Will and Reality in the Netratantra
An Investigation into Cosmological Powers Through the Eyes of Continental Philosophy

by
Jesper Moeslund Poulsen

Aarhus 2020

Abstract

"Will and Reality in the Netratantra - An investigation into Cosmological Powers Through the Eyes of Continental Philosophy" by Jesper Moeslund Poulsen. Religious Studies, The University of Aarhus, 2020.

The focus of this thesis will be - through selected passages from the *Netratantra* - to investigate and discuss the esoteric cosmological notion of will (*icchā*) in the 9th century tantric text the *Netratantra* through philosophical models based on Arthur Schopenhauer and Friedrich Nietzsche's understanding of willpower (*Wille zur Macht*). I will show how the concepts from Schopenhauer and Nietzsche will be used and remodelled to build new models that focus on perception, reality, anatomy, and of course the notion of will. These models will be applied in order to better understand different notions relating to the will (*icchā*) in the *Netratantra*. Areas such as the Being of the Goddess, the esoteric anatomy, and the shift in worldly orientation for the tantric practitioner will be examined. The odd combination of German 19th century philosophers and a 9th century tantric text is supported by the method choosen in the thesis. The method is molded on the different thinkers such as Karen Barad, Roland Barthes, Gilles Deleuze, and Felix Guattari that all share the notion that reality is fluid, which enables my thesis to draw odd parallels. I see this as a mapping of my interactions. I will show how my models, when applied, can open the *Netratantra* in new ways. Firstly, I will show how reality is not seen as a static monism, but as an dynamic interrelational trichotomy of the different aspects of the Goddess. Secondly, I will show that the will holds the key to unlock a new mode of being in the world for the tantric practitioner. Lastly, I will show that this new form of enlightenment do not create a new realm of Being, but it instead saturates and deepens the existing material reality. In the end of the thesis I will look at how these notions affect the ethics of the tantric practitioner, and set it against the leading research in the field. The concepts borrowed and remodelled from Schopenhauer and Nietzsche will create a language through which it is possible to grasp the obscure passage of the *Netratantra*.

Table of contents

Introduction

In this thesis I will investigate the aspect of will in the 9th century Sanskrit text the *Netratantra*. In order to approach this highly esoteric text I have created models based on the thoughts of the 19th century German philosophers Arthur Schopenhauer and Friedrich Nietzsche, respectively *Die Welt als Wille und Vorstellung*, and *Die fröhliche Wissenschaft*, *Also Sprach Zarathustra*, and *Jenseits Gut und Böse*. The manuscript and the writings of the German philosophers all take their outset in their conception of will (*icchā*/*Wille*) as the impetus and fabric of reality. The will is the focal point for this entire thesis, and from it ideas and conceptions of reality, perception, anatomy, etc. will be elaborated. The main question and motivation for the thesis will thus be:

> *This thesis will investigate and discuss the esoteric cosmological notion of will (icchā) in the 9th century tantric text the Netratantra through philosophical models based on Arthur Schopenhauer and Friedrich Nietzsche's understanding of willpower (Wille zur Macht).*

This narrow and simple question will naturally lead me into different disciplines such as phenomenology, epistemology, anatomy, ontology, cosmology, and ethics. These disciplines will conversely elaborate on the notion of will in both the *Netratantra* and in the selected writings of Schopenhauer and Nietzsche.

My theory will serve as a reconfiguration of the philosophy of Schopenhauer and Nietzsche. Their thoughts on will, Being, anatomy, perception, and ethics will - through a critical dialogue on their differences - be reshaped into new models more fitting for my thoughts and conceptions. With the philosophers in mind, I will present my ideas of the *trichotomy of the Erdenreich*, the *will-as-potential*, the *Vollmensch*, and the *saturated reality*. My models and ideas adapt and communicate with the *Netratantra* in various degrees of saturation, intensity and nuances. The models are meant to have a plastic or fluid nature, so it is possible adapt to changing and illogical motives. My models are used to explore the same theme; how to investigate the will in a reality that is a non-dual and immanent.

My method is founded in the thoughts of American feminist theorist Karen Barad and the French philosophers Roland Barthes, Gilles Deleuze, and Felix Guattari. Through them, ideas of the rhizome, agential realism, and the death of the Author come into play. Both my theory and my method implies the same radical shift in Being. This foundation is consistent throughout the entire

thesis and implies a non-dual and immanent reality. Being becomes dynamic, and investigations are seen as interactions. This shift is made to create a sympathetic theory and method that encounters the sources at hand and lets them breathe and evolve consciously.

My choice of sources is made from the desire to delve into areas of religion and culture, where the foundation for reality is obscure, contingent, and irrational. What all these ideas throughout the thesis have in common are a reality in constant movement - an endless becomings. In my thesis I presuppose this form of reality to be sympathetic towards this neglected notion. The majority of models and theories in the field of Religious Studies presuppose reality as structured from a clear and rational system that can be understood and penetrated with reason. However, this is not my motivation for this thesis. Instead I will try to explain the mechanisms that can occur when the foundation for reality shifts from reason (knowledge) to will (impulses). This stage is beyond language and can only be accessed pre-linguistic. Herein lies a challenge, my models must be able to work around a these ideas while talking in a new tongue instead of attacking them head on.

Before applying these ideas, I will translate key passages from the seventh chapter of the *Netratantra* and argue for divergent interpolations inherent in the manuscript. In order to fully explore the potential of the analysis, I will highlight aspects of the manuscript that I find to be influenced by a Śākta *Paścimāmnāya* school of thought. Throughout the textual examination the focal point will be the notion of *icchā* (what I have translated as will), and ideas on Being, perception, and anatomy will grow from this exploration.

After the application of my models onto the manuscript and a discussion of my theory's down sides, I will sum up this new way of approaching worldviews that presuppose a different reality, and the altered mode of being this brings about for the human being involved. The models will be able to approach experiences - whether it is communal or personal - where reality has collapsed into one single *now* that is in a constant and ever-present becoming - leaving reality to be an endless creation of the will.

Preliminary Notions on Place, Space, and Being

In this thesis I have to clarify two aspects of my thinking before moving on with the main theme. The first one of these is my usage of *space* and *place*. I am using the phrase '*place* and time' instead of the more used phrase '*space* and time'. I find that the notion *space* presupposes a transcendental metaphysics that is inconsistent with the general ontological foundation of this thesis. The notion of *space* is often one that people take for granted. Things exist in time and *space*, or so we are taught, but we navigate in *places*. The equivocal idea of *space* obscures our understanding and orientation; it can be metaphysical and simultaneously concrete. It often obscures the research. *Space* has a counterpart in *place* - the often more mundane descriptor - and both words generate the common form of orientation in the English language.

With regards to *space*, there is seldom any clear distinction between 'metaphysical' *space* - its abstract form - and concrete *space* - understood intuitively - when it is used in writing. Etymologically, *space* is derived from the Latin *spatium* - which itself is believed to stems from the reconstructed Indo-European root *sp(h)ē(i)- that has the cognates of 'hope', 'to be fat or strong', 'prosperity'. In its Latin form *space* holds the cognate of 'room' and suprisingly 'time'. *Place* on the other hand has its origin in the Latin *platea* and the older Greek πλατεῖα (*plateîa*). It stems from the reconstructed Indo-European root *plăt-, which has the cognates of 'plane', 'flat surface', 'peaceful', 'cliff' and 'side'. There is an entanglement of *space* and *place*. At first glance, both words have the connotations of the open *space*, a secure area, and this enables faulty understandings of the words, thus removing the finer nuances that I will argue lies in the words[1].

Having Danish as my mother tongue, this English distinction seems unclear and obscure. When writing consciously on subjects of Being and perception it seems counter-productive to not be fully aware of the word's possible connotations. Instead I find the Germanic languages' distinction to be more precice; the Danish 'rum og sted[2]' holds the potential to create an awareness that can meticiously penetrate one's own thinking - especially in writing - if such a thing is possible. The words in the Germanic languages are distinguished in a way that implies different modes of orientation both in a mundane setting and in an ontological framework. In the Danish language we operate with 'sted' (*place*) and 'rum' (*space*). The Danish words function differently from an English conception of *space* and *place*. The word 'sted' (*place*) stems from the reconstructed root

---

[1] The etymological investigations are made with the aid of the Austrian-Czech linguist Julius Pokorny's dictionary *Indo-germanisches Etymologisches Wörterbuch* from 1959.

[2] The same goes for the German 'Raum und Ort'.

*staði, which means 'a city' or 'a town'; something that is known, centered, and secure. Whereas the Danish word 'rum' (*space*) stems from the Old Norse adjective *rùmr* with the root-connotation of 'open'. 'Rum' is the openess of the unknown - full of potential. I want to transpose this Danish distinction onto the categories of the English *space* and *place*. This would imply that there in *space* now lies the openess of totality, the naked fields, where potential for prosperity - but also for danger - lies. *Space* is the unknown and the unknowable. In *place*, we instead find the domesticated and centered. *Place* is the town, the room, and the knowable. Think of the ancient settlers looking for *spaces* to domesticate into *places*, it is foreign and therefore potentially rewarding and simultaneously dangerous. As soon as the open *space* is understood, i.e. becomes relatable, it is transformed into *place(s)*. We cannot experience *space*, because the process of understanding our surroundings is the process that creates *places*. When we navigate, we relate, and then *space* transforms into *place*.

It is important, since writers tend to take this distinction for granted, and not properly seperate *space* and *place*. This can distort the reality in which they base their perceptual outlook. My distinction of *space* and *place* is nothing new in philosophy or religion. The importance lies in how the distinction is understood and used. For most thinkers reality, or the Real (*space*), stands as the ultimate goal. But what is the Real? For Plato it is the realm of Ideas (*space*); for philosopher Immanuel Kant it is the *Ding-an-sich* (*space*), which can only be perceived as the *Ding-für-uns* (*place*); for philosopher Michel Foucault it is only discursive practices (*places*) that is of any importance, the material world is unreachable (*space*); for quatum physicist like Werner Heisenberg and Niels Bohr reality (*space*) is unfatomable and can only be perceived through mediation (*places*), i.e. machines for measuring; and in Christianity reality are in the world of doxas, souls, and the heavens (*space*) - not in the world of man (*places*). The commonality is their use of dual perception. *Space* is too vast to understand, so we organise it into *places*. We can relate to *places*, we can navigate in *places*, as we do everyday. There is a relational and concrete aspect of *places* that is absent in the totality of *space*.

What I will argue is that different unconscious ontologies lies implicit in the various ways academics use the words *space* and *place*. In this thesis I presuppose a non-dual and immanent reality of multiplicities[3], which stresses that I do not confuse *space* with *place*. In an immanent reality *space* and *place* merge, but they stay separated in perceptual aspects. *Space* and *place*

---

[3] Cf. My chapter on method.

become modes of perceptual realisation. *Place* is the profane and mundane sphere, it is centered and fixed. *Place* is what the German philosopher Martin Heidegger would call *the totality of involvements* (*Bewandtnisganzheit*)[4]; the network of entities that interplay in a said way that implies order. *Place* categorises its surroundings. *Space,* in contrast, is the potential of everything. It is not ontologically different from *place*, but instead it holds the potential to dissolve the perceptual features, which makes *place* coherent.

Lastly, throughout the thesis I will make use of another distinction that relates to *space* and *place*; that of 'Being' and 'being'. When I use 'Being' with a capital B it implies a notion of reality as such (*space*), while 'being' implies a way of being (*place*). Since the thesis presupposes *one* reality, I understand 'Being' to linguisticly demarcate this reality. Whereas 'being' is a particular state of existence. To clarify; 'Being' should be understood as 'existence', and 'being' should be understood as an 'specific orientation in Being'.

Short Introduction to Arthur Schopenhauer and Friedrich Nietzsche

Given my method and the limited number of pages in this thesis, I have decided to dismiss the conventional presentation and positioning of the two German thinkers. I will create a short overview that show how Arthur Schopenhauer (1788-1860) ties together with Friedrich Nietzsche (1844-1900). I make use of the German indologist Wilhelm Halbfass' book *India and Europe* from 1988. He writes that: "Schopenhauer's interest in India was awakened early by the Orientalist F. Majer" (Halbfass 1988, 106). His interest in the East lead him to become "acquainted with the Upaniṣads through Anquetil Duperron's Latin translation (*Oupnek'hat*, 1801/1802) of the Persian version made under Dārā Shukōh." (ibid., 106)[5], this version was just as much Duperron's own ideas of the *Upaniṣads* as it was a translation (ibid., 115). Schopenhauer read the text almost religiously[6]. The *Oupnek'hat* was poorly translated, but he never made an effort to learn the language (ibid., 106), even though in the second edition of his *Die Welt als Wille und Vorstellung* from 1844, he added several indological additions and emendations (ibid., 107).

With the famous German indologist Paul Deussen (1845-1919) and the famous German composer Richard Wagner (1813-1883), Schopenhauer found a wider audience with the general

---

[4] Cf. his seminal work *Sein und Zeit* from 1927 (Heidegger 1993, 86).

[5] The text was translated from Sanskrit to Latin via Persian.

[6] Cf. a conversation with the Danish professor of German Literature Søren Fauth (26.04.20)

elite and in the academic study of Indian thought. Deussen dedicated his translation of sixty *Upaniṣads* to Schopenhauer (Halbfass 1988, 128), which was influenced by Schopenhauer's philosophy, and Wagner's compositions bears traits of Schopenhauer's thinking.

According to Halbfass, Nietzsche and Wagner meet in the house of indologist H. Brockhaus, arranged by indologist and former fellow student of Nietzsche E. Windisch (ibid., 124). Nietzsche had an old friendship with Deussen[7] (ibid., 124). Nietzsche took an interest in indology, because of Schopenhauer's influence[8] on Deussen and Wagner, and Nietzsche prophesied an 'European Buddhism' (ibid., 127). Nietzsche eventually broke with Deussen and Wagner, when he broke with Schopehauer's philosphy, but in Nietzsche's later periode, he could not escape Schopenhauer. This is evident in his writings, where books as *Die fröhliche Wissenschaft ("la gaya scienza")* (1882), *Also sprach Zarathustra - Ein Buch für Alle und Keinen* (1885), and *Jenseits von Gute und Böse - Vorspiel einer Philosophie der Zukunft* (1886) critises, problematises, and elaborates on Schopenhauer's idea of the will among other things.

The Schopenhaurian World as Will

The Trichotomy of Perception

Schopenhauer begins his seminal work *Die Welt als Wille und Vorstellung* with the sentence "'Die Welt ist meine Vorstellung:' - dies ist eine Wahrheit, welch in Beziehung auf jedes lebende und erkennende Wesen gilt; wiewohl der Mensch allein sie in das reflektirte abstrakte Bewusstsen bringen kann.[9]" (Schopenhauer 1911, 3). This sentence lays the foundation for Schopenhauer's solipsism. For him the world is essentially will. He distinguishes between the world of representation and of will, and these are not mutually exclusive. The will is not a metaphysical will outside the realms of the world of representation. It is an immanent will inherent in all beings and things sentient or not. The will is thus a totality that exceeds and saturates the intelligible world. In his definition the will ends up as a linguistic paradox. The will is what constitutes the world we perceive, i.e. the physical world, but simultaneously the will is what lies beyond what is realisable

---

[7] The edition of *Die Welt als Wille und Vorstellung* I am making use of in this thesis, is the edition revised by Paul Deussen.

[8] Throughout the writings of Nietzsche, Arthur Schopenhauer's thinking influenced his ideas heavily - this is evident in Nietzsche's book *Schopenhauer als Erzieher* from 1874.

[9] "'The world is my representation': this is a truth valid with reference to every living and knowing being, although man alone can bring it into reflective, abstract consciousness." (Schopenhauer 1969, 3)

for human beings[10]. The Danish professor in German Literature and Language Søren Fauth describes Schopenhauer's concept of the will as an "immanent metaphysics[11]". In this definition the paradox is made visible and accepted as a premise for Schopenhauer's philosophy. The will in its totality lies beyond human cognition and abstraction, and by necessity then, the definition must be a linguistic oxymoron. The will constitutes the possibility for at realisable reality; i.e. representation, but simultaneously this immanent and all-pervading status of the world as will affects sentient beings - especially self-aware beings - so that they cannot grasp or perceive this unity of Being. Therefore the world is purely representation and is conditioned by the subject (Schopenhauer 1911, 3). In this solipsism the human being is of utmost importance for Schopenhauer, and he defines it as such: "Dasjenige, was Alles erkennt und von Keinem erkannt wird, ist das Subjekt. Es ist sonach der Träger der Welt, die durchgängige, stets vorausgesetze Bedingung alles Erscheinenden, alles Objekts: denn nur für das Subjekt ist, was nur immer da ist.[12]" (ibid., 5). The subject is the center of its own world of representation, and therefore it supports the surrounding world. The subject stands in categorical oppostion to the other main element in the intelligible world; the object. The object is defined in relation to the subject: "Die eine ist das Objekt: dessen Form ist Raum und Zeit, durch diese die Vielheit. Die andere Hälfte aber, das Subjekt, liegt nicht in Raum und Zeit: denn sie ist ganz und ungetheilt in jedem vorstellende Wesen.[13]" (ibid., 6). Schopenhauer presents his characterisation of the world as the knower, i.e. the subject, and the known, i.e. the object. The known is the intelligible world of representations and is restrained in time and *place*. The knower on the other hand has the properties of knowledge and lies outside the boundaries of time, *place*, and causation. These boundaries, which he defines as time, *space*[14], and causation, are gathered

---

[10] A thought that is present in other systems of Christian thinking before Schopenhauer. Cf. "Part I: Concerning God" in *Ethics* by Dutch philopsopher Baruch de Spinoza (Spinoza 1936, 39-78), "Book Seven" of *Confessions* by Augustine (Augustine 2006, 139), and to some extent also Schopenhauer's contemptoraries the German philosophers Friedrich Wilhelm Joseph von Schelling and Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel in respectively the concept of *"Naturphilosophie"* and the works *Phänemenologie des Geistes* and *Vorlesungen über die Ästhetik* (even though the latter two philosophers still work with the concept of a conscious and to some extent rational entity).

[11] From a personal conversation with Professor Fauth (26.04.20).

[12] "That which knows all things and is known by none is the *subject*. It is accordingly the supporter of the world, the universal condition of all that appears, of all objects, and it is always presupposed; for whatever exists, exists only for the subject." (Schopenhauer 1969, 5).

[13] "The one half is the *object*, whose forms are space and time, and through these plurality. But the other half, the subject, does not lie in space and time, for it is whole and undivided in every representing being." (ibid., 5).

[14] In the summary of Schopenhauer's thoughts I understand his *space* to be equal to my definition of *place*.

under one principle. They create an epistemic barrier that isolates the subject in its own theater of illusion, thus separating the world of representations from the world of will. This is baptised *the principle of sufficient reason*[15]. Schopenhauer underlines that this barrier is unbreakable for the human cognition. He elaborates: "abstrahire ich aber von meinem Charakter und frage dann, warum ich überhaupt dieses und nicht jenes will; so ist keine Antwort darauf möglich, weil eben nur die *Erscheinung* des Willens dem Satze vom Grunde unterworfen ist, nicht aber er selbst, der insofern *grundlos* zu nennen ist.[16]" (Schopenhauer 1911, 127). The one will is beyond time and *place*. To overcome or go beyond the principle of the sufficient reason would be to dissolve what categorises one as a human being. Schopenhauer draws heavily on the concept of the veil of Māyā[17] (ibid., 299, 335, 416, 441 etc.), an Indian philosophical concept which sees the intelligible world as illusoric[18]. An interesting addition to the before-mentioned principle is that the phenomenal world of the subject is: "(…) also unter Leitung der Vernunft sich äussernden Willen verstehen wollte, welcher, wie gesagt, nur die deutlichste Erscheinung des Willens ist.[19]" (ibid., 132). The will is realised in the human being by the faculty of *Vernunft* (reason). Reason is the servant of the will and is exclusively expressed in the world of representation through the human being. Reason and the principle of sufficient reason is what simultaneously holds us in the representations and momentarily let us grasp higher contemplations of the beyond. Inherent in reason lies a paradox that shapes the epistemology of Schopenhauer; in a mundane setting human beings can only understand what is representation - what is will, is inconceivable for them. Reality is the groundless will, and it is therefore unimaginable for the human cognition, but still the subject strives towards realising the

---

[15] Schopenhauer takes the name from the ideas of the German polymath Gottfried Leibniz (1646-1716) (cf. most prominently his work *La Monadologie* (1714) paragraph 31-32), while criticising Leibniz of oversimplifying the principle of sufficient reason (cf. Schopenhauer's *Über die vierfache Wurzel des Satzes vom zureichenden Grunde* from 1813).

[16] "(…) if I abstract from my character, and then ask why in general I will this and not that, no answer is possible, because only the *appearance* or *phenomenon* of the will is subject to the principle of sufficient reason, not the will itself, which in this respect may be called *groundless*." (ibid., 106).

[17] Schopenhauer was known to have an affinity for Vedāntic ideas and was heavily influenced by the the *Bṛhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad* (BU) and the *Chāndogya Upaniṣad*, which have numerous parallel ideas with Schopenhauer's philosophy. Cf. BU 1.3.28: "From the unreal, lead me to the real!" (Olivelle 2008, 12), and "(…) the real is immortality." (ibid., 13). BU regards the real as endless and infinite and the unreal as temporal

[18] The Sanskrit word Māyā means among others "illusion", "unreality", and "sorcery" (Monier-Williams 2008, 811).

[19] "(…) manifesting itself under the guidance of the facult of reason. This (…) is only the most distinct phenomenon or appearance of the will." (Schopenhauer 1969, 111).

unrealisable[20], thus trying to break the boundaries that make it human. He writes with a nod to the terminology of the German philosopher Immanuel Kant[21] (1724-1804) that: "Was auch immer das Ding an sich sei (…) Zeit, Raum und Kausalität (…) nicht Bestimmungen desselben seyn, sondern ihm erst zukommen konnten, nachdem und sofern es Vorstellung geworden, d. h. nur seiner Erscheinung angehörten, nicht ihm selbst.[22]" (Schopenhauer 1911, 143). The individual subjects - as pluralities - are faulty in realising the will in its unity through reason. The subject's plurality is denominated the *principium individuationis*, and he writes hereof: "Wir haben Zeit und Raum, weil nur durch sie und in ihnen Vielheit des Gleichartigen möglich ist, das *principium individuationis* genannt.[23]" (ibid., 391). The principle of sufficient reason creates the *principium individuationis* of the will[24]. Time, *place*, and causality are demarcations, which make the groundless will graspable for human cognition, but they simultaneously limit and distort the total extent of the will. Reason is a tool and a servant for the will, the subject cannot find the perceptual key to reality through reason at first, but must choose another more concrete medium with which it can see through the veil of Māyā. In my understanding of Schopenhauer's epistemology, lies a trichotomy of will, reason, and representation. In the next subchapter I will engage myself with what I will argue is Schopenhauer's 'phenomenology' of the body, his internalisation of the *trichotomy of perception*.

---

[20] Cf. also the Danish philosopher Søren Kierkegaard's ideas of the paradox of the thought in "The Absolute Paradox: A Metaphysical Crotchet" from *Philosophical Fragments*. Kierkegaard defines it as such: "The supreme paradox of all thought is the attempt to discover something that thought cannot think." (Kierkegaard 1962, 46).

[21] Schopenhauer saw his philosophy as a "perfection of Kantian thoughts." (Halbfass 1988, 110).

[22] "Whatever the thing-in-itself may be, (…) time, space, and causality (…) could not be its properties, but could come to it only after, and in so far as, it had become representation, in other words, belonged only to its phenomenon or appearance, not to it itself." (ibid., 120).

[23] "We have called time and space the *principium individuationis*, because only through them and in them is plurality of the homogeneous possible." (ibid., 331).

[24] Schopenhauer also equates the *principium individuationis* with the Indian concept of the veil of Māyā (ibid., 378).

Phenomenology of the Body

When looking at the body in *Die Welt als Wille und Vorstellung*, I am well aware that Schopenhauer does not view it as having any phenomenological character[25]. What I view as the 'phenomenology' is first and foremost his focus on the body as key in perceiving the world as representation. For Schopenhauer, the body is the first step in the realisation of the thing-in-itself. Reason is not primarily the vehicle for enlightenment, the first steps for enlightenment lies in representation itself; i.e. the body. I will elaborate on this idea and highlight Schopenhauer's general ideas of the body.

For Schopenhauer the body holds the potential to reach beyond the *principium individuationis*, and Schopenhauer describes this potential as "diese doppelte Erkenntniss, die wir vom eigenen Leibe haben, uns über ihn selbst.[26]" (Schopenhauer 1911, 123). The 'double knowledge' of the body is analogous to a double knowledge of the world of representation. Schopenhauer elaborates:

> "(…) so verstehen, was ihr inneres Wesen sei, von dessen Erscheinen mir die Kenntniss der Ursache die blosse Regel des Eintritts in Zeit und Raum angiebt und weiter nichts. Dies kann ich darum, weil mein Leib das einzige Objekt ist, von dem ich nicht bloss die *eine* Seite, die der Vorstellung, kenne, sondern auch die zweite, welche Wille heisst.[27]" (ibid., 149-150).

The body is not only representation, i.e. an object, but also a subject, and herein lies the double insight. It is unity that has become multitude, and only as multitude can it understand itself as unity[28]. The body is both object and subject. But it cannot view the world as will, because of its

---

[25] Phenomenology is not explicitly mentioned in *Die Welt als Wille und Vorstellung*, and it does not seem as if Schopenhauer takes any notice of the discipline in his writing. Modern phenomenology came into its own as we know it around a century later with the writings of the German philosopher Edmund Husserl (1859-1938), especially in his works *Ideen zu einer reinen Phänomenologie und phänomenologischen Philosophie* from 1913, even though the ideas present in phenomenology have been around and discussed for centuries before.

[26] "this double knowledge of our own body which gives us information about that body itself" (Schopenhauer 1969, 103).

[27] "Knowledge of the cause of this inner nature's manifestation tells me only the rule of its appearance in time and space, and nothing more. I can do this, because my body is the only object of which I know not merely the one side, that of the representation, but also the other, that is called *will*." (ibid., 125).

[28] Schopenhauer talks of the mirror of the will or the Idea (ibid., 290). He even compares the objectivity of the will with the mirror of the will (ibid., 196). Schopenhauer to some extent sees the objectifications as a way for the will to mirror itself, i.e. to understand itself. This thought is reminiscent of Schopenhauer's self-declared adversary the German philosopher George Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel's idea of the spirit becoming sef-conscious in his work *Phänomenologie des Geistes*.

imprisonent in the world of representations as "(…) Zeit, Raum und Kausalität, welche allein dem Objekt zukommen; jedoch weil sie diesem *als solchem* wesentlich sind, dem Subjekt aber wieder *als solchem* das Objekt wesentlich ist (…) und insofern als die gemeinschaftliche Gränze beider anzusehen sind.[29]" (Schopenhauer 1911, 30). I will argue that Schopenhauer stresses the phenomenonal character of the body, when he writes that "(…) daher ist der Leib Bedingung der Erkenntniss meines Willens.[30]" (ibid., 121). The matter is a starting point for perception. One can only understand the world by being *in* the world. Both the world as will and the world as representation are experienced through the body, i.e. the sensory apparatus. The body is thus the receptacle for both the realisation of the will and of representations through its movements in time and *place*. It interacts and creates simultaneously.

