


August 2016

Tantric Alchemy of the Soul: A Philosophical Analysis and Synthesis of Jung and Kashmir Shaivism

Derek C. Wolter

Oglethorpe University, dwolter@oglethorpe.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.kennesaw.edu/ojur>

 Part of the [Comparative Philosophy Commons](#), [Hindu Studies Commons](#), [History of Religions of Eastern Origins Commons](#), and the [Religious Thought, Theology and Philosophy of Religion Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Wolter, Derek C. (2016) "Tantric Alchemy of the Soul: A Philosophical Analysis and Synthesis of Jung and Kashmir Shaivism," *Oglethorpe Journal of Undergraduate Research*: Vol. 6 : Iss. 1 , Article 5.
Available at: <https://digitalcommons.kennesaw.edu/ojur/vol6/iss1/5>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by DigitalCommons@Kennesaw State University. It has been accepted for inclusion in Oglethorpe Journal of Undergraduate Research by an authorized editor of DigitalCommons@Kennesaw State University. For more information, please contact digitalcommons@kennesaw.edu.

One of the most fascinating parts of intellectual globalization is the dialogue that occurs between two vastly removed systems of thought. One particular area of interdisciplinary dialogue that has emerged in the last century is between Western psychology and traditional Eastern religious and philosophical thought. When we engage these two systems of thought, we find that both attempt to answer fundamental questions about the nature of consciousness and of the universe; what is the mind; what is normal consciousness; how ought one 'cure' a sick consciousness; what are the limits of mind, and of human potential?

Two particular disciplines that bear a striking resemblance ripe for comparative study are Jung's psychology and Indian Tantrism. Some of this dialogue has already taken place, to a limited extent by Jung himself, but more so by modern pundits of Tantrism, particular Buddhist Tantrism. Right away we can see parallels between the two systems: the similarity between archetypes in the collective unconscious and Tantric deities; the emphasis on and recognition of the unique place of sexuality within a spiritual framework; the special place of consciousness in a religious cosmology; and the apparent similarities between the expansion of consciousness resulting in individuation in Jung and the liberation of nirvana in Buddhism. While some truly important work has been done in the comparative dialogue between Jung and Tantrism, it has been limited to a discussion of Buddhist Tantrism, which is perhaps the most well known manifestation of modern Tantrism.¹ I propose to engage Jungian thought with Hindu Tantra, particularly Tantrism as expounded in Kashmir Shaivism. The unique metaphysical, theistic, and psychotherapeutic techniques of Kashmir Shaivism provide a novel and insightful lens through which we can view Jungian thought concerning the metaphysics of the psyche, world, the divine, and methods of psychological growth.

This possibility of viewing Jung's psychology through the lens of Kashmir Shaivism has a unique potential to inform the ongoing conversation between Tantrism and Jung. Buddhist Tantrism, and Buddhism in general, is overall very reticent in unequivocally positing any type of absolute metaphysic or ontology that is not "directed toward solving the fundamental problem of suffering."² The other very unique aspect of Buddhism is its traditional classification as atheistic.³

¹ See Radmila Moacanin, *The Essence of Jung's Psychology and Tibetan Buddhism*. (Boston: Wisdom Publications, 2003). and Davis Judson, "Jung at the Ft. of Mt. Kailash: A Transpersonal Synthesis of Depth Psychology, Tibetan Tantra, and the Sacred Mythic Imagery of East and West," in *International Journal of Transpersonal Studies*, 28, 2009, pp. 112-118.

² L. R. Joshi, "A New Interpretation of Indian Atheism," p. 197.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 189. Joshi makes the case that a more accurate term would be "semi-theistic," because although Buddhism denies the existence of a personal God, it shares many of the characteristics we would now call "theistic." Nonetheless, as Joshi notes, in Indian philosophy generally,

While there are complex religious and spiritual ideas in Buddhism, and indeed a vast array of ritual worship and prayer that meets many of the criterion for a theism, the reality of a personal God is explicitly denied.⁴ In the overall metaphysical ontology of Buddhism there is no place for a God, and indeed very little place for devotion or worship of such a God.⁵ It is in this sense that I use the term “atheistic” to refer to Buddhism. In Kashmir Shaivism, by contrast, the concept of God is a central aspect in the very complex and distinctly articulated metaphysical ontology.⁶ It also shares much of the same parallels with Jung’s psychology, such as the focus on the expansion of consciousness, archetypal deities, emphasis and recognition of the power of sexuality, and the goal of liberation from suffering, that make for such a ripe comparative dialogue between Tantrism and Jung. These unique aspects of Kashmir Shaivism—its integral monistic metaphysics⁷, its emphasis on God— allows us to explore the areas of comparison that were beyond Buddhism’s scope, such as clarifying the relationship between a God and a metaphysical reality, as well as provides us with a unique overarching transpersonal framework in which Jung’s psychology can be viewed. Jung’s psychology, for its part, has the potential to help clarify the metaphysics and pragmatism of the relationship between the individual and archetypal images or deities, as well as the individual and God, and God and the higher impersonal characterization of Reality. This new metaphysical analysis and synthesis of Jung and Indian Tantrism, made possible by the inclusion of Kashmir Shaivism, with its unique and explicit metaphysical and ontological explication, allows for a more profound understanding of both Jungian thought and Kashmir Shaivism, but also has the potential to shed light on some of the most fundamental philosophical and religious questions of existence; what is the nature of the psyche, is there a God, what is ontologically real?

II. JUNG:

Buddhism is considered atheistic in comparison to other Indian philosophies, and it is in this sense that I use the term.

⁴ Ibid., p. 189.

⁵ Ibid., p. 197.

⁶ See David Lawrence, *Rediscovering God with Transcendental Argument: A contemporary integration of Monastic Kashmiri Saiva Philosophy.* (Delhi: Sri Satguru, 2000). Lawrence argues that an analysis of the metaphysical positions within Kashmir Shaivism provides a novel proof of the necessary existence of God. For another in-depth analysis of the metaphysics of Kashmir Shaivism, see Mark S.G. Dyczkoedki, *The Doctrine of Vibration: An Analysis of the Doctrines and Practices of Kashmir Shaivism.* New York: SUNY Press, 1987..

⁷ Mark S.G. Dyczkoedki, *The Doctrine of Vibration: An Analysis of the Doctrines and Practices of Kashmir Shaivism.* New York: SUNY Press, 1987.

Anyone who is familiar with the work of Jung will know what the difficulty in an attempt to summarize Jung's work. However, if we keep our outline in context—as but the bare bones of a psychology and philosophy that by its own nature cannot be fully rationally expounded—we can hope to mitigate the worst of the pitfalls of such an attempt. With these limitations in mind, we can hope to make explicit the implicit metaphysical and ontological positions in Jung's work.

After secondary school, Jung decided to pursue medicine at University.⁸ Through his examination of psychiatric patients, particularly schizophrenic patients, Jung slowly came to realize “that paranoid ideas and hallucinations contain a germ of meaning. A personality, a life history, a pattern of hopes and desires lie behind the psychosis. The fault is ours if we do not understand them. It dawned upon me then for the first time that a general psychology of the personality lies concealed within psychosis, and that even here *we come upon old human conflicts*.”⁹ He came to realize that these primitive impulses and images that are the stuff of psychiatric delusions are present in ‘normal’, psychologically healthy individuals as well, but on an unconscious level.

To begin with, Jung posits libido as a “kind of neutral energy”¹⁰ which is the energetic force behind the instincts and the archetypal, symbolic manifestation in the unconscious. “All psychological phenomena can be considered as manifestations of energy, in the same way that all physical phenomena have been understood as energetic manifestations,”¹¹ writes Jung. “I call it libido, using the word in its original sense, which is by no means only sexual.”¹² In the early stages of analysis, the ego, “which.. direct[s] the conscious modes of functioning”¹³ is slowly distinguished “from all the unconscious aspects of the psyche which affect the conscious ego and guide it in ways not subject to the dominance of the will alone. The task in the early stages of analysis is to recognize the non-ego forces operating in us.”¹⁴ This means becoming aware of the autonomous archetypes inside the individual psyche, such as the shadow or the persona, as well as others.¹⁵ Later on, “different aims will emerge during the second half or the later

⁸ See Carl Jung, *Memoirs, Dreams, Reflections*, trans. Richard and Clara Winston, (London: Fontana Press, 1995), p. 135- 168, Chapter “Psychiatric Activities.”

