Chapter VI

The Concept of Śakti

The concept of Śakti is one of the central concepts of Trika philosophy. It differs from the same concept in the Nyāya and the Mīmāṃsā systems. Śakti is not recognised as a Padārtha in the Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika school. But its epistemological signification has been somewhat recognised. But it has been resolved as "Kāraṇatāvacchedakatva" in general. If śakti as a padārtha is recognised then it will lead to infinite śakties according to the Naiyāyikas. Therefore, the character by which a collocation of conditions lead to the production of the effects is practically what others call the Śakti. So Udayana says: "atha śakti - niṣedhe kim pramāṇam ? na kiṁcit / tat kimastyeva ? bārham / na hi no darsane Śaktipadārtha eva nāsti / Ko'sau tarhi ? Kāraṇatvam"/1 what is the proof in negating śakti ? Nothing. Then what is it ? Well, in our philosophy we do not altogether deny śakti. Then what is it ? It is nothing but kāraṇatva or the quality of being a cause, so according to the Naiyāyikas there is no śakti other than kāraṇatva. So there is no different types of Śakti.
According to the Mīmāṃsākas, Śakti is a semi-metaphysical concept. The fire burns. But it does not burn when the counter-acting condition is present. But when the counter-acting condition is removed, it burns. How? It is because in the absence of counter-acting condition a power is generated in fire by virtue of which it burns. Hence we should take Śakti as a separate padārtha according to the Mīmāṃsākas. Further, according to the Mīmāṃsakas, the sacrifices performed at a particular point of time results in the attainment of desired effect such as, heaven etc. There is gap of time. Hence some factors must be admitted which is responsible for the production of the effect. This is 'apurva' as Śakti which contains potentially the result which is produced later on.

The power of words indicating their respective objects as an epistemological concept is however recognised in the different systems of philosophy, such as, Pāṇini, Nyāya, Mīmāṃsā etc. The Nyāya also calls it 'Saṃketa'. A word uttered has the power to indicate either the universal or the particular or both. On this point the philosophers differ.

In the context of the above discussion we find an altogether new idea of Śakti in the monistic systems of Śaiva and Śākta. It is supremely a metaphysical idea and one of the ultimate categories of Reality. It is inherent
in the very structure and constitution of the Ultimate Reality. In the Śākta form of momism śakti is the supreme category and is indistinguishable from, and indissolubly existent in Śiva. The evolution of the universe is a projection and evolution of Śakti. It is the ground of objectivity or idantā in Śiva who is perfect egoity or ahantā. "... the Supreme Brahma is not a mere knowing without trace of objectivity. In it the Aham is the Self as cit and the Idam is provided by Cidrūpinī - Śakti .... Śakti is always the object of the self and one with it. For the object is always the self, since there is nothing but the self". ²

In the Trika system the Ultimate Reality is termed as Parama-Śiva. He is transcendent or Viśvottirṇa and immanent or Viśva-maya. The Śakti in the transcendent stage is indistinguishable and identically asleep in the Parama-Śiva and this state is beyond all conceptions or descriptions. The Śiva at this stage is termed as anuttara or beyond which there is nothing. The concept of śakti is distinguished in the immanent stage i.e., when the relation of Parama-śiva with the creation is considered. The concept of Śakti in relation to the concept of Śiva is very difficult to grasp. The Reality and its essence may be considered as evolving a duality (bheda) or as a duality in unity (bhedābheda) or as complete unity or identity (Abheda). The Trika concept of Śiva and Śakti involve neither bheda nor bhedābheda, but identity or abheda. The different Trika writers have made
terrible efforts to explain this fact. Whether identity is relation or not is a debatable question, for relation involves at least two terms. On the metaphysical point of view the Śiva and Śakti or the Ultimate Reality and its essence as consciousness are not two terms in relation but two aspects of the same Reality recognised as two concepts for human understanding. The Ultimate Reality is not material or jaḍa, but is conscious or cidrūpa. But for consciousness as its essence or self-consciousness it would be material or jaḍa. A consciousness that is not conscious of itself is unthinkable. Hence the Ultimate Reality is a conscious consciousness or self-conscious. The usual manner of describing self-consciousness is by the differentiation of the subject and the object or the Aham and the Idam, where Aham and Idam are two different objects. The Ultimate Reality or Parama-Śiva is perfect egoity or Pūrṇāhantā or Pūrṇāham. For Him the Aham is also Idam, for He Himself is both the subject and the object. The entire creation is He. The self contains in itself the saṃskāras which are evolved by it in dream or imagination. The saṃskāras are the self and nothing other than itself. There is no other basis. The Trika philosophers used very often the analogy of a mirror and its reflection. The reflection in the mirror is nowhere else than in the mirror. So also the objects are nowhere else than in the Parama Śiva. But in case of the mirror or the jewel the external objects are the cause of the reflection and hence
they are jaḍa or material. But in the Supreme Reality, the cause of the reflection is the basis or substratum of the self itself and herein lies the difference between the two. As Pratyabhijñā-hṛdayam says - "Śvecchāyā Svabhittau viśvam unmilayati".  