To understand 'the double knowledge' of the body, Schopenhauer introduces the objectified will: "Die Aktion des Leibes ist nichts Anderes, als der objektivirte, d. h. in die Anschauung getretene Akt des Willens. (…) ja, dass der ganze Leib nichts Anderes, als der objektivirte, d. h. zur Vorstellung gewordene Wille ist[31]". (ibid. 119-120). Firstly, I will have to stress that the body is *already always* interacting with its surroundings. The body and its motives are the objectified will, i.e. the will as the *principium individuationis*. The body is in a constant interaction with the world of objects, the subject is *thrown into the world* because of its materiality. The perception is based on the physical body's interaction with the world of phenomenons, so I will argue that the 'phenomenology' of the body becomes the perceptual starting ground from which the world is understood. The realisation of the will lies in the body as objectified will and not in a dislocated pure reason. Schopenhauer's epistemology thus becomes non-rational and makes reason subsidiary to the will. His epistemology primarily relies on the sensory appartus of the body.

While the 'phenomenology' and epistemology seem separate, they are overlapping in their focus on the subject. Reason, for Schopenhauer, is what separates the subject from the other representations: "Dass alle diese so mannigfaltigen und so weit reichenden Äusserungen aus einem gemeinschaftlichen Princip entspringen, aus jener besondern Geisteskraft, die der Mensch vor dem

---

[29] "(…) namely time, space, and causality. These belong only to the *object*, yet because they are essential to the object *as such*, and as the object again is essential to the subject *as such*, (…) and to this extent are to be regarded as the boundary common to both." (ibid., 25).

[30] "(…) I cannot really imagine this will without my body." (ibid., 102).

[31] "The action of the body is nothing but the act of will objectified, i.e., translated into perception. (…) indeed, that the whole body is nothing but the objectified will, i.e., will that has become representation." (ibid., 100).

Thiere voraus hat, und welche man Vernunft (…) genannt hat.[32]" (Schopenhauer 1911, 44-45). This creates another paradox: The subject can reach behind this principle of sufficient reason by help of reason, but this is only because of its objectification as a body. The bodily 'phenomenology' is built on the notion of the 'double knowledge'. This is elaborated further by Schopenhauer as: "Jeder findet sich selbst als diesen Willen, in welchem das innere Wesen der Welt besteht, so wie er sich auch als das erkennende Subjekt findet, dessen Vorstellung die ganze Welt ist, welche insofern nur in Bezug auf sein Bewusstsenn, als ihren nothwendigen Träger, ein Daseyn hat.[33]" (ibid., 193). The subject is the main supporter of the world of representation merely because it is a knowing subject, but the subject can only be knowledgeable through its own representation, i.e. its body. The knowledge of the will in its totality is understood referentially as the will in its plurality. The objectification is what creates the body that ultimately strives to dissolve its own objectification. This leads to the conclusion that: "*Ding an sich* aber ist allein der *Wille*: als solcher ist er durchaus nicht Vorstellung, sondern *toto genere* von ihr verschieden: er ist es, wovon alle Vorstellung, alles Objekt, die Erscheinung, die Sichtbarkeit, die Objektität ist.[34]" (ibid., 131). The thing-in-itself is not knowable. In the end I will argue that knowledge for Schopenhauer is not purely reason, but also a 'phenomenology' seen as the knowledge of the physical world. If the subject understands itself through its matter, it can view itself as the objectified will. The 'phenomenology' of the body becomes a catalyst for the perception of reason.

The Ontology of Will

For Schopenhauer the nature of the will is: "(…) ein hungriger Wille ist. Daher die Jagd, die Angst und das Leiden.[35]" (ibid., 183), and the hunger creates the reason why: "Jede Stufe der Objektivation des Willens macht der andern die Materie, den Raum, die Zeit streitig.[36]" (ibid., 174).

---

[32] "It is the unanimous opinion of all times and of all nations that all these manifestations (…) spring from a common principle (…) which man possesses as distinct from the animal, and which has been called *Vernunft*, reason." (ibid., 37).

[33] "Everyone finds himself to be this will, in which the inner nature of the world consists, and he also finds himself to be the knowing subject, whose representation is the whole world; and this world has an existence only in reference to the knowing subject's consciousness as its necessary supporter." (ibid., 162).

[34] "But only the *will* is *thing-in-itself*; as such it is not representation at all, but *toto genere* different therefrom. It is that of which all representation, all objects, is the phenomenon, the visibility, the *objectivity*." (ibid., 110).

[35] "(…) a hungry will. Hence arise pursuit, hunting, anxiety, and suffering." (ibid., 154).

[36] "Every grade of the will's objectification fights for the matter, the space, and the time of another." (ibid., 146-147).

16

What we perceive in the phenomenological world is nothing more than the internal fight of the will in its plurality. The will is thus a will-to-live that creates out of desire. Schopenhauer elaborates: "Die Vielheit der Dinge in Raum und Zeit, welche sämmtlich seine *Objektität* sind, trifft daher ihn nicht und er bleibt, ihrer ungeachtet, untheilbar.[37]" (Schopenhauer 1911, 152). The objectivities, which are in a constant strife with each other, are only shadows of the will's own blind hunger. The representational world is the domain of the striving will in its endless hunt for new objects of desire (ibid., 195). This creates a suffering: "Alles *Wollen* entspringt aus Bedürfniss, also aus Mangel, also aus Leiden, (…) ferner, das Begehren dauert lange, die Forderungen gehen ins Unendliche; die Erfüllung ist kurz und kärglich gemessen.[38]" (ibid., 230-231). Here we see why Schopenhauer is understood as the father of pessimism. The representational world is created by a blind hunger that in the grander scheme desires object it can only obtain in short glimpse of fleeing contentment. The sorrowful striving is not only present in sentient beings, it counts for every*thing*; all representations are extents of the will and are therefore in constant conflict with other objectifications. Schopenhauer makes this clear in his statement: "So sähen wir denn hier, auf der untersten Stufe, den Willen sich darstellen als einen blinden Drang, ein finsteres, dumpfes Treiben, fern von aller unmittelbaren Erkennbarkeit.[39]" (ibid., 178). The striving does not intensify, but its motives - under the guidance of reason - are made more sophisticated in the human being's lifeworld. Underneath the complex desires of the human being there are nothing more than a blind chaotic will similar to that of the blind forces of nature. The base of Schopenhauer's reality is the will and nothing more.

Schopenhauer implies that the self-knowledge or reason is an impetus for the creation of the representations: "Die einzige Selbsterkenntniss des Willens im Ganzen aber ist die Vorstellung im Ganzen, die gesammte anschauliche Welt. Sie ist seine Objektität, seine Offenbarung, sein Spiegel.[40]" (ibid., 196). Reason helps to constantly create and reobtain the world of representation. Reason is the way in which human beings understand and realise the world the of representation, but it also represses each human being as long as reason is in the service of the will. To go beyond

---

[37] "Therefore, the plurality of things in space and time that together are the *objectivity* of the will, does not concern the will, which, in spite of such plurality, remains indivisible." (ibid., 128).

[38] "All *willing* springs from lack, from deficiency, and thus from suffering. (…) Further, desiring lasts a long time, demands and requests go on to infinity; fulfillment is short and meted out sparingly." (ibid., 196).

[39] "Here we see at the very lowest grade the will manifesting itself as a blind impulse, an obscure, dull urge, remote from all direct knowableness." (ibid., 149).

[40] "The sole self-knowledge of the will as a whole is the representation as a whole, the whole world of perception. It is the objectivity, the revelation, the mirror of the will." (ibid., 165).

the world of representation, human beings must detach reason from the supremacy of the will. However, this can only be possible through an insight into the world as endless suffering, and this insight is for Schopenhauer *Mitleiden*.

Mitleiden

For Schopenhauer *Mitleiden*, or compassion[41], is a transitory concept that can only occur when the knowledge of the human condition is realised in total as an universal condition. Schopenhauer explains:

> "Der, wie gesagt, mögliche, aber nur als Ausnahme zu betrachtende Übergang von der gemeinen Erkenntniss einzelner Dinge zur Erkenntniss der Idee geschieht plötzlich, indem die Erkenntniss sich vom Dienste des Willens losreisst, eben dadurch das Subjekt aufhört ein bloss individuelles zu seyn und jetzt reines, willenloses Subjekt der Erkenntniss ist.[42]" (Schopenhauer 1911, 209).

Knowledge has the possibility of tearing itself free from the service of the will. The phrasing "losreisst" ("tears itself free") is important, since it is not a simple or painless experience. The force that is accumulated in order for the knowledge to tear itself free stems from the realisation of the universal suffering created by the futile striving of the will-to-live. Schopenhauer expresses it thusly:

> "Wir wollen dieserwegen im *menschlichen Daseyn* das innere und wesentliche Schicksal des Willens betrachten. Jeder wird leicht im Leben des Thieres das Nämliche, nur schwächer, in verschiedenem Graden ausgedrückt wiederfinden und zur Genüge auch an der leidenden Thierheit sich überzeugen können, wie wesentlich *alles Leben Leiden ist*.[43]" (ibid., 366).

---

[41] Compassion stems from the Latin *compati* (to suffer with) and Mitleiden is a calque from the same Latin word *compati*. *Compati* stems from the Greek *sumpátheia* (συμπάθεια (sympathy)).

[42] "(…) the transition that is possible, but to be regarded only as an exception, from the common knowledge of particular things to knowledge of the Idea takes place suddenly, since knowledge tears itself free for the service of the will precisely by the subject's ceasing to be merely individual, and being now a pure will-less subject of knowledge." (ibid., 178).

[43] "(…) we wish to consider in *human existence* the inner and essential destiny of the will. Everyone will readily find the same thing once more in the life of the animal, only more feebly expressed in various degrees. He can also sufficiently convince himself in the suffering animal world how essentially *all life is suffering*." (ibid., 310)

If "*alles Leben Leiden ist*", then *all* life is equated into *one* through the universality of suffering. Human beings realise the unity of all representation through the thing all phenomenons share; suffering and their inevitable doom. The human being ends up understanding all actions as suffering. As Schopenhauer writes: "In eben diesem Grade nun durchschaut er das *principium individuationis*, den Schleier der Maja: er setzt sofern das Wesen ausser sich dem eigenen gleich: er verletzt es nicht.[44]" (Schopenhauer 1911, 438). Schopenhauer's fondness for the Indian *upaniṣadic* philosophy[45] shines through. It is through the knowledge of *Mitleiden* that human beings understand the unity of all. He even phrases it as "*tattvamasi[46]*" (ibid., 260, 420, 442). In the realisation of universal suffering the subject learns to see itself in the other; hence the chosen term *Mitleiden*.

Schopenhauer explores the boundaries of his *Mitleiden*, which originally stems from a Christian terminology[47]. He describes it as: "Man wird daher eben so viel Anderen leisten wollen, als man von ihnen geniesst.[48]" (ibid., 438), which is reminiscent of the "Love thy Neighbour" phrase from the Bible (Leviticus 19:18, Mark 12:31, Luke 10:27, Matthew 19:19). Even though his concept of *Mitleiden* seems based on Christian thinking, Schopenhauer still tries an universalistic approach[49] to compare certain elements of the *Mitleiden* with the upaniṣadic thinking:

> "(…) den Punkt erreicht, wo die Erscheinung, der Schleier der Maja, sie nicht mehr täuscht, die Form der Erscheinung, das *principium individuationis*, von ihr durchschaut

---

[44] "Now in precisely this degree he sees through the *principium individuationis*, the veil of Maya. To this extent he treats the inner being outside himself like his own; he does not injure it." (ibid., 370).

[45] cf. that Schopenhauer calls the *Upaniṣads* "the greatest gift to the nineteenth century" (ibid., 355).

[46] A key term for Schopenhauer (even though his spelling is all over the place; *Tautomes* (ibid., 420), *tat twam asi* (ibid., 260, 420, 442)) that is first mentioned in *Chāndogya Upaniṣad* 6.8.7: "tattvamasi śvetaketo iti" (that is you Śvetaketu), or as Schopenhauer phrases it: "dies bist du" ["This art thou"] with a reference to Duperron's Oupnek'hat (ibid., 420). *Tattvamasi* denotes a conception of the world as ultimately one, and all beings are therefore interconnected.

[47] Even though that there are numerous discussions on the subject of Schopenhauer's own religious convictions, Schopenhauer still bases large parts of his *Mitleiden* concept in Christian ascetics - cf. Meister Eckhart (ibid., 450), St. Francis of Assisi (ibid., 454), the two of the Church fathers Tertullian and Augustine (ibid., 479), and Jesus Christ whom he sees: "als das Symbol, oder Personifikation, der Verneinung des Willens zum Leben." (ibid., 480) ["as the symbol or personification of the denial of the will-to-live." (ibid., 405). He also makes brief mentions of Buddha (ibid., 450)] and different Hinduistic religious adepts (ibid., 454), but most of his examples for the concept of *Mitleiden* comes from a Christian mythology.

[48] "We shall therefore want to provide for others just as much as we benefit from them." (ibid., 371)

[49] Also cf. his mention of: "(…) all jene Heiligen und Asketen, die, bei gleicher innerer Erkenntniss, eine sehr verschiedene Sprache führten (…) welchen zufolge ein Indischer Heiliger, ein Christlicher, ein Lamaischer, von seinem eigenen Thun." (ibid., 453) ["all the saints and ascetics who, in spite of the same inner knowledge, used different language (…)" who can be "(…) an Indian, a Christian, or a Lamaist saint" (ibid., 383)].

wird, der auf diesem beruhende Egoismus eben damit erstirbt, wodurch nunmehr die vorhin so gewaltigen *Motive* ihre Macht verlieren, und statt ihrer die volkommene Erkenntniss des Wesens der Welt, als *Quietiv* des Willens wirkend, die Resignation herbeiführt, das Aufgeben, nicht bloss des Lebens, sondern des ganzen Willens zum Leben selbst.[50]" (Schopenhauer 1911, 299).

Der *Quietiv* des Willens (the *quieter of the will*) is of importance. The quieting is the resignation of the will-to-live, and it is the moment where the self-knowledgeable subject turns against the will[51]. The motives of the subject become meaningless in the grander scheme of things, and objects and motives show themselves as mere illusions for the subject, who has looked beyond the veil of Māyā. This realisation propels a quieting or a resignation of the will-to-live. For Schopenhauer resignation is a positive term, implying a force from the subject which is strong enough to deny the will its power. *Mitleiden* becomes an affectionate term denoting a compassion towards all living things in the world of representation, and a altruistic wish to end suffering for all existing matter. "Hieraus aber ergiebt sich, dass die reine Liebe (αγαπη, *carita*) ihrer Natur nach Mitleid ist.[52]" (ibid., 444). The quieter of the will takes the form of an universal benevolence, and through the denial the true purpose of existence springs forth. A human being "(…) nicht der Welteroberer ist, sondern der Weltüberwinder (…)[53]" (ibid., 456). The human being must overcome the world and not conquer the world, for in the conquering lies a desire for this world of representations that keeps the human being clothed in the veil of Māyā. When the human being has overcome the world through *Mitleiden* it can simultaneously deny the will its creative power and thus silencing it. For Schopenhauer it is: "Nur indem das Leiden die Form blosser reiner Erkenntniss annimmt und sodann diese als *Quietiv des Willens* wahre Resignation herbeiführt, ist es der Weg zur Erlösung und dadurch ehrwürdig.[54]" (ibid., 469). The knowledge, which grows out of the realisation that all life is

---

[50] "It then reaches the point where the phenomenon, the veil of Maya, no longer deceives it. It sees through the form of the phenomenon, the *principium individuationis*; the egoism resting on this expires with it. The *motives* that were previously so powerful now lose their force, and instead of them, the complete knowledge of the real nature of the world, acting as a *quieter* of the will, produces resignation, the giving up not merely of life, but the whole will-to-live itself." (ibid., 253).

[51] For an elaboration on this paradox, see Appendix 3.

[52] "It follows from this, however, that pure affection (αγαπη, *carita*) is of its nature sympathy or compassion." (ibid., 375-376).

[53] "(…) is not the conqueror of the world, but the overcomer of the world (…)" (ibid., 385-386).

[54] "Only when suffering assumes the form of pure knowledge, and then this knowledge, as a *quieter of the will*, produces true resignation, is it the path to salvation, and thus worthy of reverence." (ibid., 397).

suffering, creates a resignation that is powerful enough to quiet the will itself, and in the overcoming of the world Schopenhauer turns to ascetism: "Sein Wille wendet sich, bejaht nicht mehr sein eigenes, sich in der Erscheinung spiegelndes Wesen, sondern verneint es. Das Phänomen, wodurch dieses sich kund giebt, ist der Übergang von der Tugend zur *Askesis*.[55]" (Schopenhauer 1911, 449). Ascetism is for Schopenhauer the highest form of enlightenment and thus it is the denial of the will-to-live[56].

In the denial and ascetism lie an ethical demand, which Schopenhauer elaborates on as such: "so mag man (…) die gänzliche Selbstaufhebung und Verneinung des Willens, die wahre Willenslosigkeit (…) das absolute Gut (…).[57]" (ibid., 428). For Schopenhauer the ethics of good and evil is situated in the world of representations; thus being relative to its representation. When Schopenhauer mentions the absolute good, it should be seen in the context of his 'immanent metaphysics'. The absolute good is equated with the quieting of the will, because the will-to-live is ultimately suffering. The absolute good lies beyond the boundaries of the human cognition. In this ethics the absolute good shapes itself as a quieter of the will, a resignation of the will-to-live. The question remains; what is left when the will-to-live is silenced?

The Non-Being of Emptiness

"Er [der Wille] selbst kann durch nichts aufgehoben werden, als durch *Erkenntniss*.[58]" (ibid., 474). In the last book of *Die Welt als Wille und Vorstellung* Schopenhauer crowns knowledge king, and lets it reign supreme. The knowledge, or reason, is the sole agent for liberation. When the self-knowing subject through its own representation, i.e. the body, understands the world as ultimately a transitiory representations, it is able - through this knowledge - to abstract the universal suffering of all representations. It now sees itself in unison with every representation, thus gazing beyond the *principium individuationis*. With the insight, the knowledge frees itself from the service of the will and denies the will its supremacy, thus quieting the will, but in this denial lies an extreme

---

[55] "His will turns about; it no longer affirms its own inner nature, mirrored in the phenomenon, but denies it. The phenomenon by which this becomes manifest is the transition from virtue to *asceticism*." (ibid., 380).

[56] Schopenhauer finds other stages before ascetism; the lowest stage is the aesthetic contemplation through art (ibid., 315-316), it is only temporary; the next stage is experience of tremendous individual suffering which can lead to insight into the universal suffering (ibid., 463-464).

[57] "(…) we may (…) call the complete self-effacement and denial of the will, true will-lessness (…) the absolute good (…)" (ibid., 362).

[58] "The will itself cannot be abolished by anything except *knowledge*." (ibid., 400).

consequence. For Schopenhauer, the denial of the will results in the following: "verschwände aber auch jenes einzige; so wäre die Welt als Vorstellung nicht mehr.[59]" (Schopenhauer 1911, 6). In this lies a philosophical paradox[60]. For now, the solipsism of Schopenhauer's thinking will be taken at face value, so when he writes: "Verneinung, Aufhebung, Wendung des Willens ist auch Aufhebung und Verschwinden der Welt, seines Spiegels.[61]" (ibid., 485), I will for not take its logical consequences to their absolute. When the denial and dissolution has occured, Schopenhauer finds that: "(…) nur die Erkenntniss ist geblieben, der Wille ist verschwunden.[62]" (ibid., 486). He even states that: "Aber auch umgekehrt ist Denen, in welchen der Wille sich gewendet und verneint hat, diese unsere so sehr reale Welt mit allen ihren Sonnen und Milchstrassen - Nichts.[63]" (ibid., 487). Thus ends his seminal work *Die Welt als Wille und Vorstellung* with emptiness as the new reality. The self-awareness of the subject with help from the freed reason makes it possible for the will to "turn against itself"[64]. This realisation quietes the will and through this stillness it dissolves. The will is in a constant flux, its totality cannot be static. In order to be static it must be emptiness. His idea of the non-Being of emptiness stems from the buddhist concept of *śūnyatā*, a philosophical tradition he is indebted to. Now the Being of will is dissolved.

The Nietzschian Erdenreich

Immanent Reality

The clearest departure from Schopenhauer's thinking is Nietzsche's view on Being. Schopenhauer's metaphysical immanent thinking ends up with an perceptual trichotomy of will, reason, and representation that holds the opportunity for another sphere of Being; that of non-Being. Nietzsche's later thinking is contrary to this. His idea of reality is immanent in a much more radical way. Nietzsche's ontology emcompasses all aspects which are perceptually possible. He writes in *Also sprach Zarathustra*: "Alles bricht, Alles wird neu gefügt; ewig baut sich das gleiche Haus des Seins.

---

[59] "(…) if that single one were to disappear, then the world as representation would no longer exist." (ibid., 5)

[60] For an elaboration on this, see Appendix 3.

[61] "Denial, abolition, turning of the will are also abolition and disappearance of the world, of its mirror." (ibid., 410)

[62] "Only knowledge remains; the will has vanished." (ibid., 411).

[63] "But also conversely, to those in whom the will has turned and denied itself, this very real world of ours with all its suns and galaxies, is - nothing." (ibid., 412).

[64] Even though this statement is an oxymoron.

Alles scheidet, Alles grüsst sich wieder; ewig bleibt sich treu der Ring des Seins.[65]" (Nietzsche 1999b, 272-273). Everything one can perceive - i.e. parts and unions - is in an eternal flux of creation and destruction. Contrary to Schopenhauer, Nietsche views this as a positive thing; this is reality in its absolute form. He even states that: "(…) ich komme ewig wieder zu diesem gleichen und selbigen Leben (…)[66]" (ibid., 276)[67]. For Nietzsche, the human being should not reject the eternal circle of life, but should constantly affirm this order of Being[68]. In his earlier work *Die fröhliche Wissenschaft* he underlines that eternity should not be understood in a metaphysical way. He writes: "Es gibt keine ewig dauerhaften Substanzen[69]" (Nietzsche 1999a, 468). Eternity is not a platonic *Idea [ἰδέα]*, but an eternal creation and destruction of substances. The only eternity is the reconfigurations of reality, and it is not systematised by reason, instead "Der Gesammt-Charakter der Welt is dagegen in alle Ewigkeit Chaos, nicht im Sinne der fehlenden Nothwendigkeit, sondern der fehlenden Ordnung, Gliederung, Form, Schönheit, Weisheit, und wie alle unsere ästhetischen Menschlichkeiten heissen.[70]" (ibid., 468). For the human the world is understood as chaotic, because the reality of the world does not fit into our "ästhetischen Menschlichkeiten". The human being must understand itself *in* this chaos that it cannot escape in order to conquer it and not suffer from it. Nietzsche describes in *Also sprach Zarathustra* one way of conquering suffering, and that is "Schaffen - das ist die grosse Erlösung vom Leiden, und des Lebens Leichtwerden. Aber dass der Schaffende sei, dazu selber thut Leid noth und viel Verwandelung.[71]" (Nietzsche 1999b, 110). Herein lies Nietzsche's demand; in order to conquer suffering, you must live through suffering, then you will understand the creative aspects of reality. In *Die fröhliche Wissenschaft* he defines an

---

[65] "Everything breaks, everything is joined anew; the same house of being builds itself eternally. Everything parts, everything greets itself again; the ring of being remains loyal to itself eternally." (Nietzsche 2006, 175)

[66] "(…) I will return to this same and selfsame life (…)" (Nietzsche 2006, 178)

[67] This is not to be understood as a borrowed thought from the Indian idea of reincarnation - even though Nietzsche was familiar with their philosophical systems - but more a 'logical' consequence of his radical immanent ontology.

[68] In *Jenseits von Gute und Böse* he describes that: "Nicht als sein Gegensatz, sondern - als seine Verfeinerung!" (Nietzsche 1999c, 41) ["Not as its opposite, but rather - as its refinement!" (Nietzsche 2002, 25)]. This quote functions as a key in understanding some of Nietzsche's ideas of Being; everything is connected, not in opposites, but in one chaotic mess of coherence.

[69] "There are no eternally enduring substances" (Nietzsche 2008, 110)

[70] "The total character of the world, by contrast, is for all eternity chaos, not in the sense of a lack of necessity but of a lack of order, organization, form, beauty, wisdom, and whatever else our aesthetic antropomorphisms are called." (Nietzsche 2008, 109)

[71] "Creating - that is the great redemption from suffering, and life's becoming light. But in order for the creator to be, suffering is needed and much transformation." (Nietzsche 2006, 66)

important characteristic for the creator: "Nur als Schaffende können wir vernichten![72]" (Nietzsche 1999a, 422). The human beings that conquer the absurdity of suffering, gain control over reality. By viewing themselves as imbedded in reality, they have the will to create and thus destroy. This will is what is of utmost importance for Nietzsche. It is the will to power which he in *Also sprach Zarathustra* salutes thusly: "Heil dir, mein Wille![73]" (Nietzsche 1999b, 145). Nietzsche writes that through this will: "Männer sin wir worden, - *so wollen wir das Erdenreich.*[74]" (Nietzsche 1999b, 393). This will is the willing of the *Erdenreich*, the kingdom of the earth, the soil from which we are born and die, there is no metaphysical reality, only the will to power.

Will to Power

Reality is understood through the will to power. Nietzsche describes it in *Jenseits von Gute und Böse* as: "Die Physiologen sollten sich besinnen, den Selbsterhaltungstrieb als kardinalen Trieb eines organischen Wesens anzusetzen. (…) Leben selbst ist Wille zur Macht[75]" (Nietzsche 1999, 27). Life itself is nothing but the will to power, but not as an Schopenhauerian will-to-live. In *Also sprach Zarathustra* Nietzsche sets his will against that of Schopenhauer: "Nur, wo Leben ist, da ist auch Wille: aber nicht Wille zum Leben, sondern - so lehre ich's dich - Wille zur Macht![76]" (ibid., 149). Will and life are connected, but Nietzsche stresses that his will to power is the foundation for life. In *Die fröhliche Wissenschaft* he writes:

> "Leben - das heisst: fortwährend Etwas von sich abstossen, das sterben will; Leben - das heisst: grausam und unerbittlich gegen Alles sein, was schwach und alt an uns, und nicht nur an uns, wird. Leben - das heisst also: ohne Pietät gegen Sterbende, Elende und Greise sein? Immerfort Mörder sein?[77]" (Nietzsche 1999a, 400).

---

[72] "Only as creators can we destroy!" (Nietzsche 2008, 70)

[73] "Hail to you, my will!" (Nietzsche 2006, 88)

[74] "we have become men - *and so we want the kingdom of the earth.*" (Nietzsche 2006, 257)

[75] "Physiologists should think twice before positioning the drive for selfpreservation as the cardinal drive of an organic being. (…) life itself is will to power -" (Nietzsche 2002, 15).

