversity caused by the merging of essential unity, and that *pralaya* is disappearance of externality and appearance of essential nature. However, he says that in reality nothing arises (*udeti*) or perishes (*vyayate*) but it is only the power of *spanda* that effects each manifestation (*ābhāsa*) in the Supreme Being, as if it arose or perished; consequently, the great functions (*krtya*) are reduced to *udaya/pralaya* in pairs. He thinks that *udaya/pralaya* are relative situations and mutually exchangeable by different viewpoints. He expounds SpK by full use of the doctrine of *ābhāsa*. He reforms the Spanda-system so as to adjust it to the Pratyabhijñā-system.

⟨7⟩ We have noticed differences of view on *udaya/pralaya* between Kallaṭa and other commentators, namely, between the original Spanda advocator and post-Pratyabhijñā thinkers. Kallaṭa regards *udaya* and *pralaya* as production and destruction in reality. Rāmakaṇṭha and Bhagavad Utpala are influenced by the doctrine of *ābhāsa* (manifestation), while they admit the production and destruction or the great functions (*krtya*) of the Supreme God in reality. On the other hand, Utpaladeva and Abhinavagupta, the Pratyabhijñā thinkers, have their own ideas of *ābhāsa* and *vimarśa*, and approach the Spanda-system in order to compromise with it. Finally, Kṣemarāja emphasizes the doctrine of *ābhāsa* and successfully synthesizes *spanda* and *pratyabhijñā*.

(This research was supported in part by a Grant-in-Aid for Encouragement of Young Scientists from the Ministry of Education, Science, Sports and Culture.)

⟨Key Words⟩ *spanda*, *pratyabhijñā* *ābhāsa*, Kṣemarāja.

(Research Fellow, The Eastern Institute)