In Advaita Vedānta we find the viśayī and viṣaya, the subject and the object, the self and the not-self are differentiated. The object or the dṛśya is a false superimposition on the self and is unreal. But there is a fundamental difference between the Vedānta concept and the Trika concept in this respect. The Trika Idealism is a Realistic Idealism in which the draśta and the dṛśya possess the same metaphysical status, for the draśta is dṛśya and the dṛśya is draśta. All dṛśyas are manifestations or ābhāsas of the draśta and in every ābhāsa the universal consciousness is inalienably present. All the universal consciousness of the Parama Śiva just as every saṃskāra in the self is nothing but a form of the self itself.

The Parama Śiva in the Trika system is Prakāśa-vimarśa-mayaḥ. He is Mahāprakāśāvapuḥ. All revelations follow from Him. The Tantrasāraḥ says: "ekaev ca prakāśah, sa eva ca Saṃvit/ .... Sa ca prakaso na parataṁтраḥ".  

The revelation is one i.e., consciousness, that consciousness is not dependent upon anything else "Śvataṁtra ekaḥ prakāśaḥ .... vyāpako nityaḥ Sarvākāranirākārasvabhāvaḥ/". The revelation is
independent and one. It is all-pervasive, eternal, of the nature of all forms and is also formless. This independence or Svātantra or sovereignty is the essence of Śiva. It has further been said in Tantrasāraḥ : "Svatantram ānandaghanaṁ tattvaṁ tadeva ca aham /...tatraiva antarmayi viśvaṁ prativi-mvitam". The Paramā Śiva is sovereign, the bliss consolidated, the reality i.e., also aham. In Him the world is reflected.

The Prakāśa and the Vimarśa are not two different realities but the two aspects of the same Reality. Prakāśa is the basis or source of revelation and Vimarśa is the seed of revelation or revelation. The revelation of Śive and the revealer or the Śiva Himself are not different—the same Reality viewed from two points of view. This power of consciousness or the power of revelation is independent (sovereign) and this makes Śiva Pūrṇahantā or pure aham and not an absolutely attributeless reality. So it is said :

"citiḥ pratyavamarśātmā parāvāk svarasodita/svātantryam etat mukhyam tad aśvāryam parameśituḥ". The cit, the Ultimate Reality, is of the essence of pratyavamarśa or eternal consciousness. It is also called parāvāk. It is ultimate and independent and is not an evolute or projection, this is svātantrya and it is the supreme character of the Paramātma. The word 'pratyavamarśātmā' indicates the vimarśa aspect of the Parama Śiva. Svātantrya, cit, ānanda
are the different names identical in essence with vimarśā. The Trika also calls it Parāväk.