[76] "Only where life is, is there also will; but not will to life, instead - thus I teach you - will to power!" (Nietzsche 2006, 90)

[77] "Life - that is: continually shedding something that wants to die; Life - that is: being cruel and inexorable against anything that is growing weak and old in us, and not just in us. Life - therefore means: beind devoid of respect for the dying, the wretched, the aged? Always being a murderer?" (Nietzsche 2008, 50)

Life is what survives, kills, and creates, therefore life cannot be the weaker will, but only the will to power. Life conquers. For Nietzsche the will to power is the catalyst for life. Reality is made up by "*Herren-Moral* und *Sklaven-Moral*.[78]" (Nietzsche 1999c, 208) as he describes it in *Jenseits von Gute und Böse*. Reality is now a relation of the power and the weakness. He writes that:

> "Wir sind es, die allein die Ursachen, das Nacheinander, das Für-einander, die Relativität, den Zwang, die Zahl, das Gesetz, die Freiheit, den Grund, den Zweck erdichtet haben; und wenn wir diese Zeichen-Welt als 'an sich' in die Dinge hineindichten, hineinmischen, so treiben wir es noch einmal, wie wir es immer getreiben haben, nämlich *mytologisch*. Der 'unfreie Wille' ist Mythologie: im wirklichen Leben handelt es sich nur um *starken* und *schwachen* Willen.[79]" (ibid., 36).

Here we see Nietzsche's relativism shine through. Notions of causation, sequences, laws, freedom, etc. are all inventions of the human being for the sake of the human being. It is here - however small it might be - his conception of a 'metaphysics' shows; "im wircklichen Leben" it is only about weak and strong wills. In *Also sprach Zarathustra* he gives a hint to why it might be that "wircklichen Leben" is beyond our categorical comprehension, and that is: "Höheres als alle Versöhnung muss der Wille wollen, welcher der Wille zur Macht ist -: doch wie geschieht ihm das?[80]" (Nietzsche 1999b, 181). The will strives for something higher than what we can graps. The will to power becomes a principle of the reality. When the will is understood as the immanent Being, then the perception shifts. Nietzsche writes in *Die fröhliche Wissenschaft* that: "Die Welt wird für Den immer voller, welcher in die Höhe der Menschlichkeit hinauf wächst.[81]" (Nietzsche 1999a, 539). Enlightenment does not reveal a secret hidden metaphysical realm, but instead it lets the subject experience the world fuller. The immanent reality becomes saturated. We must not rejected the *Erdenreich*, but affirm it.

---

[78] "a *master morality* and a *slavemorality*." (Nietzsche 2002, 153)

[79] "*We* are the ones who invented causation, succession, for-each-other, relativity, compulsion, numbers, law, freedom, grounds, purpose; and if we project and inscribe this symbol world onto things as an 'in-itself,' then this is the way we have always done things, namely *mythologically*. The 'un-free will' is mythology; in real life it is only a matter of *strong* and *weak* wills." (Nietzsche 2002, 21)

[80] "That will which is the will to power must will something higher than any reconciliation - but how shall this happen?" (Nietzsche 2006, 112)

[81] "The world becomes even fuller for someone who grows into the height of humanity." (Nietzsche 2008, 171)

In a parable from *Also sprach Zarathustra* Nietzsche speaks of three characters of human beings, where the second and third are of importance for realising the world as will to power; the lion and the child. The lion is the nay-sayer, the defier of the norms. The lion is needed for the sacred 'No' - "ein heiliges Nein" (Nietzsche 1999b, 30) that destroys. After this catharsis the child is needed.

> "Unschuld ist das Kind und Vergessen, ein Neubeginnen, ein Spiel, ein aus sich rollendes Rad, eine erste Bewegung, ein heiliges Ja-sagen. Ja, zum Spiele des Schaffens, meine Brüder, bedarf es eines heiligen Ja-sagens: *seinen* Willen will nun der Geist, *seine* Welt gewinnt sich der Weltverlorene.[82]" (ibid.,, 31)

The forgetting is important. It is what enables the child to recreate as a will to power. The child is where the will to power is fully realised. Nietzsche writes in *Jenseits von Gute und Böse*: "Denn die Menschen sind *nicht* gleich: so spricht die Gerechtigkeit. Und wa ich will, dürften *sie* nicht wollen![83]" (Nietzsche 1999c, 162). Nietzsche's idea of the will to power ends with an aristocracy that should rule society, because they have understood reality as a will to power. They will as he writes: "Wandel der Werthe, - das ist Wandel der Schaffenden. Immer vernichtet, wer ein Schöpfer sein muss.[84]" (ibid., 75). This new *Schöpfer* (creator) will be called Übermensch.

The Reality of der Übermensch

What is interesting about Nietzsche's conception of the Übermensch is that it mirrors his notion of reality. Life and Being are constituted by creation, but the creation demands destruction and recreation to sustain and develop itself. The same aspects are contained in the Übermensch. In two different sections Nietzsche writes about this micro-macrocosmic connection between reality and human being. He writes in *Die fröhliche Wissenschaft*: "wer in sich wie in einen ungeheurem Weltraum hineinsieht und Milchstrassen in sich trägt, der weiss auch, wie unregelmässigt alle

---

[82] "The child is innocence and forgetting, a new beginning, a game, a wheel rolling out of itself, a first movement, a sacred yes-saying. Yes, for the game of creation my brothers a sacred yes-saying is required. The spirit wants *its* will, the one lost to the world now wins *its own* world." (Nietzsche 2006, 17)

[83] "For human beings are *not* equal: thus speaks justice. And what I want, *they* would not be permitted to want!" (Nietzsche 2002, 99)

[84] "Change of values - that is the change of creators. Whoever must be a creator always annihilates." (Nietzsche 2002, 43)

Milchstrassen sind; sie führen bis in's Chaos und Labyrinth des Daseins hinein.[85]" (Nietzsche 1999a, 552) and in *Also sprach Zarathustra* that: "*Ich lehre euch den Übermenschen*. Der Mensch ist etwas, das überwunden werden soll. Was habt ihr gethan, ihn zu überwinden?[86]" (Nietzsche 1999b, 14). As a consequence of his immanent reality the human being is realised as intervowen with reality. Reality is nothing more than material aspects of weaker and stronger wills[87]. Nietzsche highlights the destructive element - the human being must be conquered and overcome in order to give way to the Übermensch. The birth of the Übermensch is thus a painful proces. When the human being realises the seemingly chaotic reality of the world both inside and outside itself, it is able to overcome its own form and give way to the future Übermensch. Nietzsche famously states it as: "Ich sage euch: man muss noch Chaos in sich haben, um einen tanzenden Stern gebären zu können. Ich sage euch: ihr habt noch Chaos in euch.[88]" (ibid., 19). The chaos is seen as a potential power that should be harnessed by the heroic individual through a dangerous and laboursome journey. In his later book *Jenseits von Gute und Böse* Nietzsche elaborates on his idea of accepting chaos: "Wer mit Ungeheuern kämpft, mag zusehn, dass er nicht dabei zum Ungeheuer wird. Und wenn du lange in einen Abgrund blickst, blickt der Abgrund auch in dich hinein.[89]" (Nietzsche 1999c, 98). Chaos and destruction is necessary, but not in the sense of a complete nihilism. The Übermensch must not dwell in the chaos, but be able to harness its powers and rise above the chaos[90].

The Übermensch has the potential to reshape the passions and uncontrollable instincts into something beautiful, Nietzsche writes in *Also sprach Zarathustra* that: "Einst hattest du wilde Hunde in deinem Keller: aber am Ende verwandelten sie sich zu Vögeln und lieblichen

---

[85] "he who looks into himself as into a vast space and bears galaxies within also knows how irregular galaxies are; they lead into the chaos and labyrinth of existence." (Nietzsche 2008, 180)

[86] *"I teach you the overman*. Human being is something that must be overcome. What have you done to overcome him?" (Nietzsche 2006, 5)

[87] This idea is - however obscured it might be stated - present, when he writes in *Also sprach Zarathustra*: "Der Übermensch ist der Sinn der Erde." (Nietzsche 1999b, 14) ["The overman is the meaning of the earth." (Nietzsche 2006, 6)]. If the Übermensch crystalises the reality of the world, then the Übermensch must hold the meaning of the earth within it. The Übermensch is the articulation of the real world.

[88] "I say to you: one must still have chaos in oneself in order to give birth to a dancing star. I say to you: you still have chaos in you." (Nietzsche 2006, 9)

[89] "Whoever fights with monsters should see to it that he does not become one himself. And when you stare for a long time into an abyss, the abyss stares back into you." (Nietzsche 2002, 69)

[90] Much like the Danish philosopher Søren Kierkegaard's notion of the ethical stage, where the human being positively uses *Angst* to rise above the mundane orientation in the world (cf. the chapter "Ligevægten mellem det Æsthetiske og Ethiske i Personlighedens Udarbejdelse" in the book *Enten-Eller bind II* from 1843).

Sängerinnen.[91]" (Nietzsche 1999b, 43). The transformation is the potential to transgress, to go under, and give birth to something beautiful[92]. Similarly, he writes in *Jenseits von Gute und Böse* that: "jenes 'wilde Thier' ist gar nicht abgetödtet worden, es lebt, es blüht, es hat sich nur — vergöttlicht.[93][94]" (Nietzsche 1999c, 166). The wild animal is not dead, and should not be forgotten, but should be accepted as a part of all human beings. We are for Nietzsche nothing more than nature. In order to transgress, we must reach back in our history, see ourselves as wild animals, accept the "wilde Hunde im Keller" - our dark and striving passions - and venerate them as divine. Only then writes Nietzsche in *Also sprach Zarathustra* can we: "(…) lieber selber Gott sein![95]" (Nietzsche 1999b, 325). The apotheosis comes through an acceptance of our earthly impulses, however dark and *wrong* they may be, we should not strive for something beyond this reality, because there is nothing else than this *Erdenreich*.

In *Also sprach Zarathustra* Nietzsche investigates laughter, he writes that: "(…) dem Lachen des schöpferischen Blitzes lachte (…)[96]" (ibid., 288). Laughter is a transgressive action, and spontaneously reaffirms the stronger will. He elaborates: "(…) im Lachen nämlich ist alles Böse bei einander, aber heilig- und losgesprochen durch seine eigne Seligkeit.[97]" (ibid., 290). The laughter is holy and ambivalent: It is what is equivocally fearless and fearful for Nietzsche. We laugh in ecstacy, in joy, and in pain. Laughter becomes an aggressive respons to the absurd, and our dark emotions are allowed to breathe. Nietzsche understands this ambiguity and in *Die fröhliche*

---

[91] "Once you had wild dogs in your cellar, but ultimately they transformed into birds and lovely singers." (Nietzsche 2006, 25)

[92] For Nietzsche and Schopenhauer suffering can act as a means for enlightenment. In *Jenseits von Gute und Böse* Nietzsche writes: "Das tiefe Leiden macht vornehm; es trennt." (Nietzsche 1999c, 225) ["Profound suffering makes you noble; it separates" (Nietzsche 2002, 166)]. Nietzsche denies Schopenhauer his validity, when he in contrast to the above-mentioned statement on suffering writes in *Die fröhliche Wissenschaft* that: "*Wo liegen deine grössten Gefahren?* - Im Mitleiden." (Nietzsche 1999a, 519) ["*Where lie your greatest dangers?* - In compassion." (Nietzsche 2008, 152)]. Even though they agree on suffering, Nietzsche understands it purified of Christian benevolence.

[93] "The "wild animal" has not been killed off at all; it is alive and well, it has just – become divine." (Nietzsche 2002, 120)

[94] The apotheosis of the human being is a reoccuring theme for Nietzsche. In *Die fröhliche Wissenschaft* he asks: "Müssen wir nicht selber zu Göttern werden, um nur ihrer würdig zu erscheinen?" (Nietzsche 1999a, 481) ["Do we not ourselves have to become gods merely to appear worthy of it?" (Nietzsche 2008, 120)]. To be a conqueror of reality, one must gain the status of a god.

[95] "(…) rather be a god oneself!" (Nietzsche 2006, 211)

[96] "(…) laughed with the laugh of creative lightning (…)" (Nietzsche 2006, 185)

[97] "(…) in laughter everything evil is together, but pronounced holy and absolved by its own bliss." (Nietzsche 2006, 186)

Wissenschaft he hints that: "(…) dass der freie Mensch sowohl gut als böse sein kann (…)[98]" (Nietzsche 1999a, 457). Laughter is the mark of the free human being that is beyond good and evil.

Beyond Morality

As I have shown in the above subchapter, the Übermensch is beyond right and wrong. The strong individual now creates its own morality. "Der aber hat sich selber entdeckt, welcher spricht: Das ist *mein* Gutes und Böses: damit hat er den Maulwurf und Zwerg stumm gemacht, welcher spricht 'Allen gut, Allen bös.'[99]" (Nietzsche 1999b, 243). *My* good and evil - the new morality is defined by what the will to power desires. There is no room for equality. Morality becomes relative to societal norms. In another quote from *Also sprach Zarathustra*, he describes the ambigous morality of the future human being as such: "'Was erschrickst du desshalb? - Aber es ist mit dem Menschen wie mit dem Baume. Je mehr er hinauf in die Höhe und Helle will, um so stärker streben seine Wurzeln erdwärts, in's Dunkle, Tiefe, - in's Böse.'[100]" (ibid., 51). Not only does the strong will penetrate all the layers of the world. It goes from soil to sky and from dark to light. It demands to grow without restrictions. It wants to grow beyond good and evil. Nietzsche defends his thoughts in *Die fröhliche Wissenschaft*: "Das Neue ist aber unter allen Umständen das *Böse*, als Das, was erebern, die alten Grenzsteine und die alten Pietäten umwerfen will; und nur das Alte ist das Gute![101]" (Nietzsche 1999a, 376). The new morality is transgressive, fearless, ambigious, and contradicts itself. It is progressive and is therefore viewed with fear from the weaker wills, i.e. the dominant cult of equality. As Nietzsche states later on in the same book: "Wir sollen auch *über* der Moral stehen *können* (…) auch über ihr schweben und spielen![102]" (ibid., 465). The Übermensch is the pioneer for a new morality that raises itself above the morality of the weak, and fuses the animal nature with the divine sphere. The morals of the Übermensch is equivocally deep and light, it is a

---

[98] "that the free man can be good as well as evil" (Nietzsche 2008, 98)

[99] "But he will have discovered himself who speaks: 'This is *my* good and evil.' With this he has silenced the mole and dwarf who says: 'Good for all, evil for all.'" (Nietzsche 2006, 155)

[100] "'Why are you startled by this? - But it is with human beings as it is with this tree. The more they aspire to the heights and the light, the more strongly their roots strive earthward, downward, into darkness, depths - into evil.'" (Nietzsche 2006, 29)

[101] "What is new, however, is under all circumstances *evil*, being that which wants to conquer, to overthrow the old boundary stones and pieties; and only what is old is good!" (Nietzsche 2008, 32)

[102] "We have also to *be able* to stand *above* morality (…) also to float and play above it!" (Nietzsche 2008, 104-105)

paradox. It resembles exactly what reality is. The Übermensch understands that there is no dictomy between feelings and reason, they both spring from the same immanent reality. The new morality is as much directed by the inner animal as the inner god, it goes beyond what is human. Its roots go back to nature and forward into the future.

Remodelled World of Will

Towards a New Reality

When writing my own theory, I have made great use of the philosophy of Schopenhauer and Nietzsche. Parts of my theory are based on their thinking, parts are reconfigured ideas, and lastly I have created my own notions in order to grasp the *Netratantra* better. Before I go in depth with the theoretical aspects of the thesis, I would like to hightlight and summarise the five key terms that I use. The *trichotomy of perception*; this is based on Schopenhauer's epistemology of world as will, reason, and representation. *Erdenreich*; an idea from Nietzsche to imply the immanent, non-dual, and cyclic notion of reality, he opts for. *Will-as-potential*; my rewriting of the will based on ideas from both Schopenhauer and Nietzsche that sees the will as a way of altering one's perception to a degree where reality overflows with meaning and becomes potential. *Vollmensch*; a rewriting of Nietzsche's Übermensch, the *Vollmensch* are able to exist in a mode of being that is altered by the before-mentioned *will-as-potential*, thus it is a being more *in* the world than *of* the world. *Saturated reality*; the altered mode of being, where reality is accepted as constant becomings that the *Vollmensch* can saturate and create at will.

These five notions will be the focal points of my own theory, building upon the selected writings of Schopenhauer and Nietzsche. In this chapter the thinkers will be inobtained into my cluster of meaning. I will go through the before-mentioned notions one by one.

The Trichotomy of the Erdenreich

From the outset I want to problematise Schopenhauer's immanent metaphysics through his successor Nietzsche, while still keeping a implicit notion of the aspects of Schopenhauer's trichotomy of will, reason, and representation in a Nietzschian non-dual and immanent reality. For Nietzsche there is one material reality - the *Erdenreich* - and its materiality implies an idea of a cyclic existence; there is no heaven or netherworld. Nietzsche accepts Schopenhauer's premise for an immanent reality, but - seeing reality as a totality - Nietzsche removes Schopenhauer's idea of a dicotomy of Being and non-Being. *Nothing* - not understood in a Schopenhaurian sense of

emptiness - is beyond the earthly existence. As a consequence hereof, the material world cannot disappear into a void, but remains as the *Erdenreich*. The world is one cyclic non-duality, which can be accessed through different modes of perception or being - varying in degrees of amplification or saturation without changing the matter of reality. Nietzsche speaks of how deep (*tief*) the world is, and I think of how saturated the world is. In my theory, this is how reality - and thus Being - is understood. The perceptual trichotomy of reality do not affect the Being but only our mode of being *in* the world. When I accept the premise that the world is will, it becomes a will that *is* the material world. It is impossible to create an alternate form of Being, where we can escape the will, and the realisation it brings. The *trichotomy of perception* changes as well; it no longer functions as instruments for the human being to deny the will its power. Instead the *trichotomy of perception* becomes individual modes of being, which the human being can use to orient itself in the *Erdenreich*. In other words, a heightend perception of reality does not stem from a Schopenhaurian notion of gazing beyond the *principium individuationis* and understanding a new Being; i.e. emptiness of non-Being. Now the heightend perception helps the being to firmly grasp the *Erdenreich*, and use each mode of being to its fullest potential.

So in this thesis the *Erdenreich* is a non-dual totality of Being that perceptually takes the form of three aspects; will, knowledge and activity/representations, with the three modes being able to dissolves into one, since the world is ultimately created and animated by the one will. The three modes are different perceptual aspects of the *Erdenreich*. They are not three distinct realms of Being. Our being *in* the world is connected with our knowledge *of* the world - our mode of being reconfigures our perceptual orientation. I see it as understanding *place* as *space* for a brief moment. The *Erdenreich* thus appears as a trichotomy; the impetus of the will, the structuring by the knowledge, and the distinguishing of representations by the activity. The two latter modes of the trichotomy relates to the embodied experiences of reality, where we relate to our surroundings with a notion of *place*. This is understood as the mundane and ordinary experience of reality. The first part of the trichotomy - the will - exceeds the physical body and pushes the boundaries for embodied experiences. In this mode the 'person' experiences reality as *space*. That is, *space* without the subject/object dicotomy, and an abscence of any dicotomies what so ever - everything appears, or exists, in an embryonic stage of becoming.

When I understand reality in this way, it renders possible a deepend saturation of reality through the perceptual trichotomy, where elements differ in intensity. Elements do not alter in category or essence, i.e. they do not change in Being. Instead they alter relational and perceptual,

i.e. they alter our involvement and mode in the world. In the mode of being as will, the 'person' is overflown with the excess meaning of reality as *space*, and must succumb to the sheer potential of the unhinged will of reality. The totality of the non-dual world creates a cognitive meltdown, where only the immediate embodied knowledge is able to orient itself. Rational thought loses its dominance.

Will-as-potential

My ideas of reality are rooted in the will. The will becomes the cosmological impetus and it functions as the catalyst for attaining a *saturated reality*. My reconfiguration of will is found in the tensions between Schopenhauer and Nietzsche, but conversely I do not confine myself to any of the two thinkers. I find certain aspects of their thoughts fruitful, namely the idea that the will molds and exceeds the intelligible mundane reality. The will keeps the world in a constant state of becoming; creating and destroying *ad infinitum*. The fruitful area, where Nietzsche's *Erdenreich* meets the Schopenhauer *trichotomy of perception*, is where I base my model. When the perceptual trichotomy of world as will, reason, and representation is mastered through a will to power, then it cannot stay a will to power but must evolve.

In this grey area I define *will-as-potential*. The nature of the will possesses the potentiality and power to reconfigure reality, thus saturating and augmenting different aspects. The embodied experiences become the main instruments for the *will-as-potential* to saturate reality[103]. For the human being, the will takes it outset from the material body and the sensory organs. The will is a heightend perceptual mode of being. With the *will-as-potential* the human breaks free of the constraints of mundane knowledge, and views the world as *space* instead of *place*. Through the potential of *space*, the *will-as-potential* forces the human being to understand that Being and

---

[103] An example springs to mind from an old Nepalese folklore about a priest, where a celebratory procession is held, when a group of people returns to the Kathmandu valley with a powerful deity in their possession, thus bringing back the water to the vally plagued by drought:

> "It was a wonderful procession. While the powerful beings, the Bhairabs, carried the kalas, Brahma, the chief of the gods, swept the ground and Indra, the king of heaven, held a parasol over Karunamaya. Kubera, the richest among the gods, scattered riches along the road while Agni, the fire god, held a torch and Bayu, the wind, held a flag aloft. These heavenly beings were visible only to the good priest Bandhudatta. To the common people, they appeared merely as birds and beasts." (Lall 1991, pp. 9)

In the story, the priest is able to saturate reality through his sensory apparatus. It is of importance to note that it is the priest - here a tantric priest - that is able to perceive the deities and not the common people.

knowledge is tied intimately together; knowledge as the creation of *place* and Being as unlimited *space*. The *will-as-potential* allows the human being to alter its mode of being in the world, thus perceiving the world as *space,* i.e. pure potential, because it understands the connection between perception and Being. The *will-as-potential* reveals the world-as-potential; an overflow of meaning that renders the human being able to reorient itself in Being. This chaotic overflow can for the human being - not equipped with the embodied knowledge - seem as an emptiness, but it is only emptiness for those, who succumbs to the chaotic apperance of the world as will. The being - that overcomes the heightend mode of being - has mastered the *will-as-potential* and has thus won the world in its totality and endless potentiality. In the next subchapter, I will delve into what happens when the human being masters *the will-as*-potential. How does reality and the human being alter, when the world as representation becomes the world as potential.

Vollmensch: Beyond the Übermensch

The human being, who has mastered the *will-as-potential*, calls to a reimagining of the character of the Übermensch. I have reformulated the Übermensch to contain my notion the trichotomy of 'being in the world' and the notion of *will-as*-potential. The name for this character is the *Vollmensch* - playing on the German etymology of *voll* as meaning both full, filled and drunk. While still keeping the *mensch* (man/human) intact, since the human being does not change in apperance but only in saturation and mode[104]. I reconfigure the *mensch* to contain the idea that the *Vollmensch* is both in total contact with its body, i.e. is filled out, and at the same time - as a consequence of this - has the capacity to seem drunk or even mad to its surroundings. The *Vollmensch* is in the world in the mode of will, which renders reality plastic (malleable). The other parts of the *trichotomy of perception* are inobtained in the *Vollmensch's will-as-potential*. The *Vollmensch* is thus able to mold reality through its reorientation in the will. Reality is seen exclusively as immanent and non-dual, because the world as will and the world as representation have collapsed together by the force of the *will-as-potential*. The totality of the world is not distinguished in secondary or subsidary worlds, instead aspects of the world becomes saturated in various degrees. The *Vollmensch* is able to create, reconfigure, and destroy parts of its perception of

---

[104] The human being, who has conquered the *will-as-potential*, does not change in shape or form, but this mastering internalises the will and reconfigures the embodied knowledge of the human. This forces the human being to map its own body again with that of the *Vollmensch*.

reality, thus, stated with a Schopenhauerian terminology, the *Vollmensch* is able to control its representations.

The reconfiguration goes beyond the perceptual knowledge of the Übermensch. The *Vollmensch* understands reality as potential, i.e. *space*, because of the *will-as-potential*. I have to stress that the knowledge of the world becomes intertwined with the Being of the world; the *Vollmensch* perceives and creates simultaneously. What I have baptised as *saturated reality*, is a mode where knowledge and Being have merge and are involved with each other. The altered reality is not distant from the reality that is perceived by other beings. It is a stronger and deeper involvement with the world, where perceptual impressions and expression are under the *Vollmensch's* full control. This allows the human being to consciously understand the world as a trichotomy of representation or activity, knowledge, and will. Through mastery of the *will-as-potential* it can alter and saturate these surroundings that it now sees itself intertwined with in the non-dual worldview. It can fill (*voll*) out reality or retract to different parts of the body. The malleable reality is made possible exactly because the mode of being in the world is the will. It understands that in grasping the world (knowledge of) it alters and saturates the world (changing modes of being). The *Vollmensch* knows that reality is non-dualistic, so knowledge and Being are not opposites - they are the same. If one masters perception, i.e. embodied knowledge, then reality is mastered. In this sense the human is *voll*. It fills out its own being and goes beyond the boundaries of its own body and embodied knowledge. It saturates its body, and as a consequence hereof it is able to saturate and shape aspects of reality. It is because it is of the same nature as Being that the *Vollmensch* is able to saturate the world.

Short Summary I

The *Erdenreich* is a non-dual totality of Being that perceptually takes the form of three aspects; will, knowledge, and representation or activity. In the mode of the *will-as-potential* the human breaks free of the mundane knowledge, and views the world as *space* instead of *place*, because the three modes of being dissolves into one. Through the potential of *space*, the *will-as-potential* forces the human being to reorient itself, and understand that Being and knowledge is intimately tied together; knowledge as the creation of *place* and Being as unlimited *space*. In this state, the 'person' must become the *Vollmensch*. A character that is in the world in the mode of will. This renders reality plastic (malleable). The other parts of the *trichotomy of perception* are inobtain in the *Vollmensch's will-as-potential*. The *Vollmensch* is able to create, reconfigure, and destroy parts of its

perception of reality. This is the *saturated reality*. A mode where knowledge and Being have merge and are involved with each other. It is a stronger and deeper involvement with the world, where perceptual impressions and expression are more saturated or even augmented. The *saturated reality* is not a new reality, but a deeper orientation in reality.

Method

Introduction (to Reality)

An academic thesis is often a delusion of a real creative and intellectual process. It offers a linear narrative that occurs in a controlled sequence, to contain the sprawling chaos of the creation of the thesis. It is a make-believe, where the complexity of the subject matter is set in clear structures. Methodological awarness is an important feature in every thesis, but so is the awareness of how different methods change our relation to the subject matter. Methods create a *place*, where we can fathom the vast *space*. *Space* is impossible to perceive; we must create *places* through methods. This counts for tantric studies as well. The English Indologist Richard Gombrich hints at something similar in his book *What the Buddha Thought*: "But what method or methods they use will depend on the circumstances of the case." (Gombrich 2009, pp. 92)[105]. The myth of the objective method is seducing, but to think of methods in this manner is unnecessarily deliminated and categorical. In this chapter I will argue that methodology is an empty category, and that methods are not tools for the academic *doctors* to use on the objective world that lies *in front* of them on the dissecting table. Instead I will argue that a method should be as fluid as the world with which the academic is *always already* engaging. There is no stepping outside of the world, and no essence deliminates one culture from another. We must reorient oneself in a contantly self-engaging reality. To elaborate on my thoughts I have drawn on ideas of the American feminist theorist Karen Barad, the French philosopher duo of Gilles Deleuze and Felix Guattari, and lastly the French philosopher Roland Barthes.