⁹ Jung, *Memoirs, Dreams, Reflections*, p. 149, emphasis my own.

¹⁰ C. G. Jung, *Symbols of Transformation in The Collected works of C. G. Jung*, vol. 5, trans. R. F. C. Hull, ed. William McGuire et al. (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1976), p. 139.

¹¹ Jung quoted in Anthony Storr, *The Essential Jung*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1983. p. 51

¹² *Ibid.*, p. 51

¹³ June Singer, *Boundaries of the Soul: The Practice of Jung's Psychology*. (Anchor Books, 1994), p. 215

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 215

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, 215-216

stages.”¹⁶ During this stage, the emphasis is on integration rather than differentiation, and on “achieving harmony with the totality of being.”¹⁷ Gradually, the individual moves from the limited standpoint of the ego, towards a larger “union with the self”¹⁸ Jung calls this process of development towards a synthetic unity *individuation*.¹⁹ “If the unconscious can be recognized as a co-determining factor along with consciousness, and if we can live in such a way that conscious and unconscious demands are taken into account as far as possible, then the centre of gravity of the total personality shifts its position,”²⁰ writes Jung. “It is then no longer in the ego, which is merely the centre of consciousness, but in the hypothetical point between conscious and unconscious. This new centre might be called the self.”²¹ Here we see Jung begin to posit a *shift* in individual identity, and an expansion of consciousness within the individual as the goal of his practice—a goal that is implied by the very structure of the psyche itself.

The path of individuation for Jung was thus a path of self-realization: “Individuation means becoming a single, homogenous being, and, in so far as ‘individuality’ embraces our innermost, last, and incomparable uniqueness, it also implies becoming one’s own self. We could therefore translate individuation as ... ‘self realization.’”²² By self, however, we must remember not to confuse ourselves with the average, everyday meaning of the self, which typically refers to the locus of autonomy or will, or the sum total of unique personality traits. By self, Jung means “the primary, all-encompassing archetype.”²³ Self in Jung’s psychology is “that center of being which the ego circumambulates; at the same time it is the superordinate factor in a system in which the ego is subordinate.”²⁴ More than that, “The self embraces the whole of psychic totality, incorporating both consciousness and the unconscious; it is also the center of this totality.”²⁵

Jung’s conception of the Self is inextricable tied to his conception of God—the theistic component of his metaphysics. The Self is that essence of the *numinous*, and “is a God image, or at least cannot be distinguished from one.”²⁶ Here too we see more fully Jung’s radically different conception of the Self. The Self is simultaneously the true center of one’s own identity, as well as a numinous

¹⁶ Ibid., p. 216

¹⁷ Ibid.

¹⁸ Ibid., p. 216

¹⁹ Ibid., p. 137

²⁰ Jung quoted in Anthony Storr, *The Essential Jung*. (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1983), p. 19

²¹ Ibid.

²² Jung quoted in Singer, *Boundaries of the Soul*, p. 137.

²³ Singer, *Boundaries of the Soul*, p. 215.

²⁴ Ibid., p. 210.

²⁵ Ibid., p. 218.

²⁶ Ibid., p. 239

archetype that represents the ground of Being itself—God. From the perspective of the ego, this Self appears as the image of God that is in some sense external to itself. From a larger perspective, however, the Self, and thus God, is viewed as one's own true, authentic identity. From the limited perspective of the ego, this numinous archetype, the Self, is represented differently depending on the individual culture and traditions surrounding the individual. Jung writes, "Living in the West, I would have to say Christ instead of "self," in the Near East it would be Khidr, in the Far East atman or Tao or the Buddha."²⁷ As evidenced by his extensive personal writings on the subject,²⁸ God played an enormous role in Jung's life and work. "That the world inside and outside ourselves rests on a transcendental background is as certain as our own existence,"²⁹ writes Jung. Gods of all types were for Jung "autonomous 'images'... which, whenever they appear are called "God" by naïve people, and because of their numinosity (the equivalent of autonomy!), are taken to be such."³⁰ God, then, exists as an archetypal image or force, "a will transcending his consciousness."³¹ Ultimately, however, it is that utterly compelling, omnipotent force that is both inside and outside oneself. It is the same force that compelled Jung in his youth³², that almighty Will which has the power to utterly break the finite Will of the ego. And thus we come to perhaps the crux of Jung's psychology. It is a *gnosis* in the true sense of the word as a spiritual *knowing*;³³ an expansion of identity from the limited, finite ego, to the infinite, numinous Self that is the totality of the psychic process. From this, we can begin to see the metaphysical commitments underlying Jung's thought. The goal of his psychotherapy is an expansion of individual consciousness that results in a fundamental shift of identity from the ego to a larger concept called the Self, which represents the totality of all psychic process, conscious and unconscious. This Self is also identical with the primary numinous archetype within the individual psyche, also called a God-image. This God-image, while consistent in its essential features across cultures, varies in its particular representation.

From this, we can now examine the foundation of Jung's ontology, and examine his explicit metaphysical claims about the nature of reality. Jung's conception of the ontological world is centered around his observations of the

²⁷ Jung quoted in Anthony Storr, *The Essential Jung*. (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1983), p. 332

²⁸ See Jung, *Memoirs, Dreams, Reflections*.

²⁹ Jung, *Mysterium Coniunctionis* p. 551.

³⁰ *Ibid.*

³¹ *Ibid.*, p. 550.

³² See Jung, *Memoirs Dreams, Reflections*, Chs. I & II.

³³ Stephan A. Hoeller, *The Gnostic Jung and the Seven Sermons to the Dead*. (Illinois: The Theosophical Publishing House, 1985), p. xxv- xxvii.

human psyche, and is encapsulated in his conception of the *unus mundus*.³⁴ Jung takes the idea of the *unus mundus* from medieval alchemical philosophy, which for him is the most poignant symbolic representation of the process of the expansion of consciousness and the interrelation of matter and spirit.³⁵ *Unus Mundus* is “the original, non-differentiated unity of the world or of Being; the [insert Greek text here] of the Gnostics, the primordial unconscious.”³⁶ It is out of this undifferentiated, primordial unity that differentiated subject and object emerge.³⁷ “The division into two was necessary in order to bring the “one” world out of the state of potentiality into reality,”³⁸ writes Jung.

This primordial unity, or *unus mundus*, is the “primordial unconscious”³⁹ out of which subject and object, and differentiation later emerge, and is in this sense primarily psychical, rather than physical.⁴⁰ In describing the later stage of individuation, Jung writes that it involves “a full recognition of the psychical essences of substances as the fundamental essences of the world, and not by virtue of speculation but by virtue of experience.”⁴¹ This primacy of the psychical over the material is also evident in Jung’s writings on parapsychological phenomena, which he calls “synchronicity.”⁴² From “the ‘acausal’ correspondences between mutually independent psychic and physical events, i.e., synchronistic phenomena, and in particular psychokinesis,”⁴³ writes Jung, “We now know that a factor exists which mediates between the apparent incommensurability of body and psyche, giving matter a kind of ‘psychic’ faculty and the psyche a kind of ‘materiality.’”⁴⁴ In some of his writings, however, Jung seems to suggest that the *unus mundus* is in fact neither purely psychical *or* physical, but rather that “all reality would be grounded on an as yet unknown substrate possessing material and at the same time psychic qualities.”⁴⁵ However, as we have noted,⁴⁶ in other places Jung seems to suggest that the *unus mundus* is in fact psychical rather than physical. The psychical aspect of the *unus mundus* is also emphasized in the process of

³⁴ Davis, “Jung at the Foot of Mt. Kailash,” p. 149

³⁵ Davis, “Jung at the Foot of Mt. Kailash,” p. 149; for Jung’s description, see C. G. Jung, *Mysterium Coniunctionis*, in *The Collected Works of C. G. Jung*, vol. 14, ed. Gerhard Adler, trans. R. F. C. Hull. (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1977), Ch. VI, “The Conjunction”, specifically 462- 469. Also, Storr, *The Essential Jung*, p. 331, introduction to part 9.

³⁶ Jung, *Mysterium Coniunctionis*, p. 463.

³⁷ Davis, “Jung at the Foot of Mt. Kailash,” p. 149.

³⁸ Jung, *Mysterium Coniunctionis*, p. 462.

³⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 463.

⁴⁰ Davis, “Jung at the Foot of Mt. Kailash,” p. 161.