As we have seen, Śakti is the central concept of the Trika system, the Trika philosophers lay much emphasis on the two treaties of Mālinīvijaya or Mālinīvijayottara and the Śri-Vijñānabhairava in respect of the concept of Śakti. The Mālinīvijayottara considers that Parama Śiva and Śakti are of the same or similar characters. "Tatresaḥ sarvakṛtsaṁtaḥ sarva-jñānaḥ sarvakṛt prabhuḥ / sakalo niṣkalo' anantaḥ sakti-rapyasya tadvidhā"/8 The Lord is the source of all absolute quiescence, omniscient, the Universal, transcendent and endless and the sakti also is of the same characters. In fact, Śiva and Śakti are nothing but the two aspects of the same Reality. They are non-distinguishable and blended in an eternal identity. The question of dualism or duality does not arise there. The same text also considers the sakti as samavāyini or inseparably associated with the creator of the world. It is the potent desire of the Lord to create. The Śri Vijñānabhairava after describing the nature of Bhairava considers the same Reality as Parādevi or Śakti as parāpara. "Sā parāpararūpeṇa parādevi prakīrtītā"9. "Śaktiśaktimatoryasmādbhedaḥ sarvvaḍa sthitāḥ / atastaddharmadharmitvāt parāsaktīḥ parātmanāḥ //10 One who is Bhairava is also Bhairavī. Śakti is the essence of Reality. They are like the fire and the burning power of fire. The thing is
known by the power. So the Lord is known by the essence. The distinction is pragmatic and not real. The Lord is to be known by the Śakti. Sphurattā or revelation is the means by which the Lord is to be understood. The Īśvara-Pratyabhijñā says "Sā sphurattā mahāsattā desākālāviṣeṣiṇī / Saiśāsāratayāproktā hṛdayaṁ parameśṭhinaḥ". She is the revelation, the great existence, independent of space and time. She is the heart and the essence of the Lord. She is again all-pervasive, absolute, the source of existence, beginningless, endless and inexhaustible.

Thus there cannot be any virtual distinction between the Lord and the Śakti, as we have seen Śiva is prakāśa-vimarsa-mayaḥ i.e., of the nature of revelation and self-consciousness. The word 'samavāyini' implies a kind of relative duality, but it is because in our conception we make a pragmatic distinction between the thing as possessor and the attribute as possessed; but it is, in fact, a case of identity. The Trika philosophers used the word 'Paramaśiva' and 'citi' indifferently to mean the same Reality. The Mālinīvijay-vārtik (979) also says "Śivaḥ avichyuta cidrūpah". The cit or the pure sentiency is never lost from the Śiva. Śakti has been called the pure cit, the pure sentiency. Reality is consciousness or sentiency or the energy of the pure sentiency or cit-Śakti. It is not unconscious, nor is consciousness a power embellish which takes away from the
absolute nature of the Lord or an attribute that determines the Ultimate Reality. The Upaniṣads also describe Lord as saccidānandam i.e. pure existence, consciousness and bliss as the essential character of the Lord. It is needless to interpret the essence of the Lord in a negative manner to retain the indeterminate or nirguṇa character of the Lord. For the word nirguṇa does not mean a blank or a void in the literal sense.

Śakti, in her transcendental state is immersed in the Paramāśīva as sleeping. This state has also been called the great void (mahāśūnya). It is the ultimate ground of all existence. As the Ultimate ground it is the source of all existence and reality. This state has also been called the svarūpaviśrānti, the eternal rest of the essence, the great, untroubled quiescent depth of the great ocean from which the bhāvarāśi, the existents proceed and in which they are ideally present.

We have seen the cit is not contentless but that in which all the contents are ideally present. Consciousness is not non-conscious but is self-conscious. This self-consciousness distinguishes the Lord as consciousness from dead materiality or unconsciousness. Hence self-consciousness is not a defect or deformity. In common philosophical parlance self-consciousness indicates either a dualism where the self and the not-self are totally apart from each other or the
duality of subject and object created in a process within the heart of the central reality. In both cases it is a form of limitation and hence self-consciousness has been denied in the conception of a nirguṇa Bharman. The Advaita, to avert this difficulty, interpretes the conscious character of the Lord in a negative manner simply to avoid the blemish of characterisation. But the Śivādvaita offers a better solution by identifying the absolute consciousness as self-consciousness which does not involve either a dualism or a duality. What is a consciousness that is not self-conscious? Is not consciousness at all. Unless there is the self-consciousness the consciousness cannot even be called consciousness. Hence in the ultimate analysis the transcendent consciousness is also self-conscious. This self-conscious character of the Ultimate Reality has been called the Vimarśa Śakti. That which is cit, is therefore, vimarśa also. This term has not been used in this sense by any other system of Indian Philosophy.