When working with the thoughts of influential thinkers like Arthur Schopenhauer and Friedrich Nietzsche, methods from History of Ideas often seem to be the obvious approach. These methods entail an understanding of thinkers in a linear trajectory of time and *place*, which is not

---

[105] Gombrich also continues in this vein, when he writes that: "There is no such subject as methodology. Mediocre academics like using long words, and at some time in the past generation someone decided it would be more impressive to call method 'methodology'." (ibid.). The idea of methodology presupposes a field of research or a clearly defined toolbox from, which the academic can use the methodology to grasp the subtle realities of the world infront of the academic.

fruitful for my thesis. Instead I have chosen the above-mentioned approach to facilitate an open dialogue. I will not deny the History of Ideas their validity of situating and tracing ideas throughout history, but I find this approach to be troublesome in this thesis[106]. Instead I turn to the above-mentioned thinkers so I can mold a method that fits my philosophical investigation. I find that these thinker's approaches compliment each other in meaningful ways. The macro perspective of my method is based on ontological notions by Barad, and Deleuze and Guattari, respectively the article "Posthumanist Performativity: Toward an Understanding og How Matter Comes to Matter" (2003) and the book *A Thousand Plateaus* (1980). In the micro perspective I redefine Barthes' thoughts on text, author, and reader via his essay "La mort de l'Auteur" from 1967, and a selected passage from Ricœur's speech "Défi et Bonheur de la traduction" for the Deutsches Verlagsanstalt in 2004.

Agency and Bulbs

To understand my approach I will first explain the foundation for my method. I create the foundation through the before-mentioned thinkers' ideas. I will start with a quote from the American feminist theorist Karen Barad explaining her ideas on Being:

> "On an agential realist account, it is once again possible to acknowledge nature, the body, and materiality in the fullness of their becoming without resorting to the optics of transparency or opacity, the geometries of absolute exteriority or interiority, and the theoretization of the human as either pure cause or pure effect while at the same time remaining resolutely accountable for the role 'we' play in the intertwined practices of knowing and becoming." (Barad 2003, 812)

Her mention of becomings is reminiscent of Deleuze and Guattari's understading of Being. They summarise their theory of the rhizome in the quote:

> "Let us summarize the principal characteristics of a rhizome: unlike trees or their roots, the rhizome connects any point to any other point, and its traits are not necessarily linked to traits of the same nature; it brings into play very different regimes of signs, and even nonsign states. The rhizome is reducible neither to the One nor the multiple. it is not the One that becomes Two ore even directly three, four, five, etc. It is not a multiple derived from the One, or to which One is added ($n + 1$). It is composed not of units but of

---

[106] Because of this thesis' restrictions; i.e. it being a university MA-thesis with a limited number of pages to make use of, I will not elaborate on the finer details of these disciplines' methods, but instead offer an alternative to, what I find problematic in their approaches.

dimensions, or rather directions in motion. It has neither beginning nor end, but always a middle (*milieu*) from which it grows and which it overspills. It constitutes linear multiplicities with *n* dimensions having neither subject nor object, which can be laid out on a plane of consistency, and from which the One is always subtracted (*n* - 1). When a multiplicity of this kind changes dimension, it necessarily   changes in nature as well, undergoes a metamorphosis." (Deleuze & Guattari 2019, 21-22)

In both theories the world is an totality, a multiplicity, and is ever-changing. Movement is key; nothing stands still, and interactions happen constantly whether the "subject" desires it or not. For them there is no "subject", and therefore no "object". The "subject" is not investigating from the outside, but is intertwined in reality - it *is* reality. All actions are contingent of the multiplicity; even our knowing *is* a becoming[107]. The totality of becomings is shaped by agents. It can take the form of human and nonhuman agents, but there is no difference in their degree of agency[108]. Barad writes about agents/agentiality that:

"In summary, the universe is agential intra-activity in its becoming. The primary ontological units are not 'things' but phenomena - dynamic topological reconfigurings/ entanglements/relationalities/(re)articulations. And the primary semantic units are not 'words' but material-discursive practices through which boundaries are constituted. This dynamism *is* agency. Agency is not an attribute but the ongoing reconfigurings of the world." (Barad 2003, 818)

The universe is then a cluster of different intra-acting agents. Much like the rhizome theory of Deleuze and Guattari. The world is decentralised; there is no central subject that investigates objects around it; one is always *in* the center in such a radical way that the need for a conventional understanding of a center fades. Deleuze and Guattari describes this in regards to plateaus: "A plateau is always in the middle, not at the beginning or the end. A rhizome is made of plateaus." (Deleuze & Guattari 2019, 22). The world is in a constant radical '*now*', and is without beginning or end. There is no beyond the totality[109], and the knowledge that emerges from it. Barad

---

[107] Becomings is the notion of Reality as constant reconfiguration, thus everything is in a constant becoming. The French term used by Deleuze and Guattari is *devenir*.

[108] She elsewhere describes this radical form of agency as: "Agency is a matter of intra-acting; it is an enactment, not something that someone or something has. Agency cannot be designated as an attribute of 'subjects' or 'objects' (as they do not preexist as such)." (Barad 2003, 826-827). Here, there is not talk of a philogical agency or a Cartesian agency, but a rewriting of the ontology of agency all together.

[109] This is reminiscent of the German philosopher Martin Heidegger's concept of *Geworfenheit*.

especially has an interesting notion of how her ontology affects the way we should understand epistemology. She highlights this notion of being intrinsicly connected with all other agents as:

> "We do not obtain knowledge by standing outside of the world; we know because 'we' are *of* the world. We are part of the world in its differential becoming. The separation of epistemology from ontology is a reverberation of a metaphysics that assumes an inherent difference between human and nonhuman, subject and object, mind and body, matter and discourse. *Onto-epistem-ology* - the study of practices of knowing in being - is probably a better way to think about the kind of understandings that are needed to come to terms with how specific intra-actions matter." (Barad 2003, 829)

Human are in an inherent relationship with the *world* with an intuitive understanding of the surroundings, because they are *always already* in the world, and not existing in a metaphysical reality. Barad coins the term onto-epistem-ology to grasp reality. Intra-actions are becomings, and our understanding shapes our intra-actions. We can no longer understand things from a distance; every investigation into reality reconfigures reality as such. This is why Deleuze and Guattari advocates for a new way of researching in this ontology: "The rhizome is altogether different, a *map and not a tracing*. Make a map, not a tracing." (Deleuze & Guattari 2019, 12). For Deleuze and Guattari we must understand all our actions as having a creative value, we cannot investigate a subject without interacting - and thus creating - with it and the agents in its proximity. They state further down that: "The map has to do with performance (…)" (ibid., 12). The performance is the conscious understanding of our involvement with the world of agents. We must make maps of agential intra-actions, instead of tracing genealogies. This affects their 'method'. Deleuze and Guattari writes: "There is no longer a tripartite division between a field of reality (the world) and a field of representation (the book) and a field of subjectivity (the author). Rather, an assemblage establishes connections between certain multiplicities drawn from each of these orders (…)" (ibid., 24). There is no distinction between ontology and method, they are created simultaneously. This idea mirrors that of Barad. She writes: "Moreover, the agential cut enacts a local causal structure among 'components' of a phenomenon in the marking of the 'measuring agencies' ('effect') by the 'measured object' ('cause')." (Barad 2003, 815). The focus on the onto-epistemology becomes a focus on an epistemology of proximity both in time and *place*. Common for all the thinkers is that epistemology becomes grounded in an ever-present reality devoid of metaphysical *outside*. It is the proximity of here and now that enables us to understand, and this is excatly why I will argue that

Deleuze and Guattari writes: "The rhizome is an antigenealogy." (Deleuze & Guattari 2019, 10) and Barad states: "Boundaries do not sit still." (Barad 2003, 817). We no longer have the privilege of static objects and isolated subjects, and everything is now creatively intra-acting. Time and *place* is understood via interactions, thus method is a practice of the present *here and now*.

Ici et Maintenant

From a micro perspective I am looking at how to approach a text. Coinciding with my reading of Barad, and Deleuze and Guattari I find the writings of the French philosopher Roland Barthes. I will base my ideas on his seminal essay "La mort de l'Auteur" from 1967. As the title suggest, Barthes commits homicide and the Author[110] falls victim. In this essay I will argue that his thinking mirrors that of the before-mentioned understanding of Being in his approach to textual criticism. In the below-cited quote, I will argue that this ontology shines through:

> "Ainsi se dévoile l'être total de l'écriture: un texte est fait d'écritures multiples, issues de plusiers cultures et qui entrent les unes avec les autres en dialogue, en parodie, en contestation; mais il y a un lieu où cette multiplicité se rassemble, et ce lieu, ce n'est pas l'auteur, comme on l'a dit jusqu'à présent, c'est le lecteur.[111]" (Barthes 1984, 66)

A single text consists of a multiplicity of writings across time and *place*. I will argue that his approach to reading is reminiscent of the agential realism; reality is the sum of all the agents.

Barthes wants to reinstate the reader, and oppose the Author. He highlights the overly excessive focus on the life of the author, when he writes: "L'*auteur* règne encore dans les manuels d'histoire littéraire, les biographies d'écrivains, les interviews des magazines, et dans la conscience même des littérateurs, soucieux de joindre, grâce à leur journal intime, leur personne et leur œuvre.[112]" (ibid., 62). He wants a new and more conscious way of understanding texts:

---

[110] Roland Barthes distinguishes between 'author' and 'Author'. For him, the Author with a capital A implies the notion of the romantised ideal of a spirit (*Geist*) of the Author that can be found in the text.

[111] "Thus is revealed the total existence of writing: a text is made of multiple writings, drawn from many cultures and entering into mutual relations of dialoque, parody, contestation, but there is one place where this multiplicity is focused and that place is the reader, not, as was hitherto said, the author." (Barthes 1977, 148)

[112] "The *author* still reigns in histories of literature, biographies of writers, interviews, magazines, as in the very consciousness of men of letters anxious to unite their person and their work through diaries and memoirs." (Barthes 1977, 143).

> "Nous savons maintenant qu'un texte n'est pas fait d'une ligne de mots, dégageant un sens unique, en quelque sorte théologique (qui serait le 'message' de l'Auteur-Dieu), mais un espace à dimensions multiples, où se marient et se contestent des écritures variées, dont aucune n'est originelle: le texte est un tissu de citations, issues des mille foyers de la culture.[113]" (Barthes 1984, 65)

Barthes sees the text as "un tissu de citations, issues des mille foyers de la culture", i.e a multi-centred tissue of agents, affecting each other constantly in the rhizomatic reality to use the vocabulary of Barad, Deleuze, and Guattari. There is no *l'Auteur-Dieu*, no authoritative voice of reason, no essence, or objectivity. The text is a constant accumulations of intra-actions in time and *place* with each of them gaining validity in the *here and now*.

In the essay Barthes focuses on an interesting aspect: "la naissance du lecteur doit se payer de la mort de l'Auteur.[114]" (ibid., 67). In the quote I will argue that Barthes sees death and birth as intrinsicly woven together. Reading is writing and understanding is creating. Furthermore, Barthes writes:

> "Tout au contraire, le scripteur moderne naît en même temps que son texte; il n'est d'aucune façon pourvu d'un être qui précéderait ou excéderait son écriture, il n'est en rien le sujet dont son livre serait le prédicat; il n'y a d'autre temps que celui de l'énonciation, et tout texte est écrit éternellement *ici* et *maintenant*.[115]" (ibid., 64).

Here I reencounter the "*ici* et *maintenant*". The creative and birth-giving process is simultaneously the reconfiguration of texts. I see a clear commonality between Barthes' focus on the here and now, the onto-epistemology of Barad, and the anti-genealogy of Deleuze and Guattari.

In this *ici et maintenant* lies the emancipation of the readers. They become writers. Barthes argues that the readers write and re-write the text constantly through their reading, and describes this process as: "finalement hors de toute fonction autre que l'exercise même du symbole, ce

---

[113] "We know now that a text is not a line of words releasing a single 'theological' meaning (the 'message' of the Author-God) but a multi-dimensional space in which a variety of writings, none of them original, blend and clash. The text is a tissue of quotations drawn from the innumerable centres of cultures." (Bartes 1977, 146)

[114] "the birth of the reader must be at the cost of the death of the Author." (Barthes 1977, 148)

[115] "In complete contrast, the modern scriptor is born simultaneously with the text, is in no way equipped with a being preceding or exceeding the writing, is not the subject with the book as predicate; there is no other time than that of the enunciation and every text is eternally written *here and now*." (Barthes 1977, 145)

décrochage se produit, la voix perd son origine, l'auteur entre dans sa propre mort, l'écriture commence.[116]" (Barthes 1984, 61). Futhermore, Barthes lets the author be just one agent in the matrix with which the reader interacts: "il est seulement ce *quelqu'un* qui tient rassemblées dans un même champ toutes les traces dont est constitué l'écrit.[117]" (ibid., 67). In a text a myriad of information is gathered, but it is not constrained in the form of a book. It is a living field (a tissue) and every time we read, the text opens itself up again; the myriad of meanings reactivate and intra-act with a new myriad of meanings. With the idea of an Author, the text is frozen in time and *place* - a captive of essentialism. The author-based reading renders impossible any involvement. The killing of the Author is made possible by a new Being that is based on the constant involvement of *here and now*. The reader becomes the liberator and is liberated.

Reconfiguration as method

In the intersection of these thoughts my method blossoms, and to be clear, my method - simultaneously overflowing and devoid - springs from my engagement with Being. I find myself *thrown into* the world - entangled in the surroundings that too have agency. Gone is the reign of the isolated reseacher, and now the world in its multiplicity is allowed to encounter and argue equally. This is understood on two levels, which operate simultaneously; a macro and a micro level.

On a macro level I understand the reality as a non-dual whole, a rhizome, or a multiplicity connected in an ever-growing intra-action of agents; i.e. everything, which exists, configures and reconfigures constantly, this is reality. Nothing possesses everlasting borders from which we can perceive them eternally. Instead the world is ephemeral, fleeting, but not relative or devoid of meaning. Agents exist in different trajectories. Each trajectory are intersected in multiple ways by other trajectories, which renders it possible to view them both in their own respective trajectory, i.e. in a linear understanding time and *place*, but this also renders it possible to map them in their totality, i.e. the totality of connections. It is in the latter understanding I find my grounds for a dialogue between German 19th century philosophers Schopenhauer and Nietzsche, and the 9th century Nepalese text the *Netratantra*. I understand the textual sources through my interactions with them. Reality is animated by the multitude of interactions. In consequence, my understanding of

---

[116] "finally outside of any function other than that of the very practice of the symbol itself, this disconnection occurs, the voice loses its origin, the author enters into his own death, writing begins." (Barthes 1977, 142)

[117] "he is simply that *someone* who holds together in a single field all the traces by which the written text is constituted." (Barthes 1977, 148)

reality goes as far as my interaction with reality; be it in embodied and/or practical knowledge gained from interactions, or through knowledge gained from books and cultural transmission. My 'epistemology' is an *epistemology of proximity*. If I involve myself with certain aspects of reality I will gain knowledge of them; no involvement, no knowledge. My proximity is my *here and now*, much like Barad's onto—epistemology/agential cut I focus on present configurations. The *epistemology of proximity* operates with a notion of past and future, but can only understand it in the here and now; i.e. the current configuration. The *epistemology of proximity* is based on interactions in the proximity. The saturation can differ, but existence of the material world remains. Remember, it is the knowledge of the world that changes not the Being of the world; there is a difference between *place* ('knowledge of') and *space* ('Being as') as mentioned earlier. A fluid notion of time and *place* renders creative forms of dialogue possible, when I understand myself as a center of proximity.

On a micro level the method becomes intuitive. In the rhizome I become a spontaneously occured "center", a re-territorilisation of meaning, where the threads of the different agents meet and connect. Every center is created in relation to its surroundings, hence my notion of *epistemology of proximity* stated above. This notion of proximity paves the way for a *spontaneous hermeneutics*. This should be understood as a hermeneutics that is lived, and occurs spontaneously. It can be theorised, but cannot be synthesised from theory. It is an intuitive process of understanding that is not bound by *place* and time, but by proximity; i.e. my involvement that can exceed a narrative construction of history. As a human being I find myself *always already* in the middle of reality. I am - because of my faculty as a being in time and *place* - in the ever-changing *history*, this allows me to approach different schools of thought, practices, epoches, and trajectories to communicate in a *spontaneous hermeneutics*. I understand the validity of the here and now. This approach does not, however, end in total relativism, the threads that connect still have a point of connection in my proximity. I cannot redirect trajectories, but I can encounter them in multiple ways. My involvement is not universal, my involvement is a temporary becoming; an actualisation of certain aspects of my surroundings. The hermeneutic is a spontaneous dialogue between agents created in different epochs and areas, which are actualised in the here and now of the current configuration. I am a reader, someone who understands and creates, much like Barthes' notion of the reader.

My method is being conscious of creative and intuitive processes. I am creating maps from which I can read connections. I am not tracing sources back to their 'origins', I am instead mapping

my involvement with them. I borrow this from Deleuze and Guattari; mapping as an actualisation of the world around me. In this thesis the actualisation of my proximity becomes a dialogue between the German philosophers Arthur Schopenhauer and Friedrich Nietzsche, and the *Netratantra*. This dialogue is possible because I am the center of proximity, in which different threads, or agents, coexist. At first the process is intuitive, like a neural network, the threads connect intuitively and spontaneously, but the method lies in being conscious of this process and mapping it. When I am conscious of the process I can actualise the connections creatively and not just intuitively, thus making it a method. My method becomes a way of grasping processes that happen intuituvely and making them conscious, so I can use them academicly.

On the Suffering of Translation

The method colours my translation. A translation is never complete nor perfect - it is quite the contrary. As the French philosopher Paul Ricœur wrote in his speech "Défi et Bonheur de la traduction" for the Deutsches Verlagsanstalt in 2004: "Ces difficultés sont précisément résumées dans le terme d'«épreuve», au double sens de «peine endurée» et de «probation». Mise à l'épreuve, comme on dit, d'un projet, d'un désir voire d'une pulsion: la pulsion de traduire." (Ricœur 2004, pp. 4). This double sense of "épreuve" is what has to be understood before it is possible to move on with the translation. Ricœur elaborates on his thought:

> "Pour éclairer cette épreuve, je suggère de comparer la «tâche du traducteur» dont parle Walter Benjamin sous le double sens que Freud donne au mot «travail», quand il parle dans un essai de «travail de souvenir» et dans un autre essai de «travail de deuil». En traduction aussi, il est procédé à certain sauvetage et à un certain consentement á la perte." (ibid.).

What Ricœur has fleshed out is the reality every translator must accept. To translate is to reconfigure meaning, and in connection to this there is a pain to endure. Ricœur stresses the fact that a translation always loses some of the 'original' depth. Therefore he calls it "le travail de deuil"; a grief that is necessary for the real translation to be possible. I must admit "un certain consentement á la perte", and no matter how thoroughly I analyse morphology, syntax, or etymology, the 'essence' is unreachable. I must accept that the idea of an essence is an illusion, and through accepting this, I realise the enormous potential the reinterpretations brings forth. Within the loss of essence, the text and reader is set free. The interpretative potential reigns. In this totality of meanings I must secure that my reinterpretation is coherent and my process is transparent for others.

This "double sens de terme d'«épreuve»" is not an excuse to venture into total relativism, but instead is a way to highlight and map different concepts - a different way of approaching a translation, where the *here* and *now* is made transparent.

Sources

Choice of Sources

The biggest questions raised when working the textual material is 'Why'; "Why these diverse sources? Why let them enter into dialogue?". I can only answer this 'Why' with a 'Because'; because I found a gap in the field of Religious Studies. In that gap I found my foundational argument: The general research seems to imply - knowingly or unknowingly - an 'ontology' that I find disadvantageous in approaching worldviews that figure in the tantric manuscript the *Netratantra*. The challenge is also present in a greater array of certain types of religions, cultures, and general experiences, be it personal, inter-personal, or communal. When Being is not made visible the sources examined lose their nuances, and in the worst cases they lose their meaning and value all together. In all the theories I have encountered in the field of Religious Studies, two things persist; 1) a dualistic understanding of reality[118], and/or 2) that reality is structured rationally, whether or not it is realisable for the human being[119]. When approaching a vast majority of tantric texts I find the case to be opposite. The world is contingent, ever-present, and ever-changing, and a clear and transparent model for understanding this type of Being is needed. Thus I have chosen the sources at hand, i.e. Schopenhauer and Nietzsche, because of their focus on this matter.

To reiterate, I am *always already in* the world, and thus my choices are formed in my engagement with the world. The main challenge for my thesis is approaching the *Netratantra* or any other tantric text in a way I find 'substantial'[120]; questioning the foundation, and working my way up from there. The already existing theories in Religious Studies presuppose a dual ontology or/and a harmonious or rational structuring of the world surrounding them. Instead I want to create models that can grasp the mode of Being, I encounter in these worldview both in text and in field

---

[118] Cf. the confusion between knowledge of the world and the Being of the world in certain readings of tantric texts.

[119] Cf. the overtly masculine reading of the *Netratantra* (see subchapter on "A short discussion of divergent interpolations in the seventh chapter of the Netratantra") locating the cosmogony in the reason of Śiva and not in the violent and lustful impulses of Śakti.

[120] I know this word is conter-intuitive given my method. 'Substantial' is not understood as an essential reading, but rather 'substantial' as having substance (meaning) in my interaction.

research[121]. I find that the worldview is first and foremost chaotic and devoid of conventional ideas of morals, however structured and coherent some of theses notions of a reality seem for the human beings. How would I approach a non-rational worldview with academic models that by default are rational? Reality is vast and sprawling, chaotic and sometimes irrational, and that is exactly what this thesis wants to enclose on. Academic models must not be seen as static models. They should be versatile. They must inobtain the fluid Being and worldview they want to encircle. *My models are not made to contain ideas, but to grasp them and create a language, so that we can communicate.*

The choice of both the *Netratantra* and of the selected writings of Schopenhauer and Nietzsche are made because of their explorations of a reality that is based in this chaos and these feelings that cannot be tamed by categories. The body and the sensory experiences are taken into account. My choices are not done to show similarities for an easy application, but instead so I can have variations on a theme, exploring and highlighting different ideas based in similar 'ontological' systems. In dialogue, the sources reveal grey areas and create decentralised systems. I am able to create a *place*, where these sources can communicate, and new perspective can occur in my grasping. The sources are chosen, because I am situated in a certain time and *place*, which allows me to connect and involve myself with these texts. Without this approach these sources would never have been able to meet across the cultural and temporal trajectories, but by accepting the reality as a mesh of constant engagements I can.

Furthermore, the common denominator for the sources in the thesis is their focus on the will (*icchā*/*Wille*) as foundation for achieving a new mode of being in the world. This idea spreads across different areas of thought, practice, time, and *place*, but they all have in common that they engage with and want to grasp the unfathomable - both philosophical and religious - without necessarily categorising the core. The grasping allows free thinking without confinement to rigid structures. This thesis is sympathetic towards the material at hand; listening and engaging with the sources, thus trying to understand instead of containing and confining.

The Netratantra

It is important to clarify that the limited space of this thesis reduces my corrections and textual criticism. My translation is based on the *Amṛteśatantram* manuscript from Nepal-German

---

[121] This field research would not have been made possible, if I was not allow to assist Dr. Bjarne Wernicke-Olesen, for which I am grateful.

Manuscript Preservation Project from the National Archives in Kathamandu, Nepal[122], and relies on the text critical *apparatus* adopted from the work of Prof Gavin Flood, Dr Rajan Khatiwoda, and Dr Bjarne Wernicke-Olesen[123]. I decided not to make use of the otherwise often used commentaries by Kṣemarāja. I find that other translations are affected by his commentaries in ways which colours the understanding of the obscure parts of the text. I elaborate on this in the next subchapter. When a translation finds aid in commentaries, it must be made transparent. There is uncertainty regarding the age of the manuscript and the *Netratantra*. In Flood *et al.*'s translation they date the *Amṛteśatantram* manuscript to be around ca. 1200 AD (Flood *et al.*, 1). The English indologist Alexis Sanderson dates the *Netratantra* as text to be "between *c.* 700 and *c.* 850, probably towards the end of that period." (Sanderson 2005, 243). In this thesis I take this as gospel truth. My translation of the selected passages of the *Netratantra* is found in Appendix 1, and a full translation of the chapter by Flood, Khatiwoda, and Wernicke-Olesen is found in Appendix 2. Next, I will takes a critical look at the different interpolations of the *Netratantra*.

A Short Discussion of Divergent Interpolations in the Seventh Chapter of the Netratantra

Before my analysis of the *Netratantra*, I will have to locate and distinguish - what I believe to be - different layers of interpolations and influences from various schools of thought. My argument in this subchapter is that there are two distinct schools in the seventh chapter of the *Netratantra* both striving for dominance, or perhaps they are both emerging as a synthesis of different thoughts. I find it pivotal to underline the distinct elements of Śaiva- and Śākta-schools. There is already literature on this subject, and I will discuss these. Afterwards, I will highlight my own conviction. In this chapter I will make use of manuscripts N_1, N_2, and K_1 as they figure in Flood, Wernicke-Olesen, and Khatiwoda's translation[124].

  Gavin Flood describes in his book *The Tantric Body* from 2006 the *Netratantra* as "a Śaiva text from Kashmir" (Flood 2006, 108) and earlier on in his book he writes that: "The Śaiva texts that occupied the middle ground between the Siddhānta and the more extreme Śaiva and Kaula texts, namely the *Netra-tantra* and *Svacchanda-tantra*, came under scrutiny of Kṣemarāja, who wrote commentaries on both texts, claiming them for the monist." (ibid., 67). In his categorisation

---

[122] Mallinson and Singleton describes the Preservations Project's enourmous range (Mallinson & Singleton 2017, xxiv).

[123] See Appendix 2.

[124] See Appendix 2.

of the *Netratantra* Flood places it in a Kashmirian Śaivism, and mentions Kṣemarāja categorisation of the text as monistic. This is nothing new. Kṣemarāja is an Indian commentator and key figure that keeps reoccuring in the academic research that advocates for a Kashmirian monist reading of the *Netratantra* in the line of Abhinanavagupta. So before I go any further I will present this polarising figure and use him to show how his commentary on the *Netratantra* has influenced scholars the last fifty years.

Kṣemarāja is as Hélène Brunner writes in her article "Un Tantra du Nord: Le *Netra Tantra*" "le célèbre disciple d'Abhinavagupta" (Brunner 1974, 125), and with that in mind it seems natural that Brunner views the *Netratantra* as part of "le śivaïsme du Kashmir" (ibid., 125) because of the authoritative commentary. Kṣemarāja is a student of the tantric renaissance man Abhinavagupta (c. 950-1016 CE), and Kṣemarāja follows Abhinavagupta's teachings in the Kashmirian school called *Trika*. Therefore, it is important to view his commentary as a product of Abhinavagupta's teachings, and not as a key to a deeper understanding of the hidden truths of the *Netratantra* - his commentary is one tradition's interpretation of the text. His commentary is still heavily used as an guiding tool to the many obscure passages, but the question is; are the scholars using his commentary consciously or unconsciously? It is not my role to guess their agendas. All I can tell is that scholars like Hélène Brunner, André Padoux[125] and Gavin Flood[126] all rely on Kṣemarāja's commentary as a way of understanding the manuscripts obscurities, and draw conclusions from his interpretations.

