ŚAKTI AND ŚAKTIMAT
In our discussion of Śrī Jīva's conception of the Ultimate Reality we have already mentioned about the supreme powers of the Lord. With the help of these powers or śakti he maintains His integrity and absolute divinity, and also manifests Himself as the three divine aspects - Brahmā, Paramātman and Bhagavat.

Again, the differences which exist in the non-dual ultimate Reality are nothing but the modification of those powers or śakti. They are not at all independent but are entirely dependent on the central Reality of Bhagavat. So, in order to understand Śrī Jīva's philosophy we must have a clear idea of śakti - its nature and relation.

In our world of experience we find various manifestations of objects with forms, and properties (dharma) like their attributes and their functions. Those objects are always known to be effects of certain particular causes. Each effect is known to have originated from some specific cause, and not from any and every cause. From this we understand that a particular cause possesses the capacity or potency of producing a particular effect. For, otherwise any effect would have originated from any cause. If we do not admit that there is in a lump of clay the potency of producing a jar, or, there is in milk the potency of producing curd, then a lump of clay could have produced curd, and the milk, a jar. Thus to admit casuality is to admit potency or śakti. It is kārya-jñāna-śakti or the effect-producing capacity of a particular cause which determines the casuality of that particular cause to its particular effect,
and distinguishes that casuality from all other casualities. Otherwise, all casualities being undistinguished casualities, any effect would have originated from any 'cause' (1).

Again, it is found that what is called a 'cause' is not simply the substance or the object; but it is the sakti or capacity of that object to produce the particular effect, which is the real cause. It is not the substance 'fire' which is the cause of burning, but it is the burning capacity of fire which effects burning. So it is found that when some pratibandhaka or obstructing substance comes in (like a gem, etc.), the effect burning does not occur in spite of the fire being there. But the fire again burns if the obstructing substance is removed.

So it must be admitted that there is some sakti or potency in the fire which is overpowered by the pratibandhaka, or the obstructing substance (2), and which is again released when the pratibandhaka is removed, or an exciting (uttejaka) jewel is brought in.

Here of course, logicians like the Naiyāyikas, etc. hold that they can do without admitting such sakti or saktis, and explain the effects by the nature (svabhāva) of things, if they determine or define the cause more carefully. Fire alone is not the cause of burning. As there are obstructing items to every

(1) kasmat kṣīrādeva dadhyutpadyate, na mṛttikāyaḥ, mṛttikāya eva ca ghata utpadyate nā kṣīrāt ... saktisā ca kāraṇasya Kārya-niyamārtha kalpyamānā .../Brahma-sūtra - Śaṅkara- Bhāṣya - 2. 1. 18.

(2) Manyādisamavāsīhitena vahninā dāho na janyate, tacıṣṇyena tu janyate, tatra manyādīna vahnau dāhānukūla-śaktirnāyate, uttejakena manyādypaśāraṇa ca janyate iti kalpyate/ Siddhānta-muktāvalī - 2. Page 49 (Nīmapalagāt)
effect, so absence of obstructing items (pratibandhakābhāva) must also qualify the fire to explain the origination of the effect-burning. Therefore, it must be understood that only fire is not the cause of burning, but 'fire' with the absence of the obstructing items (pratibandhakābhāva-visīṣṭavahni) is the cause of burning. So, there is no burning when some obstructing gem comes in.

Therefore, there is no need of admitting śakti or potency. But this assumption is also not sufficient, for, there are cases where there is burning in spite of the obstructing gem being present; when some exciting gem (uttejakamaṇi – i.e. a gem which counter-acts the obstructing capacity of the obstructing gem) is brought in.

To explain such cases and to avert other similar difficulties the Naiyāyikas have to qualify the fire again and again (3) which would lead to a most cumbersome and prolific assumption of a cause. Again, if the Naiyāyikas say that śakti or potency may be explained away by admitting nature of things, it may be said in answer that nature (svabhāva) also implies potency and nothing else. The Śāktivādins, on the other hand, state in objection that burning cannot be said to be the nature of fire, because, nature of a thing must be constant. But, as the burning of fire is found to cease temporarily when some gem or chanting (mantra) is brought in, burning cannot be a nature of fire. It is only the potency of burning in fire which can be temporarily overpowered or withheld, and released again.

(3) Uttejakābhāva-visīṣṭamanyabhāvasya kāraṇatvat/
Siddhānta-muktāvalī - 2, Page 56 (N.S.)
Therefore, the advocates of sakti hold that reason and parsimony both are in favour of the doctrine of sakti which can easily explain all cases of cause and effect.

Amongst orthodox Indian philosophers, the Mīmāṃsakas specially the Prabhakaras are generally regarded as the foremost advocates of sakti because of their admitting sakti as a different padārtha or category (4) like dravya, guṇa, karma, etc. Sakti is different from substance, attribute, movements, etc. because sakti cannot be included in any one of them, since sakti abides in all of them as potency for producing some effect (kāryajānana-sakti).