⁴¹ Jung quoted in Davis, “Jung at the Foot of Mr. Kailash,” p. 161

⁴² Jung Quoted in Storr, *The Essential Jung*, p. 333.

⁴³ *Ibid.*

⁴⁴ *Ibid.*

⁴⁵ *Ibid.*

⁴⁶ Jung, *Mysterium Coniunctionis*, p. 462

individuation, during which the individual comes to “a full recognition of the psychical essences of substances *as the fundamental essences of the world*”⁴⁷ And indeed, if we posit that the difference between psychical and physical is not so much the existence of matter per se⁴⁸, but rather the presence of *intentionality* or *meaning*, then it seems as if any substratum that underlined both psychical and physical, by the inclusion of the *intentional* or *meaningful* aspects of its psychic nature, would be considered, by our current definition, psychical rather than physical. In other words, even if the *unus mundus* is a kind of synthetic unity that includes both psychical and physical aspects, it would seem that the psychical aspect is indeed the most primary. Thus in Jung we find a clear monistic, non-dual ontology. Moreover, it is a monism that gives primacy to the psychical over the physical.

However, we must put this in context of Jung’s work as a psychologist, and all of what we have gleaned from his other positions. The fact that Jung’s observations cannot in and of themselves prove the metaphysical existence of God, or for that matter, any ‘concrete’ (non-psychical) claims, does not mean that there is no metaphysical or ontological picture of the world presented as the logical outcome of Jung’s observations and claims. We do not find an explicit metaphysical proof in any of Jung’s writing, but we do find an implicit, logically consistent image or hypothesis of a metaphysics. Our view of this depends on how seriously we consider Jung’s quasi phenomenological positions; if it is the case that we can never escape the subjective, psychical perception of the ‘world’, that we are always influenced by unconscious archetypes; that the primordial ontological unity is itself the *unconscious*, then all of our psychic metaphysical claims are the only metaphysical claims possible. In light of all of this, Jung’s assertions that he is not attempting to make any metaphysical claims must be interpreted in the context of his time period, his audience, his position within the ‘science’ of psychology and psychiatry, and the nature of the claims themselves. And in any case, our task in this paper is not to argue for proof, empirical or otherwise, of Jung’s metaphysics; it is rather to unravel the implicit ontology present in Jung’s writings and to compare and synthesize this with the explicit metaphysics suggested by Tantrism, in our particular case, Kashmir Shaivism.

Thus, we see three distinct metaphysical claims in Jung’s thought.

1. Individuation: The goal of human life, and the amelioration of neurosis and suffering, is a process of expansion of consciousness. It involves a recognition of the unconscious, and a shift of identity towards a point that incorporates both the conscious and unconscious. It is also a

⁴⁷ Jung quoted in Davis, “Jung at the Foot of Mr. Kailash,” p. 161, emphasis my own.

⁴⁸ Storr, *The Essential Jung*, p. 333—Jung suggests the idea that the psyche has a kind of material existence.

process of self-realization, where the individual uncovers his true identity as a Self, or God.

2. Relative and Absolute nature of God: God is at once relative and absolute. From the standpoint of the ego, God is viewed as a numinous God-image that is seen as “other,” and takes on the individual characteristics and symbols of particular individuals and cultures. On another level, however, God is viewed as the sum-total of the psyche, and as one’s true identity.
3. Fundamental Ontology: Jung’s conception of a fundamental ontology is monist, where all reality is based out of a fundamental unity, which he calls *unus mundus*. It is a monistic unity that incorporates both the physical and the psychical, but is ultimately psychical in its nature.

III. TANTRA:

Perhaps no other aspect of Eastern religion has so confounded outsiders, both Eastern and Western, than Tantra. The word often conjures up images of sexual licentiousness, sensual indulgence, and morbid ascetic practices. Such a characterization is, undoubtedly, the product of systematic misinterpretation, both inside India and from outside Westerners, particularly 19th century missionaries.⁴⁹ Modern scholarship has done much to dispel the erroneous characterizations of Tantra, however Tantra remains a difficult concept to fully encapsulate. This does not mean such a task should not be undertaken, however, and given the modern resurgence of Tantric practice, as well as the immense historical influence and significance of the Tantric movement in India, it remains a vital goal.

When we speak of Tantra, we are referring to a set of religious beliefs and practices that developed in India around the 7th century CE.⁵⁰ Its origins can be traced originally to the Śaiva sects of Northern Indian, from which it later spread over most of the region. “The term Tantra,” writes Alexis Sanderson, “means simply a system of ritual or essential instruction.”⁵¹ In context, however, Tantra is distinguished from other religious ritual and instruction in that it is viewed as a further, more profound and serologically powerful revelation than the original founding or orthodox texts and practices.⁵² In the Śaiva tradition from which it originated, for example, Tantra is viewed as a further and more authoritative

⁴⁹ Geoffrey Samuel, *The Origins of Yoga and Tantra: Indic Religions to the Thirteenth Century*. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008). p. 230.

⁵⁰ Gavin Flood, *Introduction to Hinduism*. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996). p. 160

⁵¹ Alexis Sanderson, “Śaivism and the Tantric Traditions.” In *The World’s Religions*, edited by S. Sutherland, L. Houlden, P. Clarke and F. Hardy. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul (1988), pp. 660-704. P. 660

⁵² *Ibid.*

revelation than the *sruti* and *smṛti* texts and doctrines.⁵³ Tantra does not deny the truth or authority of the *Vedas* and other orthodox texts, but incorporates and subsumes them under the higher authority of the Tantric texts. This pattern holds true for Tantra in all of the traditions in which it arises, such as in the Vaisnava Tantras and the Sakta Tantras⁵⁴, and also within Buddhist Tantra (*Vajrayāna*), where the Tantras are viewed as the culmination of Mahayana Buddhism.

Beyond their structural place within their respective traditions, Tantra is defined by a set of features that are common to them. Very generally, Tantras are characterized by⁵⁵:

1. World view: The Cosmos is a manifestation of divine energy of the Godhead, and this divine cosmos is homologized in the individual microcosm.
2. Ritual: Similar Gods and Goddesses, as well as other ritualistic aspects, such as temple architecture, sacred designs, and liturgy are found throughout.
3. Practice: Tantras make use of similar visual (mantra, meditative visualizations), auditory (mantra), and bodily exercises (yoga, mudra) in attempt to “ritually appropriate and channel that energy, within the human microcosm, in creative and emancipatory ways.”⁵⁶ These methods are occasionally intentionally transgressive or antinomian.

We must be wary, however, of trying to encapsulate all of what Tantra has come to mean in a single definition, or even a list of shared features or family resemblances. As David Gordon White argues, Tantra must be approached through various “lenses” to allow for an adequate mapping of Tantra.⁵⁷ These include thematic and phenomenological comparisons, from an various outside, etic positions, as well as emic views from inside the practice of Tantra itself, to the extent possible for the uninitiated.⁵⁸ Another helpful distinction White makes is between the “hard core” and “soft core” of Tantra. The “hard core” is comprised of those elements that are exclusive to the most prototypical of Tantric manifestations, and is a very limited definition. The “soft core”, however, includes traditions that have incorporated large aspects of Tantrism, and which may consider themselves to be Tantric in nature, but which do not meet all the

⁵³ Ibid.

⁵⁴ Flood, p. 158-159

⁵⁵ Flood, p. 160; White, p. 9; Samuels

⁵⁶ White, p. 9

⁵⁷ Ibid., p. 5

⁵⁸ Ibid.

definitions of Tantra qua Tantra. With these distinctions in mind, it becomes possible to engage in a fruitful study of Tantra.

With this broad characterization of Tantrism in mind, let us now turn to the specific manifestation of Tantrism we are concerned with—Kashmir Shaivism. To understand Kashmir Shaivism, and prior to unearthing its metaphysical commitments, it is helpful to understand its place within the larger religion of Hinduism.