Brunner is to my knowledge the first to make use of Kṣemarāja's commentary. She uses him excessively throughout her above-mentioned article, she even inherits his distinction and division of the seventh chapter. She writes: "Selon Kṣemarāja, la première reflète, à propos du corps subtil, l'enseignement de l'ecole kaula, la seconde celui 'des Tantra' (…) L'Exposé de cette méthode (16-51) prend plus de place que celui de la première (1-15)." (ibid., 142). There is nothing problematic about her use of Kṣemarāja's division of the seventh chapter, but her acceptance of Kṣemarāja's interpretation as the *right* way of viewing certain obscure elements are problematic[127]. Similarly in André Padoux's book *Tantric Mantras: Studies on mantrasastra[128]* from 2011 he writes

---

[125] Cf. Padoux, André: 2011 *Tantric Mantras: Studies on mantrasastra*, Routledge, Oxon.

[126] Cf. Flood, Gavin: 2018 "Practice in the *Netra Tantra*: An edition and annotated translation of chapters six, seven, and eight", Oxford (unpubl.), pp. 1-33.

[127] cf. the first foodnote on pp. 142, where Brunner adapts Kṣemarāja's reading of the *vyoman* as *śūnya* (Brunner 1974, pp. 142).

[128] In Padoux's bibliography Brunner's article from 1974 is listed. I will argue that this is why Padoux also uses Kṣemarāja's commentary as the main interpretation.

of the *Netratantra*: "I shall consider here a passage from the *Netratantra* (NT), a Śaiva text (…) which was commented upon by Kṣemarāja (…) and was interpreted by him in the spirit of the non-dualistic Śaiva system of the Kashmirian exegesis of the Trika-Pratyabhijña." (Padoux 2011. 95). The reliance on Kṣemarāja's commentary is still intact, instead of looking at the text in its own terms. Of course Padoux makes clear that he knows of Kṣemarāja's exegetic adherence to the *Trika* school in the commentary. Of course, this does not imply that Padoux only reads the *Netrantantra* through the lense of Kṣemarāja's optic, but it shows Padoux's willingness - without hesitation - to place the manuscript in the tradition of the most predominant commentary, instead of looking for redactions and possible interpolations in the *Netratantra*. So in Flood, Brunner and Padoux's scholarly works we see an idea of the *Netratantra* as a mainly Kashmirian Śaiva text influenced by the *Trika* school of Abhinavagupta because of Kṣemarāja's commentary.

Contrary, I will argue that there is a second school that is present in the manuscript. This would be the Śākta oriented *Paścimāmnāya* school. David Gordon White defines this school, when he describes the transmissions between the tantric schools in his book *The Alchemical Body* from 1996, as: "This was the *paścimāmnāya* (Western Transmission), a Śākta sect devoted to the worship of the goddess Kubjikā which, based mainly in Nepal, also incorporated tantric, yogic, and alchemical elements into its doctrine and practice." (White 2007, 2). There are several parts of his argument I will highlight and use as an *ad hoc* typology. At first, I will put an emphasis on the worship on Kubjikā. The worship of Kubjikā was predominant in Nepal, and she was known as the crooked one[129]. The same mention of the "Crooked One" is found in the *Netratantra* 7.21, where she is described as *kuṇḍalākhyāṃ*, i.e. "(…) she called the Crooked One (…)". Although Kubjikā and *kuṇḍalā*[130] are different words, they are synonyms in tantric literature. They signify Kuṇḍalinī. The second part I will highlight from White is the geographical location of the manuscripts N_1 and N_2. Both manuscripts were found in Nepal and had been in the possesion of the Newar royalty in Kathmandu. This fact corresponds with what Flood writes in *The Tantric Body*: "Some passages in tantric texts deals directly with kingship[131]. The *Netra-tantra* states that the tantric teacher (*ācārya*) needs to worship the eight mothers for the protection of the king and kingdom." (Flood 2006, 80).

---

[129] Cf. Monier-Williams; Kubjikā is translated as "hump-backed" or "crooked" (Monier-Williams 2008, 291).

[130] Kuṇḍalā can also be translated as "a ring" or "the coil of a rope" (Monier-Williams 2008 pp. 290).

[131] This is the focus of Alexis Sanderson's article "Religion and the State: Śaiva Officiants in the Territory of the King's Brahmanical Chaplain" from 2005.

White views the *Paścimāmnāya* school as a Nepalese school with a focus on the goddess Kubjikā and Flood attaches the *Netratantra* to a patronage of the royal family. Both these arguments links together. The Newar royalty of the Kathmandu Valley was believed to be secretly worshipping the Kubjikā[132], which indirectly corresponds with the first part of White's argument. The third and last argument is the thematic content of the *Netratantra*; the tantric, yogic, and alchemical elements. In Hélène Brunner's before-mentioned article she summarises each chapter of the *Netratantra* in great detail. Since my focus is only on the seventh chapter I will briefly show the similarities in White's typology and Brunner's summary. The focus on alchemy is not mentioned. The other two elements from White's typology are present. The person addressed in the chapter is refered to as a yogin, and he seeks *śaktis*, *siddhas* and tantric knowledge. So given David Gordon White's definition of the *Paścimāmnāya* school I will argue that several traits of the *Netratantra* fits into this definition, and could point at a interpolation of the Śākta influenced *Paścimāmnāya* school on a *Trika* school manuscript or vice versa.

With these two schools in mind I will look at the manuscript itself. There are obvious sections in the chapter, where the manuscript is unclear or contradicts itself on the relation of Śiva and Śakti. In verse 7.18 it is stated that: "[Then] from that virile power, the highest Śakti, known as action (*kriyā*), [is] arisen in the middle. [She is] separated upwards by knowledge (*jñāna*), the splitting of the knots, and by will (*icchā*)." This statement is contrasted with the Sanskrit *icchājñānakriyārūpaṃ śivam* in verse 7.50, which translates as "(…) Śiva (…) having the form of will, cognition and action". I will argue that these are divergent ideas. Both Śiva and Śakti occupy the same three aspect of the physical immanent world. It becomes a fight of dominance over ontologies. At the same time, they both occupy the area of the monistic ideal. In verse 7.38-39 Śiva is called the "all-pervading Śiva"[133], this would be set against verse 7.40 where it is said about Śakti has: "penetrated everywhere". Again there is a disagreement of divine dominance. My last argument is the redaction in verse 7.34d where the Nepal-German Manuscript Preservation Project's manuscripts named N_1 and N_2 diverges from the Kashmirian manuscript named K_1. In N_1 and N_2 it is phrased as *yoginīsamarasī*, to be the "same essence as yoginīs", but foodnote 38 in Flood et al.'s translation, notes that there is a redaction in the Kashmir edition. Instead the

---

[132] This is something Mark Dyczkowski works extensively with in his article "The Cult of the Goddess Kubjika: A Preliminary Comparative Textual and Anthropological Survey of a Secret Newar Goddess".

[133] See Flood et al. translation in Appendix 2.

Kashmirian manuscript uses *yogī samaraso*, to be "the same essence as Śiva[134]". This seemlessly small difference has major theological consequences. When the practitioner reaches the ultimate wisdom of the world (as will), does the practitioner then enter into the masculine godhead or into the feminine sphere of the creative Goddesses? It is important that I position myself, and that I am conscious about how this positioning changes how I interact with the manuscripts and translations at hand.

I do not believe that the *Netratantra* is solely a Śaiva tantric text. I will argue that the elements found points towards a diverse culture, informed at large by the Kashmiri *Trika* school and the Nepalese *Paścimāmnāya* school. I will in my thesis examine the *Netratantra* as influenced mainly by the *Paścimāmnāya* school with its roots in a Śākta tantric enviroment of Kathmandu. Of course I am aware of the aspects of a male oriented Śaiva *Trika* tradition, but for this thesis, the main area of interest lies in the perception of the known world, i.e. the creation of the Goddess that "penetrates everything".

The Notion of Icchā in the Netratantra

In this subchapter I use the term will, when I translate *icchā*. Words can denote a vast spectrum of meanings, and it is important to remember my method; to translate is to mourn the impossibility of transfering the 'meaning' in full. Instead, I have to make sure that I am transparent in my translation, so my motivations are visible, since *icchā* has various meanings. According to the English sanskritist Monier Monier-Williams *icchā* bears the meaning of 'wish', 'desire', and 'inclination' (Monier-Williams 2008 169). He does not translate it as will, but it still denotes an idea reminiscent of will. A wish or a desire is strong and motivated, and demands future actions. This is mirrored in the notion of will. They all contain the notion of something uncontrollable, impulsive, and not necessarily rational. They are not rooted in reason. There is a scholarly tradition of using will as *icchā* in translations of tantric texts in general; in André Padoux's translation of *Yoginīhṛdaya*, he uses *icchā* and 'will' interchangeably (see Padoux 2013, 38); in the American indologist David Kinsley's book *Tantric Visions of the Divine Feminine: The Ten Mahāvidyās,* he translates *icchā śakti* as the power of will (Kinsley 2016, 121, 137)[135]. This ties together with the

---

[134] Even though the Sanskrit reads *yogī*, the English indologist Alexis Sanderson has pointed out that in this case, the *yogī* should be seen as the *yogī par excellence*; that is Śiva.

[135] An example against my point is the English scholar and painter Philip Rawson, he writes in his book *The Art of Tantra* from 1973 that: "(…) they [the qualities of the Goddess] extend themselves from her own nature, as respectively, desire (Icchā) (…)" (Rawson 2010, 130).

philosophical framework of the *Netratantra*. Creation is a forceful endeavor, and in connection with the word *śakti* (power) *icchā* shifts from its milder connotations of wish or desire and becomes a more uncontrollable and impulsive force. Śakti's rudimentary first form, as I will show in the next subchapter, is the aspect of will, where she is Reality as pure potential; i.e. beyond the subject/ object dicotomy. In this non-rational pre-linguistic stage I find it necessary to use will and not wish or desire, since wish and desire are always mended on an object of desire. Will can be without object, therefore I understand *icchā* as will, when the Goddess is in her state beyond subject and object.

Systems of Being in the Netratantra

To narrow my thesis, I will look closer at two interlocking subjects; the structure of Being and the aspect of will. Whether the subjects are influenced by either the *Trika* or the *Paścimāmnāya* school, the structure seems to be a tripartite system, where will takes precedence over the other aspects, in such a degree that I view the will as a seperate category.

     The first two verses of the seventh chapter lists the different elements in the esoteric body, and among these are the threefold Śakti (*śaktitraya*) (7.2). I have translated it as 'threefold' and not as 'three', since the world is understood monistic. The threefold Śakti is different forms of the same Goddess, they cannot be seen individually, they are aspects of each other. It is important to view *traya* as 'threefold', so the unity comes forth. She can expand and collapse as she pleases, therefore is Śakti both rooted in the esoteric anatomy and the universe at once.

     In verses 7.6-7 both Śakti and Śiva are mentioned[136]. The importance lies in the practitioner's understanding that the creative Śakti is rooted in the esoteric womb that all practitioners have[137]. When the person realises the full extent of the esoteric anatomy, i.e. having a divine womb, the practitioner should self-identify with this creative energy in the body.

     In verses 7.16-18 the trichotomy of Śakti is elaborated on. In verse 7.18 the texts states: "[Then] from that virile power, the highest Śakti, known as action, [is] arisen in the middle. [She is] seperated upwards by knowledge, the splitting of knots, and by will." The *śaktitraya* is understood as *kriyā*, *jñāna*, and *icchā*. The two preceeding verses state that the practitioner should seek "refugee in the place of birth, the place of vibration" (7.16), and there "[he] should throw his virile

---

[136] See Appendix 1 for notes on the Śaiva influence.

[137] Cf. other tantric texts, where both male and female practitioners have an esoteric liṅga. F.ex. Śiva Saṃhitā 3.1 (*hṛdy asti paṃkajaṃ divyaṃ divyaliṃgena bhūṣitam*), where there is a divine *liṅga* in the heart.

powers" (7.17). After this he is able to graps the reality, first as action (*kriyā*), then as knowledge (*jñāna*), and lastly as will (*icchā*), thus reversing and dissolving the phenomenal world. The hierachy is stressed by the movement upwards simultaneously through the cosmos and the body of the practitioner. Śakti is split upwards, i.e. distinguished in her different forms of orientation; *icchā* (impetus), *jñāna* (categorisation), and *kriyā* (movement). The order of creation is made apparent.

Through verses 7.36-37 the ontology and the goal of these practices are dealt with. These verses are of special interest for me. "Without distinction, free from illness, Śakti manifest [herself] (…)" (7.36). There are several notions of interest. 'Without objects' (*lakṣyahīnā*) denotes a movement beyond the mundane cognition, where the practitioner is able to reach a new mode of being in the world; realising *place* as *space*. Objects have not vanished, but are not used as orientation. With this changed mode of being, the *divyadeha*[138] (a divine body) occurs. A body 'free from illness' (*nirāmayā*) appears often in the tantric corpus. I will argue that these aspects are preliminary for the practitioner to be equipped for the perception of reality as potential. In the article "Perfected Body, Divine Body and Other Bodies in the Nātha-Siddha Sanskrit Texts" the Czech indologist Lubomír Ondračka argues for the same outset. Although his article mainly emphasises the confusion around the different "bodies" in the Nātha-Siddha universe, I still think that there are points to be made. He states: "It is clear that this body is nothing extraordinary. It marks the very outset of the yogin's effort and it is definitely not a non-material or spiritual, but an ordinary physical one" (Ondračka 2015, 219). For Ondračka the role of the divine body is the outset for the adept practitioner, and the body is still a physical one. The body is not the goal but the harness the adept needs in order to survive in this altered mode of being. After attaining a divine body, i.e. becoming free from illness[139], the real work begins. The practitioner creates an esoteric divine body, so it can exist in the new mode of being. Śakti is perceived anew "as the element of will, as the form of knowledge, and as the nature of action." (7.36). The practitioner now understands reality as a threefold reality. The three constituents are mentioned alongside different denoting descriptions. The will, which is primary, is mentioned as the element of will (*icchāmātravinirdiṣṭā*). The element (*mātra*) is the foundation and impetus of the three aspects. As the element of will, Śakti is the essence of reality. The will is a undifferentiated unity that is without

---

[138] This shift is mentioned in the *Netratantra* 7.5c as *divyadeha sa bhavati*.

[139] This could imply immortality, but it is not stated clearly. There seems to be a clear line between immortality and being a divine entity. The *divyadeha* does not presuppose that the practitioner have reached a god-like state, this seem to be later on (cf. the Kashmiri edition K verse 7.34d "yogī samaraso" (the same essence as Śiva).

distinction. Afterwards, there is 'the form of knowledge' (*jñānarūpā*), where the form (*rūpā*) is of interest. Reality takes its form through knowledge. The will, i.e. reality, is systematised by knowledge. Knowledge gives form (*place*) to the formless will (*space*). The last aspect is mentioned as 'nature of action' (*kriyātmika*). The phenomenal nature (*ātmika*) of Śakti, i.e. the human world, is animated by actions, and with actions come movement and navigation in time and *place*. In this verses the trichotomy and the interrelation of each aspect become visible. Will is the foundation, it is the elementary form of Śakti. Then, the creative being of Śakti comes into form through knowledge. Lastly the forms are animated by actions, movements in time and *place* are made possible. In verse 7.37 it is stated that: "Having filled [it] by the seal of the Sky Goer[140] (*khecarīmudrā[141]*) up to the [level of] Śakti". Through the realisation that Śakti is every aspect of reality, the practitioner's esoteric anatomy is created; the body is overflown with every aspects of Śakti. The reality of Śakti is understood as the practitioner's own esoteric body. With the divine body, the practitioner can comprehend reality as action, knowledge, and will.

The connection between creation and the aspects of Śakti is further elaborated upon in verse 7.40. "She [is] the womb of powers of all the gods. The womb is of the nature of fire and moon; having penetrated everywhere, she manifests as everything from that [womb].". Śakti is understood as the womb of everything. She is the creative force. Each of her threefold aspects implies an active and creative element. Even the powers of the gods stems from her womb. The world comes into being, because of Śakti; in this sense everything is Śakti. She manifest as reality from her own womb, nothing is outside her Being. This connects with verse 3.36, where reality is her threefold Being. Will is a pre-phenomenal aspect. Time and *place*, i.e. phenomenal reality, exist because of knowledge and movement. She is the womb of Being.

Verse 7.50 contrast this idea by stating that the monistic reality is the Being of Śiva. This is, as I have argued earlier on, a disagreement between divergent schools, and I must accept these inconsequences. Even when Śiva is everything, the tripartite system is intact: "Having attained the condition without illness, he should meditate on Śiva - his own self, the all-pervading, having the form of will, knowledge, and action - as his own experience". Will, knowledge, and action are the threefold Being (*icchājñānakriyārūpaṃ*). In the disagreement of deity, the tripartite system is only recontextualised in the light of either Śakti or Śiva. In this verse I again encounter the idea of a

---

[140] For an introduction to the *khecarīmudrā*, see James Mallinson's book *Khecarīvidyā* (Mallinson 2007b, 17-35)

[141] *khecarī* means to roam (*carī*) in space (*kha* in its locative form).

divine body, when it states "Having attained condition without illness". This body seems to be preliminary for the practitioner despite the schools.

Short Summary II

In my thesis I have chosen different verses from the seventh chapter of the *Netratantra* that highlight a *Paścimāmnāya* school of thought. In my translation of these, *icchā* is translated as will, to denote an impetus that lies beyond a subject/object relation. The verses highlight a non-dual (*advaita*) and immanent Being with an inner trichotomy of creation (*icchā*), configuration (*jñāna*), and movement (*kriyā*). This tripartite system seems to be a consistent aspect of reality, whether it is a Śaivistic or Śaktistic worldview. The hierachy is obvious; will is the primary force behind everything, it is the womb of the Goddess (*space*). From that she forms the phenomenal world (*places*) in her form as knowledge. This creates movements (*time*) in the world of objectives. This, contrastly, allows the practitioner to reverse this creative process, which is implied in verse 7.16-18. Reality is reverse and dissolved upwards, until it reaches back into the Goddess' unity. This allows the practitioner to understand a new mode of being; a more saturated reality. Before the practitioner can exist in this new mode of being, it has to create a divine esoteric body, as it is implied in verses 7.36 and 7.50. This is needed to comprehend the world as the will of the Goddess.

Encountering the Netratantra

To Open a Text

When looking at the cosmological notion of the will in the *Netratantra*, I have found it to imply a reality that is contingent. I have created models to grasp this reality. My application will thus be a grasping of the text, and this will hopefully open the text in new potential ways. The *Netratantra* as a text is situated in time and *place*, but its semantic range is not confined to the time of its creation. The *Netratantra* tradition is believed to be from the 9th century in North India and Nepal, but it is weaved by threads that existed long before the *Netratantra's* configuration, and in the form of a manuscript it have had an cultural impact in the following centuries. To grasp the *Netratantra*, I must approach it fluidly. The text is a tissue of what came before, and it reaches into the future as a reconfigured collection of meaning. When my theoretical models encounter and interact with the *Netratantra*, my models adapt to the text. The application is a mapping of how I open up the *Netratantra*, and hopefully this will show new insights on the notion of will that will ramify out into

reality, perception, ethics, etc. I will to some degree mirror my application in my chapter on my own theory, and thus start with the *trichotomy of perception*, *Erdenreich*, *will-as-potential*, the *Vollmensch*, and lastly *saturated reality*.

Trichotomy of the Erdenreich

As it is apparent from the chapter on the *Netratantra,* the reality found is non-dual and immanent, and it seems to be constituted of an interrelational tripartite system of will, knowledge, and action. At first this could resemble the Schopenhauerian system of will, reason, and representation, but there is a difference in focus that I will tend to later. For now the emphasis on a tripartite system opens up for deeper and more saturated modes of being in the *Netratantra*. Instead of viewing reality as *one* entity - the Goddess, the God, or some rational *logos* (λόγος) - that creates *one* static world, I find the Godddess to be threefold, and her all-encompassing presence animates every aspect of Being; creation is a constant becoming, because of the three aspects' impact on Being and perception. Every level of Being relates to the next, and every relation is a new becoming. When Śakti is the element of will (*icchā*), she is unlimited creation, and lies beyond mundane realisation[142]. When the world is will, it is of unlimited possibilities, and in order to make this inconceivable *space* (world of will) into realisable *place*, it must be structured by reason (*jñāna*). When the Goddess takes the form of knowledge, the phenomenological world comes forth; the world of will is structured as the world of representation. In her aspect as knowledge the unity of the Goddess becomes the multiplicity of phenomenons, and the otherness of objects appear[143]; she creates *place*.

When creating the world of objects through knowledge the Goddess enables the possibility for movements (*kriyā*). The movement between objects renders time possible[144], thus creating *place* and time for us to live in. In the notion of movement I find a discrepancy between the trichotomy of the *Netratantra* and Schopenhauer. The *Netratantra* understands movement (*kriyā*) as an integral

---

[142] With a Schopenhauerian, notion her form as will lies beyond the principle of sufficient reason.

[143] Her motivation for creating multiplicities remains unknown, and it is not understood as a blind striving hunger, as it is in Schopenhauer's philosophy. In verse 7.40 (and shortly in verse 7.6) she is described as the womb of all, and this might indicate that the creation of the world of phenomenons is a natural process that has *always already* happened.

[144] I find it to be a philosophical axiom that time can only be, if there is the possibility for movement between obejcts. It is paradoxical to think that anything else than a constant *now* (i.e. the experience of an eternal present) can exists in an absolute unity; the passing of time becomes a useless concept in a radical monism, where there is nothing to perceive time amongst.

part of existence - it is a level of being. As I have argued, Schopenhauer's trichotomy is of a perceptual notion. For Schopenhauer, the representations are not static, but - because of the subject's primacy - the subject seems to be the main proponent for movement, and the animation of the subject itself is driven by the extent of will and not by the faculty of movement. Reason - in the service of the will - creates representation. Conversely, in the *Netratantra* knowledge (*jñāna*) creates forms (representations), which renders possible movement (*kriyā*). Thus, in the *Netratantra*, representations become a subordinated link between *jñāna* and *kriyā*.

This causal difference might seem small, but there is a point to it. In *Die Welt als Wille und Vorstellung* Schopenhauer understands the notion of movement as secondary, this might relate to his solipsism that movement becomes an illusion like everything else, and that the will is the only impetus. The *Netratantra* sees movement as one of the modes of the Goddess, in which objects - distinguished by knowledge - interact. Our world of phenomenons are animated because of movement; *place*, time, and objects are characterised in mutual interactions. This relational point is where the two texts diverge. In the *Netratantra* everything is a part of the living Goddess, and the subject loses its dominance. Contrary to this is Schopenhauer's solipsistic notion, where the subject is the only representation endowed with the 'double knowledge', ensuring the 'subject' its primacy. For Schopenhauer movement seems to merely be a consequence of representations. For him everything is will, even representations are cloaked ideas of the will. For the *Netratantra* everything is the Goddess, and she chooses to distinguish herself in different modes of being. In my models I operate with the idea that perception and Being is two sides of the same coin, and in the conflicting areas between the *Netratantra* and Schopenhauer, this becomes apparent. For Schopenhauer the world of reason and representation are only perceptual cloaks for the will. Contrary, the Goddess is everything existing, she is also everything perceptually realisable - distinguishing perception from Being is impossible. As it is stated in verse 7.1-2, the nature of the practitioner is the threefold nature of Śakti that is already present in the esoteric anatomy of the practitioner. This is because of the material and non-dual reality. My focus lies in the notion that each aspect of the Goddess enables a new mode of orientation in the world, i.e. a new relation between perception and Being. This is made possible with the idea of the *Erdenreich*, which resembles the reality of the Goddess. Both of these conceptions understand reality as ultimately non-dual and immanent. This allows the practitioner to stay in the world, and not flee to a new realm of Being, but instead achieve a new mode of being.

In dislocating Schopenhauer's trichotomy and applying it on a different Being, i.e. the *Erdenreich*, it opens the *Netratantra* in new ways. I will argue that the trichotomy of *icchā*, *jñāna*, and *kriyā* presupposes a religious understanding of reality, where perception and Being forms a synthesis. The practitioner can understand each aspect of the Goddess through the embodied knowledge, i.e. the esoteric anatomy and yogic techniques, and each aspect changes how the practitioner interacts *in* the world. The will is the unfathomable reality, the reality beyond the boundaries of human cognition, i.e. time and *place*. The aspect of will is *space*, and it is full of potential and creative power, but it is not of a different Being. The world as will is still an aspect of the Goddess. The only difference is that the will is beyond time and *place* - the basic categories of understanding for the human being. Thus, understanding the will is understanding reality as unlimited potential, and this is made possible by the trichotomy of the Goddess.

The Cosmological will

Building upon the foundation of the notion of will found in the writings of Schopenhauer and Nietzsche, I have created the *will-as-potential*. In the application I hope that this notion will help grasp the will (*icchā*) in the *Netratantra*. The *will-as-potential* holds the ability to access reality as *space*, and in this mode of being the human form and cognition experiences an excess of meaning[145]. This is apparent with the esoteric anatomy of verse 7.1-2, where the human form is improved to withhold the new mode of being, and verse 7.36, where the human cognition can realise reality "without distinction". Reality is perceived as all three aspects of the Goddess; the practitioner understands that there is no beyond - what Nietzsche would describe as - the *Erdenreich*. Throught the *will-as-potential*, the practitioner constantly finds itself in the realm of the divine. To remain and survive in this new divine sphere[146] the practitioner must attain a divine body[147]. The divine body, I will argue, is attain through the esoteric anatomy, where the practitioner

---

[145] Bjarne Wernicke-Olesen describes in his PhD-thesis *Śāktismen - et bidrag til den religionsvidenskabelige og indologiske modellering af en indisk tradition* from 2015 the idea of *floating signifiers* or '*significant floattants*' - here in the context of Śāktism - that are overdeterminated to such a degree that they become semantic underdeterminated (Wernicke-Olesen 2015, 144). A similar point could be made when then practitioner access reality as *space*. The overflow of input, meaning, and stimuli overdeterminates the sensory apparatus to a degree, where the totality of reality would seem like an unified Being devoid of demarcations (*places*) and the experience of time.

[146] The divine has often been seen as a dangerous area for a person unequipped with the right remedies, cf. Jacob's Ladder from the Bible (Gen. 28: 10-19), or chapter four "Mysterium tremendum" of the German philosopher Rudolph Otto's *Das Heilige* from 1917 (Otto, 1917, 13-28).

[147] Cf. verse 7.36 and 7.50, where the practitioner is said to be without illness.

transposes a new mapping on the physical body. The embodied knowledge that is the conscious mode of *kriyā* is used to reorient the practitioner. The practitioner is able map its body through practice (*kriyā*), and gain insight (*jñāna*) into the *will-as-potential* (*icchā*). The body is strengthend and saturated through the usage of the esoteric anatomy. This enables the practitioner to saturate its body so it can exist in all modes of being, and realise that all modes of being are already present in the esoteric anatomy in the form of the threefold Śakti. The body is important in the *Netratantra*, it is the rudiment for realisation. The haptic body becomes the starting ground for realisation. This focus on the body's transgressive potential will become more apparent in the next subchapter, but for now it is important to focus on the will that is the impetus for reality. It lies beyond the perceptual boundaries. Attaining the *will-as-potential* is done through a reversal of the hierachy of Being to heighten the experiences of reality.