The Bhāṭṭa Mīmāṃsakas (5) also admit potency though they include it in guṇa or attributes. But in all cases, according to the Bhāṭṭas, potency or sakti is to be apprehended only by arthāpatti or postulation by seeing its effects, or by textual authority (6).

(4) Sa ca Vahniniṣṭha-dāhānukūla-saktirūpa-kāraṇa-vighataka-tayaiva nirvahati; manyādi-pratibandhakatvānyathānupa-pattyā siddhāvayāh sakteḥ śadbhavesvanantarbhūtavādatīrktavam (iti Prabhakarā)

Siddhānta-muktavai - Dinakarī - Page 45.
(Nirmaya-sagar ed.)

(5) Atra saktireva nāstiti tārkitānāṃ matam / agnyādīnāṃ dāhakatvādi-saktiṃ ca svabhāvaḥ hedena saṁarthayaṃ / tadayuktam / svabhāvasya yāvadṛavyabhāvityāt / dāhakatvā-deśca maṇipraṇādinā nirākāryatvāt / svabhāvaḥsaṁbdenāpi sakteva paryāyāntareṇa grahaṇa-prasangācchca /

Manameyodaya - Page 259-60 (Adyar)

(6) Śaktitva-saṁnyavatātīm dravyakarmagunāśrayam / śrutyarthāpatti-kirjayām saktimāhūḥ kumārilāh //

Ibid - Page 258 (Adyar)
But in another way, the advocates of satkāryavāda (the theory of the pre-existence of effects in the causes) are all Śakti-vādins or advocates of śakti on a profound metaphysical basis. Sat-kārya-vāda means that all effects exist in potential forms in their causes even before the origination of those effects. So the potency or śakti in the causes are nothing but the subtle potential forms of the effects themselves. Oil originates from the oil-seeds only because it exists in the oil seeds. Oil cannot originate from sand-grains, because it does not exist there. So creation or production is only the manifestation (abhivyakti) of śakti or the potential form of the effects into the patent form. There is nothing as new origination. Therefore, the subtle unmanifested form of the effect in the cause is śakti or potency.

Thus, all Sat-kārya-vādins like the Sāmkhyas, Pātañjalas and Vedāntins admit śakti as the unmanifested state of effects in the cause. But it should be understood that in all these cases śakti or potency is supported by some substance or locus in which the potency abides. Potency cannot exist independently of the cause or the locus in which śakti remains though in an unmanifested subtle form.

Even the primal śakti, according to the Vedāntins, which is constituted of the three guṇas (7), is subservient to and supported by Brahman - their substratum.

(7) Devatmasaktim svagunairnigudham. Śvetāsvatara-Up. - 1. 2.
Regarding the status of śakti, the Sāṃkhya, Pāṇaṅjala and others differ from the Advaita-Vedāntins. According to the Sāṃkhya, Pāṇaṅjala and others, the potency in the cause is non-different both from the cause and the effect, and śakti is as real as the cause and the effect.

But, according to the Advaitins potency or śakti even in phenomenal objects, though non-different from the cause and the effect, is not as real as the cause. Potency being the subtle unmanifested form of the effect is of the same nature with the effect possessing equal grade of existence with the effect. All effects, according to the Advaitins, are but names made of words - 'vācārāmbhaḥ vitarkādhyam' - and are false in contrast with the cause, as is stated in 'mṛttikā ityeva satyam' - only the clay is real. Therefore, potency which is but the unmanifested form of the effect is as false as the effect in contrast with the cause.

In fact, the Advaitins are anirvacaniya-kāryavādins, and therefore, anirvacaniya-śakti-vādins as well. According to them all effects are inscrutable in their nature from various stand-points. The effects are held (by all satkārya-vādins) to be manifestations of the cause, or of the potency in the cause.

This theory of manifestation is unavoidable for the theory of sat-kārya or pre-existence of the effects. If it be admitted that the manifestation exists before the effort of the agent (kṛtyaspāra), then the efforts of the agent for the manifestation of the effect become useless. Again, if it is held that the
It cannot also be argued that the efforts are necessary for the manifestation of 'the manifestation' which remained unmanifested before (activity of the agent), because, such assumption will lead to regressus ad infinitum. Thus, owing to inexplicability of the manifestation, the Advaitins conclude that the effects or their manifestations are something inscrutable in nature, and are therefore not as real as the cause. So all effects are false in comparison with the cause, as is also vindicated by Śruti-texts — "Vācārāmbhaṇam víkāro ... mṛttika ityeva satyam". Now, potency being only a subtle form of the effects is equally inscrutable and false. Not only with regard to phenomenal objects, but this inscrutability and falsity of potency are also true with regard to the sakti or potency of Isvara i.e. Brahman endowed with potency. According to the Advaitins, there is nothing like sakti in the Absolute Brahman from the Absolute stand-point. It is only from the empirical point of view that Brahman is conceived as possessing sakti or potency (8). When thus endowed with potency Brahman is Isvara. The relation of potency to its substratum Brahman or Isvara is also inscrutable being neither identity nor difference. (tattvānyatvābhyaṃ tirvacanīya).