This power of vimarśa is the self-reflection of the Lord on Himself as the ideal ground of all existence which is in Himself. The Lord is ideally the ground, the existence and end of all existence and in this way He knows Himself as the perfect ego or pūrṇāhantā, the perfect egoity. The aham and the idam are not different or opposed to each other like light and darkness (tamaḥprakāśavat) or
contradictory (viruddha svabhāvaḥ) as Śamkara would say. The aham knows himself as idam. The 'I' is the 'I am'. So Punyānanda in his Kāmakalāvilāsa says: "Svātmasātkṛtākhilaprapancaḥ paripūrṇāham bhāvanāgarbhitaḥ athavā jagaduṭpattisthitilaya—hetubhutākṛtrimāham iti parāmarsaḥ vimarsaḥ". The entire existence is ideally in the Lord. He is implicitly and ideally the perfect ego, is the ideal ground of the creation, maintenance and destruction, is the pure aham and this kind of parāmarsa or ahambhāva as the 'I am' is the Vimala which is only another name of the cit. Thus cit and vimarsa are not two different things or characters, but the words used to denote the same Reality. So Abhinava says: "citihpratyavamarṣatma".

The word 'pratyavamarṣa' has also been interpreted by Abhinava as 'S evade' which means the ideal source of all empirical words. The empirical words are always accompanied by indication of something meant by them or the saṃketa. The Parāvāk is independent of Saṃketa, the eternal logos from which the words distinguishing the empirical objects proceed. It is the ideal murmur or the sleeping voice, the root of all existence in its complete rest, paripūrṇa viśrānti. It is the transcendental principle of the pure being or Śiva. It is the parāvāk of the Vaiyākaraṇa, the source of limitless manifestation. This constitutes the 'I'-ness or ahantā of the Lord. Vimarsa is the subjectivity while time and space constitute objectivity or idantā, but vimarsa or parāvāk containing within itself the seed of time and space is itself
beyond time and space. In this state and process there is a difference-in-non-difference or bhedabheda vyavasthā in which the same subject manifests as infinite subjects positing infinite objects, but the ground, the eternal subject remains the same. Thus the manifestation proceeds with pramātṛbheda. Several witnesses witnessing the dance of a dancing girl behave as one in respect of the witnessing and enjoying of the dance.