We will begin with the first major distinction between Saivism in India—Puranic and non-Puranic Saivism. The Puranas are “a vast body of complex narratives which contain genealogies of deities and kings up to the Guptas, cosmologies, law codes, and descriptions of ritual and pilgrimages to holy places.”⁵⁹ It is difficult to date the origins of the various Puranas (of which there are 18 major Puranas⁶⁰), but the majority of them were likely established during the Gupta period (320- 500 CE).⁶¹ Unlike the system of Tantras, and in particular the Tantras of the non- puranic Saiva sects that would develop later, the Puranas were fully within the purvey of the Vedas and orthodox Brahmanism. The Puranas mention four divisions of Saivas, or worshipers of Siva, but they are all generally viewed as “outside the vedic or puranic system.”⁶² When we speak of Puranic Saivism, therefore, we are speaking of the worship of Siva “within the general context of vedic domestic rites and Smarta adherence to *varnasramadharama*,”⁶³ rather than as an exclusive, initiatory worship of Siva. The main distinction, then, between Puranic and non-puranic Saivism is the initiation (*diksa*) of the follower of non-Puranic Saivism, who seeks liberation through the practice of teachings found in the teachings of Siva, and who views these Saiva teachings as more authoritative than the Vedas.⁶⁴

Within non-Puranic Saivism, there are two principle divisions—the *antimarga*, the outer or higher path, and the *mantramarga*, the path of mantras.⁶⁵ The two are distinguished by their ultimate goals, as well as who permitted to practice. The *antimarga* path aims exclusively at the liberation of the individual from suffering and is only open to ascetics. Perhaps the most famous and influential manifestation the *antimarga* is the Pasupatas, and their subgroup, the Lakulas.⁶⁶ The *mantramarga*, by contrast, also aims for the liberation of suffering

⁵⁹ Flood, *Introduction to Hinduism*, p. 109

⁶⁰ Ibid.

⁶¹ Ibid., p. 110

⁶² Ibid., p. 154

⁶³ Ibid., p. 155

⁶⁴ Ibid.

⁶⁵ Flood, Gavin Flood, “The Saiva Traditions”, in *The Blackwell Companion to Hinduism*, (Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 2003. Ed. Flood). p. 200- 225.

p. 206

⁶⁶ Ibid.

of the individual, but also allows for the pursuit of supernatural powers, and blissful experiences in other worlds. It is also open to both ascetics and married householders. While we might be tempted to further distinguish the *antimarga* and *mantramarga* paths in that the *mantramarga* path allows for more transgressive or antinomian practices than the *antimarga* path—practices which are particularly prominent in the non-Siddhanta Bhairva sects—this would be a false dichotomy. Within the Lakula division of the *antimarga* path, for example, we find ascetics who “may eat or drink anything,” and to whom “No action is forbidden.”⁶⁷ The Lakula soteriology denied the basic distinction between purity and impurity⁶⁸, freeing the ascetic to undertake any practice in his pursuit of liberation and his worship of Siva (or Rudra, as the case may be). Another salient distinction between *antimarga* and *mantramarga* is the focus of the *mantramagra* on the *sakti* element of theory and practice. While the *antimarga* tends to focus on the solitary, ascetic aspect of Rudra (Siva), *mantramarga* includes a focus on Siva’s consort, and the power she manifests (*sakti*).⁶⁹

Within the *mantramarga* we can make the distinction between the Saiva Siddhanta and the non-Siddhanta, or Bhairava teachings.⁷⁰ The teachings of the Saiva Siddhanta are largely dualistic, meaning they accept a fundamental distinction between the Soul and Saiva, and were generally less antagonistic and hostile to vedic orthodoxy.⁷¹ This philosophical dualism is reflected in the nature of Tantric practice in Saiva Siddhanta: the Siddhantika maintains the distinction between purity and impurity, and thus exclude such transgressive practices of offering meat and alcohol, as well as other impure substances, found in non-Siddhanta Tantras.⁷² The teachings of the non-Siddhanta, on the other hand, were often explicitly hostile to Vedic authority, and were generally non-dualistic in their philosophical orientation.⁷³ This again is reflected in the nature of their practices, which often involved traditionally impure substances, and had few if any prohibitions of action.

It is within the Bhairava, or non-siddhanta division of the *mantramarga* that Kashmir Shaivism developed. When we speak of Kashmir Shaivism, we are referring to the type of Shaivism that began with Vasugupta in the 9th century with the composition of the Siva Sutras, and which reached its culmination in the figure of Abhinavagupta and his immediate disciples in the 11th century.⁷⁴ The

⁶⁷ Sanderson, “Saivism and the Tantric Traditions,” p. 664

⁶⁸ Ibid., p. 666

⁶⁹ Ibid., p. 667- 668

⁷⁰ Flood, “The Saiva Traditions,” p. 209

⁷¹ Ibid.

⁷² Ibid., p. 210

⁷³ Ibid., p. 209

⁷⁴ Flood, Introduction to Hinduism, p. 167

philosophy that is most representative of Kashmir Shaivism is called the school of recognition, or *Pratyabhijna*. *Pratyabhijna* literally means “recognition”, and the school takes its name from *The Stanzas on the Recognition of God (Isvaraprayabhijnakarika)*, written by Utpaladeva (925-975 CE).⁷⁵ As Mark Dyczkowski writes, “The Pratyabhijna represents the fullest expression of Shaiva monism, systematically worked out into a rational theology of Siva and philosophy of absolute consciousness with which He is identified.”⁷⁶ The most important theologian within the *Pratyabhijna* school is undoubtedly Abhinavagupta, (975- 1025 CE)⁷⁷, who expounded on the philosophical aspects of *Pratyabhijna*, as well as the ritualistic aspects⁷⁸.

Let us turn now to the philosophy of the *Pratyabhijna* itself. It is within the *Pratyabhijna* that we will find the explicit metaphysics of Kashmir Shaivism. As we have said, the *Pratyabhijna* is considered non-dual, and as such denies any distinction between the individual soul (*atman*) and Siva, and any existence that is separated from the absolute.⁷⁹ The individual soul, the Lord (Siva), and the universe are all ontologically unified in “a single reality whose nature is consciousness (*samvit*, cit).⁸⁰ In this sense, *Pratyabhijna* is essentially idealist.⁸¹ It is idealist in the sense that “something mental (the mind, spirit, reason, will) is the ultimate foundation of all reality, or even exhaustive of reality.”⁸² “On the other hand,” writes Gavin Flood, “the Pratyabhijna maintains a cosmological doctrine of emanation, that the cosmos emanates from the one [Reality].”⁸³ In this sense, *Pratyabhijna* affirms the real existence of the physical world.⁸⁴ “We can contrast this view with that of the Advaita Vedanta,” writes Dyczkowski. “The Advaita Vedanta understands the world to be an expression of the absolute insofar as it exists by virtue of the absolute’s Being. Being is separateness and as such is never empirically manifest. It is only transcendently actual as ‘being-in-itself.’ The Kashmiri Saiva position represents, in a sense, a reversal of this point of view [that Being is never empirically manifest]. The nature of the absolute, and also that of Being, is conceived as an eternal becoming (*satatodita*), a dynamic flux or Spanda, ‘the agency of the act of being.’ It is identified with the concrete actuality

⁷⁵ Mark Dyczkowski, *The Doctrine of Vibration: An analysis of the Doctrines and Practices of Kashmir Shaivism*. (New York: SUNY Press, 1987), p. 17; Flood, *An Introduction to Hinduism*, p. 167, p. 247

⁷⁶ Dyczkowski, *The Doctrine of Vibration*, p. 17

⁷⁷ Flood, *An Introduction to Hinduism*, p. 167

⁷⁸ Ibid.

⁷⁹ Dyczkowski, *The Doctrine of Vibration*, p. 38

⁸⁰ Flood, *An Introduction to Hinduism*, 167

⁸¹ See Dyczkowski, *Doctrine of Vibration*, p. 46, “Saiva Idealism.”

⁸² “Idealism,” in *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, <http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/idealism/>

⁸³ Flood, *An Introduction to Hinduism*, p. 248.