Thus potency in phenomenal objects and in Brahman (Isvara)

(8) Sambandha-vārtika - 176.
are equally inscrutable and false. Vidyāraṇya states in his
Pañcadasī - 'Māyā as sākṣī or potency of Brahman is to be apprehended
by its effects, like the potency of fire. It is not real. Sākṣī
cannot be apprehended anywhere by anyone before its effects are
produced'. (9).

In another verse he mentions - 'Just as fire cannot be held to
be the potency (sākṣī) of fire, but potency of fire must be distinct
from fire (vah-nilakṣaṇa), so also the potency of "Sat" (Brahma as
Reality) cannot be 'Sat' (reality). It must be sadvilakṣaṇa - some­
thing distinct from 'Sat' or Reality. Therefore, sākṣī being sad­
vilakṣaṇa must be not real (10).

The relation, as stated before, is also inscrutable and false,
because sākṣī cannot be identical with Brahman; for, it is the
object of a concept different from the concept of Brahman, and is
denoted by a word different from the word denoting Brahman. Again,
sākṣī undergoes pariṣṭāma, while Brahman does not.

On the other hand sākṣī cannot be entirely different from
Brahman as it has no independent existence apart from Brahman, and
is, therefore, inseparable from Brahman.

Rāmānuja, the theistic vedantist stands in opposition to
the view of the Advaitins with regard to sākṣī as well as in other
respects. According to him the supreme powers of the Lord which
are classified according to the Viṣṇupurāṇa as para-sākṣī, aparāsākṣī and avidyā-sākṣī, are as real as the Lord, and are part and

(9) Pañcadasī - 2. 47.
(10) Ibid - 2. 48.
parcel of the nature of the Lord. His excellent attributes such as omniscience, powers of creation, etc. are His superior powers (Paraśakti).

The individual souls which are but His body, are His inferior powers (apara-śakti). Avidyāśakti, according to him, is only the actions or karma of jīvas which veil and contract their wisdom which is infinite by nature, and thereby create their bondage. Thus, the nature of avidyāśakti conceived by Rāmānuja is quite different from, and more realistic than that conceived by the Advaitins and others.

As Brahman is essentially of the nature of all-pervading consciousness intrinsically endowed with excellent attributes, the relation of His superior powers and those attributes with Him is a kind of identity (tādātmya). His nature cannot be conceived without those attributes. The relation of the jīvas and of the world with Him is also a kind of identity, which is found in the case of body and soul.

The individual souls are like the body of Brahman, just as, an embodied person (sarīrin) cannot be conceived without his body (sarīra), so also Brahman cannot be conceived without His body constituted of cit and doct i.e. souls and nature (prakṛti). Thus, it is said that the relation of sarīra–sarīrin (body–soul relation) exists between Brahman with everything else – the individual souls and the material world. Brahman is thus described as cidacit–sarīra. (10A)
Before passing over to the concept of sakti of the Gaudīya school, we should have some reference to the concept of sakti according to sakti-tantric philosophy.

According to them sakti is identical with consciousness, or consciousness is identical with sakti. Though Prakāśa as Pure consciousness is conceived as the highest Reality, yet through Its unrestricted freedom or Its power of will It assumes some limitation so as to be able to manifest this universe (11).

Thus the Advaita saktta philosophy maintains a position distinct both from the Advaitins and from the Vaiṣṇava philosophers. It does not require a false potency or māyā-sakti to explain creation and universe, nor does it admit any sakti distinct from the Ultimate Reality as is maintained by the theistic Vedāntins.

From the discussions of the views on sakti however, one point is evident that sakti or potency is always supported by a substratum; sakti must abide in saktimat. Moreover, the powers of the world-cause = Brahman are undoubtedly subordinate to Him, according to all schools of Vedāntins. Even the potencies in phenomenal objects are not independent but subordinate to the will of the Lord who is regarded as the ultimate support (seturvidharana) (12) to prevent all chaos. And even to those who do not admit such an all-powerful Brahman as world-cause and

\[
\text{(11)} \quad \text{Citisvarūpaḥ svātmaiva tattadhāvātmanā sadā / bhāsat eva svācchandyasāktyā maḥāhikam vidyate kvacit //}
\text{Tripurā-sahasyatantra - 18. 40. 41.}
\]

\[
\text{(12)} \quad \text{esa eṣa seturvidharana esaṁ lokānāmasambhedāya/}
\text{Bṛhadāraṇyaka-Up. 4. 4. 22.}
\]
world-support, the potencies in the phenomenal objects are not entirely independent, because, they are moulded according to and regulated by the unseen previous actions of the jīvas.