The vimarsa has actually been called the svātantryaśakti of the Lord. For this concept of 'Svātantra' Abhinava appears to be indebted to Pānini, according to whom, "Svatantraḥ kartā prayojakaḥ". The agent is independent and he is the initiator of Kartṛtva-śakti, the power of agency. The Lord is the agent, the agency and the Karma. The prakāśya is the prakāśātmā (prakāśātmā prakāśyortho). Even the objects of the dream are the same as the dream. Pratynbhijnā says, "ātmāta eva caitanyaṁ cit kriyā cītiḥ Kartṛtā / tātparyeṇoditastena jaḍātma hi vilakṣānaḥ "//. The caitanya is cit kriyā, the function of the caitanya and is also cit-kartṛtva, the conscious agency. This makes it different from the non-conscious objects. The Vimarśinī says, "cītiḥ pratyavamarśātmā parāvāk svarasoditā / svātantrynametat mukhyaṁ tadaiśvaryam paramesītubh"/. The consciousness is of the nature of pratyavamarśā. It is the parāvāk, independent and this svātantrya or independence of the Lord is the chief excellence of the Lord. So also Abhinava in his
Tantrālokaḥ says, "aham pratyavamarśātmā svātantryaśaktirevā syāsti". So this svātantra is the aham pratyavamarśā or the sense of perfect egoity of the Lord who is paripūrṇa aham. Abhinava takes the word 'pratyavamarśā' as śabdana which means the logos. The objects are the manifestations of the ideas and the ideas are dormant in the thinker. So the logos and its manifestations are eternally sleeping in the Lord making it His essence which is identical with the Lord. The Mālinīvijayavārtik (979) says, "Śivaḥ avicyuta cidrūpāś tissrastatsaktayastuyāḥ / tāḥ svātantryavasopāttagrahitṛgraḥyarūpīkāṁ"//. The subjects and the objects, the pramātā and the prameya, are evolved from within His being and this is the inalienable essence of the Lord. In other systems, the objects are different from the thinker and they have an independent source like the prakṛti or the atom or the ajñāna. But in this system the objects are the thinker himself or evolved by the subject from within His being. So it is a kind of transcendental subjectivism. The Lord is the subject in all subjects. Let us take the case of witnessing the dance of a dancing girl. Inspite of certain empirical differences in respect of the body etc. all the subjects are identical in enjoying the dance. There is sa samyojana or integration as well as viyojana or difference. All these factors are according to the will of the Lord cikĪrṣārūpā or the creative will of the Lord and in respect of this creative will the Lord of consciousness is not bound
by any external factor. Herein lies the svātantrya-śakti of the Lord, which being identical in meaning with cit and vimāra, is the chief characteristic of the Lord. The Īśvara-pratyabhiñā (5th Âhnika) says, "parāmarśa lakṣaṇām tu svātantryam yadi bhavati tadā upapadyate sarvvaṃ / parāmarśo hi cikīṛṣārūpā icchā tasyānca sarvvaṃantar- bhutam nirmanēvyamahedārūpeṇ āste "//. The svātantrya is defined by parāmarśa. This is the desire of the Lord to create and in this desire all that is to be created remains in identical relation. So Tantrasāraḥ also says, "Svatantra ekaḥ prakāśāḥ / svātantryādevacac desākālākārā vacchedavirohāt vyapakonītyah sarvākāranirākārasvabhāvāḥ / tasya ca svātan- tryam ānanda śaktiḥ". The revelation or manifestation is eternally unconditioned in the Lord by which the Lord is both formless as well as of universal forms. This svātantrya has also been called ānandaśakti, it is where the Lord takes rest (nijānanda viśrānta). This svātantrya which is the Supreme Cause and ground of all existence is also called the 'māyā-śakti' of the Lord (Paramesvāryasāvāntryameva nimittat yat, tat māyā-śakti-rucyate). 'Svātantrya' is the ground of revelation and is the māyā-śakti of the Lord (citi tattvasya eva svātantryam māyā-śakti). All these go to show that to account for the origin of the world including the distinction between the infinite subjects and the infinite objects should be sought not in any extraneous factors as the other philosophers have sought, but in the ahaṅka or the egoity
of the Lord. This ahantā or the aham is not the ahamkāra of the Advaitins nor the ahamartha of the Viśiṣṭādvaitins which means individual subjecthood; but is the original essence of the Lord Himself. In creation or revelation preceded by a differentiation of the finite subjects (pramātr-bhada-prathanapūrvvakam) the Lord is not bound by any other factor and herein lies His svātantrya which is also called the māyā-šakti. This śakti or power is called vyāpinirūpā, of the form of eternal pervasion; niśkala, a total one; jagatonidhi, the source of the world; anādyantā, without any beginning and end; and vyāyāhīnā or neverlost (sā ca ekā vyāpinIrūpā niśkalā jagatonidhiḥ / anādyantā śivesānī vyayaṁhīnā ca kathyate //). The words 'svātantra' and 'vimarsa' are entirely new concepts not found in the six orthodox schools in Indian Philosophy and it is by these concepts, that the Śaiva finds a universal key to unlock the door to the great world-mother or the śakti.