The *will-to-potential* alters reality from *place* to *space*. It ties in with the reversal of the order of cosmology shown in verses 7.16-17. The upwards motion implies a hierarchical system of reality that unravels with ascension or thickens with descension. The *will-as-potential* allows the practitioner to move in all the three aspects of being (i.e. will, knowledge, and action). The upward direction of the *suṣumnā* and the *kuṇḍalinī* creates a sense of an *axis mundi* that allows the micro- and macrocosmos to map over each other. The descending movement of creation from the aspect of will (*icchā*) to the action (*kriyā*)[148] is reversed by the particular ascension of the practitioner, where the esoteric main channel (*suṣumnā*) functions as an unravelment of creation. The imagery serves as a pedagogical notion. Of course, the reversal of the Being should be seen as more complex than a simple *axis mundi*, but the upwards movement is a general motive in the cosmology of the Indian mythology[149]. This reversal allows the practitioner to understand the will as the fabric of reality, and simultaneously to understanding the will as the power of creation. I will argue that the reversal is not upwards and linear, but that it is multi-directional[150]. The idea of a single liberatory trajectory

---

[148] Cf. Padoux's translation of the *Yoginīhṛdaya*, where it is stated: "When she turns towards [creation] so as to manifest the universe which is held [within her] as a seed, taking on the form of a hook, [she becomes] Vāmā because she vomits the universe. //37// Then, being the energy of will, this very [goddess] embodies herself as the visionary [word]. Then, as energy of knowledge, she is Jyeṣṭhā, and the intermediate word is being enunciated. //38//" (Padoux 2013, 38). Here we see the same hierachy of will, knowledge, and action. The descension is then a thickening of the will into action (here vomit).

[149] Cf. Mount Meru (White 1996, 190, 230, 328) and the ascension of Kuṇḍalinī.

[150] It is important to note that the *Netratantra* is creating a synthesis of the vertical axis model and the central locus model. For the vertical axis model cf *Netratantra* 7.9-11; for the central locus model cf. *Netratantra* 7.12-14; and for a *amṛtaplāvana* cf. *Netratantra* 7.45-47. This means that it is concerned with more directions than the *suṣumnā's* up and down. See Appendix 2.

seems to be contra-productive, especially for a practitioner that wishes to stay in the world with a new heightend perception. When entering this new mode of being, the practitioner is not ascending the earth, but the practitioner is very much *in* the world - penetrating and inflitrating the fabric of reality - that it understands as itself. With the reversal comes a shift from *place* to *space*, i.e. an affirmation of reality, and not a dissolvement of reality. The adept can ascend or descend onto different levels at will.

The world of knowledge and actions - i.e. representations - are ordered and confined to time, *place*, and causation; with the terminology of this thesis, they are *place*. The world as will is perceptually different. It is pure creation, it is unstructured and in a constant becoming; meaning that it is *space* - beyond time and causation. In *space* the subject/object division is dissolved, and sickness has disappear along with the notion of time. But the world of will's material fabric is identical to the world of phenomenons. The practitioner can access this state of reality with the *will-as-potential*. It is a tool for the adept, a source that it can harness and tap into. After understanding that everything is the all-pervading will of the Godddess, the practitioner's knowledge and perception shifts. The world of phenomenons is not a frozen series of objects occuring in time, affected by causation, but is - because of its identicality with/origin in the will - in a state of constant becomings. Everything is animated by and affecting its surroundings simultaneously. Reality is vibrating. Plurality is constantly ceasing and creating. The *will-as-potential* allows the adept to be in the world as a creative will, thus reconfiguring itself and its surroundings. This alters the human being radically and it becomes something different than a normal human being - hence the need for a divine body. The urgency of the non-dual *Erdenreich* throws the practitioner into a state of necessary reconfiguration. Now it can only choose reality as *will-as-potential*. It must reconfigure itself into something fuller than a human being.

The Saturated Reality of the Vollmensch

With the *Erdenreich* understood as a totality through the *will-as-potential*, the practitioner is able to return to the world of actions and representation much like the Nietzschean Übermensch and very unlike the Schopenhauerian ascetic. The tantric virtuoso remains among the living as an altered human being that has realised reality in its unlimited potential. The virtuoso becomes a *Vollmensch*. A human being capable of expanding, retracting, altering, and saturating both its surroundings and

itself as it pleases[151]. This returnal allows the *Vollmensch* to understand everythings in constant becomings - every interaction is creative. *The Vollmensch embodies the will-as-potential and can thus control the world of representations at will.* This control over the world of representations is a control over the saturation of the world. The tantric virtuoso does not gaze beyond the veil of Māyā, or dissolves reality into emptiness. Instead the virtuoso emerges itself *in* reality as such, expanding itself out into different hemispheres or playfully sporting with *yoginīs* in the universe[152]. But the *Vollmensch* is also able to explore the minuscule parts of the esoteric anatomy[153], and through them travel in microscopic universes contained inside the body of each practitioner, expanding moods, or amplifying sensory experiences. This is *saturated reality*, a conscious experience of an immanent and ever-becoming reality - a constant *now*. In this *saturated reality* the virtuos *Vollmensch* understands that the world is nothing more than the will of the Goddess. In identifying her will, the *Vollmensch* now enters into reality as potentality, saturation, and depth, where it masters all three aspects of reality. The *Vollmensch* understands and creates the world of representation and actions simultaneously. The world - or should I say the experience of the world - becomes plastic and moldable. Certain hints are given in the manuscript. This, I believe, is the case with the esoteric anatomy, where the embodied knowledge of the tradition[154] shapes the *divyadeha* of the practitioner. Another hint is the total union with Śakti in verses 7.36-37, and verse 7.40, where the realisation of Śakti as the womb of everything comes into play. The *Vollmensch* is not seperate and above the world, but *becomes* more of the world than before, and that underlines the impossibility for the *Vollmensch* to step outside of the world. The more the *Vollmensch* realises the more it is integrated into the Being. Every action is now a creation and/or a destruction, because the practitioner sees itself as one with the unified Goddess. The practitioner creates the world around it, because it *is of* the world around it. There is no distinction, as it is stated in verse 7.36. For the *Vollmensch* the world of representations is in a constant altering. The *Vollmensch* creates and

---

[151] To become small as an atom (Mallinson & Singleton 2017, 364) is one of the yogic powers among "flight, long-distance hearing and sight, omniscience, the ability to become infinitely small, large, light, heavy or invisible, the ability to locate buried treasure, mastery of alchemy, and control over other people." (ibid., 359). Most traditions only list eight *aṇimā* (yogic powers) (ibid., 364).

[152] As an assistant for Dr Bjarne Wernicke-Olesen on a field trip around the Kathmandu Valley in 2018, we were told by an *aghori* informant that he would roam the universe and sport with the *yoginīs* while meditating. I will argue that this is an example of a *saturated reality*.

[153] Cf. NT verse 7.1-2, where spaces (*vyoman*) exist inside the body of each practitioner.

[154] Because of the limited amount of pages, I can only point to the research on embodied traditions done by Prof Gavin Flood in his *The Tantric Body* from 2006.

perceives simultaneously; this is the *saturated reality*. The *Vollmensch* saturates reality at will, because it is in a constant sphere of potentiality; i.e. *space*. The *saturated reality* is a collapsing of the trichotomy of reality - Being and knowledge is merge together. And the *Vollmensch* can now control the world of representation through the *will-as-potential* in an ever-present *here and now*.

Short Summary III

In sum, reality is understood as a trichotomy of will (*icchā*), knowledge (*jñāna*), and action (*kriyā*) that are all aspects of the same non-dualistic and immanent Goddess (Śakti). The non-dual and immanent reality embodies the practitioner's knowledge; the elements of the reality of the threefold Goddess is mirrored in the body of the practitioner. Each of these aspects creates different modes of orientation in the world, where the orientation implies a change in the practitioner's perception. Of the three aspects the will holds a special position, it is the impetus for creation in the world. When the practitioner has mapped the body with its esoteric anatomy it can unravel reality; that is understand the *place* around it as *space* through the *will-as-potential*. The will holds the possibility to reconfigure the practitioner's body and cognition, thus pushing it into a transgressive sphere. The practitioner becomes the *Vollmensch*. A character that holds the potential to survive in the unlimited creational aspect of the Goddess as will. The mode of being for the *Vollmensch* is will, and this changes its relation to its surroundings. It understands reality as full of potential, and it can saturate reality as it pleases, because it understands itself as part of the Goddess. In the *saturated reality* the *Vollmensch* can reshape and augment reality, because it understands and creates simultaneously. Reality is plastic and the practitioner understands the perception and Being is connected, so it can shape reality at will. This sets it *jenseits Gute und Böse* much like the Übermensch.

Discussion of the Ethical Consequences

Certain aspects of the theory can not be based entirely on the source material of the *Netratantra*. Especially the ethical consequences of my theory can be hard to place in the text. My focus is on the seventh chapter of the *Netratantra*, where a direct application of ethics can ambiguous. The main question is; what is the morals for a tantric practitioner if we accept the theory and application of this thesis? And how does this relate to the leading research?

If the will is acccepted and understood as reality in its most versatile form, then the conventional morals become obsolete. Both Schopenhauer and Nietzsche accepts that the moral codex of a given society will alter after enlightenment. Both imply an altered sense of morality after

understanding the world as will. For Schopenhauer, the greater good becomes situated outside of the world of representations. For Nietzsche, the will presents a world beyond the confinements of the societal 'good' and 'evil'. For both, ethics become subjective, relating to the human being in its new found being.

In my theoretical models I argue for the *Vollmensch*. The *Vollmensch* is the tantric adept in the *Netratantra*. It is an altered being that has understood and created the world as *will-as-potential*. This insight creates certain consequences, one of them is the *saturated reality*. All of a sudden the practitioner is *in* the world in a new mode. It can saturate the representations, this affects how it relates and interacts. Reality is cyclic and non-dualistic and this creates complications, when talking of ethics. For Schopenhauer, this creates the greater good, beyond human cognition, but for the *Vollmensch* it removes the idea of good and evil. The *person* loses its singularity; it stops understanding itself as one distinct in the multiplicity, and leaks out into its surroundings. Death and birth is equated in Being. For the *Vollmensch* the life and death are stages of becomings in the unity of the Goddess. Mundane ethics are secondary. The need for benevolence disappears, there is no other to act out one's altruism, when the practitoner no longer distinguishs between subject and objects. The *Vollmensch* sees itself in the other, but opposite Schopenhauer's ascetic that wants to escape the suffering, the *Vollmensch* has overcome suffering, since suffering and death is seen as creative aspects. In the limited space that I have in this thesis I cannot answer, whether this should be seen as the abscene of ethics or a new form of ethics[155]. The main point here would be that there is no need for benevolence in the *saturated reality*.

When it comes to academic research into ethics in the *Netratantra*, there have been some discussions. These are often based on a narrow reading or translation, and therefore often lack a greater depth. The first mention of an ethics in the *Netratantra* is found in Hélène Brunner's before-mentiond article. In this article she claims that: "Avec le nectar suprême de cette méditation subtile, le *yogin* redonne vigueur (…) à son propre corps ou à celui d'un autre." (Brunner 1974, 143) and later concludes that: "le difficile *yoga* par lequel on trompe le Temps permet de vaincre la mort, la sienne et celle des autres." (ibid., 147). In these quotes Brunner argues that the tantric practitioner performs the rituals for himself as well as for others. She mentions that the verses that display this

---

[155] In further research into this area I would like to cover the idea of evil, the cycle of death and life, angst, and transgressive practices, of which I do not have the time now.

ethic are found in 7.4-5[156] with the punchline being verse 7.5ab[157]. This idea follows the subsequent research on the seventh chapther of the *Netratantra*. In Alexis Sanderson's article "Religion and the State: Śaiva Officiants in the Territory of the King's Brahmanical Chaplain" from 2004, he hints at the same idea that the tantric ritual is made for the king and the country. It should be mentioned that Brunner's article is mentioned in Sanderson's article. He describes the Śaiva Officiant as:

> "He is presented as the performer of rites for the protection and prosperity of all members of society, but this wider constituency is generally mentioned only after the text has specified the king, his wives and their children, who are the principal intended beneficiaries and in many cases the only ones." (Sanderson 2005, 244)

Later he underlines this point with the quote: "After speaking of these daily rites for the king's personal protection the Netratantra goes on to the ceremonies that the Śaiva officiant must perform on special occasions for the more general benefit of the king and his kingdom." (ibid., 250-251). Again I see the idea that the rituals imply a form of ethics. The quotes from Sanderson article implies that there is an almost benevolent motive for the tantric adept. His rites in general are mended on the royalty. Sanderson also underlines that the royal family also functions as beneficiaries. Lastly, when writing on the research history on ethics in the *Netratantra*, I look at Gavin Flood's tentative translation of the seventh chapter of the Netratantra in his article "Practice in the Netra Tantra: An edition and annotated translation of chapters six, seven, and eight" from 2018, and the English indologists James Mallinson and Mark Singleton's translation the *Netratantra* verse 7.5 in their book *Roots of Yoga* from 2017. Flood translates verse 7.5 - that Brunner writes of as well - as "Thus the yogi revitalizes himself or others." (Flood 2018, 22)[158]. In the same manner Mallinson and Singleton translate the verse 7.5 as: (…) the yogi nourishes either his body or someone else's (…)" (Mallinson & Singleton 2017, 203)[159]. I can see in the literature that they are all informed by both Brunner and Sanderson[160]. Flood extensively uses Brunner's article as a guiding tool for his own translation of the *Netratantra*. They all reproduce the idea of a inherent

---

[156] For translation and Sanskrit see Appendix 2.

[157] *āpyāyaṃ kurute yogī ātmano tha parasya vā*.

[158] Note that Flood has later changed his mind on the translation, see Appendix 2.

[159] Mallinson's and Singleton's translation is based on the Kashmiri edition just as Brunner (1974) and Sanderson (2004).

[160] James Mallinson's doctoral thesis was supervised by Sanderson.

benevolence in verse 7.5, and then read the rest of the chapter through this. With this short *vue* of the focus on ethics in the *Netratantra*, I will argue that the small amount of space dedicated to researching ethics, has been dominated by one argument[161]. Because of this, the work on ethics is very limited and often reproduce prior work without looking critical at it.

In this discussion I am well aware of the difference that existed between a society upheld by the royal patronage and self representation of the individual tantric practitioner in the text. My thesis implies an ethics that surpasses the conventional ethics found in the society surrounding the practitioner. This poses a challenge, mostly because of the limited research I have done into the ethical consequences, but there is an argument in my favor; an argument found in the philology of verse 7.5[162]. The phrase *ātmano tha parasya vā* has been read 'for another' because of the *ātmano (...) parasya*[163], but this could be understood differently. If I see *parasya* as adjectival, relating to *ātmano* as a genetive with a dative function, this could explain why the *divyadehas* and *bhavati* in verse 7.5cd is in singular and not in its plural form. So instead of being 'for another' it is understood as 'his highest Self'[164]. In Flood *et al.'s* new translations of the *Netratantra* verse 7.5ab has been changes to 'his highest Self'; see Appendix 2.

With all this said, there is still no clear answer to whether the practitioner is performing the rites in benevolence, or if the arguments posed by Sanderson and others are an indicator of a forced ethics. If the royalty is the main beneficiaries for the tantric adept, then there is a point in making the rituals seem as if they have an ideal of benevolence. If the argument is that there is no sign of benevolence, then the non-dualistic nature of the text clearly underlines an indifference to mundane morals given the dissolvement of the subject/object-driven reality. Morals are applied in order to exist in a multitude, but when there is nothing foreign to the practitioner, there is no need for benevolence.

---

[161] As with David Gordon White's article "Netra Tantra, at the Crossroads of the Demonological Cosmopolis" on the demonology of the nineteenth chapter, or Bettina Sharada Bäumer's book *Yoga of Netra Tantra: Third Eye and Overcoming Death* on the yoga found in the first, seventh, and eighth chapter, general work on the *Netratantra* is still very limited.

[162] Cf. a conversation with Dr Bjarne Wernicke-Olesen (19.11.20).

[163] *parasya* taken as "other than, different" (Monier-Williams 2008, 586).

[164] *parasya* can also have the meaning of "highest or supreme" (Monier-Williams 2008, 586).

Conclusion and Futher Consequences

In this thesis I have investigated the cosmological notion of the will (*icchā*) in the 9th century tradition of the *Netratantra*. The will ties in with numerous aspects of reality. So in order to investigate the will, I have found myself in a position, where I must ask questions *vom Grund auf*. To approach this ground I found the vocabulary from Arthur Schopenhauer and Friedrich Nietzsche especially helpful. I created several models from my interactions with their thinking that could help me grasp the reality of the *Netratantra*. The models encompassed on Being (the *trichotomy of the Erdenreich*), will (the *will-as-potential*), the transgressive human being (the *Vollmensch*), and the heightend mode of being (the *saturated reality*), all of which benefitted my encounter with the will in the *Netratantra*. The will became the 'instrument' for enlightenment.

Before I analysed the selected passages from the seventh chapter, I argued for different interpolations inherent in the chapter, and highlighted what I found to be an influence from *Paścimāmnāya* school of thought. This made it possible for me to argue from a Śaktistic perspective that puts an emphasis on the creational aspects of the Goddess. I found the verses to describe a non-dual and immanent Being of the Goddess with an inner trichotomy of the aspects of creation (*icchā*), configuration (*jñāna*), and movement (*kriyā*). The world was comprehended through and as the will of the Goddess. Thus the world was foremost irrational, and the will seemed to be the key to this worldview.

What I found in my grasping of the manuscript was that the reality was understood non-dual and immanent, with an inner tripartite structure of will (*icchā*), knowledge (*jñāna*), and action (*kriyā*) that were all aspects of the same non-dualistic and immanent Goddess (Śakti). This system kept the world in a perpetual motion of creation and destruction. To gain access to the other aspects of Being the practitioner must realise it through its own body. When the practitioner mapped the body with its esoteric anatomy it could unravel reality, and the different aspects of the Goddess created different orientations in the world both perceptual and in being. *Place* could now be perceived as *space*. The adept understood reality as the *will-as-potential*. In the transgressive mode the will reconfigured the practitioner's body and cognition, so the tantric adept became a *Vollmensch*. The new mode is a constant *now*. The character can now survive in the unlimited creational aspect of the Goddess. This mode of being for the *Vollmensch* is will, and the will changes the *Vollmensch*'s relation to its surroundings. It is beyond time and *place* and views reality

without distinctions. This creates the notion of the *saturated reality*. Perception and Being is connected, and the *Vollmensch* can saturate reality by force of the cosmological will.

The will is thus the impetus for all the other aspects both in the cosmology of the *Netratantra* as well as for the investigation in my thesis. So through the models based on Schopenhauer and Nietzsche I have found that the cosmological will is the foundation for the tantric adept, without it there could be no altered mode of being. The will is the both the ground from which the rest of the aspects are set in motion, but also the key for the practitioner to reach a saturated experience of reality. The will thus has a dual nature of creator and liberator. This reorientation *in* and new perception *of* reality are made possible by the esoteric cosmological notion of will found in the *Netratantra*. I have been able to encounter this notion of the will, through the philosophical models I have created based on Schopenhauer and Nietzsche's conceptions of the will.

My theory poses one major challenge, and in my discussion I have looked at the consequences of the moral implications. I showed the conflicting areas between the leading research and my ideas, where my theory points to a more fluid notion of ethics that do not cover an idea of benevolence. This discussion is still on-going and more research needs to be done in this area of my theory. In the end I have presented a new approach, when enquiring into tantric texts. The models are still being refined, and more application needs to be done to elaborate and nuance my theory.

Literature

Primary:

Barad, Karen: 2003, "Posthumanist Performativity: Toward an Understanding of How Matter Comes to Matter" in *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society*, *Vol. 28, No. 3.*

Barthes, Roland: 1984, [1967] "La Mort de l'Auteur" in *Le Bruissement de la langue: Essais critiques IV, pp. 61-67*, Éditions du Seuil, Paris.

Heidegger, Martin: 1993, [1927] *Sein und Zeit*, Max Niemeyer Verlag, Tübingen.

Kierkegaard, Søren: 2009, [1843] *Enten-Eller, bind II*, Gyldendalske Boghandel, Nordisk Forlag A.S., København.

Netratantra (*Amṛteśatantram*), National Archives, Kathmandu, manuscript no. 1-285. Nepal-German Manuscript Preservation Project reel no. B 25/4. Palm leaf; written in nandīnāgarī/ jainanāgarī; AD 1200.

Nietzsche, Friedrich: 1999a, [1882] *Die fröhliche Wissenschaft* from *Friedrich Nietzsche: Sämtliche Werke: Kritische Studienausgabe in 15 Bänden*, Deutscher Taschenbuch Verlag de Gruyter, Berlin.

Nietzsche, Friedrich: 1999b, [1886] *Also Sprach Zarathustra, Ein Buch für Alle und Keinen* from *Friedrich Nietzsche: Sämtliche Werke: Kritische Studienausgabe in 15 Bänden*, Deutscher Taschenbuch Verlag de Gruyter, Berlin.

Nietzsche, Friedrich: 1999c, [1886] *Jenseits von Gute und Böse. Vorspiel einer Philosophie der Zukunft*, from *Friedrich Nietzsche: Sämtliche Werke: Kritische Studienausgabe in 15 Bänden*, Deutscher Taschenbuch Verlag de Gruyter, Berlin.

Otto, Rudolph: 1920, [1917] *Das Heilige,* Trewendt & Granier, Breslau.

Paul Ricœur: 2004, "Défi et bonheur de la traduction" in *Sur La Traduction*, Bayard, Paris, pp. 7-20.

Schopenhauer, Arthur: 1911, *Die Welt als Wille und Vorstellung: Erster Band* from *Arthur Schopenhauers Sämtliche Werke: Herausgegeben von Dr. Paul Deussen, Professor der Philologie an der Universität Kiel*, R. Piper & Co., Verlag, München.

Schopenhauer, Arthur: 1912, *Über die vierfache Wurzel des Satzes vom zureichenden Grunde: Dritter Band* from *Arthur Schopenhauers Sämtliche Werke: Herausgegeben von Dr. Paul Deussen, Professor der Philologie an der Universität Kiel*, R. Piper & Co., Verlag, München.

Secondary:

Augustine: 2006, [1955] *Confessions and Enchiridion: Edited and translated by Albert Cook Outler, PhD, DD*, Westminster John Knox Press, Louisville, Kentucky.

Barthes, Roland: 1977, [1967] "The Death of the Author" in *Images Music Text: Esssays selected and translated by Stephen Heath*, FontanaPress, London.

Bäumer, Bettina Sharada: 2019, *Yoga of Netra Tantra: Third Eye and Overcoming Death*, IIAS Shimla and D.K. Printworld, New Delhi.

Brunner, Hélène: 1974, "Un Tantra du Nord: Le Netra Tantra" in *Bulletin de l'Ecole française d'Extrême-Orient Tome 61*, pp. 125-197.

Deleuze, Gilles and Felix Guattari: 2019, [1987] *A Thousand Plateaus*, Bloomsbury, London.

Dyczkowski, Mark: 2001, "The Cult of the Goddess Kubjika: A Preliminary Comparative Textual and Anthropological Survey of a Secret Newar Goddess", Franz Steiner Verlag, Stuttgart.

Flood, Gavin: 2006, *The Tantric Body: The Secret Tradition of Hindu Religion*, I.B. Tauris, London.

Flood, Gavin: 2018, "Practice in the *Netra Tantra*: An edition and annotated translation of chapter six, seven, and eight", Oxford, (unpubl.), pp. 1-33.

Flood, Gavin *et al.*: *The Lord of Immortality: An Introduction, Critical Edition, and Translation of the Netra Tantra,* vol. I, chapters 1-8. Critucally edited, translated and introduced by Gavin Flood, Bjerne Wernicke-Olesen, and Rajan Khatiwoda, Tantric Studies, (London: Routledge, *forthcoming*).

Gombrich, Richard: 2009, *What the Buddha Thought*, Equinox Publishing Ltd., London.

Halbfass, Wilhelm: 1988, [1981] *India and Europe*, SUNY press, Albany.

Kierkegaard, Søren: 1962, [1936] *Philosophical Fragments or A Fragment of Philosophy by Johannes Climacus*, Princeton University Press, Princeton, New Jersey.

Kinsley, David: 2016, [1997] *Tantric Visions of the Divine Feminine: The Ten Mahāvidyās*, Motilal Banarsidass Publishers Private Limited, Delhi.

Lall, Kesar: 1991, *Lore and Legend of Nepal*, Pilgrims Edition, Kathmandu.

Leibniz, Gottfried Wilhelm: 1898, [1714] *The Monadology and other philosophical writings: Translated with introduction and notes by Robert Latta*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Mallinson, James: 2007a, *The Shiva Samhita: A Critical Edition and An English Translation*, YogaVidya.com, Woodstock.

Mallinson, James: 2007b, *The Khecarīvidyā of Ādinātha: A critical edition and annotated translation of an early text of haṭhayoga*, Routledge, London.

Mallinson, James and Mark Singleton: 2017, *Roots of Yoga*, Penguin Classics, London.

Monier-Williams, Monier: 2008, [1872] *A Sanskṛit-English dictionary etymologically and philologically arranged with special reference to Greek, Latin, Gothic, German, Anglo-Saxon, and other cognate Indo-European Languages*, The Claredon Press, Oxford.

Nietzsche; Friedrich: 2002, *Beyond Good and Evil: Prelude to a Philosophy of the Future: Translated by Judith Norman*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Nietzsche; Friedrich: 2006, *Thus Spoke Zarathustra: A Book for All and None: Translated by Adrian del Caro*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Nietzsche; Friedrich: 2008, *The Gay Science: With a Prelude in German Rhymes and an Appendix of Songs: Translated by Josefine Nauckhoff*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Olivelle, Patrick: 2008, [1996] *Upaniṣads: Translated from the Original Sanskrit by Patrick Olivelle*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Ondračka, Lubomír: 2015, "Perfected Body, Divine Body and Other Bodies in the Nātha-Siddha Sanskrit Texts" in *The Journal of Hindu Studies Volume 8, Issue 2*, Oxford University Press and The Oxford Centre for Hindu Studies, Oxford, pp. 210-232.

Padoux, André with Roger-Orphé Jeanty, 2013: *The heart of the yoginī: The Yoginīhṛdaya, a Sanskrit tantric treatise/Introduction, translation, and commentary [by] André Padoux with Roger-Orphé Jeanty*, Oxford Univeristy Press, Oxford.

Padoux, André: 2011, *Tantric Mantras: Studies on mantrasastra*, Routledge, Oxon.

Pokorny, Julius: 2002, *Indo-germanisches Etymologisches Wörterbuch*, A. Francke Verlag, Bern.

Rawson, Philip: 2010, [1973] *The Art of Tantra*, Thames & Hudson Ltd., London.

Schopenhauer, Arthur: 1969, *The World as Will and Representation: by Arthur Schopenhauer: Translated from the German by E. F. J. Payne*, Dover Publications, Inc., New York.

Sanderson, Alexis: 2005, "Religion and the State: Śaiva Officiants in the Territory of the King's Brahmanical Chaplain" in *Indo-Iranian Journal, Vol. 47*, pp. 229-300.

Spinoza, Benedict de: 1936, *Philosophy of Benedict de Spinoza: Translated from Latin by R. H. M. Elwes, With An Introduction by Frank Sewall, M.A.*, Tudor Publishing Co., New York.