The theistic Vedantins like Rāmānuja, Śrī Jīva, etc. also maintain that the supreme powers of Brahman, as well as potencies in phenomenal objects abide in their substratum and are subordinate to Brahman. But though the potencies of the external objects may sometimes be withheld or overpowered, the powers of Brahman cannot be withheld or overpowered by anything, since, they are quite natural (svābhāvika) to Him.

Again, unlike the Prābhākaras who hold potency to be inferable by its effects (kāryānmeyā śakti), and like the Bhāṭtas who hold potency as apprehensible only through arthāpatti (postulation), Śrī Jīva holds potency to be apprehensible only through arthāpatti which is never an inference or tarka. He supports his view by the authority of the Viṣṇupurāṇa where it is said - "Śaktyayah sarvabhāvānāmacintyajñānagocarāḥ" (12A).

After discussing the nature and status of Śakti or potency according to all the main different schools of Indian thinkers, we shall now discuss the unique nature and status of Śakti as maintained by Śrī Jīva.

Śrī Jīva has not entered into any controversial discussion about the existence of Śakti. He has admitted the existence and predominance of Śakti on the authority of the Śruti, Brahmasūtras,

---

(12A) Viṣṇupurāṇa - 6. 3. 2.
Visnu-Purana, and other scriptural texts. Amongst other sources of valid knowledge he admits arthapatti or postulation as the testimony to admitting sakti both in the phenomenal objects, and in the Ultimate Reality - the supreme Lord.

In fact, Sri Jīva’s unique conception of the relation of sakti and saktimat indicates his originality in the conception of sakti, and also places him in a distinguished position amongst the schools of philosophy.

Sri Jīva has placed sakti in an important role in his philosophy. To him this world is the display of His māyā-sakti which is also known as vahirangā sakti, because, the outer-glory of the Lord as the universe is manifested and maintained by it. The jīva or individual souls are the expressions of His jīva-sakti or taṭasthā sakti. The other power which is known as svarūpa-sakti performs the highest role, and is supreme in its nature. It is supreme because it is almost identical with the Lord, and is intrinsic to Him. In fact, it is svarūpa-sakti which accounts for His supreme Lord-hood (Bhagavattā), and is directly related with the Lord. With the help of this power the Lord enacts His drama eternally in the immaterial plane with His eternal associates, and thus enjoys Himself eternally.

It is also found that with this svarūpa-sakti the Lord maintains His transcendent nature, and is the seer or knower of all his creation. It is by His power of illumination (citsakti or svarūpa-sakti) that everything illumined. The bodies, sense-organs and the minds of all jīvas also function by attaining consciousness.
derived from Him (13). Thus, by His consciousness He is the propeller of everything else. The Śruti-texts which declares that "there is no seer other than He", means that though there are other seers like the jīvas, they are not independent (svayam-siddha) seers, but are subordinate to the ultimate seer - the Lord. Again, by his cit-śakti (svārūpa-śakti) He also controls the three guṇas of māyāśakti attached to the jīvas, and as kāla or time He controls both the causes and the effects in the creation of the universe. It is also to be understood that while the bodies, the vital airs, the sense-organs or the elements, etc. can neither know themselves, nor know others, the jīvas can know both themselves as well as other things different from them. But still, jīva cannot know the omniscient Lord who is the knower of all. But the Lord by the virtue of His supreme cit-śakti knows everything else as well as His own self (14).

With regard to the creation of the world the jīvas, the Lord (Paramātman) takes the help also of His svārūpa-śakti. In fact it is the svārūpa-śakti of the Lord which activates the māyā-śakti to create the world for the sake of the jīvas, and also initiates the taṭāstha-śakti for the creation of the jīvas. None of these two powers such as māyāśakti and taṭāsthaśakti can function for themselves without being directed by the svārūpa-śakti.

Besides, we know, the Lord who is Advaya-jñānatattva reveals

(13) Bhagavat-sandarbha - Page 43 (5.4)
(14) Tattvāt-sarvadraṣṭram evastraṣṭvam evastraṣṭvampyasti
Ibid - Page 47 (Satyarupa Goswami)
Himself into three divine aspects as Brahman, Paramātman and Bhagavat with His svarūpa-(antarāṅga) sākta which is directly related to Him.