⁸⁴ Dyczkowski, *Doctrine of Vibration*, p. 51, “Saiva Realism.”

of the fact of appearing, not passive unmanifest Being.”⁸⁵ While this distinction may seem trivial, it is one of the most defining characteristics of the metaphysics of *Pratyabhijna*, and Kashmir Shaivism. Because the nature of the absolute is eternal *becoming*, it is not distinct from the concrete manifestations of everyday reality. The absolute unity of Being is not in any way separate from the concrete *becoming* of reality. On *Pratyabhijna*'s relation to Advaita, Dyczkowski further writes, “The Vedantin seeks to preserve the integrity of the absolute by safeguarding it from all possible predication. The Saiva defends the absolute status of the absolute by ensuring that it is in every way self-subsistent (*svatantra*), and all embracing (*purna*).”⁸⁶ The ultimate nature of reality for the *Pratyabhijna*, and Kashmir Shaivism, then, is both idealist and realist, accepting the reality of the manifest world, while also positing a higher unity of pure consciousness, out of which the manifest world emanates.⁸⁷

This concept of the *becoming* aspect of ultimate reality is emphasized and made more explicit in the *Spanda* school of thought within Kashmir Shaivism. The *Spanda* school takes its name from the *Spandakarikas* written by Vasugupta⁸⁸, and later expounded by Abhinavagupta's cousin and pupil, Kshemaraja.⁸⁹ The *Spanda* school as it developed represented its own distinct school of thought, much as the *Pratyabhijna* did. The texts of the *Spanda* school, however, focused mostly on the practical aspects of liberation, and so accepted all of the philosophical tenants of *Pratyabhijna*. The *Pratyabhijna* likewise accepted the teachings and practices of the *Spanda* school as being in accordance with the fundamental ontology of *Pratyabhijna*. Indeed, it would be a fair, albeit limited, generalization to say that the *Pratyabhijna* represented the primary philosophical and ontological grounding of Kashmir Shaivism, while the *Spanda* school represented the most prominent practical methods of liberation in Kashmir Shaivism.⁹⁰ Within the *Spanda* school of thought, we find further explanations of the nature of consciousness and the fundamental Reality.

The *Spanda* school itself posits that “every activity in the universe, as well as every perception, notion, sensation or emotion in the microcosm, ebbs and flows as part of the universal rhythm of the one reality, which is Siva, the one

⁸⁵ Dyczkowski, *Doctrine of Vibration*, p. 52.

⁸⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 38

⁸⁷ Again, for a complete discussion of *Pratyabhijna* metaphysics, see Dyczkowski's *Doctrine of Vibration*, specifically the first chapter, “Integral Monism of Kashmir Shaivism.”

⁸⁸ Kshemaraja attributes the *Spandakarikas* to Vasugupta, however some scholars view the text as the work of his closest disciple, Kallatabhatta. – Dyczkowski, *The Doctrine of Vibration*, p. 22.

⁸⁹ Dyczkowski, *The Doctrine of Vibration*, p. 21

⁹⁰ For a complete discussion on the relation between *pratyabhijna* and *Spanda*, see Mark Dyczkowski, *The Stanzas on Vibration*, chapter 7, p. 33-48. Also, Dyczkowski's *Doctrine of Vibration*.

God Who is the pure conscious agent and perceiver.”⁹¹ Practice is divided into three methods, or *upaya*.⁹² The first is the divine means (*sambhavopaya*). This method is essentially undivided absorption in the consciousness of Siva, through the grace of Siva, and without using any meditation methods.⁹³ The second means is the empowered means (*Saktopaya*). This method is perhaps most paradigmatic of *Spanda* practice. It involves focusing on the flux of perception, turning the mind back into pure consciousness. The adept focuses on the moment of consciousness in-between thoughts and other perceptions, and in so doing sees into the heart of consciousness itself. Strong emotions such as love, or anger, can also create a momentary gap in the flux of consciousness, and can be used by the adept of *Spanda*.⁹⁴ The final means of the *Spanda* school are the individual means (*anavopaya*). The individual means incorporate “any spiritual discipline which involves the recitation of mantras, posturing of the body, mediation on particular divine or cosmic form and concentration on a fixed point, either within the body or outside it.”⁹⁵ This last means, then, represents almost all forms of yogic practice, both Tantric and non-Tantric.⁹⁶ Dyczkowski notes however, that “Kashmir Saivism does not reject any form of spiritual discipline which genuinely elevates consciousness.”⁹⁷ Just as Abhinavagupta and the *Pratyabhijna* attempted to create a unified philosophy and theology of monistic Saivism that incorporated, explained, and subsumed all other Tantric theologies at the time, so too Abhinava’s Kashmir Saivism attempted to incorporate and account for all yogic and Tantric methods of liberation⁹⁸. Abhinava’s work is invaluable in discussing Tantrism as a whole, as well as monistic Hinduism in general. And although the practice of Kashmir Saivism in India has all but disappeared, its impact can still be found in almost all aspects of Saiva worship as an invaluable mirror of inclusive Tantric practice, and in Hindu orthodoxy in general.

The soteriological goal of *Pratyabhijna*, and indeed Kashmir Shaivism, is for the individual self “to wake up to the realization of its identity with pure consciousness.”⁹⁹ From the *Pratyabhijna* point of view, “True knowledge (*sadvidya*)... is to know that the apparent opposites normally contrasted with one

⁹¹ Dyczkowski, *The Doctrine of Vibration*, p. 21.

⁹² *Ibid.*, p. 172-173.

⁹³ *Ibid.*, p. 180- 189.

⁹⁴ Dyczkowski, *Doctrine of Vibration*, p. 189- 204.

⁹⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 172.

⁹⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 204-218.

⁹⁷ *Ibid.* p. 172

⁹⁸ Dyczkowski, *Doctrine of Vibratin*, p. 163- 218, “Path to Liberation.”

⁹⁹ Flood, *Introduction to Hinduism*, p. 247

another, such as subject and object, unity and diversity, absolute and relative, are aspects of the one reality.”¹⁰⁰

From this analysis, we can lay bare the metaphysical accounts of the world, the psyche, God, and the self presented in Kashmir Shaivism. We have in Kashmir Shaivism an ontological view that Mark Dyczkowski calls “integral monism.”¹⁰¹ “Reality is the One (*eka*) which becomes manifest as the many (*bahu*). Universal being moves between two poles, viz., the diversification of the one and the unification of the many.”¹⁰² This is a monism that encompasses both unity and difference, and subsumes both under a higher, integral unity, “a structured whole consisting of a graded hierarchy (*taratamya*) of metaphysical principles corresponding to the planes of existence (*dasa*).”¹⁰³ The relationship of the ultimate nature of Reality in Kashmir Shaivism to other metaphysical positions is particularly important. As Dyczkowski points out, “almost every school of Indian thought aspires to lead us to a plane of being and an experience which it believes to be the most complete and satisfying.”¹⁰⁴ Furthermore, “All these views are correct insofar as they correspond to an actual experience. But this is because the absolute, through its inherent powers, assumes the form of all the levels of realisation[sic] (*bhumika*) which correspond to the ultimate view (*sthiti*) each system upholds. Dualism is not an incorrect view of reality although it corresponds to only one of the levels within the absolute.”¹⁰⁵ This is the sense in which Kashmir Shaivism is truly *integral*; it does not outright deny other metaphysical and religious systems, but rather qualifies and *integrates* them into a higher order of religious and metaphysical truth.

In Kashmir Shaivism, the individual soul is identical with the supreme subject, or Being-- Siva.¹⁰⁶ Although this supreme deity is often identified with the mythological Siva, it is also at times associated at times with Bhairava, a wrathful form of Siva, and a whole slew of female deities, such as Kali and Para.¹⁰⁷ The particular forms of the “supreme state”¹⁰⁸ are all viewed as equally legitimate, and are all contained under the larger, non-sectarian conception of *Paramesvara*, or Supreme Lord.¹⁰⁹ The individual’s true identity is this supreme

¹⁰⁰ Ibid., p. 40 This higher unity or “Superego” is an important development within Indian philosophy, and we could perhaps draw the parallel between *Pratyabhijna*’s concept of *Paramesvara*, or supreme Lord, with Sri Aurobindo’s much later conception of *Paramatman*.

¹⁰¹ Dyczkowski, *Doctrine of Vibration*, Ch. I, “Integral monism of Kashmir Shaivism.”

¹⁰² Dyczkowski, *Doctrine of Vibration*, p. 42

¹⁰³ Ibid., p. 42

¹⁰⁴ Ibid., p. 43. We might also add that *all* religions in many ways do this.

¹⁰⁵ Ibid., p. 43.

¹⁰⁶ Flood, *Introduction to Hinduism*, p. 167.

¹⁰⁷ Dyczkowski, *Doctrine of Vibration*, p. 46.

