

AN ENQUIRY INTO THE NATURE OF LIBERATION

L'Institut Français de Pondichéry (IFP), UMIFRE 21 CNRS-MAEE, est un établissement à autonomie financière sous la double tutelle du Ministère français des Affaires Etrangères et Européennes (MAEE) et du Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique (CNRS). Il est partie intégrante du réseau des 27 centres de recherche de ce Ministère. Avec le Centre de Sciences Humaines (CSH) à New Delhi, il forme l'USR 3330 du CNRS "Savoirs et Mondes Indiens". Il remplit des missions de recherche, d'expertise et de formation en Sciences Humaines et Sociales et en Ecologie dans le Sud et le Sud-est asiatique. Il s'intéresse particulièrement aux savoirs et patrimoines culturels indiens (langue et littérature sanskrite, histoire des religions, études tamoules...), aux dynamiques sociales contemporaines, et aux écosystèmes naturels de l'Inde du Sud.

The French Institute of Pondicherry (IFP), UMIFRE 21 CNRS-MAEE, is a financially autonomous institution under the joint supervision of the French Ministry of Foreign and European Affairs (MAEE) and the French National Centre of Scientific Research (CNRS). It is a part of the network of 27 research centres under this Ministry. It also forms part of the research unit 3330 "Savoirs et Mondes Indiens" of the CNRS, along with the Centre de Sciences Humaines (CSH) in New Delhi. It fulfils its missions of research, expertise and training in Human and Social Sciences and Ecology in South and South-East Asia. It works particularly in the fields of Indian cultural knowledge and heritage (Sanskrit language and literature, history of religions, Tamil studies...), contemporary social dynamics and the natural ecosystems of South India.

IFP, 11, St. Louis Street, P.B. 33, Pondicherry – 605001, India, Tel: (413) 2334168

Website: <http://www.ifpindia.org>

Email: ifpdir@ifpindia.org

L'École française d'Extrême-Orient (EFEO), fondée en 1900 à Hanoï, est un établissement relevant du ministère français de l'Enseignement supérieur et de la Recherche dont la mission scientifique est l'étude des civilisations classiques de l'Asie. Son champ de recherches s'étend de l'Inde à la Chine et au Japon et, englobant l'ensemble du Sud-Est asiatique, comprend la plupart des sociétés qui furent indianisées ou sinisées au cours de l'histoire. Autour de ses dix-sept centres et antennes, installés dans douze pays d'Asie, se sont constitués des réseaux de chercheurs locaux et internationaux sur lesquels l'École a pu s'appuyer pour construire son essor. L'EFEO aborde l'Asie par des recherches pluridisciplinaires et comparatistes, associant l'archéologie, l'histoire, l'anthropologie, la philologie, et les sciences religieuses. À Pondichéry, les projets de l'EFEO portent essentiellement sur l'« indologie » classique : sanskrit, tamoul ancien, histoire, histoire de l'art et des religions.

The mission of The French School of Asian Studies (EFEO), founded in 1900 in Hanoi and today under the aegis of the French Ministry of Higher Education and Research, is to study the classical civilizations of Asia. Stretching from India, in the West, across the whole of South-East Asia to China and Japan, the EFEO's research areas cover most of the societies which have been 'Indianised' or 'Sinicised' over the course of history. A network of international scholars working at the EFEO's seventeen centres and branch offices, which are spread across twelve Asian countries, has been essential in the development of the School's research programme. Interdisciplinary projects bring together leading scholars in the fields of anthropology, archaeology, history, philology, and religious studies. In Pondicherry, the projects of the EFEO focus mainly on classical Indology: Sanskrit, Old Tamil, History, and History of art and of religions.

EFEO, 22, avenue du Président-Wilson,
75116 Paris, France.

Tel: (33) 1 53 70 18 60

Website: <http://www.efeo.fr/>

EFEO, 16 & 19, Dumas Street,
Pondicherry – 605 001, India.