The other two powers i.e. māyāsākta and the tatasthā sākta are not directly related with Bhagavat, because, in this aspect the Lord has no concern whatsoever with the phenomenal order, and is only engaged in the joys of His immaterial plane with His eternal associates. For this reason, it should be noted, that Śrī Jīva depicts svarūpaśākta as antarāṅga, jīvaśākta as tatasthā, and māyāśākta as vahirāṅga. Since the Lord has no direct concern with the functions of jīvaśākta and māyāśākta they are tatasthā or marginal, and vahirāṅga or extraneous respectively. It may be mentioned in this connection that Baladeva, though he has mentioned the sāktis as paraśākta, jīvaśākta and avidyāśākta according to the descriptions of the Viṣṇu-Purāṇa, he has not described them as antarāṅga, tatasthā and vahirāṅga with their significant meanings.

While Śrī Jīva calls the jīvaśākta as tatasthā or marginal because of its not being included in either of the Lord Himself and the world (ubhayakotau apraviṣṭatvāt), Baladeva does not state anything about the marginality of jīvaśākta. On the other hand Baladeva states somewhat differently that the Lord with paraśākta is the nīmitta or the efficient cause of the world, and the Lord with kṣetrajñāśākta and māyāśākta is the upādāna or the stuff of the world. (15).

(15) Vedāntasyamantaka – 2. 9-10. (Shyamlal Gosvāmin, ed.)
Now the manifestation of Bhagavat as Brahman though accomplished through svarūpa-śakti is but an imperfect manifestation of the Lord in which He is not apprehended as a śaktimat possessing śakti. Or, in other words, in this manifestation of Brahman śakti remains undifferentiated from Śaktimat. And, therefore, Brahman is not apprehended as functioning through any śakti. But, Paramātman who is the partial manifestation of Bhagavat is the creator, sustainer and dissolver of the creations. So, these māyā-śakti and tatastha-śakti are directly concerned with Paramātman and indirectly with Bhagavat who is the source of all.

In the Bhagavat-sandarbha Śrī Jīva emphasizes that these powers do not stand by themselves but reside in Bhagavat as their substratum (tāṣāmekaṁ nidhānam).

He says in accordance with a Bhāgavat-sūtra that Lord is the repository of these various different powers which performs their respective functions according to His sweet will (16) and not independently. Therefore, it shows that the powers of the Lord are under His full control. He is the Lord to them. The peculiarity of the Gaudīyas is that they consider that aspect to be the highest Reality in which the manifestation of the powers especially of svarūpa-śakti is in its perfect display. This has been manifested in the yugalamūrti in which the Lord is in eternal embrace with Rādhā (who is the embodiment of the essence of śakti His svarūpa-śakti). This union signifies the deepest love and

(16) Svavavarge uttama-madhya-kaniṣṭhabhāvena vartamānā vividha-śaktayaḥ śivāyā śivāya ... yadāśritya anisam ... Svavavāyāparyam kurvanti ītyarthah -..-..-..-
Bhagavat-sandarbha - Page 29 (Satyananda Gosvamin Ed.)
excelling sweetness which is also the most significant point of meditation to the Gauḍīya school.

However, we find that Śrī Jīva Gosvāmin does not only admit ṣakti, but he lays the highest importance to it. Moreover, he recognises the reality of the ṣaktis and of their manifestations as the world and the jīvas, unlike the Śankarite Advaitins.

The Absolute has been described as the root cause of everything. The effects which we experience as the phenomenal order are caused by Him. He is both the material cause, as well as the efficient cause. Actually the powers of the Lord and not the substance display themselves as the phenomenal world and the individual souls.

In this point the Gauḍīyas are different from the Nimbārka and Rāmānuja schools who hold that the world is the modification of Brahman Himself. Thus, the modifications of the powers do not disturb the integrity of His transcendent Being. Therefore, the ṣakti-paripāramāvāda of the Gauḍīyas explains the reality of the creations, as well as maintains the transcendence of the Ultimate Reality undisturbed. Regarding the means of apprehension of potency or ṣakti Śrī Jīva refers to the Viṣṇu-Purāṇa and says that they are "acintya-jñāna-gocarāh" i.e. they are apprehended by a means of knowledge which is beyond reasoning - beyond the jurisdiction of inference. Both Śrīdhara and Śrī Jīva state that this
acintya-jñana refers to arthapatti or postulation (17) which is tarkasaha i.e. a kind of valid knowledge which transcends reasoning, because of being not included in inference. We do not apprehend any potency or sakti directly, i.e. we do not perceive sakti in any substratum. But we perceive the effects of potency as different products and manifestations. As these effects cannot be explained otherwise (karyasya anyathāṃṇapatyā) we postulate that there must be potency in the causes which enables the causes to produce such effects. As in the case of phenomenal objects, so also in the case of the supreme Lord His sakti or powers are to be apprehended in the same way through arthapatti or postulation.

