Brahman though same principle with Paramātman and Bhagavat is mere the substrate with all powers and attributes dormant. Jñāna-yogī's realisation as nirviṣeṣa is primary and inferior. Epistemological support of Śrī Jīva's view. Indeterminate perception of the indiscrete - always prior and inferior to determinate perception of the qualified. Advaita view of supremacy of indeterminate perception refuted. Powers in Brahman proved by derivative meaning of the word as भूति, भृंहयाति. Mukta-pragrabhā vṛtti of the meanings prove unrestricted powers. Śrutī-texts in support. Figurative use of the word Brahman to others also proves the powers in Brahman. Brahman as halo of Śrī Govinda in Brahmaśamhitā. Jñāna-yogī's realisation as nirviṣeṣa not false but partial. Transcendence by śaktiyoga is necessary. Complete Reality is realised through śakti and divine grace. Brahman not actually nirviṣeṣa or niḥṣaktika. Even Śaṅkara admits Brahman to be sarva-jñā and sarva-śakti-samanvita - though these powers denied subsequently through laksanā. Bhāga-laksanā - a weak point of Śaṅkara.
It has been already stated that Brahman is the same principle with Paramātman and Bhagavat; but the only difference is that all the powers and attributes of the Lord are unmanifested or dormant in Brahman. For this reason Brahman is considered to be nirviṣeṣa or attributeless, and devoid of all powers by the Jñāṇayogins. It is also realised by the Jñāṇayogins as unqualified and attributeless. But such realisation, according to Śrī Jīva, is an inferior realisation.

Śrī Jīva has attempted to vindicate this view of Brahman from the epistemological standpoint. The Naiyāyikas hold that before each determinate perception (savikalpa-pratyakṣa) there is an indeterminate perception of the indiscrete and unqualified object. Thus, indeterminate perception (nirvikalpa-pratyakṣa) which is prior to determinate perception is imperfect. Now, Brahman being the undifferentiated (nirvikalpa) and indiscrete aspect of the Reality is similar to the object of indeterminate perception. Therefore, the realisation of Brahman by the Jñāṇayogins as indiscrete and attributeless, as in the case of an indeterminate perception, is certainly inferior to the realisation of Bhagavat with all his powers and attributes which is complete like a determinate perception.

According to the Advaitins indeterminate realisation is final and ultimate in respect of determining the nature of the Reality. But, Śrī Jīva points out that indeterminate perception precedes determinate perception as held by the Naiyāyikas, and
is incomplete in respect of knowing the nature of anything. Therefore, the realisation of the Jñānins about Brahman as devoid of powers and attributes is but incomplete knowledge of the Reality through their indeterminate realisation.

But what is realised by the Jñānins as nirviśeṣa Brahman is in no way niḥśaktika or devoid of powers. This may be proved through the derivative meaning of the word Brahman which presents to us the real nature of Brahman as being endowed with various powers. Śrī Jīva states in his Sarvasambadīnī that the word 'Brahman' which is derived from the root Brṇ, means both brṇhati and brṇhayati i.e. to be great and make others great (1). Śrī Jīva asserts that these meanings prove the existence of powers in Brahman.

But, every word used to denote the Ultimate Reality or Paratattva, should be understood in an unrestricted sense (mukta-pragrāhā-vṛtti). So the word 'Brahman' should mean not only to be great and to make others great, but also unrestricted characteristic of being great, and the power of making great (2). The unrestricted meaning of the word brṇhati refers to His essential nature of unbounded greatness. But, the meaning of brṇhayati which indicates that Brahman is also capable of making others great proves that Brahman possesses the power of doing so. That too should be understood in an unrestricted sense, which means

(1) 'Brahma Brṇhati Brṇhayati'-iti śrutiśca/
Sarvasambadīnī - Page 30 (Sahitya Parishad ed.)

Brhattvād Brṇhanatvāc ca yād Brahma paramam viduh /
'Viṣṇu-Purāṇa 1.12.57.'
that such His powers are also various and unbounded.

Both these meanings are supported by different Śruti-texts. The text like "na tat samaśca abhyadhikaśca drṣyatē" refers to His unbounded essential nature as indicated by brhmhati. The other portion of the text "parśya śaktir vividhaiva śṛyuṣate" refers to His various unbounded powers as indicated by brhmhayati. The one describes the infinite magnitude of the Absolute, and the other stresses its possession of diverse infinite powers. The various powers have been described in the Śvetāsvatara-text (3) as - "Svābhāvīkā jñāna-bala-kriyāca" - i.e. His supreme powers are intrinsic knowledge, will, and activity. Therefore, to bring out the meaning of the word 'Brahman' we must take both brhmhati and brhmhayati into consideration without which the meaning will remain incomplete.

Those who hold the Ultimate Reality to be devoid of powers, take only the brhmhati aspect into consideration, and neglects the brhmhayati aspect, as a result of which the Reality is not understood in its complete form. Thus, the realisation of the followers of jñānamārga is incomplete and partial (asamyag-āmabhava).