Tel: (91) (413) 2334539/2332504

Email: administration@efeo-pondicherry.org

COLLECTION INDOLOGIE – 122

AN ENQUIRY INTO THE NATURE OF LIBERATION

BHAṬṬA RĀMAKAṆṬHA'S PARAMOKṢANIRĀSAKĀRIKĀVṚTTI,
A COMMENTARY ON SADYOJYOTIḤ'S REFUTATION OF
TWENTY CONCEPTIONS OF THE LIBERATED STATE (MOKṢA),
FOR THE FIRST TIME CRITICALLY EDITED, TRANSLATED
INTO ENGLISH AND ANNOTATED

by

ALEX WATSON
DOMINIC GOODALL
S. L. P. ANJANEYA SARMA

INSTITUT FRANÇAIS DE PONDICHÉRY
ÉCOLE FRANÇAISE D'EXTRÊME-ORIENT

Comité Editorial / Advisory Board

Diwakar ACHARYA (Kyoto University),
Nalini BALBIR (Université de Paris III et École Pratique des Hautes Études),
Peter BISSCHOP (Leiden University),
R. CHAMPAKALAKSHMI (Jawaharlal Nehru University, retired),
Alexander DUBIANSKI (Moscow State University),
Arlo GRIFFITHS (École française d'Extrême-Orient),
François GROS (École Pratique des Hautes Études, retired),
Pascale HAAG (École des Hautes Études en Sciences Sociales),
Oskar von HINÜBER (Universität Freiburg im Breisgau),
Jan E. M. HOUBEN (École Pratique des Hautes Études),
Padma KAIMAL (Colgate University),
Kei KATAOKA (Kyushu University),
Vempati KUTUMBA SASTRY (Banaras Hindu University),
R. NAGASWAMY (Tamilnadu State Department of Archaeology, retired),
Leslie ORR (Concordia University),
Aloka PARASHER-SEN (University of Hyderabad),
Pierre PICHARD (École française d'Extrême-Orient),
Herman TIEKEN (Leiden University).

Comité de Lecture / Évaluation

Les membres du comité éditorial font appel à des spécialistes de leur choix.
The members of the advisory board call on experts of their choice.

© Institut Français de Pondichéry, 2013 (ISBN 978-81-8470-195-1)

© École française d'Extrême-Orient, 2013 (ISBN 978-2-85539-130-4)

Typeset by the authors in Latin Modern and Velthuis' Devanāgarī using
EDMAC, T_EX and X_YL_AT_EX.

Cover design: Ravichandran N., Pondicherry

Photos : ???

Printed at All India Press, Pondicherry

CONTENTS

Preface	13
Introduction	15
1 Preliminary Remarks	15
2 Vedānta	23
3 Pāñcarātra	27
4 Buddhists and Cārvākas	36
4.1 Buddhists	36
4.2 Cārvākas	37
5 Atimārga	40
5.1 Pāśupatas	42
5.2 Mahāvratas, Lākulas	51
5.3 Kāpālikas, Somasiddhāntins	59
5.4 Concluding Remarks	63
6 The <i>Paramokṣanirāsakārikā</i> is itself a commentary; The <i>Raurava-</i> <i>vṛtti</i> and <i>Rauravavṛttiviveka</i>	68
7 The levels of the universe attainable by the proponents of the twenty views	70
8 The choice of these particular twenty views	76
Sources and Conventions	81
Manuscripts of the <i>Paramokṣanirāsakārikā</i> and its commentary . .	81
Previous editions	93
Remarks on the relationships between the manuscripts	95
Conventions in the Apparatus	99
Conventions in the Translation	101
Edition of the Sanskrit Text	103

Translation	219
1 Introduction: verse 1	219
2 Exposition of <i>Pūrvapakṣas</i>	224
2.1 Isolation: verse 2a'	225
2.2 Enjoyment of <i>sattva</i> : verse 2a'	228
2.3 Dissolution into the Supreme Self: verse 2b	231
2.4 Dissolution into the Supreme Material Cause: verse 2cd	237
2.5 Dissolution into Primal Matter, Egoity and the like: verse 2cd	247
2.6 A Chief Attendant of the Supreme Lord: verse 3a	249
2.7 An Omniscient Non-Agent: verse 3b	251
2.8 Agency, and yet Being Instigated [to act]: verse 3c	254
2.9 Becoming the Same as the Treasury of Light: verse 3d	261
2.10 Superiority to the Lord: verse 4a	263
2.11 Just Being Devoid of Impurity: verse 4b	266
2.12 Agency in the Perfected Soul, Indifference in the Lord: verse 4cd	267
2.13 Existing in a <i>bhuvana</i> in the Stars: verse 5ab	269
2.14 Cessation of Cognition and Agency: verse 5c	270
2.15 Cessation of Everything, as advocated by the Bud- dhists: verse 5d	271
2.16 Cessation of Everything, as advocated by the Cārvākas: verse 5d	274
2.17 Conclusion of the exposition of fruits of systems non- congruent with Śaiva Siddhānta: verse 6	275
2.18 Becoming Equal to the Lord: verse 7	276
2.18.1 The Rise of the Lord's Qualities	277
2.18.2 Transference of the Lord's Qualities	279
2.18.3 Possession by the Lord's Qualities	281
3 Refutation of <i>Pūrvapakṣas</i>	282
3.1 Enjoyment of <i>sattva</i> ; Existing in a <i>bhuvana</i> in the Stars: verse 8	282
3.1.1 Enjoyment of <i>sattva</i>	283
3.1.2 Existing in a <i>bhuvana</i> in the Stars	283
3.2 A Chief Attendant of the Supreme Lord; Becoming the Same as the Treasury of Light: verse 9ab	284
3.3 An Omniscient Non-Agent; Agency, and yet Being In- stigated [to act]: verse 9cd	286