(17) Arthāpatti or postulation is a kind of valid knowledge (or its means) in which we presume or postulate some fact only by way of explaining another fact of experience; e.g. when we see that Devadatta is getting fat day by day even without taking food at day time, we presume or postulate that he must be taking food at night, because the fact of his being fat without taking food at day time cannot be otherwise explained. So kāryasya anyathāṃṇapatyā - as the effect (of being fat) cannot be otherwise explained - his taking of food at night is postulated. The word śpati in arthāpatti means kalpanā - presumption. But Naiyāyikas and some others include arthāpatti in negative inference (vyati-rekān umiti) arguing that the process of arthāpatti involves some negative premises which may easily lead to negative inference. But Śrī Jīva like the Bhāṭṭas and the Advaitins does not include arthāpatti in inference, but regards it to be a kind of knowledge which is beyond the jurisdiction of reasoning and inference. Arthāpatti may be of two kinds (1) drṣṭārthāpatti i.e. presumption from the data of experience, (2) śrutārthāpatti i.e. presumption from the data given by the śrutī-texts.
Though we do not perceive either the Lord or His powers, we perceive the effects and manifestations such as the world and the jivas in various forms. And through scriptures we also know of the eternal divine dhāmans or realms, and the parikaras or divine associates of the Lord. All these effects and manifestations, as they cannot be otherwise explained, lead us to postulate or presume through arthāpatti-pramāṇa (17A) certain powers in the Lord which enable Him to manifest as those effects, in the form of the world, the jivas, and the divine domains and associates. It may be noted here that when we postulate anything on the basis of sense-data it is called drṣṭartha-pāṭṭi. The divine realms and associates which are not perceived by our senses, are known by us only from the scriptures. So, postulation of His svarūpa-ākāti from such scriptural data is a pure case of Srutārtha-pāṭṭi.

It is needless to state that the supreme powers of the Lord are apprehended through Śruti-pramāṇa or scriptural authority. The Śrutis like "parāsyā śaktir vividhaiva śṛṣyate", "devatma-śaktim sagunamigniḥḥam", and the Brahma-sūtras like "śrutastu śabdamulatvāt", "atmani caivaṃ vicitraśc aḥ", and many Viṣṇu-Purāṇa and Bhāgavata texts speak of his supreme powers.

Thus, through textual authority and through arthāpatti-pramāṇa various powers are apprehended to be abiding in the supreme Lord. In a Bhāgavata verse the Lord has been described as one in whom

(17A) The word arthāpatti applies both to postulation and its source (pramāṇa) - being derived respectively as arthasya āpattih - i.e. assumption of the fact, and as arthasya āpattih yasmāt - i.e. that (source) from which the fact is postulated.
pointedly contradictory powers reside (18). Not only the Bhāgavata and other scriptures declare those powers to be contradictory, but they may also be postulated to be contradictory through arthāpatti-pramāṇa by observing contradictory effects in the manifestations like the jīvas and the world.

So Śrī Jīva also draws our attention to the fact that though the powers reside in the same substratum - the Lord, they are different and contradictory in their nature and modifications. This has been fully justified by his conception of the three powers existing in the Lord. We find that the effects of māyā-śakti are absolutely different in nature and characteristics from the effects of svarūpa-śakti.

In the modifications of māyā-śakti we find materiality and mutability, whereas in the modification of svarūpa-śakti like svarūpa-vaiōbha, etc., we find consciousness, eternity, and immutability. Moreover, the impact of svarūpa-śakti on the jīvas and on this material world is to impart existence, consciousness and bliss; but, the impact of māyā-śakti on the jīvas is fascinating and deluding them towards wordliness making them adverse to their Lord.

Tatāstha-śakti or jīva-śakti by which the jīvas are manifested as conscious parts (citkāṇa) possesses a peculiar characteristic of being liable to be swayed away into the domain of the māyā-śakti which is the external power of the Lord. Again,

(18) "Samrāddhaviruddha-śaktaye" - Bhāgavata - 4. 17. 33.
it may also be able to have access into the realm of svarūpa-śakti — the intrinsic power of the Lord, when the jīvas realise their essential nature as the eternal servant of the Lord. Thus, Śrī Jīva's conception of the powers fully justify the statement of the Bhāgavata that the powers are contradictory. But the existence of contradictory characteristics or powers in the same locus is a logical impossibility. So the Bhāgavata describes the powers also as 'atarkya' i.e. supralogical, declaring that the Lord is "ātmesvaro'tarkyasahasraśaktih" (19).

Śrī Jīva also admits the view of the Bhāgavata that those powers though contradictory, reside in the same Lord because of being 'acintya' or 'atarkya'. The meaning of this statement is that, though it is true that the contradictory attributes or powers cannot logically stand in the same substratum at the same time, and so the existence of contradictory powers in the Lord as their substratum denies logical reasoning, yet it should be understood that the logic of the finite does not hold good on the infinite Lord — the ultimate principle of Reality.