Wernicke-Olesen, Bjarne: 2015, *Śāktismen - et bidrag til den religionsvidenskabelige og indologiske modellering af en indisk tradition*, Aarhus Universitet, Aarhus (upubl.).

Wernicke-Olesen, Bjarne and Silje Lyngar Einarsen: *Haṭhapradīpikā - Haṭhayogaens Hovedværk*, *forthcoming*.

White, David Gordon: 2007, [1996] *The Alchemical Body: Siddha Traditions in Medieval India*, The University of Chicago Press, Chicago.

White, David Gordon: 2012, "*Netra Tantra* at the Crossroads of the Demonological Cosmopolis" in *The Journal of Hindu Studies, Vol. 5, Issue 2*, pp. 1-27, Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Appendix 1

Translation

Netratantra

Chapter 7 verse 1-2:

ईश्वर उवाच

Īśvara uvāca

अत: परं प्रवक्ष्यामिध्यानं सूक्ष्मम् अनुत्तमम् ।

ataḥ paraṃ pravakṣyāmi dhyānaṃ sūkṣmam anuttamam

ऋतुषष्ठस्वराधारं त्रिलक्षं व्योमपंचकं ।। १ ।।

ṛtuṣaṣṭha svarādhāraṃ trilakṣaṃ vyomapaṃcakaṃ

ग्रन्थिद्वादशसम्युक्तम् शक्तित्रयसमन्वितम् ।

granthidvādaśasamyuktam śaktitrayasamanvitam

धामत्रयपथाक्रान्तं नाडित्रयसमन्वितं ।। २ ।।

dhāmatrayapathākrāntaṃ nāḍitrayasamanvitaṃ

Translation:

(7.1) The Lord spoke: Now [I] will proclaim the highest, supreme and subtle visualizing meditation (*dhyāna*), [which] comprises of the sequence of six[165], the 16 supports[166], three objects [of focus],

---

[165] Could also refer to the six seasons (*ṛtu*) of the *Vikram* calender - prominent in nothern India and Nepal - which is used for yogic practices.

[166] The *svarādhāraṃ* has the more esoteric meaning of the number 16, which relates to the *bhūtasāṃkhya* (word that are symbolically used for numbers) . Here it refers to the 16 vowels in the sanskrit alphabet (a, ā … ṃ, ḥ).

the fivefold space[167], (7.2) the twelve knots, the threefold Śakti, the path of the three luminaries[168], and the three channels[169].

Chapter 7 verse 6-7:

यत्स्वरूपं स्वसंवेद्यं स्वस्थस्वव्याप्तिसंभवं ।

yatsvarūpaṃ svasaṃvedyaṃ svasthasvavyāptisaṃbhavaṃ

स्वोदिता तु परा शक्ति स्वस्था तद्गर्भगः शिवः ।। ६ ।।

svoditā tu parā śakti svasthā tadgarbhagaḥ śivaḥ

ताम् वहेन् मध्यमे प्राणे प्राणापानांतरे ध्रुवं ।

tām vahen madhyame prāṇe prāṇāpānāṃtare dhruvaṃ

अहं भूत्वा ततो मंत्रां तत्स्थं तच्चक्रगं ध्रुवम् ।। ७ ।।

ahaṃ bhūtvā tato maṃtraṃ tatsthaṃ taccakragaṃ dhruvam

Translation:

(7.6) That which [is its] own form, self-recognition, self-sufficient, self-pervasive[170] being, [his]

---

[167] According to Kṣemarāja *vyoman* should be understood as voids (*śūnyāta*). I disagree - and as a consequence hereof - and go against the standard translation of *vyoman*. I find that voids cannot exist in a monistic and immanent worldview. There can only be matter.

[168] I would argue that the three luminaries could be understood in connection with the three channels as sun, moon, and fire.

[169] In regards to *dhāmatraya* and *nāḍītraya* I go against my own translation of *traya* as 'threefold'. Instead I see the two *traya* in *dhāmatraya* and *nāḍītraya* as an expression of *metri causa*.

[170] I have chosen the translation self-pervasive and not all-pervasive again with the notion in mind, that I translate from an monistic totality, thus is her self-pervasion also an all-pervasion, since there is nothing else than her.

self-rising, supreme, and stable Śakti [is] the Auspicious One[171] flowing in the womb; (7.7ab[172]) she should be made to flow in the middle breath[173] [*suṣumnā*] between the inbreath and outbreath[174].

Chapter 7 verse 16-18:

तदासौ सिध्यते क्षिप्रं सत्यं देवि न चान्यथा ।

tadāsau siddhyate kṣipraṃ satyaṃ devi na cānyathā

जन्मस्थानं समाश्रृत्य स्पन्दस्थम् मध्यमां कलां ।। १६ ।।

janmasthānaṃ samāśṛtya spandastham madhyamāṃ kalāṃ

तत्स्थं कृत्वा तदात्मानं कालाग्निं तु समाश्रयेत् ।

tatsthaṃ kṛtvā tadātmānaṃ kālāgniṃ tu samāśrayet

गत्वा गृहीतविज्ञानं वीर्यां तत्रैव निक्षिपेत् ।। १७ ।।

gatvā gṛhītavijñānaṃ vīryāṃ tatraiva nikṣipet

तद् वीर्यात् परमाम् शक्तिं क्रियाख्या मध्यमोदिता ।

tad vīryāt paramām śaktiṃ kriyākhyā madhyamoditā

---

[171] In the Kashmiri edition *tadgarbhagaḥ śivaḥ* is written as *tadsthā tadgarbhagā śivā*, thus altering 'the Auspicious One' from masculine to feminine (Flood *et al.*, 1)

[172] I have split verse 7.7 between ab and cd, this is have done in accordance with the translation made by Flood, Khatiwoda, and Wernicke-Olesen (see appendix 2 or Flood *et al.* 2019, 1).

[173] *madhyame prāṇe*

[174] I have translated *prāṇa* as inbreath (inhalation) and *apāna* as outbreath (exhalation). This is translated similarly to Sanderson's belief that *apāna* should be treated as the upwards breath, i.e. exhalation. According to Monier-Williams the *apāna* is understood as a downward breath and is associated with the anus (Monier-Williams 2008, 54). As *prāṇa* is seen both a one of the five vital airs located in the body (Monier-Williams 2008, 701, and *Śiva Saṃhitā* 3.7) and as the vital energy itself, I base my translation of *prāṇa* as the inbreath on the simple basic phenomenological notion, that the inbreath is what revitalises the body. Cf. HYP 1.48 (Wernicke-Olesen & Einarsen, *forthcoming*).

विज्ञानेनोर्ध्वतो भिन्ना ग्रंथिभेदेन चेच्छया ।। १८ ।।

vijñānenordhvato bhinnā graṃthibhedena cecchayā

Translation:

(7.16cd[175]) Having sought refugee in the place of birth, namely the place of vibration, the middle *kalā*[176]; (7.17) having established [himself] in his place, [he] should seek refugee in the Self (*ātman*), the fire of the time (*kālāgnim*). [He] should throw his virile power, the attained insight, right there. (7.18) [Then] from that virile power, the highest Śakti, known as action[177], [is] arisen in the middle. [She is] seperated upwards by knowledge, the splitting of knots[178], and by will.

Chapter 7 verse 36-37:

ततः प्रवर्त्तते शक्तिर् लक्ष्यहीना निरामया ।

tataḥ pravarttate śaktir lakṣyahīnā nirāmayā

इच्छामात्रविनिर्दिष्टा ज्ञानरूपा क्रियात्मिका ।। ३६ ।।

icchāmātravinirdiṣṭā jñānarūpā kriyātmikā

ऐका सा भावभेदेन तस्य भेदेन संस्थिता ।

ekā sā bhāvabhedena tasya bhedena saṃsthitā

खेचरीमुद्रयापूर्यं शक्त्यन्तं तत्र सर्वतः ।। ३७ ।।

---

[175] I have split verse 7.16 between ab and cd, this is have done in accordance with the translation made by Flood, Khatiwoda, and Wernicke-Olesen (see appendix 2 or Flood *et al.*, 3).

[176] I have decided to let *kalā* stand in its Sanskrit form since I cannot find a translation I find fitting. A *kalā* is a part of a different classification system of the esoteric body. Cf. Flood 2006, 129, where he mentions different mappings of the body.

[177] I would argue that Śakti as the form of *kriyā* should be seen as the dormant form of the *kuṇḍalinī*, resting above the *mūladhāra* (cf. *Haṭhapradīpikā* 3.2 and 3.103).

[178] Cf. *Haṭhapradīpikā* 3.2, where the splitting of the knots are mentioned as a consequence of the *kuṇḍalinī* rising in the *suṣumnā* channel.

khecarīmudrayāpūrya śaktyantaṃ tatra sarvataḥ

Translation:

(7.36) Without distinction, free from illness, Śakti manifest [herself] as the element of will, as the form of knowledge, and as the nature of action. (7.37) She [is] one, established there and everywhere by distingushing levels of being according to his distinctions. Having filled [it[179]] by the seal of the Sky Goer (*khecarīmudrā[180]*) up to the [level of] Śakti.

Chapter 7 verse 40:

सा योनिः सर्वदेवानां शक्तीनां व्याप्य सर्वतः ।

sā yoniḥ sarvadevānāṃ śaktīnāṃ vyāpya sarvataḥ

अग्नीषोमात्मिका योनि तस्मात् सर्वं प्रवर्त्तते ।। ४० ।।

agnīṣomātmikā yoni tasmāt sarvaṃ pravarttate

Translation:

She [is] the womb of powers of all the gods. The womb is of the nature of fire and moon; having penetrated everywhere, she manifests as everything from that [womb].

Chapter 7 verse 50:

इच्छाज्ञानक्रियारूपं शिवम् आत्मस्वकम् विभुम् ।

icchājñānakriyārūpaṃ śivam ātmasvakam vibhum

निरामयम् अनुप्राप्य स्वानुभूतं विभावयेत् ।। ५० ।।

nirāmayam anuprāpya svānubhūtaṃ vibhāvayet

---

[179] i.e. the body

[180] *khecarī* means to roam (*carī*) in space (*kha* in its locative form).

Translation:

(7.50) Having attained the condition without illness, he should meditate on Śiva - his own self, the all-pervading, having the form of will, knowledge, and action - as his own experience.

Appendix 2

The Lord of Immortality: An Introduction, Critical Edition, and Translation of the Netra Tantra, vol. I, chapters 1-8. Critically edited, translated and introduced by Gavin Flood, Bjarne Wernicke-Olesen, Rajan Khatiwoda, Tantric Studies Series (London: Routledge, *forthcoming*).

Netratantra chapter 7
Subtle Visualisation

Critically edited, translated and introduced by
Gavin Flood, Bjarne Wernicke-Olesen, Rajan Khatiwoda

īśvara uvāca ||

ataḥ paraṃ pravakṣyāmi dhyānaṃ sūkṣmam anuttamam |
ṛtuṣaṣṭhasvarādhāraṃ trilakṣaṃ vyomapaṃcakam ||1||

graṃthidvādaśasaṃyuktaṃ śaktitrayasamanvitam |
dhāmatrayapathākrāntaṃ nāḍitrayasamanvitam ||2||

jñātvā śarīraṃ suśroṇi daśanāḍipathānugaṃ |
dvāsaptatisahasrais tu saptakoṭyārdhasaṃyutam ||3||

nāḍivṛṃdaiḥ samākrāntaṃ anale vyādhibhiḥ kṛtam |
sūkṣmadhyānāmṛtenaiva pareṇaivoditena tu ||4||

āpyāyaṃ kurute yogī ātmano tha parasya vā |
divyadehas tu bhavati sarvavyādhivivarjitaḥ ||5||

yatsvarūpaṃ svasaṃvedyaṃ svasthasvavyāptisaṃbhavam |
svoditā tu parā śakti svasthā tadgarbhagaḥ śivaḥ ||6||

tāṃ vahen madhyame prāṇe prāṇāpānāṃtare dhruvaṃ |
ahaṃ bhūtvā tato maṃtraṃ tatsthaṃ taccakragaṃ dhruvam ||7||

1c = *Ūrmikaulārṇavatantra* 2.184cd: ṣaṭcakraṃ [-cakra] ṣoḍaśādhāraṃ trīlakṣaṃ vyomapañcakam; 3.20cd vyomapañcakametaddhi ṣoḍaśādhāralakṣaṇam; *Prāṇatoṣiṇī dharmakāṇḍa*, line 2117: ṣaṭcakraṃ ṣoḍaśādhāraṃ trilakṣaṃ vyomapañcakam; *Gorakṣaśataka* 13ab: ṣaṭcakraṃ ṣoḍaśādhāraṃ trilakṣaṃ vyomapañcakam; *Yogacūḍāmaṇyupaniṣad* 3: ṣaṭcakraṃ ṣoḍaśādhāraṃ trilakṣyaṃ vyomapañcakam. **4c** ≈ *Prāṇatoṣiṇī, arthakāṇḍa*, line 8026: sūkṣmadhyānaṃ purodhāya sthūladhyānaṃ vadāmi te. 6.19: tejodhyānaṃ śrutaṃ caṇḍa sūkṣmadhyānaṃ vadāmy ahaṃ; 6.21 śāmbhavīmudrayā yogī dhyānayogena sidhyati / sūkṣmadhyānam idaṃ gopyaṃ devānām api durlabham. **5c** = *Kubjikāmatatantra* 18.73cd: divyadehatvam āpnoti uccārāt kṣobhakṛd bhavet.

Codices: Σ = N₁ N₂ K

1c ṛtuṣaṣṭha°] N₁N₂ : ṛtucakraṃ K **1d** trilakṣaṃ] N₁N₂ : trilakṣyaṃ K **2d** nāḍi-] N₁K : nāḍī- N₂ **3a** dvāsaptati-] N₁ : dvisaptati- N₂ : dvāsaptatyā K **3b** daśanāḍipathānugaṃ] N₁ : daśanāḍipathānugaṃ N₂ : daśanāḍipathāvṛtaṃ K **3c** dvāsaptati] N₁ : dvisaptati- N₂ : dvāsaptatyā K **3d** saptakoṭyārdhasaṃyutaṃ] N₁ : saptakoṭyārdhasaṃyutaṃ N₂ : sārdhakoṭitrayeṇa ca K **4b** anale] N₁N₂ : malinaṃ K **4b** vyādhibhir] N₁N₂K : vyādhibhiḥ N₂ **4b** kṛtaṃ] N₁N₂ : vṛtaṃ K **4d** pareṇai-] N₁K : pāreṇai- N₂ **5b** vā] N₁N₂ : ca K **5c** divyadehas tu] N₁ : divyadehas sa N₂ : divyadehaḥ sa K **5c** ātmano tha] N₁ : hy ātmano 'tha N₂ : ātmano vā K **6b** svasthasvavyāptisaṃbhavaṃ N₁N₂ : svasthaṃ svavyāptisaṃbhavaṃ K **6c** śakti] N₁ : śaktiḥ N₂ : śaktis K **6d** svasthā tadgarbhagaḥ śivaḥ] N₁N₂ : tadsthā tadgarbhagā śivā K **7a** vadven madhyame prāṇe] N₁ : vadven madhyame prāṇe N₂ : vahen madhyamaprāṇe K **7b** dhruvaṃ] N₁N₂ : dhruve K **7d** taccakragaṃ] N₁N₂ : tadgarbhagaṃ K **7d** dhruvam] N₁ : dhrubham N₂

1

The Lord of Immortality: An Introduction, Critical Edition, and Translation of the Netra Tantra, vol. I, chapters 1-8. Critically edited, translated and introduced by Gavin Flood, Bjarne Wernicke-Olesen, Rajan Khatiwoda, Tantric Studies Series (London: Routledge, *forthcoming*).

The Lord spoke:

[1-2] Now I will tell you about the excellent, supreme, Subtle Visualising Meditation, which comprises the sequence of six [*cakras*],[1] the supporting vowels,[2] the three objects,[3] and the five voids,[4] the twelve knots,[5] the three powers,[6] the path of the three abodes,[7] and the three channels.[8]

[3-5] Having realised the body, O One with Beautiful Hips, as a body that follows the path of ten channels and thirty five million channels via the seventy two thousand channels, and as a body overrun by a host of channels riddled with diseases in the fire, the yogi then fills the highest Self[9] with the nectar of the Subtle Visualisation proclaimed as the highest. He becomes a divine body bereft of all disease.

[6-7ab] That which is his own form, his self-perception,[10] his stable all-pervasive being, his self-arisen supreme and stable power (*śakti*), the Auspicious One, abiding in his womb,[11] she should be made to flow in a stable manner in the middle breath between exhalation and inhalation.

---

[1] *Ṛtuṣaṣṭha°* is not Pāṇinian Sanskrit (*ṛtuṣaṭ°*). However, the expression is maintained by the scribe in N₂ due to *metri causa*. According to Kṣemarāja the six locations (*sthāna*) of the sequence of six are the 'place of birth' (*janma*), navel (*nābhi*), heart (*hṛt*), palate (*tālu*), 'drop' (*bindu*) between the eyes, and the place of resonance (*nāda*) in the head. As Padoux has observed, the text does not explicitly mention the thousand petalled lotus of later yogic traditions (cf. Padoux 2002, p. 174), although it does mention *dvādaśānta*, the point twelve fingers above the crown of the head (although sometimes identified with the aperture at the crown).

[2] Based on parallel passages and the context the reference for the 'supporting vowels' (*svarādhāra*) is arguably the 'sixteen supports' (*ṣoḍaśādhāra*, cf. NT 7.10). Sanderson (1986 p. 164) renders *ādhāra* as 'loci', while 'support' indicates the idea that these are somatic receptacles of the sound-cosmos within the body. They are listed by Kṣemarāja as sixteen located at different points of the body, although not listed in our text itself. They are supports of the 'soul' (*jīva*), namely the big toe (*aṅguṣṭha*), ankle (*gulpha*), knee (*jānu*), generative organ (*meḍhra*), anus (*pāyu*), the 'bulb' (*kanda*), the 'channel' (*nāḍī*), stomach (*jaṭhara*), heart (*hṛt*), 'tortoise channel' (*kūrmanāḍī*), throat (*kaṇṭha*), palate (*tālu*), eye centre (*bhrūmadhya*), forehead (*lalāṭa*), aperture of Brahmā (*brahmarandhra*), and the place of 'twelve fingers' (*dvādaśānta*).

[3] The three objects (*lakṣya*), according to Kṣemarāja, are forms located internally, externally, and both (*triṣyantarbahirubhayarūpāṇi*).

[4] The five voids or spaces (*vyoman*) are also known in tantric Buddhism. They are located at the genitals (*janmavyoman*), navel (2ⁿᵈ *vyoman*), heart (the 3ʳᵈ *vyoman*), between the eyes (the 4ᵗʰ *vyoman*), and the forehead (the *nādavyoman*). See Brunner's excellent note and helpful diagram (1974 p. 142 note 1). See also Padoux 2002, pp. 174-76.

[5] The twelve knots (*granthi*) are *māyā*, *pāśava*, Brahmā, Viṣṇu, Rudra, Īśvara, Sadāśiva, Indhikā, Dīpikā, Baindava, Nāda, and Śakti.

[6] The three powers (*śakti*) are 'will' (*icchāśakti*), 'cognition' (*jñānaśakti*) and 'action' (*kriyāśakti*).

[7] The three abodes or 'astral splendours' (*dhāman*) are the moon, sun, and fire. They are known to later yogic texts indicating inner, cosmological visions and are also linked with the left (*iḍā*), right (*piṅgalā*), and central channel (*suṣumnā*) of the subtle body.

[8] The three channels (*nāḍī*) are *suṣumnā*, *iḍā* and *piṅgalā*.

[9] An alternative translation might be 'the yogi fills the Self then [the Self] of another' implying ethics. However, for syntactical and contextual reasons this is less likely.

[10] *Abhimāna* indicates not so much pride as a sense of oneself.

[11] Here we have followed K in our translation for grammatical reasons (*tadsthā tadgarbhagā śivā*).

2

svoditena varārohe spaṃdanaṃ spadanena tu |
kṛtvā tadabhimānam tu janmasthāne nidhāpayet ||8||

bhāvabhedena tat-sthānām mūlādhāre prayojayet |
nādasūcyā prayogena vedhayet sūkṣmayogataḥ ||9||

ādhāraḥ ṣoḍaśaṃ bhitvā graṃthidvādaśakaṃ tathā |
madhyanāḍipathārūḍho vedhayet paramaṃ dhruvaṃ ||10||

tatpraviṣṭas tadā bhūtvā tatsamo vyāpakaḥ śivaḥ |
sarvāmayaparityāgān niṣkalaṃ kṣobhyaśaktitaḥ ||11||

punar āpyāya tenaiva mārgeṇa hṛdayāntaraṃ |
tatra praviṣṭamātrams tu dhyānālabdhaṃ rasāyanaṃ ||12||

viśrāmyānubhavaṃ prāpya tasmāt sthānāt pravāhayet |
sarvaṃ tad amṛtaṃ vegāt sarvatraiva nirodhayet ||13||

anatanāḍibhedena hy anantāmṛtam uttamam |
anantadhyānayogena paripūrya svakaṃ puram ||14||

bhuktvājarāmaras tadvat sabāhyābhyantaraṃ priye |
evaṃ mṛtyujitāt sarvaṃ sūkṣmanādena pūritaṃ ||15||

tadāsau siddhyate kṣipraṃ satyaṃ devi na cānyathā |
janmasthānaṃ samāśṛtya spandastham madhyamāṃ kalāṃ ||16||

11a ≈ *Tantrāloka* 1.14: avatāraḥ sa viñeya ubhābhyāṃ vyāpakaḥ śivaḥ; *Vāmakeśvarīmata* 4.10: avatāraḥ sa viñeya ubhābhyāṃ vyāpakaḥ śivaḥ.

8b spadanena] N₁ : svandanena N₂ : spandanena K **8c** tad] N₁N₂ : taṃ K ; abhimānaṃ] N₁K : abhimānan N₂ **9a** tatsthānām] N₁ : tatsthānān N₂K **9b** prayojayet] N₁N₂ : niyojayet K **9c** nādasūcyā prayogena] N₁K : nādas tu vyāptayogena N₂ **10a** ādhāraḥ ṣoḍaśaṃ] N₁ : ādhāraṃ N₂ : ādhāraṣoḍaśaṃ K **10c** madhyanāḍipathārūḍho] N₁K : madhyanāḍipathārūḍho N₂ **11a** tatpraviṣṭas tadā] N₁N₂ : tatpraviśya tato K **11b** tatsamo] N₁N₂ : tatstho 'sau K **11d** niṣkalaṃ kṣobhyaśaktitaḥ] N₁N₂ : niṣkalākṣobhyaśaktitaḥ K **12a** punar āpyāyatenaiva] N₁N₂ : punarāpūrya tenaiva K **12c** praviṣṭamātrams tu] N₁ : praviṣṭamātras tu N₂ : praviṣṭamātraṃ tu K **12d** dhyānālabdhaṃ] N₁ : sthānāl labdhaṃ N₂ : dhyāyel labdhaṃ K **13a** viśrāmyānubhavaṃ] N₁N₂ : viśrāmānubhavaṃ K **13d** nirodhayet] N₁N₂ : virecayet K **14a** anatanāḍibhedena] N1pc anantanāḍibhedena N1ac : anantanāḍibhedena K **14b** hy anantāmṛtam] N₁N₂ : anatāmṛtam K **14d** paripūrya svakaṃ puram] N₁N₂ : paripūrya puraṃ svakaṃ K **15a** bhuktvājarāmaras tadvat] N₁ : bhuttkājarāmaras tadvat N₂ : ajarāmaras tato bhūtvā K **15c** mṛtyujitāt] N₁N₂ : mṛtyujitā K **15c** sarvaṃ] N1pcN₂K : sarvāṃ N1ac **15d** sūkṣmanādena] N₁N₂ : sūkṣmadhyānena K **16a** tadāsau siddhyate] N₁N₂ : tato'sau siddhyati K **16b** cānyathā] N₁ : vānyathā N₂ : cānyathā K **16c** janmasthānaṃ] N₁N₂ : janmasthāne K **16d** spandastham] N₁ : spandasthāṃ N₂K.

3

[7cd-8] Then, having become the mantra *AHAM*,[12] established there, moving in a stable manner in his [own] circle (*cakra*); the yogi should establish his self-perception[13] in the place of birth,[14] by producing vibrations by his self-arising vibration,[15] Oh Elegant One.

[9] By distinguishing levels of being,[16] the yogi should unite that [his self-perception] from that place with the root base.[17] By applying the needle of sound, he should pierce those levels through the application of the Subtle Visualisation.[18]

[10] Having pierced the sixteen centres[19] and the twelve knots, the one who has mounted the path of the central channel[20] should penetrate steadily towards the highest.

[11-13] [The yogi] who has entered that [the highest condition] becomes equal to Śiva, the all-pervading, due to the undivided agitated power (*śakti*), who drives away all diseases completely. Having filled the interior of the heart[21] again by that path, he causes the penetrated, elementary matter [*amṛta*] of the channel of elixir obtained by meditation to rest there. And having obtained this experience, he should cause all that elixir (*amṛta*) to flow quickly from that place [the heart] and leave it remaining everywhere.

[14-16ab] Ones own body,[22] entirely filled with the supreme infinite nectar and with the joy of non-death and non-old age, becomes completely filled with the subtle sound both internally and externally, O Beloved, due to the Conqueror of Death,[23] by distinguishing the infinite channel and by the infinite Yoga of Visualising Meditation.[24] Then he [the yogi with a divine body] succeeds quickly and, truly, in no other way, O Goddess!

[This ends the first technique][25]

---

[12] The mantra 'I'.

[13] The term self-perception (*abhimāna*) may also be translated by the phrase 'the power of his own self', which indicates not so much pride but a sense of oneself or sense of the power of oneself. We thank Rembert Lutjeharms for his observation on this use in Vaiṣṇava texts.

[14] I.e. the root cakra or what is later known as the *mūladhāra*.

[15] Here we have followed the Kashmir edition in our translation for grammatical reasons (*spandanena*).

[16] Brunner takes *bhāvabhedena* to mean different dispositions, modes or conditions of the practitioner (Brunner 1974 p. 162), but we have followed Wernicke-Olesen's suggestion (2016) here that it refers to differentiating different levels of being within the cosmic order recapitulated in the body.

[17] I.e. the *bhāvas* or levels of being.

[18] *Sūkṣmayoga*.

[19] Here we have followed N₂ in our translation for grammatical reasons (*ādhāram*).

[20] The *suṣumnā* channel.

[21] This may be a central locus model conflated with a vertical axis model.

[22] Kṣemarāja glosses *puram* as *deham*, which we follow in our translation.

[23] The Conqueror of Death (Mṛtyujita or Mṛtyunjit) is a form of Śiva as well as a mantra, namely the netramantra: *OM JUM SAḤ* (short version).

[24] *Dhyānayoga*.

[25] This ends the first technique, the *kulaprakriya* of penetrating the supreme abode at the crown of the head from whence the nectar of immortality flows down to the heart and from there pervades the body through the subtle channels.