3.4	Superiority to the Lord: verses 10–11ab	287
3.4.1	Absence of means of knowing superiority . . .	287
3.4.1.1	The Lord's entry into <i>laya</i> , <i>bhoga</i> and <i>adhikāra</i>	288
3.4.1.2	Śakti is superior to Śiva	292
3.4.1.3	The scriptural assertions that the Lord is a bound soul	293
3.4.2	Non-fixedness	296
3.4.2.1	Of the Condition of Being the Lord	297
3.4.2.2	Of the Perfected Soul	297
3.5	Being Devoid of Impurity: verse 11cd	299
3.6	Agency in the Perfected Soul, Indifference in the Lord: verse 12	300
3.7	Rise of the Lord's Qualities: verse 13a	303
3.8	Possession by the Lord's Qualities: verse 13b	303
3.9	Transference of the Lord's Qualities: verses 13c–42 . .	304
3.9.1	The Examples of Verbal Teaching and <i>Śāstra</i>	304
3.9.1.1	Refutation of the Example of Ver- bal Teaching	305
3.9.1.2	Refutation of the Example of <i>Śāstra</i>	306
3.9.2	The Example of Transference of merit and sin	307
3.9.3	The Example of a Flame	310
3.9.4	The Example of the Transfer of Smells	311
3.9.5	The Example of Universals	311
3.9.5.1	Universals cannot transfer, because we do not accept universals as sep- arate from individuals	312
3.9.5.2	Universals could not transfer even if they were separate from individuals	313
3.9.5.2.1	Because they manifest in in- dividuals	313
3.9.5.2.2	Because they lack form	314
3.9.5.3	Even if transference of universals and flames were accepted, it would not instantiate the transference of qualities	315
3.9.6	The Example of Sacred Water	315

3.9.7	The Example of Transference of Consciousness into Non-Conscious Matter	317
3.9.7.1	Relation of the Example to the Exemplified	319
3.9.7.2	Refutation of the Example of Transference of Consciousness into Non-Conscious Matter	320
3.9.8	The Siddhāntin's own example to illustrate the influence of the Lord on the soul	323
3.9.9	The difference of the Siddhānta from Saṅkrāntivāda and two related positions	325
3.9.10	Contact with rather than transference of the Lord's qualities	328
3.9.11	Response to the opponent's rejection of Abhivyaktivāda	329
3.9.12	The problem that transference involves leaving the previous substrate	334
3.9.13	The problem that qualities cannot be transferred	335
3.9.14	Liberation for the opponent is connected only with Śiva (<i>śāmbhava</i>), not with the soul (<i>pauruṣa</i>)	338
3.9.15	The opponent does not accept purification of qualities even in liberation	341
3.9.16	Saṅkrāntivāda entails non-duality with Śiva .	346
3.10	Cessation of Everything, as advocated by the Buddhists: verse 43	347
3.10.1	The Saiddhāntika Argument from Memory .	347
3.10.2	Buddhist Response to the Saiddhāntika Argument from Memory	348
3.10.2.1	Memory is not capable of proving non-difference	348
3.10.2.2	There is no self separate from mental events	350
3.10.2.2.1	The self is not perceived . . .	350
3.10.2.2.2	It cannot be shown to be concomitant with anything else .	351