Besides, Śrī Jīva states that these powers of the Lord are acintya, i.e. unthinkable also because they are capable of bringing about unthinkable effects (durghata—ghatakatva). With these powers the Lord assumes four-fold forms (20) in spite of maintaining his essential nature as one. It is by His svarūpa-śakti that

(19) Bhāgavata - 3. 33. 3.
(20) Bhāgavata-sandarbha - Page 33.
He remains in His essential form as svayam-krṣṇa and manifests Himself in His svarūpa-vaibhava as Nārāyaṇa, Vaikuṇṭha – the eternal domain, parikara – the eternal associates, etc. Again in His eternal glory during the marriage of the queens (mahīṣī-vivāha) and during the mahārasa the Lord enjoys in various ways assuming various forms at different places simultaneously. Such assuming of various forms in spite of maintaining His essential nature as one, is possible only by the unthinkable (acintyatva) characteristic of His svarūpa-śakti.

By His taṭasthā-śakti He manifests Himself as jīvas, and by His māyā-śakti manifests Himself as the phenomenal world. In these manifestations also the Lord maintains His integrity by the inconceivable nature of His svarūpa-śakti.

Śrī Jīva describes these four-fold forms in the following way: just as the tejas of the Sun exists in the sun-disc, and in the sun-rays outside the disc, and also in the reflections of the Sun, so also Brahman the Absolute through His different acintya-śakti remains in all of His four-fold forms – svarūpa, vaibhava, jīva and pradhāna, svarūpa and vaibhava both being the manifestation of His svarūpa-śakti. Though manifestations of different nature of the all-pervasive Brahman are not logically possible yet it has been possible through the unthinkable natural power of the Lord which is capable of bringing unthinkable effects. It may be concluded in brief that as the powers of the Lord are postulated through arthāpatti pramāṇa, and as they are 'acintya' in nature, so we cannot account for the 'how' and 'why'
about the existence and functions of these powers.

Now, Śrī Jīva states that these powers of the Lord do not only possess the characteristic of being acintya or supralogical, but also possess the characteristic of being svābhāvika. By svābhāvika he means that these powers are natural to Him and not adventitious or superimposed.

In order to prove that the powers are natural he refers to the Bhāgavata where it is described that Brahman is sat and asat, and beyond both (21).

According to Śrī Jīva this means that He is the effect (sat) as the gross existences, like earth, water, air, etc., and He is the cause (asat) as the subtle existence like prakṛti. He is also superior (param) to both these existences in His essential nature in the immaterial eternal plane like vaikunṭha and also as suddha jīvas.

In order to explain Śrī Jīva says that Lord Himself has become the gross existence and the subtle existences by the māyā-śakti, and this manifestation is described as the outer glory or vahiraṅga-vaibhava of the Lord. Again, the Lord manifests his svarūpa-vaibhava as vaikunṭhas or divine realms where Lord remains in His essential nature by His svarūpa-śakti. The individual jīvas which are distinct from and superior to the gross and subtle existences being conscious in their nature, and are different from the transcendent supreme aspect of the Lord, have been described

(21) Bhāgavata - 11. 3. 37.
as taṭastha-vaibhava or marginal manifestation.

This is called taṭastha-vaibhava because the Lord by His taṭastha-śakti manifests Himself in the form of jīvas.

Śrī Jīva emphasizes that these powers are natural to the Lord as declared in the Śruti-texts—"śvāvikī jñāna-bala-kriyā ca" (22).

The import of this assertion is that these powers are not adventitious or superimposed. If they would have been imaginary or superimposed powers, the manifestations of those powers would not have been His manifestations, but would have been appearances or vivarta as some others hold.

Again, Śrī Jīva holds that in the beginning He was one, and later on in course of His creations He Himself has become cosmic intelligence, cosmic life, and cosmic ego gradually. It cannot be said that these manifestations are due to any adjunct because in the beginning there could be no adjunct available when He was alone. Therefore, the manifestations being real it follows that these powers are natural to the Lord and not superimposed.

Moreover, in order to establish the suprema cy of the powers of the Lord, Śrī Jīva says that the powers of the Lord are never restricted or destroyed by anything else. In the phenomenal world the powers of the phenomenal objects are sometimes withheld

(22) Śvetāsvatara-Upaniṣad. 6.20.
or destroyed by other superior kinds of phenomenal powers, however, natural they may be. But in the case of Brahman it is quite different.

The Śruti declares "ṁa tat samaścābhayadhikāścā drṣṭyate" (23) which means that Brahman is the greatest Being which has no superior or equal to It. This also indicates the superiority of His powers. Because, the powers with which He is great must also be great; and so His powers cannot be restricted or destroyed by anything.

Śrī Jīva further states that these powers are not only natural but are also non-different (24) from His essence.