¹⁰⁸ Ibid., p. 46

¹⁰⁹ Ibid.

reality, and thus “all experience is a single process of recognition by a cosmic subject.”¹¹⁰

As we have already mentioned, reality is viewed as ultimately psychical in nature. Kashmir Shaivism posits the doctrine of *antaratva*, or interiority. “Everything, according to this view, resides within one absolute consciousness.”¹¹¹ The distinction between subject and object, interior and exterior, are viewed as secondary manifestations that occur within the consciousness of Siva, that is, Reality. Consciousness itself “is essentially active.”¹¹²

IV. Jung and Kashmir Shaivism Meet

What then can we make of these two great systems? For Jung, we see the following metaphysical commitments:

1. Individuation: The goal of human life, and the amelioration of neurosis and suffering, is a process of expansion of consciousness. It involves a recognition of the unconscious, and a shift of identity towards a point that incorporates both the conscious and unconscious. It is also a process of self-realization, where the individual uncovers his true identity as a Self, or God.
2. Relative and Absolute nature of God: God is at once relative and absolute. From the standpoint of the ego, God is viewed as a numinous God-image that is seen as “other,” and takes on the individual characteristics and symbols of particular individuals and cultures. On another level, however, God is viewed as the sum-total of the psyche, and as one’s true identity.
3. Fundamental Ontology: Jung’s conception of a fundamental ontology is monist, where all reality is based out of a fundamental unity, which he calls *unus mundus*. It is a monistic unity that incorporates both the physical and the psychical, but is ultimately psychical in its nature.

For Kashmir Shaivism:

1. Recognition: Kashmir Shaivism posits the recognition of one’s true identity as the telos of Man which brings about liberation from all

¹¹⁰ Lawrence, *Rediscovering God with Transcendental Argument*, p. 21

¹¹¹ Dyczkowski, *Doctrine of Vibration*, p. 46.

¹¹² *Ibid.*, p. 48.

- suffering. It involves an expansion of consciousness and a shift of identity from the limited ego to identification with God, the ground of all Reality.
2. Relative and Absolute nature of God: In Kashmir Shaivism, God is in a certain sense relative and absolute. God is absolute insofar as God, or rather, his consciousness, is the active ground of all Reality. However, God is also relative in the sense that multiple symbolic characterizations are permitted. As God is in some sense beyond all positive qualification, any relative characterization is true in a certain sense.
 3. Fundamental Ontology: Kashmir Shaivism posits an integral monism. It is integral in the sense that incorporates duality and differentiation as real manifestations of the ultimate monistic, psychical unity. Reality is viewed as fundamentally active—it is the vibration or pulsation of consciousness. It is also integral in the sense that duality, differentiation, and other metaphysical assertions are true by virtue of Reality's all inclusive nature.

What is immediately apparent in the exposition of the metaphysical views of both traditions is their immense and profound similarities. First, and most obviously, there is the fact that both systems present a metaphysics of gnostic liberation from suffering that primarily involves an expansion of the individual consciousness. Jung calls this processes of the expansion of individual consciousness “individuation,” and describes it as the movement from a limited, egocentric consciousness to a conception of consciousness that encompasses both the conscious and the unconscious, both the ego and the autonomous archetypes of the psyche, including the archetype of God.¹¹³ Kashmir Shaivism as well posits that the expansion of individual consciousness and self-knowledge towards a recognition of the individual's identity with Siva as the only method of liberation from suffering.¹¹⁴ This process involves a variety of ritual practices and meditations, including exercises that involve a ritual appropriation of the power of Tantric deities, which are seen as a kind of autonomous being within the psyche of the individual, drastically similar to Jung's conception of autonomous archetypes.¹¹⁵

This similarity between the process of *individuation* and *recognition* is more than a similarity in praxis; both are based on similar fundamental metaphysical claims. It is within the fundamental unity of Reality, Reality's primary psychical nature, and the individual's ontological identification with God or Self that *individuation* and *recognition* are possible. For Jung, it is a process of

¹¹³ Singer, *Boundaries of the Soul*, p. 216; p. 137; Jung quoted by Storr in *The Essential Jung*, p. 19.

¹¹⁴ Dyczkowski, *Doctrine of Vibration*, Ch. VII, “Path to Liberation”, pp. 163- 218.

¹¹⁵ Dyczkowski, *Doctrine of Vibration*, specifically section on “Individual Means” (anavopaya), pp. 204-218.

expansion of consciousness and increase in self-realization that results in a shift of identity towards one's true Self, or God. For Kashmir Shaivism, recognition is an expansion of consciousness and self-realization that is towards a shift in identity from ego to God (Siva). In both Jung and Kashmir Shaivism, it is an expansion of consciousness in the same metaphysical direction, within a similar overarching unified psychical ontology.

In both of these systems, self-knowledge, and the resultant expansion of consciousness, is seen as the teleological end of human existence, and the only true method of individual growth, and, ultimately, the mitigation of individual suffering. However, we do find a difference the extent, or ultimate goal of the expansion of consciousness in Jung and Kashmir Shaivism. Jung famously denies the possibility of any non-dual awareness. "One cannot know something that is not distinct from oneself," writes Jung. "I therefore assume that, in this point [regarding non-dual awareness], Eastern intuition has overreached itself."¹¹⁶ While the process of individuation aims at the expansion of consciousness towards the Self and away from the ego, Jung does not believe that there can ever be an experience without the ego as a sort of lens of consciousness itself.

We also find significant similarities between Jung and Kashmir Shaivism's conception of God. For Jung, it is undoubtedly clear that God exists as a kind of numinous archetype within the individual psyche.¹¹⁷ The particular characteristics of God are relative to the individual, but its numinous quality, and its relation to the individual ego, is constant.¹¹⁸ In Kashmir Shaivism, the individual is ultimately identical with absolute reality, mythologically represented as Siva, or a slew of other deities.¹¹⁹ However, none of these forms of the God are viewed as more important or true than any other; all are viewed as different aspects of the one Supreme Lord (*Paramesvara*).¹²⁰ In both Jung and Kashmir Shaivism, then, we see symbolic representations of God or Reality that are not absolute and inflexible, but rather take on different symbolic representations in different circumstances.

We must also consider the similarities and differences in their broader ontological picture of the world itself. For Kashmir Shaivism, we find an explicit analysis of the ontological status of the world. The ultimate reality is consciousness itself, which through acts of perception and divine will (which correspond to individual perception and will), differentiation, and subject and object, emerge. The reality of the many are not denied, but are subsumed under a unity that includes both unity and difference as necessary components. Everything

¹¹⁶ Jung quoted in Moacanin, *The Essence of Jung's Psychology and Tibetan Buddhism*, p. p. 95.

¹¹⁷ Jung, *Mysterium Coniunctionis*, p. 550-551.

¹¹⁸ Ibid.

¹¹⁹ Dyczkowski, *Doctrine of Vibration*, P. 46.

¹²⁰ Ibid.

is seen, therefore, to be interior (*antaratva*) to the individual.¹²¹ With Jung, the picture is much more implicit. Part of the problem, we have seen, of discussing the metaphysics or ontology of Jung is the fact that he himself was hesitant to make any broad philosophical claims. "I was far from wanting to enunciate a metaphysical truth,"¹²² remarked Jung in relation to his work. "When the physicist says that the atom is of such and such a composition, and when he sketches a model of it, he does not intend to express anything like an eternal truth. But theologians do not understand the natural sciences and, particularly, psychological thinking. The material of analytical psychology, its principal facts, consist of *statements*-- of statements that occur frequently in consistent forms at various places and at various times."¹²³ Jung saw his professional psychological work as solely that of an explorer of the human psyche, not unlike a natural scientist who stumbles upon an undiscovered tropical land, and makes his life work the categorization of all that he discovers. Jung did not view it as his place to make metaphysical claims based off of the empirical evidence he collected of the psyche, both in himself and in his patients. That is the job of the philosopher, and thus we should feel no qualms in trying to enunciate the metaphysical reality that is suggested by Jung's work, despite his own reticence to do so. First and foremost, Jung's conception of *unus mundus* stands as the primary starting point. He saw the world as fundamentally a unity of out of which subject and object, as well as the many, emerge. He also describes this *unus mundus*, or primordial unity, as fundamentally psychical in nature, but in some sense incorporating both physical and psychical aspects.¹²⁴

To what extent, then, can we equate the ontological world view of Kashmir Shaivism with Jung's? It would be rash to outright equate the two. While Jung does indeed posit a kind of primordial psychical unity of Being, it is not clear that he also posits the *realism* of the differentiated, or indeed, the realism of the physical *within* the psychical, which, as we have noted, is one of the distinguishing characteristics of the integral monism of Kashmir Shaivism. It is not even clear that Jung's ontological conception is fully non-dual. It rather appears that Jung's ontological conception is more similar to the Advaitan position mentioned earlier¹²⁵, in which the unity of the One is established as the true reality, while the differentiated many are ultimately taken as illusion. However, from the ontological position of Kashmir Shaivism, this type of conception of the world is not completely incorrect, but is rather a limited

¹²¹ Dyczkowski, *Doctrine of Vibration*, Ch. I, "Integral Monism of Kashmir Shaivism"

¹²² Jung, *Memoirs, Dreams, Reflections*, p. 243.