The Lord of Immortality: An Introduction, Critical Edition, and Translation of the Netra Tantra, vol. I, chapters 1–8. Critically edited, translated and introduced by Gavin Flood, Bjarne Wernicke-Olesen, Rajan Khatiwoda, Tantric Studies Series (London: Routledge, *forthcoming*).

tatstham kṛtvā tadātmānaṃ kālāgniṃ tu samāśrayet |
gatvā gṛhītavijñānaṃ vīryaṃ tatraiva nikṣipet ||17||

tad vīryāt paramāṃ śaktiṃ kriyākhyā madhyamoditā |
vijñānenordhvato bhinnā graṃthibhedena cecchayā ||18||

mūlaspandaṃ samāśṛtya tyaktvā vāhudvayaṃ tataḥ |
prathamārgapravāhena suṣūmnākhyaṃ samāśrayet ||19||

tad evāśṛtya viramet tatsarveṃdriyagocare |
tadā pratyastamenaiva vijñānenordhvataḥ kramāt ||20||

brahmādikāraṇānāṃn tu tyāgaṃ kṛtvā śanaiḥ śanaiḥ |
ṣaṇṇāṃ śaktimataḥ prāpya kuṇḍalākhyāṃ nirodhikāṃ ||21||

māyādigraṃthibhedena hṛdy ādau vyomapañcakam |
janmamūle samayākhyā graṃthir janmani pāśataḥ ||22||

brahmā viṣṇus tathā rudra īśvaraś ca sadāśivaḥ |
kāraṇasthā tu paṃcaivaṃ graṃthādau samudāhṛtam ||23||

iṃdikākhyā tu yā granthir vimārgestanmanānusā |
tadūrdhvaṃ dīpikā caiva tadūrdhvaṃ caiva vaidadhī ||24||

nādākhyā tu mahāgraṃthi śaktigranthis tv ataḥ param |
granthir dvādaśakaṃ bhitvā praviśet paramaṃ śivam ||25||

18a tad vīryāt paramāṃ śaktiṃ] N₁ : tadvīryāt paramā śaktiḥ N₂ : tadvīryāpūritā śaktiḥ K   **17d** nikṣipet] N₁ : niḥkṣipet N₂ : nikṣipet K   **18b** kriyākhyā madhyamoditā] N₁N₂ : kriyākhyā madhyamottamā K   **18c** vijñānenordhvato bhinnā] N₁ : vijñānenordhvatā bhinnā N₂ : vijñānenordhvato bhittvā K   **19c** prathamārgapravāhena] N₁N₂ : madhyamārgapravāhinyā K   **19d** suṣūmnākhyaṃ] N1 : suṣumṇāsthaṃ N2 : suṣūmnākhyāṃ K   **20a** tad] N₁N₂ : tāṃ K   **20b** tatsarveṃdriyagocare] N₁N₂ : tatsarveṃdriyagocarāt K   **20c** pratyastamenaiva] N₁N₂ : pratyastamāyena K   **20d** kramāt] N₁N₂ : punaḥ K   **21a** brahmādikāraṇānāṃn tu] N₁ : brahmādikāraṇānāṃ tu N₃K   **21c** ṣaṇṇāṃ] N1 : ṣaṣṭāṃ N2 : śaktimatāṃ K   **7.21c** śaktimataḥ] N₁N₂ : śaktimatāṃ K   **21d** nirodhikāṃ] N₁K : nirādhikāṃ N₂   **22b** hṛdy ādau vyamapañcakam N1 : ādau thapañcakam N2 : hṛdādivyomapañcakaṃ K   **22c** samayākhyā] N₁N₂ : tu māyākhyo K   **22d** graṃthir] N1 : granthir N2 : graṃthir K   **22d** pāśataḥ] N1 : pāśavaḥ K   **23a** viṣṇus tathā] N₁N₂ : viṣṇuśca K   **23b** rudra īśvaraś ca] N₁N₂ : rudraś ca īśvaraś ca K   **23c** kāraṇasthā tu] N₁N₂ : kāraṇasthās tu K   **23d** granthādau samudāhṛtam] N₁N₂ : granthayaḥ samudāhṛtāḥ K   **24a** iṃdikākhyātu yā granthir] N₁N₂ : indikākhyas tu yo granthir K   **24b** vimārgestanmanānusā] N₁N₂ : dvimārgaśamanaḥ śivaḥ K   **24c** tadūrdhvaṃ dīpikā caiva] N₁N₂ : tadūrdhve dīpikā nāma K   **24d** tadūrdhvaṃ caiva vaidadhī] N₁N₂ : tadūrdhve caiva baindavaḥ K   **25a** nādākhyā tu mahāgranthi- N₁N₂ : nādākhyas tu mahāgraṃthiḥ K   **25b** śaktigranthistvataḥ param N₁N₂ : śaktigranthir ataḥ paraḥ K   **25c** granthir dvādaśakaṃ bhitvā] N₁N₂ : graṃthidvādaśakaṃ bhittvā K   **25d** paramaṃ śivam] N₁N₂ : parame pade K

Jesper Moeslund Poulsen   MA-thesis   The faculty of Religious Studies
02/12/2020   Will and Reality in the *Netratantra*   The University of Aarhus

83

The Lord of Immortality: An Introduction, Critical Edition, and Translation of the Netra Tantra, vol. I, chapters 1-8. Critically edited, translated and introduced by Gavin Flood, Bjarne Wernicke-Olesen, Rajan Khatiwoda, Tantric Studies Series (London: Routledge, *forthcoming*).

[16cd-17] Having resorted to the place of birth, [namely] the place of vibration, the middle constituent,[26] residing there, he should resort to the Self, the Fire of Time, and having gone there, he should throw his virile power, the attained insight, just there.

[18] Then, from that virile power, the Supreme Power (*śakti*),[27] is arisen in the middle known as action (*kriyā*). She is separated upwards by cognition (*jñāna*), the distinguishing of the knots, and by will (*icchā*).

[19] The yogi should resort to the vibration of the root centre and, having abandoned it, the yogi should resort to the twofold flow [of the inbreath and outbreath] by the name of Suṣumnā through the flow of the outspread path.

[20] Then, resorting to that, the yogi should pause in all his spheres of the senses and then gradually rise upwards by means of the Eightfold[28] Insight.

[21-22a] Having gradually given up the causes beginning with Brahmā[29] and having attained the sixth centre posessing power, she called the Crooked One[30] is restrained by distinguishing the knots beginning with illusion.

[Now begins a new topic]

[22b-25] The five voids[31] are in the heart etc.; the knot[32] in the root centre of birth is known as 'Gathering' due to its binding in the place of birth; the locations of the causes are declared to be five amongst the knots, [namely] Brahmā, Viṣṇu, Rudra, Īśvara, and Sadāśiva;[33] the knot known as 'Kindling' is Śiva, calming the two paths; above that is 'Light'; and above that is 'the Drop';[34] the great knot is known as 'Sound'; and further, the knot of power is 'the Supreme'. Having pierced these twelve knots, the yogi should enter the Supreme Śiva.

---

[26] In the *kalā*-system there are five constituents, starting with the big toe. Thus, the middle *kalā* refers to the root centre (*cakra*) or *mūladhāra* (cf. Flood 1993, 129).

[27] Here we have emendated *paramāṃ śaktiṃ* in our translation to *paramā śaktiḥ* in accordance with N₂.

[28] Correction: here we read *astama* as *aṣṭama*.

[29] This refers to the five Causes or Lords of the Cause, the Kāraṇeśvaras listed in NT 7.23, namely Brahmā, Viṣṇu, Rudra, Īśvara, and Sadāśiva each of whom rules a level of the cosmos, sometimes called *kalā*, mapped onto the body (cf. Brunner 1977 p. 118 n. 7 and Goodall 2004, p. 372 n. 807). Goodall observes that this terminology being absent from early sources 'may have entered the Saiddhāntika *paddhati*-tradition ... from the *Svacchanda*.'

[30] The Crooked One (*kuṇḍalā*) refers to the coiled power Kuṇḍalinī, a power higher than Śiva but below Paramāśiva. See Padoux 1991.

[31] Correction: here we read *vyama* as *vyoman* in accordance with K.

[32] The lowest knot is the *māyā-granthi* that also corresponds to the lowest void (*janma-granthi*) so the heart is arguably the third void and not the first (cf. the diagramme in Brunner 1974, p. 142 n. 1).

[33] That is, the five Kāraṇeśvaras are also the name of the knots. Thus we have *māyā* and *pāśava* located in the centre at the organ of generation, followed by the knots beginning with Brahmā at the heart, with Viṣṇu at the throat, Rudra at the palate, Īśvara between the eyes, and Sadāśiva at the forehead. Above these are the remaining knots listed in the following verses up to the crown of the head.

[34] Here we follow K in our translation of this *granthi* as 'drop' (*baindava*) since the Nepalese text's term *vaidadhī* seems obscure.

The Lord of Immortality: An Introduction, Critical Edition, and Translation of the Netra Tantra, vol. I, chapters 1-8. Critically edited, translated and introduced by Gavin Flood, Bjarne Wernicke-Olesen, Rajan Khatiwoda, Tantric Studies Series (London: Routledge, *forthcoming*).

brahmāṇaṃ ca tathā viṣṇuṃ rudraṃ caivaśvaram tathā |
sadāśivaṃ tathā śaktiṃ śivasthānaṃ prabhedayet ||26||

kham anantaṃ tu janmākhye nābhau vyomadvitīyakaṃ |
tṛtīyaṃ tu hṛdi sthāne caturthaṃ vindumadhyataḥ ||27||

nādākhyaṃ tu samudṛṣṭaṃ ṣaṭcakram adhunocyate |
janmākhyaṃ nāḍicakraṃ tu nābhau mayākhyam uttamaṃ ||28||

hṛdisthaṃ yogicakraṃ tu tārdūlusthaṃ bhedanaṃ smṛtaṃ |
viṃdusthaṃ bhedacakraṃ ca nādasthaṃ śāntam ucyate ||29||

pūrvoktāni ca sarvāṇi jñānaśulena bhedayet |
ākramyā dharajanmākhyaṃ tanmūlaṃ pīḍayecchanaiḥ ||30||

tasyādhārasya suśroṇi paryāyān śṛṇv ataḥ param |
janmasthānaṃ tu kumākhyaṃ sthānapaṃcakaṃ ||31||

matsyodaraṃ tathaivaṃ hi mūlādhāraṃ tad ucyate |
tasmāt tāṃ khecarākhyāṃ tu mudrāṃ vindeta yogavit ||32||

mudrāyā tu tadā devi ātmā vai mudrito yadā |
tadā cordhvaṃ tu vicared vijñānenordhvataḥ kramāt ||33||

vidyād vidyād paraṃ yāvat sthānaṃ suravarārcitam |
tasthānaṃ devi saṃprāpya yoginīsamarasī bhavet ||34||

niṣkalaṃ bhāvam āpanno vyāpakaḥ paramaḥ śivaḥ |
evaṃ bhūtvā samaṃ sarvaṃ nispandaṃ sarvatodita ||35||

tataḥ pravarttate śaktir lakṣyahīnā nirāmayā |
icchāmātravinirdiṣṭā jñānarūpā kriyātmikā ||36||

26b caivaśvaraṃ tathā] N₁N₂ : caiveśvaram tathā K   **27a** janmākhye] N₁N₂ : janmākhyaṃ K   **27d** vindumadhyataḥ] N₁ N₂ : bindumadhyataḥ K **28c** janmākhyaṃ] N₁N₂ : janmākhye K   **29b** tārdūlusthaṃ] N₁ : tālusthaṃ N₂K **29e** viṃdusthaṃ bhedacakraṃ ca] N₁N₂ : bindusthaṃ dīpticakraṃ tu K   **30c** dharajanmākhyaṃ] N₁N₂ : janmādhārākhyaṃ K   **31a** tasyādhārasya] N₁N₂ : janmādhārasya K **31c** kumākhyaṃ] N₁ : kūrmākhyaṃ N₂ : kūrmākhyaṃ K **32a** tathaivaṃ hi] N₁N₂ : tathaiveha K   **32b** mūlādhāraṃ tad ucyate] N₁N₂ : mūlādhāras tathocyate K **32e** tasmāt tāṃ] N₁N₂ : tatsthāṃ vai K   **33a** mudrāyā] N₁N₂ : mudrayā K   **33e** cordhvaṃ] N₁ : cordhvan N₂ ; vicared] N₁N₂ : visared K   **34a** vidyād vidyād] N₁N₂ : bhindyād bhindyād K   **34b** yāvat sthānaṃ suravarārcitaṃ] N₁N₂ : sthānaṃ yāvat svaravarārcite K   **34c** tasthānaṃ devi] N₁ : tatsthānaṃ devi N₂ : tatsthānaṃ caiva K   **34d** yoginīsamarasī bhavet] N₁N₂ : yogī samaraso K   **35d** nispandaṃ] N₁N₂ : niḥspandaṃ K ; sarvatodita] N₁N₂ : sarvadoditaṃ K   **36a** pravarttate] N₁N₂ : pravartate K

The Lord of Immortality: An Introduction, Critical Edition, and Translation of the Netra Tantra, vol. I, chapters 1-8. Critically edited, translated and introduced by Gavin Flood, Bjarne Wernicke-Olesen, Rajan Khatiwoda, Tantric Studies Series (London: Routledge, *forthcoming*).

[26] The yogi should pierce the abodes of Brahmā, Viṣṇu, Rudra, Īśvara, Sadāśiva, Śakti, and Śiva.

[27-28a] The endless void is known as 'Birth'; the second void is in the navel; the third is in the place of the heart; the fourth is in the middle of the drop; then the one known as 'Sound' is pierced.

[28b-29] Now, the six circle (*cakra*) system is told: the channel circle (*cakra*) is known as 'Birth'; in the navel is the supreme circle (*cakra*) known as 'Illusion';[35] the 'Yogi' cakra is in the heart; the place of the uvular is remembered as 'Splitting'; and the place of the bindu is known as 'Rupture'; while the place of sound is said to be 'Tranquility'.

[30] The yogi should pierce all the cakras previously spoken about with the trident of knowledge. Having ascended, the yogi should gently press the root known as the 'Birth Support'.[36]

[31-32b] Hear the synonyms of that support, O One with Beautiful Hips, namely 'the Supreme', 'the Location of Birth', 'the Bulb', and 'the Tortoise'.[37] The places are five. Thus, the root cakra is also said to be 'the Fish Belly'.

[32cd] Afterwards, the knower of yoga should find the seal called 'Sky-goer' (*khecarā*).

[33] When by the seal, O Goddess, the self is sealed, then he should gradually ascend upwards by means of insight to the highest place.

[34] While the chief of the gods praises that highest place, O Goddess, one having entered it with deep wisdom, should become of the same essence as yoginīs.[38]

[35] Thus, being Śiva, the supreme, all-pervading, he merges with the perfect condition [i.e. the essense of the yoginīs]. Then all is said to be the same and eternally motionless.

[36] Then the power (*śakti*), who is without characteristics and free from suffering, manifests herself as will, cognition and action.

---

[35] Thus the *māyācakra* is distinct from the *māyāgranthi*.

[36] Presumably this means press the root support with his heal, which assumes he is performing the meditation seated on his heals in a kneeling posture, although this is not clear.

[37] Here we have emendated *kumākhyaṃ* in our translation to *kūrmākhyaṃ* according to N₂ and K.

[38] K leaves out this reference to *yoginīs* (*yoginīsamarasī*) making *yogī* the subject of the sentence. The Nepalese manuscripts (N₁N₂) are thus theologically distinct from the later Kashmir edition (K) here, although the addition of the term *yoginī* renders the verse unmetrical.

The Lord of Immortality: An Introduction, Critical Edition, and Translation of the Netra Tantra, vol. I,
chapters 1-8. Critically edited, translated and introduced by Gavin Flood, Bjarne Wernicke-Olesen,
Rajan Khatiwoda, Tantric Studies Series (London: Routledge, *forthcoming*).

ekā sā bhāvabhedena tasya bhedena saṃsthitā |
khecarīmudrayāpūrya śaktyantaṃ tatra sarvataḥ ||37||

yāvac ca noditaś candras tāvat śūnyaṃ nirañjanam |
bhāvagrāhyasamākīrṇaṃ sarvāvasthojjhitaṃ param ||38||

vyāpakaṃ parameśānam anaupamyam anāmayam |
bhavanti yoginas tatra tadārūḍhā varānane ||39||

sā yoniḥ sarvadevānāṃ śaktīnāṃ vyāpya sarvataḥ |
agniṣomātmikā yoni tasmāt sarvaṃ pravarttate ||40||

tatra saṃgrathitā mantrās trāṇavanto bhavanti hi |
sarveṣāṃ caiva saṃhāraṃ tad eva paramam padam ||41||

tasmāt pravartate sṛṣṭir vikṣobhya paramaṃ śivam |
anaupamyāmṛtaṃ prāpya biṃduṃ vikṣobhya līlayā ||42||

candrodaye tadā khyāte paramāmṛtam uttamam |
bahalāmṛtakallolam anantaṃ tatra saṃsmaret ||43||

tasmāt prāpyāmṛtaṃ śubhraṃ svaśaktyā caiva karṣayet |
madhyamārgeṇa suśroṇi kāraṇāṇi prabhedayet ||44||

āpyāyanaṃ prakurvīta sthāne sthāne py anukramāt |
yāvad brahmapadaṃ prāptaṃ tasmād āpyāyayed adhaḥ ||45||

janmasthānapathāc caiva kālāgnau ca pracakramet |
tad āpūrya samaṃtāt tu paripūrṇaṃ smaret punaḥ ||46||

suṣumnāmṛtenākhilaṃ paripūrṇaṃ vibhāvayet |
anantanāḍibhis tatra romakūpaiḥ samantataḥ ||47||

38b śūnyaṃ] N₁N₂ : sūkṣmam K   **38c** bhāvagrāhyasamākīrṇaṃ] N₁N₂ : bhāvagrāhyamasaṃdigdham K   **39a** parameśānam] N₁N₂ : padam aiśānam K   **39d** tadārūḍhā] N₁N₂ : tadārūḍhau   **40b** vyāpya sarvataḥ] N₁N₂ : cāpyanekadhā K   **40c** yoni] N₁N₂ : yonis K   **40d** tasmāt sarvaṃ pravarttate] N₁N₂ : tasyāḥ K   **41c** saṃhāraṃ] N₁N₂ : saṃhāras K   **43a** candrodayaṃ tathākhyātaṃ] N₁N₂ : candrodaye tadā khyāte K   **43c** bahalāmṛtakallolam] N₁ : bahulāmṛtakallolam N₂ : bahalāmṛtakallolam K   **44a** śubhraṃ] N₁N₂ : śuddhaṃ K   **44d** kāraṇāṇi] N₁N₂ : kāraṇādi K   **45a** prakurvīta] N₁N₂ : prakurvīt K   **45c** py pracakramet] N₁N₂ : tu pravartayet K   **46b** ca] N₁N₂ : tu K   **46d** punaḥ] N₁N₂ : puram K   **47b** paripūrṇaṃ] N₁K : tu paripūrṇāṃ N₂

The Lord of Immortality: An Introduction, Critical Edition, and Translation of the Netra Tantra, vol. I, chapters 1–8. Critically edited, translated and introduced by Gavin Flood, Bjarne Wernicke-Olesen, Rajan Khatiwoda, Tantric Studies Series (London: Routledge, *forthcoming*).

[37] She is one, established there and everywhere by distinguishing levels of being according to his division, filling (it) by the seal of the sky-goer (*khecarīmudrā*) up to the level of the power (*śakti*).

[38-39] And as long as the moon has not risen, the yogis, having ascended to that place there, become the highest all-pervading Śiva, empty, spotless, completely immersed in being (*bhāvagrāhya*),[39] free from all [lower] conditions, unparalleled and healthy, O Best of living beings.

[40] She is the womb of the powers (*śakti*) of all the gods. The womb is of the nature of fire and moon, it penetrates everything and manifests everything from that [i.e. from itself, *śakti*].

[41] The protecting mantras strung together there [i.e. in the womb/in her] become the [re]absorption of everything. That is the highest stage.

[42-43] From that creation manifests, when the supreme Śiva is agitated and the yogi obtains the unparalleled nectar (*amṛta*), having playfully agitated the drop (*bindu*). Then with the arising of the moon, the supreme, highest nectar is made known. There [the yogi] should meditate on the deep, wave of infinite nectar.[40]

[44] Having obtained the pure nectar from there, [the yogi] should draw it by his own power (*śakti*) through the middle path [*suṣumnā*], O Slender Waisted One, [and] he should pierce [the levels] beginning with the causes [as previously described].

[45] [The yogi in imagination] should fill the places [i.e. the centres of the body with nectar] in due order from below until Brahmā's place is attained [at the crown of the head].

[46] [The yogi] should [then] proceed in stages along the path from the place of generation to the fire of time [in the big toe]. [Then] having filled [himself with nectar, he] should again meditate the body as completely full.

[47] [The yogi] should visualise the entire [body] there completely filled with the nectar of the central channel [flowing] through the endless channels completely through to the pores of the skin.

---

[39] The meaning here is unclear. *Bhāvagrāhya* may be rendered as 'the grasping of being or existence' or 'immersed in being', but it could be a technical term for, in Bettina Baumer's phrase, 'an intense emotive state' (Baumer 2019: 177). Kṣemarāja is not much help here, glossing it simply as 'one's own light' (*svaprakāśam*). The term occurs once more in NT 22.7: *śivaḥ sarvātmakaḥ śuddho bhāvagrāhyo hy anuttamaḥ*. There are a few other witnesses to the phrase and these are recorded in the apparatus.

[40] We take this verse (and possibly NT 7.38) to mean that the yogi attains the supreme state and only then does the vision of the moon appear, which is the drop (*bindu*).

niṣkrāmya vyāpako bhūtvā svamṛtormibhir ākulam |
amṛtārṇavasamrūḍho majjantam amṛtārṇave ||48||

tadūrdhve hy amṛtārṇaṃ tu pradrutaṃ vyāpakaṃ śivam |
evaṃ samarasībhūtvā hy amṛtaṃ sarvatomukham ||49||

icchājñānakriyārūpaṃ śivam ātmasvakam vibhum |
nirāmayam anuprāpya svānubhūtaṃ vibhāvayet ||50||

amṛteśapadaṃ sūkṣmaṃ samprāpyevāmṛtībhavet |
tadāsau hy amṛtībhūtvā mṛtyujinnātra saṃśayaḥ ||51||

kālajit subhago vīro mṛtyus tasya na bādhate |
kālasya vaṃcanaṃ sūkṣmaṃ mayā te prakaṭīkṛtam ||52||

na kasyacin mayākhyātaṃ tvad ṛte bhaktivatsale ||53||

iti amṛtīśavidhāne sūkṣmadhyānādhikāraḥ saptamaḥ paṭalaḥ

11

The Lord of Immortality: An Introduction, Critical Edition, and Translation of the Netra Tantra, vol. I, chapters 1–8. Critically edited, translated and introduced by Gavin Flood, Bjarne Wernicke-Olesen, Rajan Khatiwoda, Tantric Studies Series (London: Routledge, *forthcoming*).

[48] [The yogi] having caused [the nectar] to flow and having become all-pervading, filled with waves of pleasant nectar, the flood of nectar bursts forth and merges in the ocean of nectar.

[49] Higher than that, however, [there is another] ocean of nectar flowing forth, [namely] the all-pervading Śiva. [The yogi] having thus become of the same essence [as that ocean of nectar, i.e. Śiva], [there is now] nectar everywhere.

[50] And having attained the condition without suffering, he should discover through his own experience that Śiva in the form of will, cognition and action is a manifestion of his own true nature.

[51] Having attained the subtle state of the Lord of Immortality, [the yogi] becomes immortal. Then having become immortal [he will become] a Conqueror of Death, without doubt.

[52] The fortunate hero, who is the Conqueror of Time, is not troubled by death. The Subtle [Visualisation] for the cheating of time has been revealed to you by me.

[53] Except for you, O Devoted One, [this practice] has not been revealed by me to anyone.

Thus [ends] the seventh chapter concerning the Subtle Visualising Meditation in the practice of the Lord of Immortality.

Appendix 3

The paradox of Reason

A major paradox in Schopenhauer's ontology is the status of reason, a paradox that he does not address in his book. The problem lies in his understanding of his ontology of the will, and consequently the notion of the will turning against itself. Firstly, if the will was to turn against itself it would imply multiple wills or an internal hierachy in the one will's Being. Secondly, this "turning against itself" is made possible because of reason, but reason is part of the inner mechanics of the will. Schopenhauer states of reason that it is "Ursprünglich also zum Dienste des Willens, zur Vollbringung seiner Zwecke bestimmt, bleibt sie ihm auch fast durchgängig gänzlich dienstbar: so in allen Thieren und in beinhe allen Menschen.[181]" (Schopenhauer 1911, 181). As I have shown earlier on, reason is in the service of the will, since all existing things are all part of the one will. This immanent metaphysics renders it impossible to exist outside the confinements of the will's Being. Schopenhauer explains the interaction of will and representation as: "Die einzige Selbsterkenntniss des Willens im Ganzen aber ist die Vorstellung im Ganzen, die gesammte anschauliche Welt. Sie ist seine Objektität, seine Offenbarung, sein Spiegel.[182]" (ibid., 196). Reason is inherent in the will and renders possible the will's creation of the world of representation. The transition of reason from the servant of the will to the rebellious liberator is obscured. Schopenhauer writes: "(…) nur als Ausnahme zu betrachtende Übergang von der gemeinen Erkenntniss einzelner Dinge zur Erkenntniss der Idee geschieht plötzlich, indem die Erkenntniss sich vom Dienste des Willens losreisst, eben dadurch das Subjekt aufhört ein bloss individuelles zu seyn und jetzt reines, willenloses Subjekt der Erkenntniss ist (…)[183]" (ibid., 209). He elaborates "Nur indem das Leiden die Form blosser reiner Erkenntniss annimmt und sodann diese als *Quietiv des Willens* wahre Resignation herbeiführt, ist es der Weg zur Erlösung und dadurch ehrwürdig.[184]" (ibid., 469). The suffering becomes the key for the liberation of reason from the servitude of the will.

---

[181] "destined originally to serve the will for the achievement of its aims, knowledge remains almost throughout entirely subordinate to its service; this is the case with all animals and almost all men." (Schopenhauer 1969, 152).

[182] "The sole self-knowledge of the will as a whole is the representation as a whole, the whole world of perception. It is the objectivity, the revelation, the mirror of the will." (ibid., 165).

[183] "the transition that is possible, but to be regarded only as an exception, from the common knowledge of particular things to knowledge of the Idea takes place suddenly, since knowledge tears itself free for the service of the will precisely by the subject's ceasing to be merely individual, and being now a pure will-less subject of knowledge." (ibid., 178).

[184] "Only when suffering assumes the form of pure knowledge, and then this knowledge, as a *quieter of the will*, produces true resignation, is it the path to salvation, and thus worthy of reverence." (ibid., 397).

It is important to delve into the seemingly conflicting conclusion Schopenhauer reaches. If the world is nothing more than the totality of the will, then reason is of the one will. Then why can the individual human through reason turn against the will? This would create a parallel reality that would compete with the dominating reality of the will, since to turn against the will is to erase the foundation of reason. The turning against would either create a sub- or parallel reality, or be an internal self-destructive impuls. The latter could explain reason's striving for status of non-Being as the culmination of the blind and chaotic will's desires. I cannot conclude anything, and this paradox is not something Schopenhauer takes into account or even mentions throughout his work, instead one must accept his inconsequences in order to understand him.