3.10.2.2.3	It cannot be inferred through <i>anyathānupapatti</i>	351
3.10.2.2.4	Who is the inferrer?	351
3.10.2.2.5	Anything that can be inferred is ‘other’, and thus cannot be the self	352
3.10.2.2.6	The shining forth of cogni- tion must be accepted	355
3.10.3	Rāmakaṇṭha’s own view	356
3.10.3.1	Rāmakaṇṭha’s overlap with Buddhism	356
3.10.3.2	Does the perceiver appear as per- manent or momentary (<i>sthira-grāha-</i> <i>kaprakāśa</i> or <i>bhinnagrāhakaprakāśa</i>)?	358
3.10.4	The Buddhist Response: stability is super- imposed.	360
3.10.5	Rāmakaṇṭha’s Response: Superimposition of a permanent perceiver is impossible.	361
3.10.6	The condition of being a rememberer is our logical reason, not memory.	370
3.11	Cessation of Everything, as advocated by the Cārvākas: verses 44–46	371
3.11.1	Proof of the existence of consciousness prior to birth from the behaviour of newborn babies	372
3.11.2	Memory of past lives	376
3.11.3	Proof of a beginningless sequence of lives	377
3.11.4	Something beginningless cannot cease	377
3.11.5	Cārvāka: Causal efficacy proves that the self is subject to destruction	378
3.11.5.1	Something eternal would be inca- pable of producing effects either se- quentially or simultaneously	378
3.11.5.2	Rāmakaṇṭha: Both direct percep- tion and inference refute the mo- mentariness that you postulate	384
3.11.5.3	The nature of things is to produce effects only when certain auxiliaries are present	385

	3.11.5.4	Cārvāka: There are three options; each of them is problematic	385
	3.11.5.5	Rāmakaṇṭha's Response	386
	3.11.5.6	The single nature of the auxiliaries defended	389
	3.11.5.7	The production of several different effects	395
	3.11.6	Conclusion	398
3.12		Cessation of Cognition and Agency: verse 47	400
3.13		Dissolution into the Supreme Material Cause: verse 48	404
	3.13.1	Souls Dissolved into a material cause would Return Again	404
	3.13.1.1	Only the bound return	405
	3.13.2	Destruction of selves	406
	3.13.3	Two contradictory effects cannot arise from the same material cause	407
	3.13.4	Selves are not Effects	409
	3.13.5	Selves do not have a Common Continuous Nature	409
	3.13.5.1	Selves are never objects of perception	409
	3.13.5.2	Only my own self appears to me; I have no direct experience of other people's selves	413
	3.13.5.3	To the omniscient are not all other selves objects of perception?	413
	3.13.5.4	Inference of continuous nature is im- possible	416
	3.13.5.5	Selves do not have continuity with existence; but they do exist	416
	3.13.5.6	Without continuity, how can we ac- count for word usage?	417
	3.13.5.6.1	Do not pots have potness as their continuous nature?	419
	3.13.5.6.2	Similarity and continuous na- ture are two different things	419
	3.13.5.7	How can the similarity of selves be known?	421

3.13.6	Even if Selves were effects of a Supreme Cause, recurrent return would make your position untenable	422
3.14	Dissolution into Primal Matter (<i>prakṛti</i>), Egoity (<i>ahankāra</i>) and the like: verse 48	423
3.15	Dissolution into the Supreme Self: verses 49–52	423
3.15.1	Souls dissolved into a material cause neces- sarily return again	423
3.15.1.1	Brahman is not a material cause, so your objection does not apply	424
3.15.2	Why is this world unreal?	424
3.15.2.1	Because it is not of the nature of consciousness	424
3.15.2.1.1	Something can be cognised by something other than it, and yet real	425
3.15.2.2	Because of not standing up to analysis	425
3.15.2.2.1	That is the fault of the anal- yser not the world	426
3.15.2.2.2	Doubt is appropriate, not cer- tainty as to non-existence . .	427
3.15.2.2.3	Things <i>do</i> stand up to analysis	427
3.15.2.3	Because scripture tells us so	428
3.15.2.4	Rāmakaṇṭha's own position: Plu- rality can be established through self-awareness	432
3.15.2.5	Plurality can be established by di- rect perception	437
3.15.2.6	<i>brahman</i> is the material cause of the world	438
3.16	Isolation: verses 53–56	442
3.16.1	Those liberated in the Sāṅkhya system have not had all of their karma destroyed	442
3.16.1.1	They still have karma to be experi- enced above <i>guṇatattva</i>	442
3.16.1.2	Sāṅkhya response: all karma pro- duces just one life	447

3.16.1.3	No: karma produces more than one future life	450
3.16.2	The Isolation of the <i>viññānakevalin</i> is not the same as your Sāṅkhya Isolation	455
3.16.3	Isolation is not Liberation	459
4	Conclusion: verses 57–59	461
4.1	To aim for the annihilation of the self is the ultimate in foolishness	461
4.2	The value of the teachings of other traditions	464
4.3	The result of following other traditions	466
4.4	The purpose of the exposition of other traditions	467
Abbreviations and Symbols		469
Works Consulted		471
General Index		493