¹²³ *Ibid.*, p. 244.

¹²⁴ Jung, *Mysterium Coniunctionis* p. 462- 463; Davis, "Jung at the Foot of Mt. Kailash," p. 189; Storr, *The Essential Jung*, p. 333.

¹²⁵ Dyczkowski, *Doctrine of Vibration*, Ch. I, "Integral Monism of Kashmir Shaivism."

conclusion, based off a failure to grasp the true nature of reality, and expand reality to include all differentiation as well as unity.¹²⁶ In this sense, the ontological world-view of Kashmir Shaivism seems to subsume and integrate a position such as Jung's, again demonstrating the distinctly *integrative* character of the metaphysics of Kashmir Shaivism. This again brings us back to the idea that Kashmir Shaivism provides a larger overarching ontological framework in which we can view Jung's thought. By Jung's own account, he creates a theory which helps to explain and subsume all of the diverse psychological and religious phenomena which he observes. His goal is not to deny the reality of any experience, but rather qualify and explain all experiences. While Jung's own metaphysics explains and accounts for a multitude of psychological and religious phenomena, such as the diverse symbolic representations of God, the even larger metaphysical framework of Kashmir Shaivism allows for still further explanatory reach, allowing for the metaphysics of other religions, for example, to be explained and subsumed themselves.

This leads to the next significant difference in their metaphysics—that of the nature of the ego and individuality. At first glance, it may seem that the two systems are diametrically opposed—Jung seems to be advocating for an affirmation of individuality, as represented by his concept of individuation as the supreme goal of psychotherapy, while Kashmir Shaivism denies the individual in identifying him the supreme principle of reality, Siva. This opposition, however, is mostly in their respective language rather than their metaphysics. As we have already outlined, the process of individuation involves a moving towards the archetype of the Self, God, in the unconscious. It involves a dis-identification from the ego. This paradoxically allows for the fullest expression of the unique individuality of the person. Thus in individuation there is a dual process of narrowing and expanding that occur simultaneously. In Kashmir Shaivism as well, we find this same process of narrowing and expanding occurring simultaneously. This again further establishes the similarity between *individuation* and *recognition* as not only similar on a metaphysical level, but also in praxis. While Kashmir Shaivism does posit the absolute unity of Being, it is a unity that includes and subsumes both unity and diversity. Differences of subject and object, and between personalities, are not deemed to be ultimately unreal, as is the case in *Advaita Vedanta* and other Hindu soteriologies, but are rather just as true as the non-difference between them. Kashmir Shaivism embraces this paradox of unity and difference as the fundamental principle of God, which is represented as a constant flux of Being and non-Being, unity and difference, with each pulse of the vibration equally real.¹²⁷ The difference between Jung and

¹²⁶ Dyczkowski, *Doctrine of Vibration*, P. 43.

¹²⁷ See Dyczkowski, *Stanzas on Vibration* for complete translation of the *Spandakarikas* and exposition of the doctrine of *Spanda*

Kashmir Shaivism with regards to individuality, then, is the same as their difference concerning the limit of the expansion of consciousness. It is not that Jung posits individuality and Kashmir Shaivism denies it—it is rather that they both posit the true existence of individuality and universality with regards to the individual, but Kashmir Shaivism takes this distinction farther into a full-fledged paradox, a paradox which is rooted in the same paradox that Jung is unwilling to accept with regards to the possibility of non-dual awareness. Thus, we see that the true distinction is in magnitude rather than kind. The overall metaphysics of Jung and Kashmir Shaivism are essentially in harmony, and differ only in the magnitude of their claims. Kashmir Shaivism takes its ontology slightly farther and more explicit than Jung, in asserting that all duality and differentiation is essentially real, and that *all* metaphysical systems can be viewed as true, whereas Jung seems unwilling to explicitly commit himself to such a position. Both posit a near identical metaphysics that underlies their respective theories on *individuation* and *recognition*, but Kashmir Shaivism accepts the possibility of complete non-dual awareness and identification with the Divine, while Jung is hesitant to accept such a possibility.

In all of their differences, we seem not to find outright contradictions, but rather *qualifications*—subtle, yet important distinctions that show their similarities as much as their differences. In all of their differences discussed—regarding the limit of expansion of consciousness, of individuality, and of the ontological status of the world—we find that the metaphysics of Kashmir Shaivism is more broad, and taken to farther logical conclusions than those of Jung. In this sense, then, we can say that Jung's metaphysics, while not identical with the metaphysics of Kashmir Shaivism, is able to fit *within* the metaphysics of Kashmir Shaivism as a limited, although not contradictory metaphysics. It is this unique relationship between the metaphysics of Jung and Kashmir Shaivism that make for such an important and fruitful comparison.

CONCLUSION:

What then are we to make of our comparison and synthesis of these to great systems of thought? Firstly, this kind of comparison and synthesis helps to better illuminate the individual systems themselves. Jung's conception of individuation, i.e. expansion of consciousness and self-knowledge, helps us to better understand the nature of Kashmir Shaivism's *gnosis* of spiritual insight. Jung shows the relationship between the expansion of consciousness and increase in self-knowledge and neurosis—something that Kashmir Shaivism, focused as it is on the ultimate eradication of suffering, has little to say. As we have shown the immense similarities and harmony of Jung and Kashmir Shaivism's ideas on the expansion of consciousness and self-knowledge, Jung's focus on the more

immediate aspects of individuation and neurosis act as a kind of supplement to the broader conception of spiritual insight and *gnosis* in Kashmir Shaivism.

Kashmir Shaivism's conception of the expansion of consciousness and self-knowledge, can likewise act as a supplement to Jung's ideas on individuation. While Jung's theories deal extensively with individuation in relation to the amelioration of overt, neurotic symptoms, they deal comparatively less with the later stages of individuation and self-knowledge. Kashmir Shaivism's focus on the latter stages of self-realization help to create and contextualize a broader, more explicitly transpersonal system of thought. This difference in their respective emphasis make perfect sense, given their unique place in history. Jung approached his theories on the expansion of consciousness and self-knowledge (individuation) from the standpoint of psychiatry, and as such is more concerned with the mitigation of overt neurosis than final union with the ground of Being. Kashmir Shaivism, for its part, developed within an explicitly religious context in India. While Jung describes the broad similarities of the symbolism, methods, and rituals that underlie the world's great religions, and explicates Man's quest for spiritual illumination in psychological terminology, Kashmir Shaivism is *itself* a system of methods, symbolism, rituals, and philosophy that guides individuals towards spiritual *gnosis*.

Jung's conception of God as a "numinous archetype"¹²⁸ in the unconscious psyche of the individual also helps to explain the seeming plurality, or relativity of God's representation in Kashmir Shaivism. As we have already noted, within Kashmir Shaivism we find multiple symbolic characterizations of God, and all are accorded equal value.¹²⁹ Through viewing these varying representations of God in Kashmir Shaivism through the lens of Jung's theory of autonomous, numinous archetypes within, and partially determined by, individual consciousness, we are able to more fully account the differing symbolic representations. We could then say that not only is God able, through his unity *with* differentiation and ultimate power able to manifest as multiple, equally real and true representations of God, but that the individual's psyche, too, plays a role in shaping the representations of God.

The fact that these two systems of thought, so vastly removed—geographically, temporally, and contextually—share so many consistent metaphysical postulates, is also deserving of our attention. Not only does this provide compelling support of their truth, more than anything, it demands that we take them seriously. The largely empirical and experiential nature of these two systems adds to this demand. Truths concerning the nature of the individual psyche, God, and the world must be true in all time and places if they are really

¹²⁸ Jung, *Mysterium Coniunctionis*, p. 550-551.