The knowledge of this non-difference is the clue to the understanding of the relation of śakti and śaktimāt. In order to establish the relation of śakti to śaktimāt Śrī Jīva Gosvāmin says that whenever we think of an entity or reality, we think of it as some substratum with its śakti or potency, e.g. when we think of fire we think of it with its powers of light and heat.

In fact, an entity as a whole is constituted of both the substratum and its powers which are like attributes of the substratum. But still, the entity must be understood as possessing the substratum and the powers distinctly. Though śakti is in a sense identical with the substratum (śaktimāt) still śakti must be

(23) Śvetāsvatara-Up. 6.8.
(24) Svabhāvabhūtaḥ svarūpādabhinnah/
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thought of as something distinct from the ākārmat. For, otherwise when some substance (viz. fire) is found with some of its powers overpowered or withheld due to something else (e.g. gems or chanting mantras), that substance would not have been found or said to be existing in the absence of its power.

Śakti is no doubt identical with the substratum being part and parcel to constitute the whole of the entity or the reality, but it is different as well.

If śakti would have been absolutely identical with the ākārmat, śakti would not extend and function even outside the ākārmat. The light and the heat of a lamp are found functioning outside the lamp. Besides, we cannot perceive Brahman in any way; but we can perceive the functioning effects of His śakti all over the universe. This also proves that His śakti is different from Him. Again, it is found that a single substance possesses various powers; this also proves that the powers or śakti is different from the substance (25).

Thus, śakti is both identical with and different from Ākārmat - the supreme Lord. But this is logically impossible - abheda and bheda being entirely contradictory. But the Gaudīya school holds this relation of śakti to Ākārmat is acintya - unthinkable or supralogical. This identity-in-difference is the relation of śakti to Ākārmat even in the case of phenomenal objects.

By admitting such relation of bhedābheda of śakti to śaktimati the Gauḍīya vaisnavas have solved many difficulties in maintaining their position with regard to the nature of the Ultimate Reality.

It is also due to this bheda, that the Lord functions through his jīvaśakti and māyaśakti to manifest as the jīvas and the world, and yet maintains His essential transcendental nature and His perfect glory through His svarūpa-śakti or citēakti. Because of the identity (abheda) in the relation all the manifestations and activities are conceived to be His manifestations and activities; and because of the difference (bheda) in the relation the modifications and impurities of jīvaśakti and māyaśakti do in no way affect His transcendental essential nature. In other words, their doctrine as śaktiparīṇāma enables them to explain the integrity and purity of the supreme Lord in spite of all the impurities in the world. Śakti-parīṇāma-vāda also renders them a distinctive position as contrasted with the Rāmānujites and the Sankarites who uphold Brahma-parīṇāma-vāda and Brahma-vivartavāda respectively.

According to Brahma-vivartavāda of the Śankarites, śakti with all its modifications and manifestations is but an appearance of Brahman, and is consequently inscrutable (anirvacanīya) or false. The relation of śakti to śaktimati is also, according to them, inscrutable in the sense that śakti is neither definable as identical with, nor as different from śaktimat. To the Śankarites such inscrutability means falsity.
Again, according to Brahma-parināma-vāda of Rāmānuja and others, creation or manifestation of the universe is a modification of Brahman Himself.

Brahman according to them is qualified One with all souls and nature as His body i.e. attributes or śakti according to them is part and parcel, and identical with Brahman. At the time of dissolution He is said to be kāraṇa-Brahman (Brahman as cause), while at the time of creation He Himself is said to be kārya-Brahman (Brahman as effect). Thus, Rāmānuja according to Śrī Jīva, has in a way admitted some vikāra or modification of Brahman thereby disturbing the integrity of His essence. But by admitting modification of śakti and not of the Lord Himself, Śrī Jīva has maintained the essential integrity of the Lord. But again if this śakti were absolutely identical with Paramātman, the modification of śakti would mean modification of the Lord Himself. So, it is found that by admitting the supralogical relation of identity-in-difference, Śrī Jīva has maintained his distinctive position by averting the shortcomings which in his view are contained in Brahma-Parināma-vāda of Rāmānuja.

On the other hand, he has averted the defect in Brahma-vivartavāda holding the universe as false and unreal which, according to Śrī Jīva, is neither supported by reason nor by the Šruti. The world being real manifestation of māyāśakti is not false.

It may be said in this context without hesitation that the conceptions of the Ultimate Reality, and of the status of the world
depend to a great extent on the nature of the relation of śakti and śaktimat. Though it is found that the Śaṅkarites and the Gauḍīyas are both advaitins, yet they differ as polar opposites regarding the nature of the Ultimate Reality, and the status of the world. While to the Śaṅkarites it is impossible to admit attributes in the Absolute who is indeterminate One, to the Gauḍīyas the Ultimate Reality is the Absolute with His eternal powers in their fullest manifestations.