In fact, cit or pure sentiency, vimarsa or self-consciousness and svātantra, the supreme sovereignty and independence are the terms identical in their implication and indicate the supreme attribute of Paramaśiva and constitute the essence of the Lord. The two, the fire and its burning power, are identical; similarly, the distinction between the Paramaśiva and śakti is pragmatic. The two are identical. Only the fact is that one is to be understood by the help
of the other. So the Śrivijñānabhairava says -

"na vahnerdāhikāśaktirvyatirikta vibhāvyate / kevalāṁ jñānasattāyāṁ pṛāmbho'yaṁ praveśane"/.20

The last part 'pṛāmbho'yaṁ praveśane' means that to understand or to enter into the Lord, the sakti is the gate.

"Śaktyavasthāpraviṣṭasya nirvibhāgena bhāvana / tadāsaum śivarūpī syācchaivīmukhamihocyate"/.21

The sakti is Śaivismukha and the bhāvanā or contemplation should be by non-distinction of Śiva and Śakti.

(iii)

The concept of 'Śakti' has variously been studied from several points of view and in several ways by the Trika philosophers. It is, therefore, extremely difficult to systematize these views and to co-ordinate one view to the other. Our effort will be to put a few of these views in order to bring out a systematic exposition from the philosophical point of view. From the transcendental point of view the sakti has been described as cit or pure sentiency, ānandam or the essential delight, svātantrya or the absolute sovereignty and vimala or the self-consciousness of the Lord. Practically there is no essential difference among these concepts from the transcendental point of view. The difference
appears to be functional and all functions from this point of view are combined in the Lord and the diverse manifestations of the unitary consciousness. These diversities of concepts and functions are also due to the analytic and limited vision of the human intellect. They are identical and even in the identical stage of the transcendental status have also some grades which can not be realized by us from the human point of view.