¹²⁹ Dyczkowski, *Doctrine of Vibration*, p. 46.

truths. Thus, given the timeless nature of Truth, it is absolutely vital to examine and understand past systems of thought in relation to current systems of truths, and to take their postulates seriously, as worthy of engaging with, rather than outdated products of history. In these two systems of thought, we have a synthetic harmony of thought that spans over a thousand years' time, and a continent of diverse cultures between them. Nor are their similarities mere semblances of agreement; we find that at the core, the metaphysical postulates of Jung and Kashmir Shaivism are in general agreement, or harmony.

This is not to deny or obliterate distinctions between the two. As Lama Anagarika Govinda writes on comparative religions, "It is their differences that constitute their character and their beauty."¹³⁰ In comparing two systems of religious or philosophical thought, "unity should not be established at the expense of productive variety and true life but by tuning the essential differences into a harmony that is strong enough to tolerate and to hold together the greatest contrasts."¹³¹ Not only does the harmony illuminate the individual aspects themselves, but help to create the broader synthetic composite of metaphysical thought.

When we do examine these metaphysical systems of thought, taking seriously the fact of their convergence on a multitude of fundamental issues of metaphysics, we find that the systems of thought themselves are unique in their *scope* of explanatory value. If a physical theory, for example, is able to logically and plausibly explain one or two principles of the universe, we take it as a 'good' theory worthy of our consideration. If, however, a physical theory is able to explain and account for a larger amount of aspects of the universe, we find these theories even better. With the theories of Jung and Kashmir Shaivism respectively, we find that an incredible amount of aspects of human existence, individual psychology, and religious thought is subsumed, explained, and accounted for. They are systems that do not strictly deny the metaphysical truths of other systems of thought, but rather expand and qualify metaphysical and religious truths of all kinds.

If we take another system of metaphysical truths as our overarching explanatory foundation, say Christianity, as it is ecumenically understood in the Nicene Creed,¹³² for example, we find that a vast majority of other metaphysical and religious systems of thought are unequivocally false by the virtue of the limited metaphysics of Christianity. All worship of other Gods— Krishna or Siva, for example, can have no metaphysical place in Christianity, as only the Christian

¹³⁰ Lama Govinda, *The Psychological Attitude of Early Buddhist Philosophy*, (London: Rider & Company, 1973), p. 17-18.

¹³¹ *Ibid.*, p. 18.

¹³² Catechism of Catholic Church, Part One, Section Two, The Credo.
http://www.vatican.va/archive/ccc_css/archive/catechism/credo.htm.

God is viewed as ontologically real. If, however, we take the metaphysics of Jung or Kashmir Shaivism as our overarching metaphysical explanatory foundation, we find that essential elements of Christian metaphysics can be preserved. Worship of the Christian God and Jesus, for example, are perfectly legitimate expressions of the Self for Jung,¹³³ and Kashmir Shaivism as well admits multiple symbolic representations of God¹³⁴, and indeed multiple metaphysical truths subsumed under its higher unity.¹³⁵¹³⁶

This integrative aspect is particularly unique to both Jung and Kashmir Shaivism. Both systems of thought incorporate and integrate other systems of metaphysical truths, while Kashmir Shaivism, given its even broader metaphysical stance, integrates and incorporates Jung's thought as well. We find intrinsic value in our comparison and synthesis in the fact that such a study affords us a better understanding the individual traditions of thought themselves, which is itself worthwhile. We also find extrinsic value; through comparing and synthesizing the metaphysical postulates and engaging seriously with them, we find compelling support for the truth of their statements, which allow us to form a more complete picture of the nature of fundamental truths of human existence; what is the fundamental nature of the universe, is there God, how does the individual relate to the universe and mitigate suffering?

Bibliography

Bloefeld, John. *The Tantric Mysticism of Tibet*. E. P. Dutton and Co., 1970.

Coward, Harold. *Jung and Eastern Thought*. New York; SUNY Press, 1985.

Dyczkowski, Mark. *The Doctrine of Vibration*. Albany: State University of New York, 1987.*

Dyczkowski, Mark. *The Stanzas on Vibration*. Albany: State University of New York, 1992.*

Flood, Gavin. *An Introduction to Hinduism*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 1996.

¹³³ Jung, *Mysterium Coniunctionis*, p. 551; Jung, quoted in Storr, *The Essential Jung*, p. 332

¹³⁴ Dyczkowski, *Doctrine of Vibration*, p. 46.

¹³⁵ Dyczkowski, *Doctrine of Vibration*,

¹³⁶ This is by no means meant as a criticism of Christianity; Christianity merely serves as a contrasting system of metaphysical truths to Jung and Kashmir Shaivism.

- ___ *The Tantric Body: The Secret Tradition of the Hindu Religion*. London: I.B. Tauris. 2006.
- ___ *Body and Cosmology in Kashmir Saivism*. San Francisco: Mellon Research University Press, 1993.
- ___ "The Saiva Traditions", in *The Blackwell Companion to Hinduism*, Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 2003. Ed. Flood. P. 200- 225.
- Fontana, David. *The Secret Language of Symbols: A Visual Key to Symbols and Their Meanings*. Chronicle Books, 1994.
- Govinda, Lama Anagarika. *Foundations of Tibetan Mysticism*. Weiser Books, 1969.
- Govinda, Lama Anagarika. *The Psychological Attitude of Early Buddhist Philosophy*. London: Rider and Company, 1969.
- Hoeller, Stephan A. *The Gnostic Jung and the Seven Sermons to the Dead*. Illinois: The Theosophical Publishing House, 1985.
- "Idealism," in *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, 30 August, 2015.
<http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/idealism/>
- Judson, Davis. "Jung at the Foot of Mount Kailash: A Transpersonal Synthesis of Depth Psychology, Tibetan Tantra, and the Sacred Mythic Imagery of East and West," in *International Journal of Transpersonal Studies*, 28, 2009, pp. 112-118.
- Jung, C. G., & Shamdasani, S. (1932). *The Psychology of Kundalini Yoga: notes of a seminar by C.G. Jung*. 1996 ed. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.
- Jung, C. G. *Symbols of Transformation*, in *The Collected Works of C. G. Jung*, vol. 5, trans. R. F. C. Hull, ed. William McGuire et al. (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1976), p. 139.
- Jung, C. G. *Mysterium Coniunctionis*, in *The Collected Works of C. G. Jung*, vol.

14, ed. Gerhard Adler, trans. R. F. C. Hull. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1977.

Jung, C. G. *Psychology and Religion: West and East* in *Collected Works of C. G. Jung* vol. 11, ed. Gerhard Adler, trans. R. F. C. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1975.

Joshi, L. R. "A New Interpretation of Indian Atheism." *Philosophy East and West*. Vol. 16, No. ¾, July-Oct., 1966. Pp. 189- 206.

Lawrence, David Peter. *Rediscovering God with Transcendental Argument: A contemporary interpretation of Monistic Kashmiri Śaiva Philosophy*. Delhi: Sri Satguru, 2000.

Moacanin, Radmila. *The Essence of Jung's Psychology and Tibetan Buddhism*. Boston: Wisdom Publications, 2003.

Ramachandra Rao, S. K. *Tantra, mantra, yantra: the tantra psychology*. New Delhi: Arnold Heinemann. 1979.

Silburn, Lilian. *Kundalini: The Energy of the Depths: A Comprehensive Study Based on the Scriptures of Nondualistic Kashmir Saivism*. New York: SUNY Press, 1988.

Samuel, Geoffrey. *The Origins of Yoga and Tantra: Indic Religions to the Thirteenth Century*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008.

Sanderson, Alexis. "Śaivism and the Tantric Traditions." In *The World's Religions*, edited by S. Sutherland, L. Houlden, P. Clarke and F. Hardy. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul (1988), pp. 660-704. P. 660

Singer, June. *Boundaries of the Soul: The Practice of Jung's Psychology*. Anchor Books, 1994.

Storr, Anthony. *The Essential Jung*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1983.

Watts, Alan. *Psychotherapy East and West*. New York: Ballantine Books, Inc., 1961.

Wicks, Robert “The Therapeutic Psychology of the Tibetan Book of the Dead”.
Philosophy East and West, Vol. 47, p. 4479-494.

White, David Gordon. *Tantra in Practice*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 2000.

* For primary source information regarding Kashmir Shaivism, I will be relying primarily on Dyczkowski’s works, where he translates and expounds on fundamental works in Kashmir Shaivism, as the majority of works are as of yet unpublished in any Western language.