Śrī Jiva also puts forward another argument in His Sarva-sambādinī to prove the existence of powers in Brahman. Figurative use (gaunata prayoga) of the word 'Brahman' in persons other than Brahman due to their proximity or likeness (sannidhāna) to Brahman,

(3) Śvetāsvataraopaniṣad - 6. 8.
also proves that there must be powers in Brahman (4). When some powers or attributes of any person are found to exist in another person, gaṇa-prayoga or figurative use is admitted; just as, when strength, etc. of a lion is found to exist in a person, that person is figuratively called as a lion amongst men (purusa-simha). Thus, if Brahman would have been devoid of powers, no one else (like a saint or God) could have been figuratively called as Brahman by the virtue of possessing some powers like that of Brahman.

In the commentary on the Bhāgavata which is famous as Kramasandarbha, Śrī Jīva Gosvāmin describes Brahman as merely knowledge separated from its characteristics like its various powers (5). Brahmāsaṁhitā has proceeded further and described Brahman as the diffused light or rays of Bhagavat who is like the Sun which has taken a form (maṇḍala) as condensed light or rays (6).

Commenting on that verse Śrī Jīva remarks that Śrī Govinda or Bhagavat, though the same principle with Brahman, is the substrate (dharma) because of its qualified specific manifestation, and Brahman is adjective (dharma) because of its unqualified indiscrete manifestation. Therefore, the former i.e. Bhagavat is

(4) Tat-sannidhāna-balenaiva tathātathābhāve 'anyeṣāṃgaṁī- kṛtepi śaktireva paryavasyatītī (Sarvasambādini - Page 30).

(5) Śaktivargalakṣaṇataddharmātiriktaṁ kevalam Jñānaṁ Brahmāti sabdyate. (Krama-Sandarbha - 1. 2. 11.)

(6) Brahma-saṁhitā - verse 49.
like the Sun (disc) (7).

But, by his constrained efforts to interpret Brahman as adjective Śrī Jīva has evidently indicated that actually Brahman is not adjectival like the halo, but is the same substrate of Sat, Cit and Ānanda, which underlies all the aspects of the Divinity. In Bhagavat-Sandarbha Śrī Jīva clearly asserts that Brahman as Sat, Cit and Ānanda is the substantive (viśeṣyam) (8).

The realisation of the Reality by the jñāhins as nirviśeṣa Brahman is not false but, it is rather incomplete or partial realisation because of not realising the real powers and attributes of the all complete Reality. So, this stage of realisation has to be transcended through bhaktiyoga by which alone the complete realisation is possible. Neither jñāna nor yoga is enough for the complete realisation of the infinite powers and glories of Parabrahman. It is only through bhakti which also is a modification of His svarūpa-śakti, that complete realisation of His perfect manifestation dawns upon the devotee through His divine grace.

The most significant point which Śrī Jīva stresses on, is that what is realised by the jñāna-yogins and described by the scriptures as nirviśeṣa Brahman is not actually nirviśeṣa or nihāaktika, i.e. not actually devoid of powers and attributes. Even Śaṅkara, who is the greatest advocate of nirviśeṣa Brahmanavāda,

(7) 'Dvayorekarūpatvēpi viśiṣṭatayā svirbhāvāt Śrī Govindaśya dharmirūpatvam, avidiṣṭatayā svirbhāvāt Brahmapo dharmarūpatvam; tat pūrvasya mandalasthāniyatvamiti bhāvah/ commentary by Śrī Jīva Gosvāmin on the Brahma-Samhitā - verse 49.

(8) Bhagavat-Sandarbha - Page 2,3.
states that Brahman is omniscient and endowed with all powers (sarvajña, sarvaśakti-samanvitam), and that is the meaning obtained from the derivation of Mm the word 'Brahman' (9). Though Śaṅkara has subsequently held Brahman to be devoid of such omniscience and powers, taking resort to Bhāgalakṣaṇā, but that is certainly his weak point in interpreting the Śruti-texts.

Śaṅkara also admits that the word Brahman means some qualified entity by its primary force, but the qualifying attributes or adjectives should be left off retaining only the portion (bhāga) of pure consciousness through implication called bhāgalakṣaṇā. But it is not at all proper to resort to such laksana when it is possible to get the real meaning through the primary sense of a word. It is the primary meaning of the word Brahman which presents the real nature of Brahman as being endowed with Its natural powers.

\textit{(9) Nitya-sūdha-buddha-muktasvabhāvaṁ sarvajñaṁ sarvaśaktisamanvitam Brahma, Brahma-sabdasya hi vyutpādyamānasya nityaśuddhatvādasya rthāḥ pratiyante,} 
\textit{vrhaterdhātorarthānugamāḥ/} Ṣaṅkara-
\textit{Brahmasūtra-bhāṣya - 1. 1. 1.}