The concept of 'svātantrya' or absolute sovereignty of the Lord or the śakti is the same as cit and it has been called ānanda-śakti by Abhinava in his Tantrasāraḥ ("tasya ca svātantryam ānandaśaktiḥ"). This svātantryam may be conceived in different ways. It is the universal delight of Lord. But delight in respect of what? It is His pure sentiency which is of the nature of vimarsa or self-consciousness. The self-consciousness involves a kind of duality and we may say this duality is one of aham and idam. The idantā according to Trika is not different from the ahamgarbhitaḥ. The Trika is a system of absolute monism where there is no second principle. So the idam is also nothing but the aham. The aham is idam and the idam is aham. As it has been said in the Pratyabhijñāhrdayam, "citiḥ svatantrā viśvasiddhi hetuḥ". The cit alone is the source of the entire manifestations. Creation and destruction are the unmeṣa and the nimeṣa of the single śakti. It is transcendentally concentrated in
the point of the cit which is anuttara, the vindu, viśrānti which is absolutely unconditioned, logically prior to the manifestation not exactly of the empirical universe but of the putting forth of self-consciousness itself. The śakti or the Lord is kartā or the agent in himself and by himself and not by the agency of any other factor. Herein lies the svātāntreya or the absolute independence of the Lord. Here Pānini-sūtra "svatantraḥ kartā prayojakaḥ" comes to the help of the Trika philosophers. But this svātāntreyaśakti is not a blank negation. It is not absolutely inactive but has in itself the power of unmeṣa, the manifestation of the idantā. The aham is, therefore, the idam which is unmanifested as an other. So the svātāntreya assumes the forms of I-consciousness where the 'I' is the subject and the 'I' is the object. It is the form of 'I am' and this is vimarsa. So the concept of cit and ānandam include the concept of svātāntreya and vimarsa. So the four-fold concepts of cit, ānando, vimarsa and svātāntreya are concentrated in the two concepts of cit and ānandam. Of course, Abhinava in his Tantrasāraḥ equates svātāntreya as ānandaśakti. It is the prakāśa which is not dependent. This single prakāśa is the saṃvīti or cit. The svātāntreya or ānandaśakti is the source of the other śakties. So Abhinava in his Tantrasāraḥ says—"vastutaḥ icchā-jñāna-kriyāśakti-yuktah anavacchinnah / prakāśo niñānandaviśrāntaḥ śivarūpah, sa eva svātāntreyāt ātmānaṁ saṃkucitaṁ avabhāsayaṁ aṇurūtyucyate /...punarapi
ca svātmānaṁ svatantratayā prakāśayati. So, for Abhinava, the concepts of cit, svātantrya, vimarśa and ānanda have the same connotation. From our point of view we make distinctions in the meanings of these concepts and in fact there is no distinction. The eternal state of rest of the Lord is at the same time the state of His self-consciousness and delight. It may be said to be a synthesis of "catuṣṭāpa Brahman" in which the waking, the dreaming, the sleeping and the turiya state are simultaneous and not in a temporal order. The idea is significant from the point of view of the sādhaka or one who is aiming at liberation. The sādhaka is to identify himself with the absolute sovereign delight of the Lord and to think that the entire universe is in him reflected and this kind of meditation ultimately leads to samāvesā or a steady residing in the Lord without the help of any extraneous factor. As Abhinava says in his Tantrasāraḥ—Lord does not reveal anything other than Himself, a thousand flames of fire reveal themselves and are not revealed by any other thing meaning any other upāya and thus meditating, the sādhaka enters in the Śiva in a moment ("upāyajālaṁ na śivāṁ prakāśayet, ghatena kiṁ bhāti sahasradhitiḥ / vivecayann ājat hamādarādarsanāḥ svayaṁ prakāśaṁ śivamāviśet kṣanāt"//.25
We have seen that the Reality can be conceived as para, parāpara and apara. The parāpara stage has got its root in the Para and extended in the apara or the phenomena. From the parāpara point of view or the transcendent in relation to the immanent empirical, the three manifestations of the Śakti has been described as icchā, jñāna and kriyā i.e., desire, knowledge and action. The parāmarśa which is essentially svātantrya assumes the form of icchā or desire which is the desire to create. The Īśvarapratyabhijñā of Utpala says, "parāmarśoḥ cikīrṣārūpā icchā tasyāḥ ca sarvvaṁ antarbhūtaṁ nirmātavyaṁ abhedarūpeṇa āste". The sustainer of the world assumes the desired nature of Him who desires to create. Here the things to be created exist in the Śakti as aham. It is sisrksā or the desire to create. But to create oneself as many is not something different from oneself (Sarvvaṁ abhedarūpeṇa āste). It is the creative functioning of the Śakti or the māyā-Śakti which stimulates from within her the stirring up of the ideal universe which was hitherto suppressed. The universe in this state is ideal and not put forth as other. It is the self-wonderment of 'I am' or 'I am this'. But 'this' here is not separate from the 'I'. There is no bheda, but there is a bhedāvabhāsa or an appearance of bheda or difference. The universe is ideal not yet empirical. It has reference to the idantā
in the uppermost level. The icchā-śakti is the source of the sadāśiva-tattva.

The jñāna-śakti or the power of knowledge involves the determination of our manifestation and the discrimination between that and the other i.e., apohanaḥ. The elements in the manifestation are determined here. The determination is as "it is 'this' and not 'that' ". It has also been called the āmarsa. As Mālinīvijayottara says "evametaḥ itijñeyāṁ nānyathethi suniścitaṁ / jñāpayantī jagatyatra jñānaśakti- rnigadyate".27

Abhinava in his Tantrasāraḥ says "sarvākārayogitvam kriyāśaktiḥ".28 The Lord has been said as also the Śakti as "sarvākāra nirākāra svabhāvaḥ". The multiplicity has got the identity and unity of the Lord implied in it. The Lord is sarvam. He is in the multiple forms, but as to what these multiple forms would be or what multiple forms the Lord will assume is effected by the Kriyāśakti. Although the Lord is free to create or assume the forms of the myriad of universes and their objects, yet there is a determination emerging from the freedom of the Lord in the form 'let this be so'. So the Mālinīvijayottara says, "evaṁbhutam idaṁ vastu bhavatyāti yadā punaḥ / jata-tadai vatat tadvat kurvvatyatra-kriyocayate".29 So Kriyāśakti is responsible for the assumption of the various definite forms or the putting forth or projection of the universe in its entirety. It is
said that icchā, jñāna and kriyā are the three names given from the human points of view, just as a jewel assumes differentiation according to the reflections of light and viewed from different angles of vision.
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